The St Marks area of Ladywood is located in the heart of Birmingham where demand for parking is high due to the close proximity to Birmingham’s Broad Street, Barclaycard Arena and City Centre. Consultation has been carried out on proposals for the area with the intention of finding a solution to help manage parking.
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Background

The CPZ programme seeks to assess the need for and feasibility of introducing area-wide parking controls to help address reported parking problems

Introduction

Consultation on a programme for the development of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) across the city was undertaken in 2010. A priority ranked list of areas was developed identifying areas where further work was to be undertaken; Westside (incorporating Central Ladywood and St Marks areas) was one of the priorities identified.

Initial public consultation was carried out in the St Marks area in 2013. Birmingham City Council (BCC) worked with Atkins, its consultants at the time, and this became known as the Stage 1 consultation phase. At the time around 82% of respondents said they would be supportive of a permit scheme and other controls suggested across the area.

The outcome of the Stage 1 consultation provided some justification for the development of parking proposals. However, the Council was not able to continue at the time due to the availability of resources and the prioritisation of other highway schemes across the City.

In 2015 BCC was able to revisit parking proposals in Ladywood. It was decided it would be appropriate to carry out further informal consultation to understand what people who visit, live and work in the St Marks area think about the current parking situation and what proposals they would like to see.

AECOM was commissioned by BCC to support them in managing the second consultation stage proposing parking controls in and around the Ladywood and St Marks area

Objective

The proposed measures seek to improve parking around the St Marks area. Currently the lack of control allows for all day commuter and event parking. This situation creates difficulties for residents and visitors alike.

The purpose of the scheme is to enable priority for local residents, where appropriate, whilst ensuring that sufficient parking remains available for visitors and some local workers through better parking management.

The aim of parking measures is to help make the community a more desirable place to live, work and visit. Additionally, the project seeks to assist in promoting sustainable transport by increasing the attractiveness of public transport, cycling and walking as a travel choice, contributing towards improving health, the environment, reducing car usage and providing better access for people without access to a car.

This report outlines the results of the Stage 2 consultation and the methodology used to encourage engagement with the local community.
Stage 1 Consultation

The key findings of the Stage 1 consultation carried out in 2013 are summarised below:

- 600 leaflets were distributed, 84 questionnaires were returned with an overall response rate of approximately 14%.

- 87% of residents who answered the questionnaire believed parking was a problem in their area. Of these, 82% said they would be in favour of parking controls being introduced to their area.

- 95% of respondents agreed with time restrictions being applied Monday to Friday and 39% agreed that Monday to Saturday would be suitable.

- 57% of respondents thought the restrictions should apply 8am to 6pm; 17% thought 8am to 10pm was required.

Overall, there was support for the scheme found across the entire area. Some general issues were raised:

- There were some concerns that the parking scheme would not work due to lack of enforcement. This was based on a perception that current restrictions are not enforced.

- Residents generally agreed that the permits should be free of charge or low cost and some expressed concern about the number of permits that might need to be purchased per household.

- A number of residents expressed concern about illegal and inappropriate parking. This included blocking driveways, limiting access for emergency vehicles, restricting visibility at junctions and parking on footpaths.

All feedback from the Stage 1 consultation was reviewed in detail and some amendments made prior to the next stage. Specific local issues noted by AECOM were as follows:

- **St Marks Street:** residents expressed concern about HGV parking reportedly by those visiting the warehouse located on St Marks Street.

- **Goodman Street / Acorn Grove:** respondents were concerned about the management and enforcement of the proposed parking restrictions, particularly when events are being held at the Barclay Card Arena.

- **St Marks Crescent:** residents seemed to be very much in favour of the permit scheme due to perceptions about commuter parking; however, some requested additional double yellow lines at junctions to improve visibility.

84 responses were received in 2013; an overall response rate of 14%.

82% of the responses to the Stage 1 consultation were in favour of restrictions.
2015 Consultation

Methodology

The Stage 2 consultation began on Monday 2\textsuperscript{nd} November 2015 and was set to run for six weeks until Friday 11\textsuperscript{th} December 2015.

