

Information provided by the Acting Director of Environment.

*Call-in letter paragraphs in italics*

1. *"I believe the decision not to extend the parking area 'U' to the Northern end of Queen's Park Rise, or to implement parking restrictions of any sort in either Canning Street, or the area identified in the report to the meeting as 'Richmond Heights', was taken improperly, as it ignored the results of the consultation that were made in the streets concerned – where a majority of residents voted FOR such parking schemes – and because of flaws in the consultation process itself."*
2. Brighton & Hove City Council's consultation process for the introduction of parking schemes and for reviews of schemes is based on national guidance issued by the Department of Transport and on the council's own Public Consultation Policy. It is a three-stage process. At each stage of the process, a member decision on whether to proceed or not is made based on the information and results provided in the relevant report.
  - Stage 1: Information/decision about where to introduce a parking scheme
  - Stage 2: Consultation to ascertain public opinion and information about what is required
  - Stage 3: Formal Traffic Regulation Order to make scheme legally enforceable
3. The decision to consult (Stage 1) on the Hanover, Elm Grove, Queen's Park, Craven Vale and Bakers' Bottom area was taken at Environment Committee in January 2008 when the timetable for the next few years was agreed. Information gathering included data surveys which analysed parking patterns and vehicle capacity and took place in 2009.
4. For this entire area, it was decided to introduce an additional consultation prior to the design & survey leaflet. This took place in September - November 2009. It was designed to gauge local opinion about car parking issues and to let residents and businesses know that further consultation on a parking scheme would follow. This consultation consisted of a short questionnaire sent to households/premises in the identified area. A series of workshops were also held with representatives from local communities, businesses, transport providers and the emergency services, and ward councillors.
5. The usual consultation period (Stage 2) consists of a detailed map and questionnaire sent to all residents and businesses in the relevant area. This took place during April 2010. There were also public exhibitions with staff from the council and the consultants on hand to answer any queries or to explain more about parking schemes. Any telephone

calls or e-mail queries were also responded to throughout the entire period.

6. The outcomes and information from both consultation periods were fully analysed, with the detailed results broken down into areas and presented at Environment Cabinet Member Meetings on 25 March 2010 and 16 September 2010 respectively.
7. The consultation therefore followed a clear and agreed process, enabling residents to respond confidentially to both postal surveys as well as to take the opportunity to discuss issues with officers. The council cannot be responsible for resident campaigns for or against parking schemes but it is clear that its own consultation process was conducted properly and correctly.
8. All the results of the consultation were clearly presented as public documents at Environment Cabinet Member meetings and therefore no results or opinions were ignored or disregarded in the decision-making process.
9. ***“In short, figures show many residents who do not own cars chose not to respond to the consultation, thus skewing the results, and because of fear of ‘death threats’ (as reported in The Argus of 22/9/2010) many residents felt it was unsafe to state their views accurately.”***
10. The council cannot second-guess why people do not respond to consultation. We also cannot assume that those who do not reply are in favour or are against the proposals. We can only draw conclusions from those that express a preference. The response rate for this parking scheme consultation is a reasonable percentage for such surveys but is lower than in many areas where parking schemes have been introduced.
11. The council is aware that there was a local campaign in the Hanover & Elm Grove area against the introduction of any scheme. Representation from all groups, whether for or against, were presented in the September 2010’s Environment CMM report. As stated above we cannot be responsible for how residents choose to express their approval or disapproval for our proposals but our consultation questionnaire ensures that residents can express their preferences and opinions in a confidential manner.
12. ***“This decision has important ramifications, both for **community safety in the streets concerned** (as emergency vehicles have experienced problems accessing some residences on said streets due to unregulated parking of cars restricting access), and democratically, as residents feel their views as expressed in the consultation should have been taken into account.”***

13. There is no legal obligation to bring forward resident parking schemes on road safety grounds. Road safety solutions are needed for specific accident related issues, not parking controls. The council will always respond to individual or local requests for safety measures such as double yellow lines. These requests will be assessed and if suitable, presented for consultation and approval via the Traffic Order process. In areas of high parking demand, the council would prefer to introduce regulations via a parking scheme as this provides options for resident and other parking alongside visibility and access considerations. However we have always stated that we will consult on schemes to see what local communities want and that there are no forgone outcomes with regard to this. All views expressed during the consultation were taken into account and reproduced within the relevant reports but the majority opinion did not wish for regulation in the form of a parking scheme.
14. *“The consultation document itself made clear that **results for small areas within the full consultation zone could lead to new parking restrictions in those areas**, even if a majority of residents in the entire area voted against any such scheme.”*
15. There were pockets within the whole area consulted where residents who voted were in favour of a parking scheme. However, the council took into account the impact of proceeding in smaller areas when adjacent narrow streets would remain unregulated and the decision was not to proceed with individual streets or small pockets of streets.

