

## **REPORT ON PARKING IN SEAFORD ANNEX C ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN RESPONSES**

The Seaford parking consultation carried out in Jan/Feb 2007 sought to obtain the views of those households and businesses within the proposed control areas by means of a standard questionnaire. In addition to such responses, the County Council also received a number of written responses, comprising:

- over 1150 letters;
- 5 petitions / packages of responses.

The responses of Seaford Town Council, Seaford Chamber of Commerce and Seaford Residents Association (each of which was opposed to the proposals) were considered individually in preparing the response to the consultation, as were individual petitions.

All other written responses analysed with comments categorised in accordance with the codes in Schedule 1. Letters were analysed and spreadsheets prepared, linking each letter with its ESCC postal system reference number, its content and its street of origin. Respondent's name and exact street address have not been included. The spreadsheets (Seaford Parking File 1 and Seaford Parking File 2) present the data as 'address-based', but with a field to show the number of individual signatories to all letters received from that address.

The spreadsheet analysis does not include:

- Letters from Seaford Town Council, Seaford Chamber of Commerce and Seaford Residents Association
- A Petition of 765 signatures supporting the Chamber of Commerce's rejection of the consultation proposals;
- A bundle of 30 Consultation Questionnaire responses from a Residents Association in the proposed eastern control area (which would have been included in the overall analysis of all formal Consultation Questionnaire responses carried out by Alpha Parking);
- A bundle of 31 pro-forma letters supplied by a town centre shop (this letter is the basis for one of the more frequent standard responses received by the County Council). This bundle was not included in the spreadsheet analysis as none gave an address (only signatures).

- A bundle of 48 letters received by the County Council at various times during the consultation but without addresses and therefore not booked in to the ESCC postal system. A handful of such letters that had been booked in to the ESCC system at various times have been included in the analysis.
- An individually signed listing, supplied by a resident in the Fitzgerald Road area, of other residents in that area confirming that they have responded to the consultation by written response.

Most written responses included more than one comment. As is usual, therefore, the total number of comments recorded exceeds the total number of written responses received.

The key results from the analysis of the written responses are:

1. A total of 1054 'principal' letters were identified. A further 105 letters were identified as being linked to a 'principal' letter (e.g. husband and wife replying separately but identically – or more than one response from the same person). 'Principal' letters may have been co-signed. The total number of identifiable individuals directly associated with 'principal' letters was 1221.
2. Although the survey was intended to canvass only those areas directly affected by the outline proposals, written responses were received from all over the town, and from outside the town. Of the 1054 'principal letters' 298 (28%) were from streets within the consultation proposals area, 642 (61%) from other parts of Seaford, and 114 (11%) from addresses outside Seaford. 35 were identified as from local businesses of which 31 were within the consultation proposals area.
3. A large majority (more than 75%) of 'principal' letter responses were based wholly or largely on groups of words up to a paragraph in length (and often even the whole letter) that appear to have had their basis in pro-forma responses etc circulating in and around all or part of the town.
4. Most written responses therefore dealt with the issues in a relatively general manner that was not site specific. Significant exceptions were the standard pro-forma responses received relating to the Blue Door Nursery in

Wilmington Road; from staff at Brooklyn Motors; from residents in the Bramber Road / Ashurst Road / Dean Road area; and from members of the Crouch Bowling Club.

5. Of the 1054 'principal' letters, 1039 (98.5%) objected to the CPZ and allied proposals (including all 35 local businesses). 1 supported the proposals (resident within the proposed control area) with the remaining 13 not expressing a view (of which 9 were resident within the proposed control area).
6. The most commonly expressed concerns were that town centre traders would be badly hit (354 comments or 33% of total 'principal' letters) and/or that both businesses and residents would be adversely affected (423 comments or 40% of total 'principal' letters);
7. 90 (9% of total 'principal' letters) expressed the specific concern that the charging proposals were excessive and/or designed to raise funds for the County Council.
8. Having expressed their views on the overall proposals, and their strategic concerns, fewer respondents went on to give their specific views on current parking issues and possible changes that they may support. The most frequent supplementary specific comments included:
  - a. 153 (15% of total 'principal' letters) supported free on-street parking in the town centre;
  - b. 146 (14%) expressed the view that there are no current parking problems in Seaford;
  - c. 252 (24%) suggested "improve existing car parks and signing";
  - d. 164 (15%) wanted "reasonably priced" off street car parks with 52 (5%) suggesting that they be free of charge;
  - e. 114 (11%) suggested "better enforcement of existing restrictions".
9. Few 'principal' letters specifically mentioned the seafront - 60 (6%) rejected proposals for charging for parking on the seafront, with less than 1% (6) supporting the proposal.

