

Richmond Heights Area Residents Parking Scheme (extension to Area C) Consultation Report January 2012

Background

In September 2009 a letter plus short questionnaire about parking issues was sent to all property addresses in the Hanover and Elm Grove Area. In addition workshops had also been held in the local area with residents and stakeholders to establish sufficient demand to proceed to informal consultation on the introduction of a residents parking scheme. Maps and plans for consultation on a proposed parking scheme for Hanover and Elm Grove area were designed, based on evidence gathered in these 3 exercises, and also from on-street parking surveys conducted by Mott MacDonald (traffic engineering and transport planning consultancy) and in consultation with ward councillors.

It was decided not to proceed with a scheme for the Hanover and Elm Grove area due to the negative response from the overall area.

However, respondents from a segment of the Hanover and Elm Grove area in the Richmond Heights area were broadly in favour of a scheme. At the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 9 November 2011, it was agreed to consult these residents again to determine whether they would like the opportunity to join the neighbouring Area C (Queens Park) residents parking scheme

Headline Findings

The consultation achieved a 23% response rate.

61% of respondents were in favour of joining the Area C Parking Zone.

Methodology

Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 1086 property addresses in the Richmond Heights Area of Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. For the first time in a BHCC Residents Parking Scheme Consultation, respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: 21 respondents (8.5%) chose this method.

Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at:

St Mary's Church Hall, 61 St James' Street, Brighton

- Tuesday 10 January, 2012 ,1.30pm to 5.30pm
- Thursday 12 January, 2012, 3.30pm to 7pm

There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Tuesday 3 January, 2012 to Tuesday 31 January, 2012, 9am to 5pm. There are 17 streets in the proposed scheme area.

253 valid responses¹ were received giving a response rate of 23%.

Results

Q1 Are you in favour of a residents parking scheme in your street?²

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
151	61	98	39	249

Results on a street by street basis were as follows:

Street	No. properties mailed	No. forms returned	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Albion Street	92	15	16	9	60	6	40
Ashton Rise	158	20	13	16	80	4	20
Elmore Road	31	9	29	6	67	3	33
Grove Hill	156	21	13	13	62	8	38
Ivory Place	25	5	20	3	60	2	40
John Street	155	27	17	19	70	8	30
Queens Park Road	132	32	24	15	47	17	53
Richmond Gardens	3	1	33	0	0	1	100
Richmond Parade	16	5	31	4	80	1	20
Richmond Street	70	27	38.5	13	48	14	52
Stanley Street	52	19	36.5	10	53	9	47
Sussex Place	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sussex Street	55	15	27	12	80	3	20
Tarner Road	39	7	20	4	57	3	43
Tilbury Way	32	9	28	7	78	2	22
Windmill Street	61	34	56	20	59	14	41
Windmill Terrace	8	3	37.5	0	0	3	100
Total	1086	249	23	151	61	98	39

¹ Responses from outside the area (x1) or where no street name was given (x8) have been removed from the analysis but included in an Appendix.

² 4 responses where people have not replied whether they are in favour of the proposed scheme have been removed from the analysis of this question.

Q2 Respondents were asked whether they are a resident, a business owner or manager or work in the area. Respondents could tick more than one option.

	No. responses	% responses
Resident	244	96.5
Business owner or manager	8	3
Work in the area	13	5

Q3a How many cars in your household?

No. of cars	No. responses	Total No. cars	%
0	63	0	25.5
1	146	146	59.5
2	34	68	14
3	1	3	0.5
4 or more	1	4	0.5
Total	245	221	100

245 respondents have at least 221 vehicles.

Q3b Do you have access to off-street car parking?

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
31	13.5	199	86.5	230

Q4a What type of business do you own or manage in the area?

What type of business?	No. responses	% responses
Retail outlet	2	1
Office-based	3	1
Other, includes tyre and exhaust company, dentist, driving instructor, hair & beauty salon, music teacher, office at home, work from home (x2), site manager Carlton school,	9	4
Total responses	14	100

Q4b How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

No. of vehicles	No. responses	Total No. vehicles	%
0	2	0	
1	5	5	
2	1	2	
3	1	3	
4 or more	3	12	
Total	12	22	100

12 respondents had at least 22 vehicles associated with their business.

Q5 Any other comments?

An open text box enabled respondents to add comments. Although expressed in residents' own words analysis of the open text shows common themes emerged and have been grouped as follows:

Comments	No. of times made	% responses
Don't want to pay to park / it is too expensive	35	19.5
General positive comments	32	18
There will be no guarantee of a parking place/ number of parking places will be reduced	24	14
The scheme will discourage displacement/ commuter/ long term parking in the area	22	13
There are no parking problems in the area/ scheme not needed	10	6
Don't want to pay for visitors to park	8	4.5
The scheme will discourage parking on the pavement	7	4
General negative comments	7	4
There will be less cars parked on narrow streets = better access especially for emergency vehicles	6	3
The scheme will cause displacement	6	3
Want different hours of operation	4	2
I think this will make the parking situation worse	4	2
The scheme won't solve evening parking	3	2
I am worried that the Amex extension will make parking worse in the area	3	2
This is a money making exercise	2	1
Would like more car club spaces	1	0.5
I am worried that we won't get more than one permit	1	0.5
This will stop cars getting damaged	1	0.5
The scheme should cover more of Hanover	1	0.5
Total comments	177	100

Demographic Information

Gender

Gender	No.	%
Male	127	50
Female	113	44.5
Transgender	1	0.5
Prefer not to say/ no reply	12	5
Total	253	100

Age

Age	No.	%
18-24	7	3
25-34	44	17.5
35-44	54	21.5
45-54	48	19
55-64	55	22
65-74	21	8.5
75+	17	7
Prefer not to say/ no reply	7	3
Total	253	100³

Disability

Disability	No.	%
Yes	59	23.3
No	157	62.1
Prefer not to say/ no reply	37	14.6
Total	253	100

³ Does not add up to 100 due to rounding

Ethnicity

Ethnicity		No.	%
White	English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	210	83
	Irish	4	1.6
	Gypsy	-	-
	Traveller	-	-
	Polish	-	-
	Portuguese	1	0.4
	Any other white background	11	4.3
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	1	0.4
	Indian	-	-
	Pakistani	-	-
	Chinese	-	-
	Any other Asian background	2	0.8
Black or Black British	African	-	-
	Caribbean	-	-
	Sudanese	1	0.4
	Any other black background	1	0.4
Mixed	Asian & White	2	0.8
	Asian & Black African	-	-
	Asian & Black Caribbean	-	-
	White & Black African	1	0.4
	White & Black Caribbean	-	-
	Any other mixed background	-	-
	Other ethnic group	Turkish	-
Arab		1	0.4
Japanese		-	-
Other ethnic group		1	0.4
Prefer not to say/ no reply		17	6.7
Total		253	100

Further Information

Responses received with no street details given:

9 responses were received with no street names given so it is difficult to know whether these are from within the consultation area. 8 of these were hard copy forms; as these were mailed to all residents, it is likely that these are from within the area and the other was an online response.

5 of these are in favour of a scheme and 4 are not in favour.

Responses received from outside the area:

2 responses were received from people living outside the consultation area, both were received online:

1 from Marine Parade who is not in favour of the scheme.

The other came from Scotland Street in Hanover who is in favour of the scheme.

