

## Appendix F – Hanover light touch parking scheme – List of Objections/Comments

Item	Name	Address	Object/Support	Comments
1	Petition	118 signatures (including number of names with already submitted comments)	Object	Want to see Top Triangle (Carlyle, Arnold, Lynton, Baxter and Cromwell Street) included within the full scheme Zone V.
2	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Questions the legitimacy of whether a change to the original proposal is the right and proper way to proceed.</p> <p>The recent consultation was a survey to see whether a zone had support of majority of residents and if so which option. Object to the council decision to divide the original area into two separate zones as it is a breach of the original proposal.</p> <p>Residents in the light touch scheme will be subject to an inadequate scheme. There will be limited enforcement in the later restricted hour, so non-residents and residents without permits, can park knowing that it's unlikely to be patrolled and park for free at the inconvenience of the permit holding residents of the Zone S.</p> <p>Keep the area as one proposal and make whole of Hanover and Elm Grove area as a full scheme.</p>
3	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Limit chances of finding a space to park and increase parking problems</p> <p>Residents no option but to park on both sides of street as not enough spaces but do not block emergency services</p> <p>If going to be imposed would make sense to be in a full scheme with rest of Hanover</p>
4	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	No provision to accommodate residents wishes of being able to keep parking on the pavement, majority of residents voted for no scheme at all. High level of car ownership and elderly and people with small children will have to park on other side of busy road.
5	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Lived in Arnold Street for 30 years and parking has become impossible</p> <p>With a light touch scheme residents will not be able to park</p>
6	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Unfair to have one system in part of Hanover and a different one for them, it will mean residents from further down will park in the top triangle when the zone is not operating.</p> <p>Top triangle has greater car ownership than other areas of Hanover and feel they are being punished more by removal of parking on one side of the roads. They will be paying for spaces that don't exist. They will be unable to move cars due to the fear of someone else taking their places. Whatever scheme the council decides on it should be the same for the entire area.</p> <p>Parking will be reduced but problems of parking will not addressed</p>
7	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	Will be paying for parking but will have less parking, a light touch scheme will mean having to be in competition with drivers on weekends and evenings who have not paid for parking.
8	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>The streets within the light touch proposal will be used by non-residents to park while residents with permits will have difficulty in finding parking on the streets in which they live, particularly as the available parking spaces will be reduced/</p> <p>It is already difficult to park in the evenings and weekends in the top triangle and the proposal will make this considerable worse.</p>
9	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Making all of Hanover a full scheme with the exception of the top triangle will mean all the displaced cars will park in the light touch roads, it will be unworkable and unfair.</p> <p>Residents in this area will be paying to park but without having any spaces available.</p> <p>If a full scheme is coming in then it should be for everyone so that everyone who has paid has an equal chance of parking.</p>
10	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Own a car along with most of their neighbours and currently manage to park on their street, if CPZ introduced then half of the spaces will be removed, this will mean they will be forced to park two or three streets away from their home, which is unacceptable and should be able to park outside own property.</p> <p>CPZ will cause husband significant health problems as unable to drive for long periods or walk long distances.</p>
11	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>Against introduction of any scheme Arnold Street is busy but parking is manageable.</p> <p>Residents should not have to pay for parking and have a free permit scheme funded by pay and display of non-residents.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will mean residents will have to pay for 2 hours a day but non-residents displaced by full scheme will park in their road outside of the controlled hours, making parking much worse.</p>
12	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>The scheme will leave few parking spaces for residents at the top end of Hanover</p> <p>Work shifts and rely on parking outside house</p>
13	Resident	Arnold Street	Object	<p>The proposal is not what was voted for, a split into two areas was not a consideration for the vast majority of residents.</p> <p>For the top triangle to back onto a full scheme will be unworkable and make parking very difficult. Vehicles forced out of the full scheme area will park in these streets for most of the day and all the weekend and will be joined by visitors to Brighton.</p> <p>Combined with the loss of parking, the chances of finding a space close to their homes will be difficult, even if included in full scheme then think parking will be impossible for some residents with permits.</p> <p>High level of car ownership and concerns with regards to number of spaces and how many permits will be issued and if households will even be able to have one permit.</p> <p>The problems currently experienced in parts of Hanover which have voted for a full scheme will not move to the light touch area.</p> <p>Would like to see Carlyle, Arnold, Lynton, Baxter and Cromwell Street included in the full 'V' scheme.</p>

14	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Light touch will not work should be full restrictions or none Will not be able to park in street due to displaced parking and will be charged £100 Either increase the hours or put in full restriction
15	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Object to yellow lines being placed down one side of road thereby having the amount of parking
16	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Object to yellow lines being placed down one side of road thereby having the amount of parking
17	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	The remainder of the area will be a full scheme, to have a light touch (with a 50% reduction on parking) will make it harder to park in road and there will be displacement especially at the weekends when no scheme in operation. If scheme is to proceed it should be included within a full scheme.
18	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Will reduce the parking by half in the whole of Hanover. The light touch area will have people parking in the roads to walk into town- reducing the chance of being able to park. Household needs two cars and concerned that they will not be able to get two permits and unsure where they will be able to park the second car. Cars currently park half on the pavement and people/children/ wheelchairs can still pass - pavement should be reduced to allow parking - also Elm Grove should also have additional parking within the current pavement area.
19	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Proposed light touch does not serve the top section of the Hanover area. If CPZ goes ahead for Hanover then same restrictions needed in Baxter Street to ensure they do not receive the overspill parking. Their roads will be subject to losing half the spaces and will create a genuine issue for families.
20	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	The loss of 50% of the parking spaces in Baxter Street will not leave sufficient room for residents' cars.
21	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Object to parking on one side of street over and object to Baxter Street being in a different scheme to rest of Hanover, the road will be free to non-residents to park and make it impossible for residents to find parking.
22	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	There isn't a parking problem on Baxter Street, the introduction of a light touch scheme will half the number of spaces on the road. Will only restrict non-residents at certain times of the day the rest of the day they are free to park. Residents will have to pay for a permit though highly unlikely to find a space anyway Residents shouldn't be punished because businesses do not provide parking for employees
23	Resident	Baxter Street	Object	Object to any controlled parking in Hanover - will reduce the number of spaces and residents will have to compete with all the displaced vehicles from other zones and visitors to the area out of the very limited operation times. Will also be charged for the most competed parking spaces in Brighton One car for household which is a necessity and require parking in their street.
