

Appendix 2 Results of Public Consultation

- 1 A letter and questionnaire were sent to 85 affected properties in the area shown at the back of Appendix 2. The survey population consists of 43 residents, 39 businesses (excluding vacant premises at the time of the survey), two places of worship and one educational establishment.
- 2 The questionnaire, requesting responses to five questions, are also enclosed at the back of Appendix 2. The three-week consultation period occurred between 26 March and 15 April 2012.
- 3 Thirty three (33) completed questionnaires were received providing a response rate of about 39 percent. The results of this consultation are discussed below.

Question 1

- 4 This question shows the composition of respondents being:

| Type | Numbers | Percentage |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Residents | 11 | 33.3% |
| Business | 19 | 57.6% |
| Both | 1 | 3.0% |
| Other* | 2 | 6.1% |
| Total | 33 | 100.0% |

*Other includes places of worship and educational establishments.

- 5 It is noted that although there is a marginally larger resident population, most respondents were businesses.

Question 2

- 6 This question highlights the frequency of noise disturbances from the night-time economy. About 50 percent of respondents suffered from noise at varying frequencies, mostly on a weekly basis.

| Extent | Numbers | Percentages |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| At least once a week (often) | 11 | 33.3% |
| A couple of times a month (sometimes) | 3 | 9.1% |
| Less frequently | 2 | 6.1% |
| Never | 17 | 51.5% |
| Total | 33 | 100.0% |

- 7 Unsurprisingly, all residents reported suffering from noise often or sometimes, as opposed to the majority of businesses who did not suffer from noise disturbances. This may be because the majority of businesses in the area are offices hence are less likely to be affected by the night-time economy.

| Type / Frequency | Often | Sometimes | Less Frequently | Never |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Resident | 9 | 2 | | |
| Business | | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| Both | | | | 1 |
| Other | 2 | | | |
| Total | 11 | 3 | 1 | 18 |

- 8 The results show that residents and businesses have conflicting views on this issue.

Question 3

9 This question seeks to establish whether removal of out-of-hours parking at Mitre Street will help address the noise issue. The majority of respondents do not believe removal of out-of-hours parking will improve the situation. However, one reason cited for this was the lack of enforcement late at night* to support any such changes for it to be meaningful.

| Support | Numbers | Percentage |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Yes | 11 | 33.3% |
| No | 17 | 51.5% |
| Don't Know / Not Sure | 5 | 15.2% |
| Total | 33 | 100.0% |

*Parking enforcement is available until 6 pm Sunday, 10 pm Monday to Thursday and 24-hours Friday and Saturday.

10 Again, unsurprisingly, most residents think that increased parking restrictions will help address the noise issue but this view is not shared by most businesses.

| Type / Support | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure | Total |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Residents | 7 | 4 | | 11 |
| Business | 3 | 11 | 5 | 19 |
| Both | | 1 | | 1 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Total | 11 | 17 | 5 | 33 |

Question 4

- 11 This question determines support for the proposal to remove out-of-hours parking at Mitre Street by converting the single yellow line to double yellow lines. Again, it can be seen that support for (42.4 percent) and against (45.5 percent) this proposal is fairly evenly split.

| Support | Numbers | Percentage |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Yes | 14 | 42.4% |
| No | 15 | 45.5% |
| Don't Know / Not Sure | 4 | 12.1% |
| Total | 33 | 100.0% |

- 12 Echoing the previous questions, most residents are in favour of increased parking restrictions but most businesses are not. Some businesses are concerned about losing the ability to load / unload. However, this proposal would not have an impact on loading restrictions.

| Type / Support | Yes | No | Don't Know / Not Sure | Total |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Residents | 9 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Business | 4 | 12 | 3 | 19 |
| Both | | 1 | | 1 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Total | 14 | 15 | 4 | 33 |

Question 5

- 13 This question gives the respondent the opportunity to make any other comments on the proposal and to highlight any other parking & loading issues in the immediate area.
- 14 One of the recurring comments made was the need to extend any parking restrictions to adjacent streets, particularly Creechurch Lane and Bury Street, as part of an area wide approach. Treating Mitre Street in isolation can result in the problem being migrated elsewhere. Consequently, the decision was taken to consider and incorporate the City-wide waiting & loading review with that for Mitre Street.

Summary

- 15 The public consultation clearly demonstrates an inherent conflict between residents and businesses in the area with regards to noise issues from the night-time economy. This can be explained by (a) the fact that the majority of businesses in the area are offices whose operation does not co-exist with the night-time economy and (b) certain businesses are part of the night-time economy and may be perpetrating the noise.
- 16 All residents reported suffering from noise often or sometimes, as opposed to the majority of businesses who did not suffer from noise disturbances. Consequently, residents are more likely to think that increased parking restrictions will help address the situation, and are therefore more in favour of the proposal.