

REPORT TO PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR PROPOSED COMMUNITY PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN THE SUNDERLAND ROYAL HOSPITAL AREA (BARNES, PALLION AND MILLFIELD WARDS)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the Committee regarding two objections that have been received, by the Council, in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 4 of the Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) that is intended for the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital (SRH), and to request the Committee to not uphold those objections that cannot be resolved within the constraints of the scheme, as set out below.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Committee will be aware that the Council introduced a permit-based CPMS in the area of SRH, known as CPMS Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3 (CPMS1, CPMS3). Following the success of CPMS1, 2 & 3, and in accordance with the Council's commitment to the area, the Council intends to introduce CPMS Phase 4 (CPMS4). CPMS4 has been designed following extensive consultation and partnership working with elected Members, a local residents association, businesses and other stakeholders including SRH management, in the Hospital area, and is intended to reduce the amount of commuter parking, principally by hospital staff and commuters, on the streets within the scheme.
- 2.2 On 11th May 2017 the CPMS4 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised both on site and in the local press. The 21-days advertisement period gives persons and organisations who may object to the scheme the opportunity to raise their objections formally with the Council.
- 2.3 In response to the TRO advertisement the Council received two objections. The location of each objector is shown on a plan of the area in Appendix A, with a summary of the objections in Appendix B and copy of the full objections in Appendix C.

3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The Council has a duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" and "the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises"
- 3.2 The indiscriminate and obstructive parking at junctions causes difficulty and reduces visibility for pedestrian and vehicular traffic attempting to negotiate the congested streets, thereby increasing danger for said road users to the detriment of highway safety.

- 3.3 Access to premises is affected by commuter parking making it difficult for residents to park their vehicles in the vicinity of their homes, causing people to walk greater distances, often carrying goods and supervising children. Trading levels for local shops and services are considered to be adversely affected, because passing customers cannot easily park in the vicinity and are more likely to shop elsewhere. Commercial and to a lesser extent residential premises experience difficulty receiving deliveries or servicing the premises due to indiscriminate and obstructive parking.
- 3.4 It is therefore considered necessary to introduce permit based parking areas, designed to deter long stay commuter parking whilst allowing residents and visitors to the area more opportunity to park within said areas. It is also proposed to introduce a number of additional restrictions, including; limited waiting, no waiting at any time and no waiting no loading at any time. These restrictions are considered necessary in order to compliment the permit parking areas.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 It is RECOMMENDED that:

- (i) The objections to the Traffic Regulation Order, for the proposed Phase 4 Community Parking Management Scheme in the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital not be upheld.
- (ii) The Council continues to monitor the parking situation within vicinity of Sunderland Royal Hospital and seek to address displacement and any other identified issue within a future phase.
- (iii) All objectors be advised accordingly of the decision.
- (iv) The Head of Streetscene instruct the Head of Law and Governance to take all necessary steps to make and bring into effect the associated Traffic Regulation Order.
- (v) The Head of Streetscene take all necessary action to implement the physical works associated with Sunderland Royal Hospital Community Parking Management Scheme Phase 4.

APPENDIX A

CPMS4 Proposals and Location of Objectors

Times of Operation

Previously proposed changes to operational times are not required as the reduced extent can be adequately enforced within the existing times.

Key:

- Proposed extent of Permit Areas, Eligible Properties & Permit Identifier - Permit Holders Only Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Existing scheme extent & Permit Identifier - Permit Holders Only Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Existing Waiting Restrictions
- Reduce Length of Existing Waiting Restrictions
- Proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellows)
- Proposed No Waiting Mon to Fri, 8am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm, (subject to separate Order)
- Existing Permit Holders Only Parking Bays - Mon to Fri 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Proposed Permit Holders Only Parking Bays - Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am, 2pm to 3pm
- Convert existing Limited Waiting to Pay & Display, 60p per hour All Days, 8am to 6pm (subject to separate Order)
- Existing Bays to remain unchanged
- Proposed Limited Waiting - Mon to Fri, 8am to 6pm, 1 Hour, No Return Within 1 Hour
- Proposed Limited Waiting Mon to Sat, 8am to 6pm, 2 Hours, No Return Within 2 Hours
- Proposed Gateway Sign OR Existing Gateway Sign to Remain
- Existing Gateway Sign to be removed

OBJECTOR 2
Arlington Street

Majority Petition for inclusion
of Ingleby Terrace

OBJECTOR 3
West Mount

Majority Petition for inclusion
of Hawarden Crescent

OBJECTOR 1
Hawarden Crescent

Limited waiting bays
to be removed.