24	Resident	Bentham Road	Object	The new scheme in Hanover and the fact their road will be in a light touch scheme is unacceptable Will no longer be able to park on their road, will have to drive around to find a space and still have to pay for a permit. If a scheme has to be introduced then the same scheme should apply throughout whole area.
25	Resident	Bentham Road	Object	Concerned on loss of parking without any traffic calming or width restriction as concerns on the speed of traffic using the roads. Feel unnecessary to remove all the parking adjacent to 1 and 124 Elm Grove The dropped kerb between 20 & 22 is no longer used as not wide enough for modern day vehicle The roads are one-way so it is not necessary to so much parking for safety reasons. The disabled bay outside no.16 needs to moved as there isn't quite enough room in front to allow for two cars.
26	Resident	Bernard Road	Object	Vehicle is 2.5metres tall - want to make sure they can get a permit?
27	Resident	Bernard Road	Support	Adequate motorcycle provision
28	Resident	Bernard Road	Object	Due to TRO-14a-2017 being a full parking scheme, this will have an adverse affect in other part of Elm Grove / Hanover causing more 'non-permit' vehicles to park during the permitted times, particularly weekends when there are no restrictions. Would be in favour of a weekend permit holders restriction.
29	Resident	Bernard Road	Support	Will enable them to park
30	Resident	Bonchurch Road	Object	Never had a problem with finding a parking space so far so would have to spend £100 for something they do not currently need The need for spaces is after 8pm when lots of cars appear so the times should be over night Have regular visitor so would use up the allowance of visitors permits The residents permit should be cheaper and more visitor permits allowed
31	Resident	Bonchurch Road	Object	Do not see how proposal will work as large proportion of houses are converted into flats, as well as student houses, meaning 70 plus people trying to park in space for 40 cars. There are also a number of businesses in the area (one of which has planning permission to be turned into flats) - how many permits will they be allocated along with the school? Also loss of parking due to disabled bays and cycle parking. Begrudge paying for a permit and still not being able to park in road. Bays should be individually marked out as people will leave large gaps restricting the number of cars able to park. Cannot rely on pubic transport and need to have car.
32	Resident	Bonchurch Road	Object	Weekends should be included in the restrictions otherwise tourist will park on the streets and prevent residents from being able to park.

33	Resident	Bonchurch Road	Object	Doesn't understand why it is a late 6-7pm restriction and it just penalises residents as they arrive home Would like a morning and afternoon restriction like other parts of the city
34	Resident	Bonchurch Road	Object	Should be 7 days a week in line with rest of Hanover other will not be able to park on weekends, particularly worrying as there will be a considerable reduction in spaces in Hanover area.
35	Resident	Brading Road	Object	A full scheme 7 days a week should be enforced HMO's should not be able to apply for multiple permits
36	Resident	Brading Road	Object	As majority of surrounding roads in Hanover being a full scheme this will displace vehicles into this area. If it goes through then a review needed within a year to allow residents chance to vote whether scheme is working or needs to be increased to full. Feels cost is high for 2 hours of reserved parking and it should be 3 hours
37	Resident	Brading Road	Object	Student living on Brading Road and have to commute to placements so need car and live in a house with 6 other people so total of 5 cars at property it will not be possible for them all to have permits and they require them
38	Resident	Hanover Terrace	Object	Buying a property in Brading Road and object to the light touch scheme planned, people from surrounding full areas will parking in the light touch to avoid paying for permits. Should consider introducing the full scheme throughout the area.
39	Resident	Carisbrooke Road	Object	Light touch scheme will cause problems with parking at weekends - should be full scheme or nothing
40	Resident	Carisbrooke Road	Object	Do not believe that restrictions are necessary, parking is safe and not a problem. The proposed charges will over stretch financially currently struggling households and will do nothing to improve value of properties or enhance non-existent issue.
41	Resident	Carisbrooke Road	Object	Concerned that if the top triangle have a full scheme it will have an impact on their road as people will park there after 7pm Would like another consultation with up to date information
42	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Removes 50% parking where 75% residents have vehicles Have to pay for permits which not everyone will get. Allows anyone else to parking apart from 2 hours in the day Creates more problems
43	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Effect of order would mean that the top triangle would lose half the current parking provision as parking restricted to one side of street, as well as reduction in space elsewhere in zone. Area of high car ownership and doesn't suffer from high level of commuter parking, the roads are full of residents' vehicles in the evenings and weekends, precisely the times when space will be shared by non-permit holders No evidence supplied to justify loss of amenity to the householders of area caused by restriction of parking to one side of road. Consultation legally flawed in that this aspect of scheme was already decided before the consultation began and no views sought or representation about it entertained. In 2010 residents made it clear that the practice of pavement parking, which has continued for years does not effect the Fire Brigade or pedestrians, was not a problem. To not consult on this issue (which will have the most serious detrimental impact on the amenity of the area and value of properties, is a breach of natural justice. The loss of parking was the one issue which engaged the residents in the consultation and reject the proposals overwhelmingly, and therefore deprived of an effective voice and then one view given disregarded. the effect of the proposed order will make it all but impossible for large number of residents to park within a reasonable distance of their homes even during the restriction hours. The is the problem which afflicts residents in the Zone V and caused them to vote in favour of a CPZ, the proposed order will create the same problem on an area where it presently does not exist and there would be no solution to it. It is unfair to solve the problem of one neighbour by moving it to another. No proper account has been taken to the effect of the displacement from Zone V into Zone S, particularly in the top triangle where it forms the border between the two zones. Carlyle Street (being the first road in light touch) would be especially badly affected by displacement during the hours when the scheme is not in operation, particularly the evenings and weekends. When consulted residents did not anticipate that there may be two schemes which would interact this way. 50 % of households in the top triangle now signed a petition which, contrary to their wishes, wants full-time CPZ to be considered. The proposed reduction in parking would mean a significant number of residents, including the elderly, families with young children and those with mobility problems (though falling short of disability) would be forced to park many streets away on the other side of Elm Grove - if they can park at all. This influx would not be welcomed by those living in that part of the zone. People are likely to park on double yellow lines or on the carriageway to load/unload, drop off and pick up people, which will block the road, meaning the roads will be impassable and be less safe than at present for pedestrians and motorists. If not blocked then the roads will be more attractive to those who already drive along it at inappropriate speed as well as large goods vehicles. If despite this representations and those of others, the CPZ is imposed, there should be a review within 3 months of its operation.