A glossy leaflet was hand delivered to all residential and business properties across the area, along with a questionnaire and high level drawings indicating what the scheme could look like.

The preliminary drawings can be found at Appendix A. A copy of the leaflet and questionnaire circulated to residents and businesses can be found at Appendix B and C respectively.

The leaflet set out why the consultation was taking place, how a CPZ might work and the general cost of resident and business permits for the purposes of informal consultation.

The consultation documents included contact details and a web address for additional information including a link to an online survey via BCC’s BeHeard service. A QR code was provided for easy smart phone access to the website and people further encouraged to take part through the use of social media.

Nine key local centres within the target area, including churches, the school, the Community and Health and Family Centre, were each provided with a consultation pack for the attention of its employees and the visiting public. Packs included copies of the questionnaire, leaflets and plans, in addition to posters for display.

72 responses were received in 2015; an overall response rate of 13.3%.

BCC officers and AECOM kept in regular contact with Ward Members throughout the consultation and a public meeting was arranged for 25\textsuperscript{th} November 2015. Members sent invitations to all local properties encouraging people to attend to ask questions about the consultation and voice any concerns about the proposals.

BCC Housing Services also attended the public meeting due to the number of car parks and other paved areas managed by them across the Ladywood area. The permit scheme proposed would only apply to highway maintainable at public expense (HMPE). Housing officers attended the meeting to gather feedback and to guide internal discussions about the potential inclusion of non-HMPE land.

To date there has been no decision regarding non-HMPE car parking nor any consultation carried out with its inclusion in mind. This report details the outcome of consultation carried out on current proposals which exclusively apply to the public highway.

Response Rate

In total 541 consultation packs were hand delivered to residents and businesses within the target area in November.

The scheme plans shown in Appendix A confirm the full extent of the consultation area.

At the end of the consultation period a total of 72 responses had been received. The Stage 2 consultation achieved a 13.3% response rate.
Breakdown of Responses

A summary of responses received through the Stage 2 consultation is provided in Appendix D. This section provides analysis of the responses to each question asked and sets out some of the key themes identified.

Question 1: Personal Details
Everyone who responded to the questionnaire, a total of 72, provided an address or postcode allowing AECOM to determine the specific location of respondents.

This enabled comments to be broken down by road to identify those roads or parts of roads with a majority in favour, and see where reasonable amendments could be made in order to gain support.

Question 2: Personal Interest
Respondents were asked to specify whether they were a resident owning or renting a property within the area, a landlord not living at the property, an employer with premises in the area or an individual working within the St Marks area.

95% of those who responded to the consultation were found to be residents of the area, with only 1% of responses from landlords with properties in the area.

4% of responses were submitted by an employer with premises in the area and no one identified themselves as an individual working within the area.

We are just pleased something is being done at last. It is a nightmare!
A resident of Acorn Grove.

Question 3: Blue Badge Holders
The 2015 consultation documents advised that all white advisory disabled bays would need to be removed to allow for implementation of a permit scheme. Within the leaflet, it detailed that the first permit for Blue Badge Holders would be provided free of charge and carers would be able to purchase a permit under the BCC scheme.

Local Blue Badge Holders were asked to identify themselves in order to help BCC understand how many could be affected by a permit scheme.

In total 10 local people stated that they had a Blue Badge. The majority of individuals with Blue Badges appear to live on St Marks Crescent and King Edwards Road.

No thank you.
A resident of Daley Close.
First resident permit should be free I believe.

A resident of Kelsall Croft.

Question 4: Are you satisfied with the proposed scheme as shown?

In 2013 82% of people stated that they would be supportive of a permit scheme and other parking controls across the area based on the information provided at the time.

Following distribution of additional information about how the scheme may operate and plans demonstrating what the scheme could look like 48 of the total 72 respondents (67%) said they were wholly satisfied with the proposals as shown, with some suggesting possible alternatives.

Four respondents (5%) said they did not know or had no particular opinion either way.

The remaining 20 (28%) stated that they did not agree with the proposals that had been suggested. Of those 20, five (25%) confirmed their objection to the scheme largely on the basis of local need and seven (35%) were not in favour due to the cost of the permit scheme. A further respondent (5%) asked a number of queries and, as a result, this response must also be considered an objection at this stage.

