

Summary of stakeholder comments received to the Hanover & Elm Grove Residents Parking Review

Who	Object/Supports/Comments	Summary	Officer comments
Brighton & Hove City Primary Care Trust	Comments	The proposed pay & display charging bands should offer more flexibility to assist visitors to park at GP surgeries for periods of up to one hour	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme.
East Brighton ward member	Comments	The majority view of residents within the Craven Vale area should be respected	See main body of report, 4.15
Bicycles & CTC	Comments	Supports parking control and preventing parking on the pavement but opposes one way street proposals unless they allow for two way cycling	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme.
East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service	Comments	Would formally object to any reduction in useable road width of less than 3.1m across the scheme	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme.
Elm Grove Residents Action Group	Objects/comment	Proposal not linked to any coherent transport strategy for supporting green initiatives and dealing with congestion. Permits cost too much and do not reflect car CO2 emissions. Proposed restrictions of 9am - 8pm and weekends are too restrictive. Parking capacity will be cut by up to 50%. One vote per household consultation is not democratic. Scheme takes no account of key workers. Alternatives such as light touch scheme have	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme. The parking proposals were linked to the council's Local Transport Plan policies and the experience of putting in successful schemes throughout the city. Permit prices are set annually by councillors on advice of officers and do reflect CO2 emissions. The consultation procedure followed established council guidelines which are informed by central government advice. The purpose of the consultation being to find out resident's views on the proposed options.
Hanover & Elm Grove ward	Comments	The majority view of residents within the ward should be respected	See main body of report, 4.9 - 4.10 inclusive
Queen's Park ward members	Comments	Residents' views should not be amalgamated across all areas, if particular sub areas vote for a scheme it should be progressed in those	See main body of report, 4.13 - 4.15 inclusive
South Downs NHS Trust	Comments	Concerned about the impact on staff working at and visiting the Brighton General Hospital site and of the financial impact on the organisation. Mobile health workers need a longer timed parking permit than the current one hour permit.	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme.
South east coast ambulance service	Supports/comment	Support parking control but have similar concerns as SDNHS Trust regarding impact on staff parking. The service is based based at Elm Grove adjacent to the Brighton General Hospital	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme.
Streets for people - Hanover	Supports/comment	Broadly support parking controls but council should be doing more to promote sustainable transport. Opposes one-way streets unless they allow two way cycle operation.	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme. The parking proposals were linked to the council's Local Transport Plan policies.
St Luke's Primary school	Objects	Concerned about the impact on staff working at the school.	It is proposed to retain the current "light touch " scheme within the St Luke's area. The council provides for a limited number of teacher parking permits within parking schemes.
St Martin's church	comments	No facilities are provided for church visitors	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme. However short and medium term pay & display facilities were included in the proposals
St Martins C of E primary school	Comments	No consideration has been given to the needs of school staff.	It is not proposed to progress a parking scheme. The scheme proposals contained provision for short and medium term shared pay and display parking and for a limited number of teacher parking permits.