44	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Majority vote for a full scheme and no mention of two schemes, the light touch in the top triangle area will mean people will park in this area. Have lived in the road with no parking problem, but proposed scheme will deny residents parking at the weekend and after 7pm. Should be included within the full scheme.
45	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Residents never given option to refuse parking scheme - light touch in Carlyle Street and full elsewhere will cause other residents to use the road as a car park, have to same scheme throughout. Feel forced to ask for a change from light to full scheme for Carlyle Street.

46	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Never given the option of light touch or full touch - cannot divide Hanover as there will never be any parking in Carlyle Street as all the lower roads will park in the higher section of Hanover. Have no choice but to accept a full scheme.
47	Resident	Carlyle Street	Objects	When voting on scheme no indication that it could lead to separate parking schemes Carlyle Street will have parking on just one side but be at the edge of the light-touch scheme with all the repercussions from this Wants an explanation on why there is a shift and why they were not provided the full information prior to the vote.
48	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Residents of top triangle (Carlyle, Arnold, Lynton, Baxter and Cromwell Streets)are broadly opposed to the scheme and would like to be moved into the Full Zone V
49	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Light touch scheme will cause all weekend and evening visitors to park in their street If have to pay the same costs as rest of Hanover then should have the same restrictions. Should have a full scheme in the whole area so benefits are shared by all residents.
50	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Object to the lack of restriction over weekends The number of parking bays will be small in relation to the number of households with cars in the street. If the bays are taken up by non-residents, then residents may not be able to park over the entire weekend period. Some residents may feel forced to leave cars in bays all weekend to keep a bay which will exacerbate the situation. Carlyle Street will be an attractive parking option for non-residents who want to park just outside the full scheme. The proposals as they stand will make it impossible for residents to park legally over the weekend and may increase risk of confrontation between residents and non-residents- they should be modified to address these concerns.
51	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Reduction in Carlyle Street is by more than half there will be insufficient parking in the area for the number of households with cars. Combined with loss of parking places in surrounding street, there will be a loss of hundreds of spaces Should consider maintained of pavement parking (which hasn't caused problems for large vehicles passing ) Scheme shouldn't have been split
52	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	The loss of 50% of parking will create more parking pressure on road. Want to see parking on both sides of road. Already have issues with cars using road to cut through between Elm Grove and Queens Park Road, and with no parking on one side will increase the speed of traffic. Parking on both sides slows drivers down. If must have a CPZ then it should be in line with rest of Hanover and be consistent otherwise creates pressure on parking in these roads (top triangle).
53	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Loss of parking from one side of road and side which has parking has 3 disabled bays and tree beds. With light touch people will be able to take advantage and park on this street from 7pm leaving little chance for residents to park. Would like to see full scheme or more than two hours a day.
54	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Want to have no scheme or one that allows parking on both sides of the road, otherwise there will be nowhere for residents to park. Should allow pavement parking to allow room for emergency vehicles. All of the area should have same scheme.
55	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Lived in the area for 17 years -over that time parking situation has been the same between 8am and 5pm the roads are empty as most people are at work but 5pm to 8am both sides are mostly full of cars. Finding a space directly outside house is rare but have always found somewhere to park in street. It will not benefit the residents or improve the amenities in the area , it will cause chaos as residents drive around trying to find a space. The parking is being reduced - concerned as to where the extra cars will go, how the permits will be issued and that even having a permit will not guarantee a space Hanover does not need restricted parking, but if it has to be implemented it should be free, should not reduce parking and restrict times when it will benefit the residents (5pm to 8pm) Will create a situation where a large proportion of residents who own cars will no longer have access to a parking space, will cause disruption to residents in area and neighbouring areas.
56	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Currently parking is rarely a problem - reducing the bays by 50 % will result in a severe shortage. Preference is for no scheme to be introduced but if not an option, then light touch for entire area or last option full scheme throughout area as this would provide equity for all residents and prevent shifting the problem into one area unfairly impacting on some residents.
57	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Has to drive to work and have not experienced problems with parking in their road. The parking will be reduced by 50% -how will parking be allocated? What are reasons for this move? People who park in this road are local residents not workers or visitors to the area.- would prefer no parking scheme at all. The top triangle are being unfairly treated. Vehicles displaced from full scheme will park in the light touch area and deprive residents of parking spaces. If changes are made they should be consistent and equal and all streets in full scheme.
58	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Severely limits number of parking spaces in road and half the residents will not be able to park in their own street.
59	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Object to massive reduction in available parking and extra charges to pay making work and home life difficult

60	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Planned 50% reduction in parking in Carlyle Street would cause hardship to family and neighbours
				Work shifts and while the current parking is far from ideal can at least usually park nearby
				Needs to use the car as public transport not an option at busy times
				Very few households without a car many have 2 and also several with vans
				Should narrow pavement on each side to allow parking on both sides or allow the current pavement parking
61	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Object because of loss of 50% parking as double yellow lines will be on one side of the road. Want to know the evidence for justifying reduction in parking.
				Have to have two vehicles and have concerns they will only be allowed one permit
				Concerns about the where the displaced vehicles will go.
				Seldom have issues currently with parking vehicles.
				Not witnessed or heard of any complaint for pushchair/pedestrian access on footpath and vehicles leave enough room for passing traffic.
62	resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Scheme would cause hardship and unnecessary street to residents and for objector possible loss of livelihood and perhaps having to move out.
				Not informed that area could be split, if they had known then they would have voted for full scheme
				Change the scheme to full for Carlyle Road, as very concerned about parking at weekends
				Together with the fact that parking will be reduced by 50% will mean they will have little of no chance of getting a space - to work all street have to be included in the same scheme.