PROJECT	DATE	REVISION	DATE
PROJECT OBJECT	PROJECT OWNER	PROJECT OFFICE	PROJECT DATE
Sunderland City Council			
Economy and Place Directorate Jack Crawford House Commercial Road Sunderland SR2 8DR			
Telephone: 0191 520 5555 Fax: 0191 553 1460 Web: www.sunderland.gov.uk			
PROJECT: Royal Hospital Community Parking Management Scheme Phase 4			
TITLE: Traffic Regulation Order Scheme Detail			
PROJECT OBJECT	PROJECT OWNER	PROJECT OFFICE	PROJECT DATE
P.J.G.	P.J.G.	0191 5611621	May 2016
CHECKED BY	DATE	SCALE	SHEET NO.
KH	Nov 2016	NTS	A2
APPROVED BY	DATE	SCALE	SHEET NO.
P.J.G.	Nov 2016	NTS	A2
PROJECT NO.	PROJECT NO.	PROJECT NO.	PROJECT NO.
TRIS/14/000675/003	TRIS/14/000675/003	TRIS/14/000675/003	TRIS/14/000675/003

APPENDIX B – Objection Summary and Consideration of Objection

	Objector	Nature of Objection	Consideration of Objection
1.	<p>██████████ ██████████ Hawarden Crescent High Barnes Sunderland SR4 7NL</p>	<p>1) The lady is strongly opposed to the inclusion of Hawarden Crescent, the street originally voted against inclusion in the 'official poll' but the decision was later overturned due to a majority petition, even though the lead petitioner does not live in Hawarden Crescent.</p> <p>2) It is claimed that the lead petitioner was bullying and coercing residents into signing the petition.</p>	<p>1) Hawarden Crescent did originally voted against inclusion (50.7% against based on a 67.4% return), however following the announcement of the results and on reflection, residents of Hawarden Crescent submitted a majority petition (58 of 113 properties or 51.3% of all properties) wishing to overturn the original vote and have their street included. The submission of this petition, and another from Ingleby Terrace, was discussed with Barnes Ward Councillors and later the Working Group, made up of elected ward members and representatives from the Barnes, Pallion and Millfield Residents Association, the decision was to uphold the petitions and extend the scheme to include Hawarden Crescent and Ingleby Terrace. The lead petitioners address is Ewing Road, however their property has equal frontage onto Hawarden Crescent, accounting for this the petition would be 59 of 114 properties or 51.8% of all properties.</p> <p>2) All 114 affected properties were written to, advising of the decision to uphold the petition. Whilst the objector may have perceived the manner of the lead petitioner to be 'bullying and coercing' no other resident has made this claim.</p> <p>For clarity the objector's</p>

		<p>3) The lady wouldn't object to inclusion if free permits were house specific rather than vehicle specific. It does not seem fair residents who are unable to drive, for sight reasons, are expected to pay £40.00 per annum to have visitors or trades appointments.</p>	<p>signature is not contained within the petition</p> <p>3) The scheme is specifically designed to only target long stay commuter parking, whilst avoiding the most common visiting times for residents, requiring vehicles to display a permit 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm, Monday to Friday, therefore visitors on a lunchtime, evenings or weekends would not need to display a permit. Due to this many residents have found that the scratch card option (at £10 per book of 10) to be a more cost effective option.</p> <p>The annual charge of £40.00 per annum for a Visitors Permit, and this cost has remained the same since the introduction of the first scheme in 2009. Being non registration specific there is an increased value for this type of permit and therefore it is priced at twice that of a second vehicle registered at a residential address. Residents with a Blue Badge or a care requirements are however entitled to a free Visitors Permit. There are also exemptions for certain construction activities within the permit area.</p> <p>4)</p>
2.	<p>████████████████████</p> <p>Arlington Street Pallion</p>	<p>1) Residents of Arlington Street voted against the scheme. There is no logic to split the street up</p>	<p>1) When assessing the voting results, particularly towards the edge of a scheme, we look at the voting patterns for particular streets as well as trying to achieve a logical boundary and where we can physically fit gateway signs. In this instance Fordland</p>

