

REPORT ON PARKING IN SEAFORD ANNEX A

SYNOPSIS OF CONSULTATION RESULTS JANUARY / FEBRUARY 2007

This Annex briefly describes the consultation process and presents a synopsis of the results which are more fully described in Annex B (report by Alpha Parking) and Annex C (Analysis of Written Responses).

The exercise undertaken in January and February 2007 was intended to more fully consult not only those residents and businesses within areas of Seaford that, in earlier consultations, had expressed support for parking controls, but also those in surrounding streets who might be affected by displaced parking if those controls were to be introduced. To that end, questionnaire packs, including information on possible proposals, were distributed to all addresses in the area concerned. Exhibitions and road-shows were held, a telephone hotline was set up, and the proposals shown on the ESCC website.

The consultation exercise generated interest and responses from an area within and around Seaford much larger than the intended consultation area. As a result, two distinct sets of consultation analysis data are available:

- analysis of the questionnaire survey including additional comments added to questionnaires or given via hotline and exhibition comments books (details presented in Annex B);
- analysis of separate written responses received (details presented in Annex C).

It is important to remember that these datasets are not directly compatible.

The questionnaire survey had a typical structured format with explicit questions and associated multiple choice answers (other than a general additional comments section). It was distributed to all addresses within a defined survey area, and was also supported by an explanatory information pack distributed with each questionnaire. About 36% (968) of householders and 55% (96) of businesses within the consultation area responded which is a more than adequate sample representative of the whole consultation area. (*Annex B*)

At the other extreme, separate written responses were self-selecting from within and outside the consultation area. They included commentary only on those issues that the respondent considered most important at the time of writing, and it cannot be ascertained whether or not the respondent had an information pack, or similar detailed knowledge about the proposals. Over 1150 written responses were received of which more than 75% were standard or adapted pro-formas. After accounting for duplicates or multiples, 1054 letters were analysed. Of those, 28% were from streets within the consultation area, 61% from other parts of Seaford, and 11% from outside Seaford. (*Annex C*)

Using the above datasets the following observations and comparisons can be made:

1. Within the consultation area 14% of households have no car. 57% have one car, 24% two cars, and 5% three or more cars. (*Annex B*)
2. A majority of respondents opposed introduction of the consultation proposals. For residents, this varied from 66% of questionnaire responses to 98.5% of written responses (irrespective of home address). The responses from businesses were more strongly against at 90% and 100% respectively. (*Annex B, Annex C*)
3. In nine streets (or part thereof) in the consultation area, there was a majority of residents in favour of the scheme. In all other streets in the consultation area there was either a majority against or the number of responses was too small to draw conclusions. (*Annex B*)
4. On no section of the seafront was there a majority of adjacent residents supporting charging. (*Annex B*) Few written responses dealt specifically with parking on the seafront; 6% opposed proposals for charging on the seafront with less than 1% supporting them. (*Annex C*)
5. Regardless of any possible variations in the proposed times of operation, at least about a half (55%) of consultation area residents and 86% of consultation area businesses would continue to oppose controls of the type consulted on. (*Annex B*)

6. 83.5% of consultation area businesses would not want controls in their street if an adjacent street was included in a scheme. Opposition is less strong among residents with nearly 30% stating that they would wish to be part of a parking zone if it was introduced in an adjacent street. (*Annex B*)
7. 88% of consultation area businesses feared that there would be a loss of trade if the proposals were implemented (*Annex B*). 73% of written responses raised the concerns either that town centre traders would be badly hit or that businesses and residents would be adversely affected by the proposals. (*Annex C*)
8. Of the written responses, about a quarter (24%) suggested improvements to existing car parks and signing, 15% that off street car parking should be more reasonably priced, and 11% that better enforcement of existing restrictions was required. (*Annex C*)
9. Many respondents considered that the proposed charging levels were too high and/or were designed to raise surplus funds for the County Council: 27% of consultation area residents, 41% of consultation area businesses, and 9% of written responses (*Annex B, Annex C*)