				Support a CP2 being implemented as would encourage responsible parking and freeing up the pavements for pedestrians. Often witness children walking to school having to go single file or walking in the road.
64	Resident	Carlyle Street	Support	Support a CP2 being implemented as would encourage responsible parking and freeing up the pavements for pedestrians. Often witness children walking to school having to go single file or walking in the road.
				Object to division of Hanover into two parts
				Their street will shoulder the costs of the scheme but have none of the benefits
				Parking is most difficult at weekends but the scheme does not apply then
				It will attract non-resident cars and tradespeople vans during weekends and Monday to Friday
65	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	The road will become busier with traffic trying to find a place and make parking even more difficult for the residents
				Carlyle street will be most adversely affected.
				Approve of the decision to reduce the parking on one side of street as pavement parking makes it very difficult to navigate as a pedestrian.
				fully support introduction of CP2 in Hanover but please can Carlyle Street have full scheme or whole area have full scheme.
				Object to any kind of scheme, light or full and as have not met anyone who thinks it is a good idea.
66	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	No problem with parking in Carlyle Street and 95% of time there are spaces.
				Two car owning household and understand that they should get one permit, but could be none, which means that they will have nowhere to park legally in their own street.
				Need two permits or alternative places to park the cars
				Accept that controlled parking is necessary in Hanover
				Carlyle Street does not experience major problems with parking spaces such as others
67	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	If the other section of Hanover have full scheme then this area will be flooded with overspill parking
				Prefer a full scheme over the light touch proposed
				Real concern is the proposal to introduce double yellow lines on one side cannot see how all car owners will be accommodated.
				Happy to pay for the privilege of parking as need car and want to park close to where they live to feel safe but cannot see how under the new proposals how this will be viable.
				Concerned about loss of parking spaces throughout the area and questions legality of charging for parking when already pay road, car and council tax.
68	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Will be first street in light touch so first street where people will park for free outside of full scheme
				50 % reduction in parking by stopping the pavement parking will cause major problems for parking as it is extremely difficult to find a space at present - would like to be included in the full scheme
69	Resident	Carlyle Street	Object	Do not want a parking scheme in their street and have repeatedly voted against it.
				If one does go in then want to see no parking lost and that everyone will not be parking in their street as it's light touch
				Best option is no controlled parking in Upper Elm Grove area.
70	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	Parking will be reduced by half for their street, will make parking incredibly difficult, do not want hassle of looking for parking when finishing work. The spaces need to be reserved for residents. They will become a car park for all the other Hanover roads.
				Will reduce the amount of parking for residents and will have to pay for parking though there will be no guarantee of parking at weekends.
71	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	Want to be able to park in their road when they want to - will not be the case under the scheme as at weekends anyone will be able to park without payment or permit.
				Would like to see area become full scheme with parking reserved just for residents
72	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	Being in a light touch area and so close to border with a full scheme will mean area will become a car park for other cars in the area, fearful of paying for a permit but not being able to park on own road.
				Object to the removal of parking on both sides of the road, hardly enough space at the moment, if loose half the spaces then will struggle to park.

75	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	<p>Cutting parking in half and creating a light touch zone that will allow everyone else to leave cars indefinitely in area, so would still be a free car park</p> <p>Has to commute and this will make it a nightmare and extremely stressful.</p> <p>Would begrudgingly agree to only people in our zone being able to park here</p> <p>The houses on opposite sides have small gardens, but the parking is on the other side</p>
76	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	<p>Object to double yellow lines halving the amount of parking in the top triangle, will impact on those who return from work after 6.30pm as there will be no-where to park and impact on quality of life and will have to pay for permit. Concerns on where the cars will park.</p> <p>Should be included in the full scheme otherwise road will be a car park but not for residents.</p>
77	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	<p>Lives in Zone U already parking problems so often parks in Freshfield Road, this new zone will increase parking problems</p> <p>Should extend Zone U to incorporate new area of make U a full scheme.</p>
78	Resident	Cromwell Street	Object	<p>The new zones will result in many people parking their cars in Zone U as there are no restrictions after 3pm. There are few spaces in Zone U after 6-7pm</p> <p>Object to the new schemes unless Zone U is made into a full scheme too.</p>
79	Resident	Down Terrace	Object	<p>The restrictions need to apply Monday to Sunday otherwise they will not be able to park the car like now because of the tourists parking cars all weekend</p> <p>Bus stop (outside 42 to 44) is not used, raised kerb should be removed and parking places put in.</p> <p>Permit parking should be allowed in Stonehurst Court</p> <p>HMO's should not be able to apply for multiple permits</p>
80	resident	Down Terrace	Object	<p>Unsure on why the times are 6-7pm should be the same as Zone U</p>
81	resident	Down Terrace	Object	<p>In agreement with a light touch scheme but would like it extended to every day of the week.</p> <p>Having a Mon-Fri restriction will leave streets vulnerable at weekends to second cars, trade, tourists and visitor parking. Currently many trade vehicles parked in Down Terrace at the weekend and they remain until Monday morning.</p> <p>The scheme will only allow parking on many narrow roads reducing parking availability considerably. Parking will be needed for the people who live there. There is already double parking in some roads and would not want to see this increase.</p>
82	resident	Elm Grove	Support	<p>Parking on pavements and double yellow lines has got out of hand in Hanover</p>
83	resident	Elm Grove	Object	<p>Happy with the situation as it is - majority had objected by petition years ago</p>
84	Resident	Elm Grove	Object	<p>Happy with the situation as it is. Need two cars but would only be allowed one permit this would mean having to change jobs.</p> <p>The parking is tough but manage, would lose half the spaces so there would be nowhere to park.</p>
85	Resident	Elm Grove	Object	<p>Boundary of the zones mean the area between Upper Elm Grove and Queens Park Road (top triangle) creates unfair division which place residents at severe disadvantage of being able to find adequate parking close to their homes.</p> <p>The closet overspill parking will be across Elm Grove - residents will not park in other areas nearest to their homes as they will either be in the new full scheme or Zone U.</p> <p>Will increase air pollution as residents will have to drive around neighbouring roads to find the spaces</p> <p>Light touch (5 day scheme) does not reflect needs of residents and will continue to have parking from non-residents, tourists, students and businesses.</p> <p>High density of car ownership in the top triangle and there is not sufficient parking places proposed.</p> <p>Concerns of residents regarding the lengths of double yellow lines along with excessive use of street furniture and inappropriate placement of bike rails - all inhibit parking.</p>