			<p>Place voted in favour, with support dropping off at the northernmost properties, whilst the majority of Arlington Street voted against it was evident that the eastern half of the street was predominantly in favour of inclusion, the result being that we needed to locate gateway signs prior to the junction of Arlington Street/Fordland Place.</p> <p>In determining gateway locations we must take account of physical constraints; footway width, location of utilities etc. location of windows, as well as neighbouring trees/foliage that may block visibility of the signs. When assessing this particular location it was observed that there were a number of utilities at the junction itself and relatively dense foliage along the northern boundary, it was therefore concluded that the boundary of 46 Fordland Place & 21 Arlington Street / 48 Fordland Place & 20 Arlington Street was the most appropriate location for gateway signs.</p>
		<p>2) Including this part of the street means that this part of the street would be Arlington Street in Fordland Place, would the gable ends of other streets name need changing?</p>	<p>2) It is quite common for properties to have boundaries on multiple streets, in this instance the gables of Fordland Place are onto Arlington Street but the postal address remains Fordland Place. There would be no need for a change of street name, simply that the relevant section of Arlington Street is properly referenced within the required legal Order. To clarify; the frontage of the</p>

		<p>3) As the street objected and you are boundary tampering we will take this further (ombudsman / MP/ Councillors etc.)</p>	<p>gentleman's property would not be within the permit area, but the gable of Fordland Place would be.</p> <p>3) See 1 & 2 above. Subject to the resolution of committee, the next level of challenge would be to the High Court, challenges do however be made on matters of procedure and propriety i.e. that the Council has failed to follow proper procedure.</p>
3.	<p>Westmount Dental Surgery 1 West Mount Chester Road Sunderland SR4 8PY</p> <p>The objection is accompanied by a 1024 signature petition, as well as staff and patients surveys, and signatures from 26 nearby residents opposed to the scheme.</p>	<p>1) The plans seem to show that only two spaces have been made available for visitors to the dentists. This is not sufficient to allow the business to function, there are 5 surgeries within the practice, serving 7,000 patients.</p> <p>2) Residents in the street deliberately park their cars on street each morning,</p>	<p>1) The proposals are intended to balance competing parking demands within a relatively small cul-de-sac. A large proportion of the parking that currently occurs could not be accommodated in a formal manner.</p> <p>West Mount itself has a theoretical parking capacity (where vehicles are parked not causing an obstruction) for a maximum 10 cars. At 15.5metres in length the area designated as limited waiting is capable of accommodating 2 to 3 cars, representing 30% of the overall capacity. Comparably the Dental Practice accounts for only 7% of the street frontage and number of properties.</p> <p>The dentists would also be able to purchase Scratch Card Permits (£10 per book of 10, single day), which would enable their customers to park within the permit holders bays. These permits are non-registration specific and could therefore be re-used within the same day.</p> <p>2) Parking surveys would confirm that some residents do move their cars onto the</p>

		<p>moving them from private driveways to do so, reducing the capacity and exacerbating the parking issues. Residents also place 'illegal' traffic cones on the highway to deter customer parking.</p> <p>It is anticipated that residents will continue their existing behaviour and park their vehicles in the permit bays, leaving no additional space for dental customers. The proposed changes will make the situation worse.</p>	<p>street on a morning, which they freely admit to. The residents state that moving their car onto the street is the only way they can ensure they can get off their driveway, as people regularly park in a manner that makes egress/access from/to a driveway impossible. Residents state that they would much prefer to park on their drive.</p> <p>The proposals are designed to regularise parking within the street, creating parking where it would not cause an obstruction (see 1 above), residents should be able to freely use their own drives.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that residents will continue their existing parking behaviour, the majority of residents have clearly stated that they would prefer to park on their own drive.</p>
		<p>3) The surgery has actively tried to resolve the parking issues, specifically regarding long stay staff parking. Arrangements have been made to secure off street parking for 10 staff vehicles from September 2017, at a cost of several thousand pounds per annum. This off street solution alleviates the issue so the merits of the permit scheme are questioned.</p>	<p>3) The proposed addition of off-street parking for staff is welcomed. Removal of 10 vehicles from West Mount and nearby streets would without doubt help to alleviate the issues, but it would not fully address the balance within the street.</p> <p>It is suggested that the combination of off-street staff parking, with limited waiting and permit bays on street, would significantly improve the situation for residents and patients alike.</p>
		<p>4) The practice has been established for over sixty years and respects the rights of the residents,</p>	<p>4) For balance; residents have shared similar accounts of abuse from patients and staff. The matter of anti-</p>

		<p>parking has never proven an issue until recently. Several homeowners have been verbally abusive to staff and patients, which has been referred to the Police.</p>	<p>social behaviour is not strictly a highway matter, however we understand that parking can be a highly emotive issue, particularly in situations such as this.</p> <p>The scheme itself is designed to try and better balance the competing highway needs within a very limited space.</p>
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX C

Objections in Full

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Hawarden Crescent

High Barnes

SUNDERLAND

Tyne & Wear SR4 7NL

12th May, 2017.

