

**Response to Call in of City Wide Parking Review
Response from Strategic Director Place**

Cllr Pissaridou's letter

Lack of consultation with local residents or current councillors –

The citywide review itself was established by a CMM decision and the principle was supported by all parties prior to the election. Officers experience of and the outcome of consultations on previous reviews has significantly influenced the proposals that have been put forward in the report. Officers are aware of the views of ward members and residents and this has been detailed in the report.

The report was based on the existing timetable and not a broad review of strategy –

The report wasn't based on the existing timetable as it was rescinded by the last Cabinet member on the basis it was no longer valid given the high degree of opposition from residents to the last 2 Consultations, including the larger Hanover & Elm Grove area where it was 70% against. The report combines obvious urgent adjustments to existing schemes alongside the recommendation to commence the citywide review itself. The sufficient evidence of support for taking forward these urgent adjustments is based on the last formal and informal consultations that had a high degree of support; there are also safety concerns – i.e. Canning Street.

The old parking timetable was not appended –

The previous parking review timetable is referred to in the report and the minutes of Environment Committee 24 January 2008 are a background paper (Item 118). The old timetable is already in the public domain and still on the Council's website.

Cllr Peltzer Dunn's letter

Lack of clarity around the timetable –

The proposed timetable for the urgent adjustments and extensions to schemes is set out in Appendix B of the ECMM report. It is intended to start preparatory work on the longer term city wide review next month, subject to democratic processes. Some internal research and consultation with officers has already begun, this was reflected in the report to ECMM and in Appendix D summary of issues. Consultation with external stakeholders should begin this year and continue until September/October 2012. Officer experience is that postal consultation is best undertaken following a period of pre publicity and the best time of year is between the Easter and Spring half term holidays, it is therefore proposed to undertake that in Spring 2012. The results will be analysed in summer 2012 and reported back to the Cabinet Member in October 2012.

Paragraph 3.4 it is still difficult to identify a larger geographically viable boundary supported by residents and ward members which, if sub

Agenda Item 23 Appendix 5

divided, would not cause immediate displacement” is factually inaccurate –

The area originally proposed for consultation was the larger West Hove & Portslade area not the Wish Park area. There are similarities between this larger area and Hanover & Elm Grove in that there may be an overall rejection of a parking scheme with smaller areas and single roads supporting a scheme, there will then be the same dilemma as to which, if any, area would proceed and what displacement could result. It is also uncertain whether to proceed with a light touch or a full scheme. Previous experience of light touch schemes has shown that they do not eliminate the problem of displacement; in fact they can make it worse, as they are not as flexible. The longer term city wide review could provide information that would enable officers to produce proposals that could improve parking management over the whole city as well as gauge residents' views on appropriate solutions for their areas.

The statement about Road Safety concerns in West Hove & Portslade is not accurate –

It is not intended to imply that there are no Road Safety issues in parts of West Hove & Portslade, only that the situation in other areas, particularly the proposed area C & J extensions, is more severe, for example in terms of double parking, congestion, traffic circulation and visibility at junctions. The report author is a professional engineer of 17 years experience in Parking Management and Road Safety Engineering and has consulted with fellow officers. Visits to all areas have taken place on different times of day and the previous consultation and correspondence has been reviewed.

Uncertainty as to what has been recommended in terms of resources –

the timetable is clearly set out in the report, and is resourced. There is a requirement for officers to investigate extra resources for an accelerated timetable, but this is not incompatible.

No consultation has been carried out in roads falling outside of Zone A extension i.e. roads south of Dyke Road/Dyke Road Avenue in Hove –

There has been consultation, residents previously rejected a parking scheme, this issue is addressed in the report, appendix D

Working group to look at Wish Ward – this is an open offer made by the Cabinet Member and officers are ready to actively engage in the process.

Attachments –

- **ECMM report 4th October 2011**
- **Environment Committee Report 24 January 2008 (includes previous timetable)**

*Owen McElroy LLB, DMPR.cert, MIHE
Project Manager*