86	Resident	Elm Grove	Object	<p>Motorcycle parking is too far away</p> <p>Consider putting in a bay in gap between Bonchuch Road and Bernard Road</p> <p>Would recommend on the corner of Whippingham Road and Elm Grove as relatively flat</p> <p>Would like to see secure parking for the motorcycles</p> <p>Numerous motorbikes parked overnight on this part of Elm Grove</p>
87	Resident	Elm Grove	Support	<p>Support CPZ but disappointed that it will be only Monday to Friday for two hours</p> <p>Permit should be significantly less than a full scheme to reflect the fewer hours that they are likely to get a parking space</p>
88	Resident	Elm Grove	Object	<p>Park on pavement and wants to continue to.</p> <p>Would rather full scheme, nothing at all or to be guaranteed that they can continue to park outside their home.</p>
89	Resident		Object	<p>Have deep concern about proposed double yellow lines in Clayton Road and two others nearby.</p> <p>Fire engines get down the road fine at the moment, many large vans use roads regularly and while it is tight it is possible</p> <p>Blue Badge holder and worry they will not qualify for a badge at a later date and then will not be able to park close to their house, which will leave them trapped and isolated</p> <p>Residents will be forced to pay and will not be able to park near their properties, concerned for people who are disabled and do not have a blue badge.</p> <p>All voted against the changes and if introduced parking will be worse and residents will be expected to pay for it. Would like area to be separate from Hanover or have parking in these roads.</p>
90	Resident	Firle Road	Object	<p>Massive local opposition to the double yellow lines, goes against the needs and wishes of the local people</p> <p>The map is misleading and doesn't mention double yellow lines</p> <p>The reason for them is nonsensical - fire engines need a road width of 3.1 m metres by law but no problems going up Firle/Glynde/Clayton Roads that any other narrow road and if is the case then they will be restricted under new scheme by disabled bays</p> <p>Many vulnerable residents in area and once double yellow lines in place they will struggle to get from their parking space to their house-any resident who applies for a disabled bay from now will not get one on their own street - feel like discrimination against residents in a deprived area.</p>

91	Resident	Firle Road	Object	Anti social behaviour on Firle Road already a problem as people ignore the one-way and race around on motorbikes/quad bikes removing the parking would create a racing circuit. Concerned about being able to park near their house as there will be displacement of vehicles from Firle Road onto surrounding roads.
92	Resident	Freshfield Road	Object	Plans propose to block access to 3 garages on Down Terrace which are used
93	Resident	Freshfield Road	Object	Garage is in Down Terrace and plans show parking across the dropped kerb - it should be a double yellow line
94	Resident	Freshfield Road	Object	Garages in Down Terrace have been in use for decades even if there isn't a dropped kerb in front of the garages. The proposed parking will lock residents cars in their garages as they will be blocked by the parked vehicles. As long as access is not guaranteed object to proposal.
95	Resident	Freshfield Street	Support	Generally in favour of light touch but should include St Luke's Road and St Luke's Terrace otherwise will cause confusion and increase the number of cars being moved at different times
96	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Lived in Hartington Road for 9 years and had a car for most of that time never experienced any problems with poor parking, and usually there are plenty of spaces, The amount for a permit is high for a household budget when there is no need for it. Previously lived in areas where have paid for parking and often had to drive around to park a long way from home. So see no benefits for residents to this scheme. Object to the restriction of 6 to 7pm and that there will be no opportunity to pay to park if people wish to visit after work then they will have to use a visitor permit. People who use the area to park for work will have left by then and seems no reason for not including pay for parking. Surveyed at least twice, if not three times in 9 years and feel the council is just pushing it for money making reasons, object to the amount of money being used in doing these surveys repeatedly.
97	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	The section of Hartington Road where they live will not have parking restrictions at the weekend, the will only make the parking situation worse than it is now, as they are close to a full permit scheme. Will have to pay for a permit but will not benefit from it as anyone will be able to park on their road at weekends when town is at its busiest.
98	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Do not agree with light touch scheme and want to see a full scheme. There will be less places to park and cars from the full scheme will park in the light touch area. There are no restrictions at the weekend allowing anyone to park. With a light touch the weekends will be worse. Would rather pay more and park at all times - Hartington Road is busier at the bottom could this half not have a full scheme.
99	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Run a small business and have concerns for the future of the business if scheme goes ahead and feel the needs of businesses haven't been fully considered. Number of employees who have to drive to work, if no where to park then staff will have to quit job. Would like more than two business permits Floating permits which are not vehicle specific Additional visitor permits Pay and display parking so staff and customers have an option to park Draft proposals should be revised to minimise impact and harm to local businesses
100	resident	Hartington Road	Object	Would like to see provision for motorcycle parking in central part of Hartington Road, there are many motorcycle owners in that part. Object to the banning of parking on the sweeping corners of junctions with Hartington Road and Ryde, Sandown and Totland Road - parking in these areas has never caused any problems and would considerably reduce the parking available. Object to any parking restrictions in the area north of Elm Grove
101	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Want consideration to be given to an EV charging point as part of the CPZ improvements. Taxis area often waiting in this area and would be good place for them to charge. Many properties do not have off-street parking so need on street charging points for people to consider purchasing an electric vehicle.
102	Resident	Hartington Road	Support	Support overall proposals Would like to see EV charging point in Hartington Road area - as there are extremely limited off-street facilities in the area and only one within the Full scheme area and non in the light touch area. The number of electric vehicles are going to increase and there is already a growing demand. EV charging points should be where there is demand from residents where there is a cluster around certain street/s. The existing car club spaces should have charging points and would encourage the car club to add EV's to their provision. Strong support of the current car club spaces and would like consideration to be given to additional spaces as this will contribute to more efficient use of cars with a net loss in car ownership putting less pressure on the parking infrastructure within their community. Support Pedal Cycle Parking Places in Bonchurch Road but there is inadequate provision in the area and there a number of cycles attached to railings, lamp post which cause an obstruction to pavements throughout area. A PCPP should be considered at the very least in Bernard Place, which would give access to a wide range of streets in the area, a and would also suggest Seville Street, De Montford Road, Franklin Road (lower end) Normanton Street and Upper Wellington Road.