Mr E. Waugh
Head of Law and Governance
P.O. Box 100
Civic Centre, Burdon Road
SUNDERLAND SR2 7DN

Dear Sir,

With reference to the notice in the Sunderland Echo of Thursday May 11 regarding the Sunderland Royal Hospital parking scheme, I wish to register my strongest possible objection to the inclusion of Hawarden Crescent under Schedule 23.63.

There was an official, properly conducted, poll in this area, as a result of which residents rejected inclusion in the scheme. Subsequently, one individual who does not even live in Hawarden Crescent hand-delivered letters through each door indicating in strongly worded terms that we should support his request for a new petition. I did not sign, and shortly afterward received another letter, the tone of which concerned me sufficiently for me to contact my three local councillors.

Councillor Galbraith visited me, read the letter and noted its tone, and assured me that no further action would be taken in view of local response to the official poll. I was therefore astonished to receive a notice that we were to be included after all, and I emailed Julie Elliott, MP, and the three councillors. As a result of Julie Elliott's follow-up, I received a copy of a letter from Mark Jackson to someone called Rachael, stating that 'residents of Hawarden Crescent and Ingleby Terrace took it upon themselves to gather support...'.

This is not the case. One bullying individual coerced residents into a fresh petition – his personal petition, not the official Council one which was impartial and unthreatening. It is entirely possible that people signing felt under a certain amount of duress: Councillor Galbraith can confirm the nature of the wording.

I would not object if each household were to receive a free, house-specific rather than vehicle-specific, permit. As it is, the charge for a visitor permit appears no more than a revenue-raising gambit for the Council, in an area where most residents are on modest or low incomes, and with a high proportion of retired people. As a single person who is unable to drive for optical reasons, am I to tell my visitors that they cannot spend a day with me and must move their cars? Or am I to turn down visits or trades appointments unless I can pay £40 a year in case someone wants to call during certain times?

This is still a very quiet road, and any reconsideration of the parking scheme should be left for at least a further year. My objections, however, are on grounds of cost, discrimination, and, most of all, because the Council, breaking a promise, has condoned giving in to bullying when an official decision had already been made.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Peter Graham

From: Peter Graham
Sent: 30 May 2017 09:50
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Jenifer Clifford
Subject: RE: Arlington Street - Royal Hospital Area CPMS4 Objection
Attachments: __Hospital CPMS4 Final TRO.pdf

Mr [REDACTED]

Apologies, please see if the attached works. If not you may need to download a PDF viewer onto the device that you are attempting to view the attachment. Please also accept this email as formal receipt of your objection.

In response to your objection I would offer the following comments:

When assessing the voting results, particularly towards the edge of a scheme, we look at the voting patterns for particular streets as well as trying to achieve a logical boundary and where we can physically fit gateway signs. In this instance Fordland Place voted in favour, with support dropping off at the northernmost properties, whilst the majority of Arlington Street voted against it was evident that the eastern half of the street was predominantly in favour of inclusion, the result being that we needed to locate gateway signs prior to the junction of Arlington Street/Fordland Place.

In determining gateway locations we must take account of physical constraints; footway width, location of utilities etc. location of windows, as well as neighbouring trees/foliage that may block visibility of the signs. When assessing this particular location it was observed that there were a number of utilities at the junction itself and relatively dense foliage along the northern boundary, it was therefore concluded that the boundary of 46 Fordland Place & 21 Arlington Street / 48 Fordland Place & 20 Arlington Street was the most appropriate location for gateway signs.

It is quite common for properties to have boundaries on multiple streets, in this instance the gables of Fordland Place are onto Arlington Street but the postal address remains Fordland Place. There would be no need for a change of street name, simply that the relevant section of Arlington Street is properly referenced within the required legal Order. To clarify; the frontage of your property would not be within the permit area, but the gable of Fordland Place would be.