Of the total 20 respondents who said they were not satisfied with the scheme proposed, seven (35%) provided comments requesting changes indicating that they would be in favour subject to various amendments to the proposals or to the BCC permit scheme.

The number of outright objections to the proposals following the Stage 2 consultation, therefore, stands at 13 (18%) of the total 72 responses received.

By breaking down the responses on a road by road basis AECOM has been able to identify which roads were mostly in favour, those which were not and the roads which had a fairly even split of opinion.

This also allowed identification of changes or omissions local people have suggested for each road or locality. The key themes coming out of this analysis are as follows:

- Residents from across the area suggest variable days and times of restriction. A full breakdown of these responses is provided in the analysis of question 5.
- A resident of Acorn Grove suggested that Durham Tower car park should be included within the scheme as a permit scheme would mean more non-residents using the car park.
- A representative of Nelson Primary School associated with King Edwards Road / St Marks Crescent felt there should be more limited waiting provided for the school.
- Residents of St Marks Crescent seemed to suggest that they would be in support of the scheme if existing and proposed no waiting restrictions were removed to allow more space for on-street parking. Another resident made it clear that they wanted Blue Badge advisory bays to remain.

I am happy with the proposed times or a reduction in the times.

A resident of Goodman Street.
Well I don’t think we are given a choice.
A resident of Acorn Grove.

Question 5: Times of Restriction

The questionnaire suggested that the permit scheme could operate at all times following a review of feedback from the Stage 1 consultation and consideration of proximity to the City Centre. This was intended to be a starting point for discussion; the local community was asked to consider what was appropriate and make suggestions for any alternative hours of restriction.

39 respondents (54%) seemed to suggest that they were happy with the hours of operation stated on the questionnaire. A further seven (10%) did not know or had no opinion either way and another did not provide an answer.

The remaining 25 (35%) said that they were not happy with the proposed times, with nine of these (36%) suggesting alternative days and/or hours, two (8%) confirming their objection to the scheme and 14 (56%) providing no comment.

There were several key issues that were raised regarding the times of any restriction and a number of alternatives were put forward by respondents. Feedback was fairly consistent across the target area; however, AECOM has been able to identify key local issues and the preferences of each road below:

- Of the nine suggesting an alternative, 78% felt that the scheme should operate during office hours or stated Monday to Friday. Many suggested this would prevent commuters parking all day but would allow residents and their visitors to park for free in the evenings and at weekends.
- One respondent requested that the restriction operate during peak times only and another suggests 6am to 8pm.

Question 6: Possible Number of Permits

The local community was asked to indicate the type and number of permits they would be interested in purchasing should the scheme go ahead.

41% stated they would likely buy one resident permit, with an additional 27% stating two permits and around 8% three or more permits. A total of 7% said they would not require a permit at this stage and 14% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.

With regards to business permits, only 3% suggested they would apply for one or more permit. This is due to the lack of businesses within the area.

Looking at the results it is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding how many resident and business permits would be purchased if a scheme is implemented in future.

Should the permit scheme go forward in any form, all those affected would need to decide how many permits they would like. The alternative is that they would not legally be able to park on the public highway. However, as it stands this is a hypothetical question.

The sample response simply provides a better indication of the proportion of permits residents, employees and businesses might apply for.

Question 7: Business Parking

Of those who indicated that they would be likely to apply for one or more business permits two advised that their company provides some level of off-street parking.

Of those who said they have alternative parking, Hydrapower Dynamics located on St Marks Street, confirmed that they have around 40 off-street parking spaces. They stated they currently have around 107 employees and would likely need to buy 35 business permits for on-street parking.
Question 8: Comments and Suggestions

All of the additional comments and suggestions made have been analysed and interrogated for key themes. In total 43 respondents (61%) submitted further thoughts, with many of these providing more than one comment on a separate subject.