103	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	As a community manage their own parking the free parking is a great asset and the loss will cause further strain on already stretched families and affect value of houses. If parking becomes an issue can it not be reconsidered later.
104	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Seen parking charges implemented at most of local parks, as a family on a tight budget this has a detrimental effect on quality of children's lives, limiting occasions they can enjoy the recreational spaces. Have had no issue with parking. Concerned that adding another charge to families will push them out of Brighton Will effect the value of properties.
105	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Too expensive for a student

106	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	No need for residents parking scheme as there is ample parking- can always park locally
				Paid parking will reduce the number of spaces available and cause new problems
				No mandate as there was a low response to consultation
				Only residents use the road to park - no businesses, customers or commuters use the road
				Residents chose area because of unrestricted free parking and families reliant on two cars for work will be in a difficult position. As will self-employed people
107	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Believes there will be a dramatic reduction in number of spaces which will only create problems for residents in the area and surrounding streets. Safety will not be improved as most residents park responsibly and considerably The scheme will increase emissions by forcing drivers to drive further in order to find spaces.
108	Resident	Hartington Road	Object	Feels it is a way of making more money Neighbours by making front gardens into drives have caused the problems. Charging will affect the poorer neighbours
109	Resident	Hartington Terrace	Support	Thoroughly support resident's parking as too many non-resident vehicles left in the area.
110	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Live in top triangle - the main problem with the proposal for light touch is it restricts parking in the day, when there isn't a problem but allows free parking in the evening, when there is a problem.
				It will reduce parking to one side of Lynton Street, halving the spaces available.
				Will have to pay for a permit but get a worse situation for it. CPZ's only push problem onto next adjoining area, working against resident and raising money for Council.
111	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Live in a very narrow and short street, by reducing the parking by 50% will mean less options for residents to park. To allow other drivers from surrounding streets will make the parking even more difficult. People coming home between 6-7pm will risk possibility of non-resident drivers filling the street in the non-restricted hours. Appreciate the roads were not built for the level of parking but necessary evil for some people to have their cars for work/pleasure and should not be penalised for it, if it can't be avoided then it must be a full scheme.
112	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Concerned with light touch along side the full scheme as anyone parking a few hours in week or weekend will park in the light touch area - taking up available space and leaving no space for permit paying residents. Both zones should be the same (full or light)
113	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Unfair that Lynton Street has light touch but roads nearby are full scheme. People will parking in their road during the free periods, making it difficult for residents who have had to buy a permit, this will be particularly difficult at weekends.
				It would be more efficient use of time and resources for Civil Enforcement Officers to patrol the area throughout the day rather than just 60 minutes twice a day.
114	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	In area known as top triangle half the parking will be lost in roads next to each other and immediately next to a full scheme. Parking not only will be substantially more difficult for residents to park on their own roads they will also have to compete with the cars that would normally park further down into Hanover.
				There are no paid parking bays in whole zone, which are necessary should friends visit.
				The fee for a permit is only slightly less than those for a full scheme, residents in the top triangle will have to pay a substantial amount of money and less chance of a space.
				Understood that the whole area would be treated as one single area as recognised that dividing it would only displace vehicles immediately outside of the scheme; this would clearly happen with these proposals as it is the area immediately outside the full scheme. No creation of new parking to help alleviate the obvious congestion this will create.
115	Resident	Lynton Street	object	Light touch scheme is ill- thought out and should not be continued in its current plan. Concerned that they need more than light touch as weekend parking is a free for all - think they need full scheme
116	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Majority of streets will see the available parking spaces reduced by at least 50% - where will the displaced vehicles park?
				Pavement parking should be allowed on both sides of streets such as other authorities to ensure residents are able to park.
				Hard standings in Elm Grove should be reinstated
				The minimum road width is nonsense and no roads have the same width. No regard given to the homes with 2 or more vehicles with regards to parking - where will these displaced vehicles expect to park
117	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Residential area with very few businesses around and the two hour a day rule doesn't make any sense and will make it extremely difficult to find a space at the weekend. The permit will cost £100 a year and will struggle to find a space near their home
118	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Concerned that the light touch scheme will mean that the problems faced lower down in Hanover will be shifted to their area, i.e. vehicles left over weekends, workers leaving vehicles during the day and this combined with a reduction in spaces will increase the problems to a horrendous level. Would like to have the full scheme like the rest of Hanover.
				Concerned that there are no traffic calming measures as the roads is used as a cut through and having parking only on one side will mean people will go faster, people speed at present so this will get worse.
119	Resident	Lynton Street	Object	Object to a light touch scheme in Lynton Street when other roads in rest of Hanover will be in a full scheme. Want top triangle area to be full scheme along with the rest of Hanover otherwise will struggle to park out of the restricted times.
120	Resident	May Road	Object	No means to unload deliveries to business, can consideration be given for a loading bay?
121	Resident	Pankhurst Avenue	Object	Gap in the bays at the bottom of Pankhurst Ave - why?
122	Resident	Pankhurst Avenue	Object	Light touch will lead to problems and weekends and beyond, so despite paying for permits ,it probably will be more difficult to park near homes Best solution to have light touch but for 7 days a week



123	Resident	Pankhurst Avenue	Object	Support the need for some form of control but not by making Clayton, Glynde and Firlie Roads no parking. Understand need for double yellow lines on one side of street for emergency vehicle access. Making both sides no parking will exacerbate problems in the area and will mean residents in these streets will now park in their roads, forcing those residents to park further from their homes. Would not east problem but increase it. Would be better to have permit parking only on one side as many houses have more than one car and need vehicles to access their work.
124	resident	Queens Park Road	Support	Supports the light touch but would like to see it for 7 days a week, if paying for a permit it should make parking easier every day and not just weekdays.
