

ditional resident, business & other stakeholder requests for parking reviews or policy changes received in the last 12 months

| Stakeholder | Summary of request/comment | Request for parking review (PR) or other Other | Officer comments |
|--|---|--|--|
| Lansdowne Road Area Residents Association | Merge CPZs M & O to create larger zone and alleviate resident parking problems in M | PR | Parking zone too large and could result in internal commuting. Lacks ward member support, Lack of evidence of support from residents in O. |
| Kestrel Close, Hove residents | Include road in Area O CPZ | PR | Residents previously said No in consultation. Lack of evidence of consensus support. |
| Manor Hill residents | Request to extend Zone H northwards | PR | Waiting restrictions and access protection lines are being investigated but there are road safety concerns over increased vehicle speeds, parking management may be a solution but there is insufficient evidence of support from residents at present. Parking problems during racecourse events. |
| Nevill Road Rottindean Residents | Request for localised resident parking zone | PR | Insufficient evidence of widespread support, and potential displacement to adjoining roads. |
| Upper Lewes Road/Lewes Road triangle residents | Request for residents parking zone | PR | Requests mainly from Park Crescent area and do not represent majority. Area previously rejected parking scheme in consultation. |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|
| Various residents | Smaller parking zones to reduce waiting times and reflect local conditions e.g. Palmeira Avenue, Hove | PR | Smaller parking zones give residents less flexibility over where they can park their car and result in longer waiting lists as a permit only becomes available when a resident leaves the area. If the zone is as small as a street, this can be a matter of years. |
| Hove Park residents e.g. The Droveaway, Onslow road | Number of long term parked vehicles, request single yellow lines or mixture of resident only and time limited bays | PR | Residents previously rejected a parking scheme, single yellow lines may cause displacement and difficulties for visitors, time limited bays would be difficult to enforce and may not solve local problems |
| Various residents | Residents in roads outside of but adjoining CPZs would like to be able to have a permit to park in the adjoining CPZ e.g. Queen's Park Road | PR | Roads in a wide area are consulted when a scheme is proposed and given a chance to vote to be in a scheme. In some zones there may be spare capacity and a potential to trial a "transitional zone permit" charged at a reduced rate and for part of a year but allow parking in the nearby CPZ, this could help reduce displacement although could only be used in areas without a waiting list. The danger is this sets a precedent and could be demanded by residents in congested areas adjacent to schemes at or near capacity, disadvantaging residents in those schemes. |
| Various residents | Provide individually marked disabled bays in residential areas | Other | There would be increased costs to the council to administer and this would have to be passed on to residents, more consultation required. |
| Local MPs | Disabled, loading, ambulance and doctors bays do not need to be 24 hour, enabling visitors to park in evenings/Sundays | Other | Conversion of some loading bays already begun. In respect of disabled bays need to be aware of Disability Discrimination Act obligations and relevant DfT guidance, particularly away from City centre locations. The needs of doctors' and ambulance bays vary according to type of premises. address in consultation |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|
| Various residents | Restrict verge and pavement parking due to obstruction and damage | Other | Needs majority support in an area to work and should not be considered as an alternative to a CPZ. New signs have been approved by the DfT but require advertising by traffic order and therefore support from members and residents. Already |
| Y & Z residents (especially Clarence Square) | Can we move to 24 our permits? Permit holders unable to park in the evenings | Other | Displacement issues, residents on waiting list disadvantaged, expense and risks of enforcement. The current parking enforcement contract operates between 7am and midnight. Could address as part of consultation and look at 24hr enforcement in the new parking enforcement contract which is due to commence Jan 2013. Could cause problems for residents on waiting lists as they use spaces after controlled hours as spare off street capacity |
| MPs for Hove & Brighton Pavilion | Request for overlap zones at CPZ boundaries enabling more flexibility for residents | Other | Difficulties in administering permit system, some residents may have two permits, difficulties in defining overlap boundaries. See also comments for roads outside of but adjoining CPZs |
| MPs for Hove & Brighton Pavilion | Introduce 15 minutes free parking for visitors | Other | Technically challenging to achieve, creates difficulties for enforcement. May have widespread financial implications for the council. The CEOs would be unaware if a visitor or resident- difficult to enforce |
| Visitors | Inconvenience of having to use coins for parking, would like to pay by mobile/online | Other | There are costs and benefits to the introduction of pay by phone, research is currently underway in respect of establishing a Business Case. Consider in consultation. |
| Various stakeholders | Should be a no limit on the number of resident/visitor permits | Other | Capacity issue, particularly difficult in areas where there is a waiting list. Unlimited visitor permits could lead to them being resold. Consider in consultation |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------|---|
| <p>Various stakeholders</p> | <p>Permit fees and parking charges should contribute towards climate change policy e.g. higher charges for second permits and for more polluting vehicles</p> | <p>Other</p> | <p>Links to sustainability objectives. This is a complex area e.g. higher polluting vehicles that are seldom used may contribute less to the city's pollution issues than smaller cc vehicles that are used daily for short journeys in heavily congested area. Difficulty in admistering higher charge for 2nd permit particularly for students arriving at the same time. Consider in consultation but there must be a careful analysis of costs and benefits.</p> |
| <p>Motorcycle Action Group</p> | <p>Motorcycles (M/Cs) should be able to park in permit, shared & exclusive P&D bays</p> | <p>Other</p> | <p>Council provides free of charge m/c bays in most streets and close to major amenities but it could be argued there are not enough m/c bays in certain areas e.g. Lanes & North Laine. Also some bays are not as well used because of problematic cambers (bikes fall over in them) MAG also raised concerns about trikes and motor cycles with side cars. The TRO states they are not permitted to park in a motor cycle bay and should park in a P&D bay but problem of where to display a P&D ticket. Current difficulties in attaching permits to m/cs.</p> |