There were several key issues for consideration raised throughout, as follows:

- 21% of all respondents reaffirmed that they were not willing to or should not have to pay for a parking permit. This often led to a suggestion that resident and visitor permits should be free of charge; or at least the first permit.
- Around 16% of comments reiterated thoughts on proposed times of restrictions, as set out in the analysis of question 5.
- 14% of respondents commented on the current disregard for parking restrictions and the inconsiderate parking that results.
- Some 14% of the comments asked questions regarding the scheme.
- 12% confirmed that they did not want the scheme to be implemented. Whereas 5% of those who commented spoke of support for the scheme and their relief that BCC had started looking at proposals again.
- 7% of the respondents commented about their parking experiences and clarified why they are for or against restrictions. This has helped AECOM to understand more about current local issues within the area.
- A total of 5% used this section to reiterate suggested changes which could be made to the scheme to increase support for proposals.

- Due the perception of a lack of enforcement in the area, 2% of those who responded requested that there be regular enforcement if the scheme goes ahead.
- 2% were concerned the scheme would take too long to put in place and that they have suffered enough, indicating eagerness for the scheme.
- A further 2% were not in favour of having their advisory disabled bay removed if the scheme was to go ahead. They suggested that these bays should be kept as part of the scheme as removal would create more of a problem for Blue Badge holders.
- 2% of comments suggested that the roads should be re-surfaced before the scheme is implemented.

“High cost of business permits reflects lack of support for local businesses.

Hydrapower Dynamics on St Marks Street."

Due to the perception of a lack of enforcement in the area, 2% of those who responded requested that there be regular enforcement if the scheme goes ahead.
Residents report problems with parking across the St Marks area and there is widespread support for permit proposals, although many consider that the cost of permits is too high.
Conclusion
13.3% response rate; with 67% in support of the draft proposals and a further 9.7% asking for changes.

Summary
On the whole it has been found that local people both living and working in the St Marks area of Ladywood have a positive view of the proposed parking scheme, subject to some minor changes.

Out of 72 respondents 48 (67%) said they were wholly satisfied with the proposals as shown, with some suggesting possible alternatives. Four respondents (5%) said they did not know or had no particular opinion either way.

The remaining 20 (28%) stated that they did not agree with the proposals that had been suggested. Of those 20, five (25%) confirmed their objection to the scheme largely on the basis of local need and seven (35%) were not supportive due to the cost of the permit scheme. A further respondent (5%) asked a number of queries and, as a result, this response must also be considered an objection at this stage.

Of the total 20 respondents who said they were not satisfied with the scheme proposed, 7 (35%) provided comments requesting changes indicating that they would be in favour subject to various amendments to the proposals or to the BCC permit scheme.

The number of outright objections to the proposals following the Stage 2 consultation, therefore, stands at 13 (18%) of the total 72 responses received.

Overall there seems to be a high demand for parking control measures in the St Marks area, with only around a quarter of those who responded indicating that they do not want the scheme to be implemented as it has been suggested so far.

Moving Forward
AECOM has reviewed the outcome and all of the feedback received through both informal consultation stages. This has allowed initial discussions to take place to help identify proposals that are more agreeable to the local community and those elements that may need to be altered or omitted to ease concerns.

There is an expectation that final proposals will be developed based on these findings and that any scheme is to be subjected to a formal statutory consultation stage as per the formal Traffic Regulation Order process. At that point the local community would be able to reconsider proposals and either object to or support the implementation of any parking restrictions put forward.

There are no locations in the St Marks area where CPZ proposals have been largely rejected by those who have responded.

There are other locations where clear support for change has been indicated though perhaps not for the times shown as set out in the analysis of question 5. No requests for different types of restriction were proposed, although some residents from across the area requested alternative times of restriction.

On the whole respondents were generally either not supportive of a permit scheme on the basis of cost or seemed supportive of the scheme but not keen on paying for permits.
There are a number of design considerations to note as part of any subsequent detailed design stage and statutory advertisement process, as advised below:

- Due to the large number of **off-street and private parking areas** managed by BCC Housing Services it may be appropriate to consider the inclusion of these areas in a CPZ scheme. Some residents have raised concern about non-resident parking in these areas and about displaced parking should the permit scheme go ahead.