125	resident	Queens Park Road	Support	Support scheme but want it to be 7 days a week or a full scheme otherwise weekend visitors will be able to park in zone
126	resident	Queens Park Road	Object	Light touch proposal will continue the promotion of weekend parking and will continue to benefit city visitors and residents will struggle to park at a time they are more likely to be at home and still having to pay for a permit The permit scheme should be continued into the weekend. As a resident please to see the introduction of controlled parking but hope consideration can be given to request.
127	resident	Queens Park Road	Support	Generally support the proposal but would like to support the proposed pedal cycle places, request additional ones on Queens Park Road and north of Elm Grove, support the introduction of the Brighton Bike Share scheme in Queens Park and request further electric vehicle charging points.
128	Resident	Queens Park Road	Support	Generally support the proposal but would like to support the proposed pedal cycle places, request additional ones on Queens Park Road and north of Elm Grove, support the introduction of the Brighton Bike Share scheme in Queens Park and request further electric vehicle charging points.
129	Resident	Ryde Road	Object	Parking is not an issue, by issuing permits would take away an asset of the area and put further financial strain to many families and individuals who cannot afford the permit
130	Resident	Ryde Road	Object	There isn't a parking problem and resent having to pay for something that is currently free, changes are unnecessary
131	Resident	Ryde Road	Object	object to permits as free parking is a bonus to young family on a low income
132	Resident	Sandown Road	Object	No problem with parking in Sandown Road and no need to change situation. Worried that the proposed parking restrictions will mean fewer spaces available for residents. Object to paying for a permit and visitor permits.
133	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	Voted (reluctantly) for a 7 day light touch scheme as it would allow reasonable free parking for friends and visitors but reduce the high density and semi permanent parking .  The proposed scheme does not consider the burden placed on Shanklin Road and Hartington Terrace which will remain from Friday to Monday the car park of choice and will be exacerbated by the reduced number of parking spaces and the introduction of the new CPZ in the rest of Hanover. Want to see the proposal changed to a seven day light touch as it will help achieve a greater equity and distribution of parked vehicles reducing the burden on the Shanklin Road area which already has a high demand due to greater proportion of flats and HMO's than in other parts of the proposed zone. Feels that businesses were able to push through their amendments in the committee without consultation with residents, more consideration was given to the original proposals than the five day scheme approved at committee The seven day light touch scheme allows businesses generous parking options. Shanklin Road, Whippingham Street, Bembridge Street, Hartington Place and Hartington Terrace all vote for a full (seven day) light touch scheme. The amendments made in committee were not entirely transparent to viewer or the councillors, no particular reason put forward for the change except simplification of administration of Zone S, which as a whole voted for a five day scheme. Resident at the north-west end of Hartington Road will continue to be disproportionately affected by the high volume, displacement parking at weekend, while residents further up the hill many who voted no to a scheme will continue to be unaffected. There will be a large reduction in parking spaces at western end of Shanklin Road when it reverts back to parallel parking (to which in favour of) but will compound the issue,
134	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	Voted against scheme but accept majority wanted it. Would like pay and display parking considered in Shanklin Road, parents regularly visit for childcare and there won't be enough visitor permits to cover that and the tradespeople who may be needed. If cannot provide p&d then can more visitor permits be allocated? Concerned about the vans which currently park at an angle at the bottom of Shanklin Road/Whippingham Street and this often blocks the road and also the pavement - worried about emergency vehicles getting through and also has had to walk with buggy in road as pavement blocked.
135	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	Object to the permit bays in Shanklin Road specifically at the top of the road between Hartington Terrace and where it forms a dead end. This is a densely populated part of the street where parking in this wider than average area is generally sustainable if one side of the road is parked at an angle to the pavement rather than parallel. The short end near the graveyard is also used for larger vehicles. Do not agree that there is a need for a turning space, it is a very short length of road and if left clear would not enable a vehicle to turn easily at the end. Current parking makes it easy to reverse out and turn and turn in Hartington Terrace. The area is well managed by residents and rarely used by non-residents Providing more permit bays would increase the council's revenue and enable families who need two vehicles to be able to get sufficient permits
136	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	Live top end of Shanklin Road close to the cemetery and there have rarely been issues regarding parking close to property, the area is a dead end and currently all the vehicles which park in this section are owned by the people who live there. Object to the reduction in spaces from 16 to about 6, the plan to leave the end of the road clear to create a turning space is unnecessary and even if it was there, people would still reverse out. Keeping the junction clear of parked cars at corner of Hartington Terrace may be a safe option but there is rarely any passing traffic. It reduces the amount of parking available. If proposals went ahead then would have to consider moving to different area.