## Schedule 1: Categories used in Analysis of Correspondence

### General Opposition (C)

- C1 Generally oppose CPZ etc proposals*
- C2 No current problems justifying proposals of this kind*
- C3 Finances (money raising exercise / stealth tax / excessive charges / etc)*
- C4 Avoid repetition of (perceived bad) Lewes example*
- C5 Consultation flawed*
- C6 Town Centre residents should expect less convenient parking*

### General Support (S)

- S1 Generally support CPZ etc proposals*
- S2 Acknowledgement that there are problems that need new measures*
- S3 Brooklyn Motors / Chichester Road problem needs addressing*
- S4 Supports charging on seafront*
- S5 Avondale road / Sutton drove needs addressing*

### General Objection

- O1 Will damage town centre trade*
- O2 Businesses and residents will be adversely affected*
- O3 Residents have rights to parking on the highway*
- O4 where do town centre workers park*
- O5 Concern over impact on streets surrounding controlled areas*
- O6 Rail commuters will transfer to Bishopstone*
- O7 No viable public transport alternative to car*

### General Proposals

- P1 Improve existing car parks and signing*
- P2 Provide reasonably priced off street parking (partic for commuters and workers)*
- P3 Provide free on street parking for shoppers and visitors*
- P4 More car parks needed*
- P5 Better enforcement of existing restrictions*
- P6 Free town centre car parks*
- P7 Better parking for rail users*
- P8 Provide permits for town centre workers*
- P9 Very short period parking hours restrictions in residential areas to deter commuters/workers should be more widely used*
- P10 Improve / publicise public transport*

- P11 On street charges in heart of town centre OK*  
*P12 Provide designated cycle routes*

### Specific Objections

- SO1 Oppose proposals for roads around Crouch Bowling Club*  
*SO2 Oppose proposals for Wilmington Road*  
*SO3 Impact of local proposals on viability of Brooklyn Motors*  
*SO4 Oppose proposals for Bramber Road / Ashurst Road area*  
*SO5 Oppose charging on seafront*  
*SO6 Oppose proposals for Pelham Road / Dane Road*  
*SO7 Oppose proposals for Chyngton Road*  
*SO8 Oppose proposals for Steyne Road*  
*SO9 Oppose proposals for Stafford Road*  
*SO10 Oppose proposals for Fitzgerald Avenue*  
*SO11 Oppose proposals for Grosvenor Road*  
*SO12 Oppose proposals for Cornfield Road / Meads Road*  
*SO13 Oppose proposals for College Road area*  
*SO14 Oppose proposals for Corsica Close*  
*SO15 Oppose proposals for Belgrave Road*  
*SO16 Oppose proposals affecting Seaford Head Lower School area*  
*SO17 Oppose proposals for roads around Seaford Primary School*  
*SO18 Oppose proposals for Kedale Road*  
*SO19 Oppose proposals for Sutton Road*  
*SO20 Oppose proposals for Chichester Road / Blatchington Road area (partic re Seaford bowling Club)*  
*SO21 Oppose proposals for Chichester Road*  
*SO22 Oppose proposals for Church Street*  
*SO23 Oppose proposals for Chyngton Road [duplicate of SO7!]*  
*SO24 Oppose proposals for Highlands Drove*  
*SO25 Oppose proposals for Sutton Drove*  
*SO26 Oppose proposals for Southdown Road*  
*SO27 Oppose proposals for Cricketfield Road*  
*SO28 Oppose proposals for Salisbury Road*  
*SO29 Oppose proposals for St Crispians*

### Specific Counter Proposals

- SP1 For Bramber Road / Ashurst Road area*  
*SP2 Ban some/all parking in Broad Street*  
*SP3 For Steyne Road / South Street area*  
*SP4 For Claremont Road (Brooklyn Motors) area*  
*SP5 Extend west zone to include Edinburgh Road area*

*SP6 For Fitzgerald Avenue area*

*SP7 Reduce free max on street parking time in heart of town  
centre (to 1 or even ½ hour)*

*SP8 For Salisbury Road area*

*SP9 For Sutton Drove area*

*SP10 For Belgrave Road area*

*SP11 For Grosvenor Road area*