- The District Engineer recommends that, if the scheme is going to be taken forward the **hours of operation** should be similar to City Centre restrictions to ensure familiarity in the parking restrictions and to assist with enforcement of the area by the Council’s Civil Enforcement officers (CEO’s).

- It is also been recommended that a review into the possible areas of **vehicular displacement** take place help determine whether additional measures are required to ensure that the displacement of parked cars does not become detrimental to highway safety.

- Residents living on St Marks Crescent without off-street parking raised concerns about existing and proposed **no waiting restrictions** preventing them from parking nearby. The design should take into consideration these concerns and try to maximise convenient parking for residents along the length of the road, whilst ensuring that safety is not compromised.

- It has been reported by local residents of St Marks Crescent, Daley Close and Acorn Grove, and Nelson Primary School that inconsiderate parking is an issue at **school drop-off and pick up times**. A request has been made for additional limited waiting close to the school, but residents are keen to ensure that the inclusion of limited waiting does not restrict availability of space for permit holders. This will need to be considered further.
Appendix A – Consultation Drawings
Please refer to individual plans for each area in more detail.
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No Waiting Or Any Time (Double Yellow Lines)

No Entry

No Waiting 1 Hour, No Return Within 1 Hour

Permit Holders Only Beyond This Point

Permit Holders Only

Existing Perimeters To Remain Unchanged

Parking Area Off Public Highway, Not Included In Scheme

All existing white bay markings within the Permit Zone would need to be removed

All existing restrictions to remain unless stated otherwise

Parking restrictions will apply during event days at the Barclaycard Arena

Permit Holders Only

Limited Waiting

Max Stay 1 Hour, No Return Within 1 Hour

Monday - Sunday, 8am - 6pm

All restrictions above (unless otherwise stated) would apply during the following hours:

- Monday - Sunday, 8am - 6pm
Appendix B – Scheme Leaflet
Working in partnership with:

By introducing a permit scheme we hope to protect parking for those who need it.

Residents and businesses will be able to purchase permits to allow them to park in the proposed designated permit spaces.

Loading and waiting restrictions have been reviewed for safety reasons to protect junctions and accesses.

The Proposed Scheme

The plan overleaf provides an overview of the proposed parking controls for the St. Marks area. Each of the proposed zones has been split into smaller areas to allow you to see the proposed changes on your road and immediate surrounding area in more detail.

There are two broad types of parking provision proposed:

A. Permit holders only parking: On these roads, parking bays for residents and workers permits would be provided operating at all times. Visitor permits can be purchased by residents to allow parking in the permit only bays.

B. Limited waiting parking: On King Edwards Road and St. Marks Crescent are proposed limited waiting bays with a 1 hour maximum stay limit free of charge. This could provide parking for shoppers and drop-off during school times.

Map data © Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. BCC License Number 100021326. 2015

You have received this leaflet because the Council is reviewing the parking controls around the St. Marks area of Ladywood and would like your views.
WHY IS THE COUNCIL REVIEWING PARKING CONTROLS?

Located in the heart of Birmingham, St Marks is in close proximity to Birmingham’s City Centre and the Barclaycard Arena. There is therefore a high demand for parking which impacts on residents and other visitors to the area. We would like to propose a scheme which could help manage the parking on street for a wide variety of users including residents, visitors, workers and shoppers.

HOW MIGHT WE DO THIS?

By introducing a permit scheme residents and businesses would be able to purchase permits to allow them to park in proposed designated permit spaces in order to make parking easier for residents and local workers.

Loading and waiting restrictions have also been reviewed to protect junctions and accesses from inconsiderate parking.

ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION

Informal consultation was carried out in 2013 in response to local demand for parking controls in parts of the St Marks area. Around 82% of respondents were supportive of a permit scheme and other measures proposed across the area, and the results provided justification for further work. However, officers were not able to progress any proposals at the time due to Council resources and the prioritisation of other highway schemes across Birmingham.

The plans have been updated and we are now seeking your views on the proposals. It is important that we get your feedback on how these proposals may impact on you and that we fully understand the parking issues that you as a resident and local businesses face. Your views and opinions can shape how things progress to ensure that we fully understand the parking issues that you as a resident and local workers face. Your views and opinions can shape how things progress.