137	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	<p>Parking on Shanklin Street works adequately as it is. The proposals will reduce the number of spaces. Having to pay for parking and arranging for visitor permits is a big inconvenience and completely unnecessary.</p>
138	Resident	Shanklin Road	Object	<p>Do not want to parking permits of any sort but the proposal for 2x1 hour slots each day serves no purpose.</p> <p>Live at the no-through road end of Shanklin Road and parking is worked out between residents to get maximum parking, the new scheme would mean less spaces.</p> <p>Main issue is large campervans who are not residents of the area, as long as they turned up in the evening they still can park, many with people living inside.</p> <p>Even with a permit there is no guarantee of getting a space, would have to leave area if permits introduced.</p>
139	Resident	Totland Road	Object	<p>Want to know if they will be guaranteed two permits</p> <p>Would like to request motorcycle parking in Totland Road (3 bikes at least) the road narrowing at junction with two way would be a good location</p> <p>Good opportunity to reinforce the one-way direction routinely defied by drivers</p>
140	Resident	Totland Road	Object	<p>Pleased scheme is light touch but concerned that roads such as Elm Grove and Queens Park Road are having spaces reduced as it will make it harder to park in other streets</p> <p>Objects to no limit on number of permits per household as there are a number of HMO's in area so not only could parking be as overcrowded as before but also more costly.</p>
141	Resident	Whippingham Road	Object	<p>Does not believe there is enough provision being made for vehicles in this area in light of half the parking being removed on many narrow roads.</p> <p>Already difficult to park and the displacement of vehicles from these roads will make it impossible. parking on Elm Grove which will be forbidden.</p> <p>Feels there will be an enormous parking problem for all residents and still have to pay for a permit.</p> <p>Should formalise the pavement parking</p> <p>Doesn't need to have a permanent loading bay outside the pub on Whippingham Street, the lorry is there once/twice a week and would be better to block road for a little while instead of having to lose two more spaces.</p> <p>Unsure why there are gaps on west side of Whippingham Road - no dropped kerbs so spaces do not need to be removed.</p>
142	Resident	Whippingham Road	Object	<p>Area did vote for a light touch scheme but on the understanding that it would be across the whole area.</p> <p>The decision to split area will mean that residents in the north of Elm Grove (S) will be limited in where they can park.</p> <p>This area is host to various businesses which attract a high volume of traffic which make use of available parking by staff and customers</p> <p>People who use the pub on a Friday then leave vehicles until later in the weekend, this includes a number of commercial vehicles.</p> <p>The area is close to the town centre and good public transport links and surrounded by full permit schemes - so offers a free place to park close to amenities</p> <p>Hard to find parking at the moment after 6pm without having to drive round surrounding streets with other cars doing the same. Is causing congestion on the narrow junctions and the illegal parking on street corners blocking junctions and footpaths.</p> <p>The lack of restrictions at the weekend will mean residents will have to pay for a permit that entitles them to nothing.</p> <p>Without regular enforcement to deter non-permit parking - vehicles will still park near the businesses in the restricted hours and they will take a chance that they won't be fined.</p> <p>Scheme should be a full permit scheme - seven days, 9am to 8pm as it would more effectively deal with the issues of long term vehicle storage, commuter parking and anti-social parking and improve resident's quality of life.</p>
143	Resident	Whippingham Road	Object	<p>No mention that there would be two schemes. People in the proposed Zone S would have voted differently if they had known. Residents of Zone S will have far worse parking conditions than they have now due parking only being restricted for 2 hours five days a week.</p> <p>The parking on many roads is being halved making the pressure on parking worse.</p> <p>People who don't want/can't get permits for the full scheme will park in Zone S outside of restricted times.</p> <p>Parking free at weekends meaning visitors to the city will park in Zone S, if residents drive anyway at the weekend they will not get parked again until the Monday.</p> <p>Whippingham Road, Bonchurch Road and Bernard Place all have busy businesses with numerous visiting vehicles all day every day, some of which are left over the weekend.</p> <p>If current plan implemented then residents will pay for permits but essentially never be able to park about from the ten hours of restricted parking a week (if enforced).</p> <p>Without regular enforcement people visiting the businesses will still park in the permit spaces during the restricted hours and residents will still struggle to find parking.</p> <p>Should be a full seven day a week scheme 8am to 8pm as it would effectively deal with the long term vehicle storage, commuter parking, and anti-social parking and would improve residents' quality of life.</p> <p>The light touch scheme would be a waste of taxpayer's money as residents will be demanding a full scheme and would require further consultation.</p>
144	Resident	Whippingham Street	Object	<p>Plan only shows parking on one side of (one-way end) Whippingham Street - could there be parking on the building side</p>
145	Business		Object	<p>Want to be able to have business permits (lots of additional stuff about the process)</p> <p>Ensure that dropped kerbs are kept clear</p> <p>Would like 5 metres of double yellow lines at junction not 6 metres</p> <p>Feels more parking places could be provided</p> <p>Wants confirming what a minimum parking bay would be?</p> <p>They can't find suitable properties to relocate to and need to find a way to operate within a CPZ</p> <p>Request that their needs of Businesses, staff and visitors are looked at</p>

146	Business		Object	Want business visitor permits introduced as scheme will have an adverse effect on businesses in area Believe the roads will be empty between 9am and 6pm Monday to Friday as there will no longer be any displacement - so makes sense to issue enough business permits to accommodate the amount needed and would raise revenue for the council.
147	Business		Support	Will improve sustainable transport in these areas.
148	Resident	Zone U	Object	The new zones will result in many people parking their cars in Zone U as there are no restrictions after 3pm. There are few spaces in Zone U after 6-7pm Object to the new schemes unless Zone U is made into a full scheme too.
149	Resident	Zone U	Object	How will it impact on Zone U? Their street will be congested after 3pm. Restrictions should match.
150	Bus company		Support	Will improve traffic flow on Freshfield Road and this will improve reliability of bus service for benefit of passengers
151	Resident	One-Way	Object	Happy to see Plumpton Road turned one-way as long as two way cycling is permitted Road is wide enough and enables people on bikes to take most convenient route It acknowledges additional effort required by someone on a bike if have to use a different route and removes that obstacle for people choosing to cycle rather than drive short distances. With minimal signage and road markings improves safety of the street, rather than people occasionally using it when it's not permitted and there are no signs. Positive measures to support cycling are important for the city's strategies to improve air quality and encourage people to exercise.
152	Interest Group	One-Way	Object	One-Ways without cycling contraflows are huge barrier to cycling - there should always be two-way cycling, if considered difficult then car parking can be removed to provide extra width. Roads can also be made completely traffic-free to enable 2-way cycling. Maximising parking is not a legitimate reason to stop people cycling. Hanover and Elm grove already difficult area to cycle due to large number of one-way streets and traffic domination - this proposal will make situation worse. Another adverse result is traffic often goes faster on one-way streets One-way streets should not be proposed without a cycling contraflow.
153	Interest Group	Various	Object	Objects creation of one-way streets, undermine many of the city's objectives around healthier living, reducing air pollution and giving people transport choice and reducing congestion. Cycling will become more difficult and routes made illegal when they are perfectly safe and legitimate. Would like to see the existing roads with one-ways in Hanover made to allow contraflow cycling. Electric bikes will enable areas such as Hanover to become more accessible by bike and more needs to be done to encourage residents of these areas to cycle and reduce their reliance on cars.
154	Interest Group	Various	Object	Greater provision of Pedal Cycle Parking Places should be considered Provide more electrical vehicle charging points Ensure all one-way streets allow two way for cycling to promote cycling and increase road safety by slowing down car speeds.