At this stage the scheme only covers highway land therefore those non-highway pockets of parking across the area would not be subject to the permit scheme. The local community is asked to consider the potential impact of displaced parking in off-street areas when responding to the consultation.

WHO IS INCLUDED?

This leaflet has gone to every property in the zones shown overleaf.

HOW MUCH WILL THE PERMITS COST AND HOW WILL THEY WORK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Cost for a yearly permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Permit - First</td>
<td>£16 (£free for Blue Badge Holders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Permit - Extra</td>
<td>£32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Visitors Permit</td>
<td>£3 for a book of 5 all day tickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Permit</td>
<td>£16 (££32 if first permit already issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Permit</td>
<td>£125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lost, stolen or damaged permits would need to be replaced at a cost of £11.00 ( £20 for business permits unless a crime reference number can be provided for a stolen permit). Each permit will be specific to the registration of a single vehicle and would need to be replaced if the vehicle or registration is changed, at a charge of £11.00.

These prices are subject to a city-wide review and could change before a scheme is implemented. Further information would be circulated to all properties well in advance of any scheme being introduced.

Residents and businesses within the proposed St Marks zone boundary (shown overleaf) would be able to purchase a permit. Visitors would be able to park in any permit space with a visitors permit valid on the date of display.

These permits could only be used within the proposed St Marks area and would not be valid in other parts of Birmingham.

WHERE WOULD RESIDENT PERMIT HOLDERS BE ABLE TO PARK?

The locations and extents of the parking restrictions would be clearly signposted, supported by road markings as appropriate. Off-street car parks and private parking areas will not be affected by these proposals and those parking in these areas would not be required to display a permit.

WHERE WOULD BLUE BADGE HOLDERS BE ABLE TO PARK?

Blue Badge holders would also need to display a valid permit to park within the permit area, although their first resident permit would be provided free of charge. No advisory disabled bays can be marked out within a permit zone and existing road markings would need to be removed.

HOW WOULD MEASURES BE ENFORCED?

The Council employ a parking enforcement contractor who could issue a Penalty Charge Notice to a vehicle, except an emergency vehicle, which is parked in the permit zone during the hours of restriction and not displaying a valid permit. Enforcement of any new restrictions in the St Marks area will be considered as appropriate, alongside existing priorities elsewhere.

FAQs

HOW CAN I HAVE MY SAY?

Please respond by:

Friday 11th December 2015

You can respond online using this website: www.birminghambeheard.org.uk and search for “St. Marks Parking Study”

Alternatively, you can complete the attached questionnaire and return it to:

FREEPOST RTSG-ZTGR-JULC
Transportation Services
Birmingham City Council
PO Box 14439
BIRMINGHAM
B2 2JE

We want as many responses as possible to get a clear picture of what local people want. If you do not respond, we may assume that you don’t have any strong feelings about the proposals.

CONTACTS

If you are aware of anyone who has not received a consultation leaflet or you wish to speak to someone regarding the consultation, you can contact us in the following ways:

Call: 0121 464 4412
Email: parkingconsult@birmingham.gov.uk
Visit: www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarks parking

For large print, Braille, audio or translation please phone 0121 464 4412. If you have difficulty hearing or speech difficulties, please call us via typetalk on 18001 0121 464 4412.
Appendix C – Consultation Questionnaire
Consultation Response Form

Consultation Start Date: 02/11/2015
Consultation Response Deadline: 11/12/2015
Scheme Title: St Marks Parking Scheme
Project Manager: Peter Bethell
E-mail Address: parkingconsult@birmingham.gov.uk

COMMENTS ON THE SCHEME PROPOSALS

Please refer to the attached map which is specific for your area. For further information or to fill out the online survey please visit: www.birmingham.gov.uk/stmarksparking

1. Please provide the following details:
   - Name: __________________________
   - Address: __________________________
   - Email Address: __________________________
   - Date: __________________________
   - Postcode: __________________________

2. Are you: (please tick one)
   - [ ] Resident (owner or renting property)
   - [ ] Landlord (not living at property)
   - [ ] Employer with premises in the area
   - [ ] Individual working in the area

3. Do you hold a Blue Badge for disabled parking?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

4. Are you satisfied with the proposed parking scheme as shown in the accompanying leaflet and maps? If not, please provide details of the changes you would like in section 8 below.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Don’t know / No opinion

5. The proposal is for the permit scheme to operate at all times. Do you think this is appropriate? If not, please provide suggestions in section 8 below.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Don’t know / No opinion

6. What type(s) of permit(s) would you be interested in purchasing? Please provide an indication of the number of permits you might like if the scheme goes ahead. Note that you would not require a permit to park in off-street or private parking areas.
   - [ ] Resident permit
   - [ ] Business permit
   - Number: ________ Number: ________

7. If you have stated business permit, does the company provide alternative off-street parking?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

8. Are there any other issues or concerns you have? If so, please provide details in the space provided below. Please continue overleaf or on a separate sheet if needed.

Peter Bethell BSc (Hons) MSc (Eng) CMILT
Principal Transportation Officer
Growth and Transportation
Birmingham City Council
Tel: 0121 464 4412

Please respond by: Friday 11th December 2015

Please note: Any personal information supplied will be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Information supplied will be used by Birmingham City Council (and its agents) as part of this and any related consultations.
Appendix D – Summary of Responses
Are you: (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident (owner or renting a property)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord (not living at property)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer with premises in the area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual working in the area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resident (owner or renting a property): 95%
- Landlord (not living at property): 1%
- Employer with premises in the area: 4%
- Individual working in the area: 0%
Do you hold a Blue Badge for disabled parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If they stated yes, the roads that they lived on are stated below and where or not they were satisfied with the scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Are you satisfied with the proposed scheme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Close</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsall Croft</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edwards Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marks Crescent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 10
Are you satisfied with the proposed parking scheme as shown in the accompanying leaflet and maps?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who said no, the key theme to the comments left are detailed below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to the Scheme</th>
<th>Definite No to Scheme</th>
<th>Issues relating to the cost of the Scheme</th>
<th>Queries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to the Scheme: 35%
Definite No to Scheme: 25%
Issues relating to the cost of the Scheme: 35%
Queries: 5%
Are you satisfied with the proposed parking scheme as shown in the accompanying leaflet and maps?

**Key Reason Why Respondents Said No By Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for...</th>
<th>Objection confirmed on basis of...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes to the scheme</td>
<td>alternative days / times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderton Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Close</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley Close</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsall Croft</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edwards Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marks Crescent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marks Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Individuals Stating No** | 20 |
**Suggesting Changes** | 7 |
**Objection Largely on Basis of Cost** | 7 |
**Other Objections** | 5 |

N.B Hydrapower Dynamics represent 107 workers. They understand the need for parking controls but do not agree with the higher cost of business permits.
The proposal is for the permit scheme to operate at all times. Do you think this is appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who said no, the key theme to the comments left are detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No suggestion left</th>
<th>Operate during Office Hours Mon - Fri</th>
<th>Operate during pick-up times</th>
<th>Definite no to Scheme</th>
<th>06:00 - 20:00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **Yes** 54%
- **No** 35%
- **Don’t Know/ No Opinion** 10%
- **Not Answered** 1%

---

- **No suggestion left** 56%
- **Operate during Office Hours Mon - Fri** 16%
- **Operate during pick-up times** 12%
- **Definite no to Scheme** 4%
- **06:00 - 20:00** 8%

---

- **No suggestion left** 56%
- **Operate during Office Hours** 16%
- **Mon - Fri** 12%
- **Operate during pick-up times** 4%
- **Definite no to Scheme** 4%
- **06:00 - 20:00** 8%
Does your company provide alternative off-street parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, how many spaces are provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4+</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the organisation that indicated how many spaces stated around 40. This is Hydrapower.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acorn Grove</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anderton Street</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crosby Close</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daley Close</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodman Street</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kelsall Croft</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Edwards Road</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sherborne Grove</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Marks Crescent</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Marks Street</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acorn Grove</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anderton Street</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crosby Close</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daley Close</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodman Street</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kelsall Croft</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Edwards Road</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sherborne Grove</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Marks Crescent</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Marks Street</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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