With reference to your objection; I can advise that objections to the scheme are to be considered by Sunderland City Council's Planning and Highways Committee on the evening of 13th June 2017, scheduled to be held at 17:30 in Committee Room 2, Civic Centre, Burdon Road, SR2 7DN. Members of the public are permitted to attend committee, whilst as an objector you are entitled to address the committee to present your objection, should you so wish.

In any instance you will be advised of the resolution of the committee in due course. In the event that you intend to speak at committee I would be grateful if you could let me know, so that we can allow sufficient time within the agenda for the evening.

Regards,

Peter

Peter Graham
Engineer
Economy and Place Directorate
Sunderland City Council
www.sunderland.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2017 15:03
To: Peter Graham
Subject: Re: Arlington Street

*****This message originates from outside your organisation. Do not provide login or password details. Do not click on links or attachments unless you are sure of their authenticity. If in doubt, email 'Ask.ICT@Sunderland.gov.uk' or call 561 5000 *****

I cant open attachments to your E-mail. We wish to object to the Council (obviously to suit their own agenda)using Arlington Street for your street parking scheme. Especially as tennant's of Arlington Street voted against the scheme for their street. There seems to be no logic to split a street up and call it another name for 25metres(aprox). So the gable end of the western end of the eastern section of Arlington Street would become Arlington Street in Fordland Place and so every cross street would have a gable end in the other street and so would the name have to be changed as well ?? As our street has objected to the parking scheme and if you carry on with this boundary tampering we will take this further (ombudsman/MP/Councillors etc.)

From: Peter Graham <Peter.Graham@sunderland.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 May 2017 09:31
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Arlington Street

Mr Avery,

As discussed, please find attached a copy of the scheme and site notice. The address for objections is towards the bottom of the Notice.

Regards,

Peter

Peter Graham
Engineer
Economy and Place Directorate
Sunderland City Council
www.sunderland.gov.uk



Sunderland City Council: Sunderland Home Page

www.sunderland.gov.uk

The Sunderland City Council website is for anyone living, working, visiting or wanting to invest in Sunderland - a great city by the sea with a balanced way of life ...

Westmount Dental Surgery
1 West Mount
Chester Road
Sunderland
SR4 8PY

30th May 2017

Elaine Waugh
Head of Law and Governance
Sunderland City Council
PO Box 100
Civic Centre
Burdon Road
Sunderland
SR2 7DN

Dear Ms. Waugh,

RE: WESTMOUNT – OPPOSING THE PERMIT PARKING CONSULTATION

I am in receipt of the above letter to ascertain whether there is community support to progress a Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS).

In your letter it states that CPMS within the city do not provide 'resident only parking' but are designed to deter long stay commuter parking, give some preference to residential parking and improve the turnover of space for visitors.

The letter gave two options for consideration:

- Option A is to convert all of West Mount into a permit area;
- Option B is to section the street into the mentioned sections, with limited waiting parking bays for patients of the practice.

My immediate response is that Option A is not a viable option for Westmount Dental Surgery and Option B places so much limitation on the amount of spaces available for visitors to the practice that it will have a detrimental effect on the practice. On looking at the plan of the proposal, it seems that there will be a maximum of two spaces made available to visitors of the practice. This is simply not satisfactory to allow business continuity. We have five fully operational surgeries within the building and I feel this action will severely affect our Dental Practice and our 7000 patients.

It is my understanding that Sunderland Council have received complaints from the residents of West Mount in relation to the parking in the street. If there are any parking issues within the street, they would be greatly alleviated by residents of the street utilising their own personal drive ways to full effect. I have previously mentioned that the residents of the street

deliberately move their cars from their driveways first thing in the morning to park on the street. There is also illegal positioning of traffic cones on the pavements to act as deterrents for people parking. The last time I checked, West Mount is a public road. I feel that our business is being targeted as the source of the problem, when I feel the residents are contributing greatly to the congestion of the street.

We have actively tried to relieve the parking issues within the street and as a practice have secured some private local off street parking for the staff of the practice, which will commence in September 2017. This means that Westmount Dental Surgery will have ten allocated private parking spaces away from the practice. This will reduce the number of cars parked on a long stay basis in the street Monday through to Friday. Details of this parking arrangement can be made available at your request. This arrangement has cost the practice near £10,000 per annum but we are committed to try and alleviate this problem and have procured this off our own back. It is a cost which will have a serious impact on the business, but it is a worthwhile investment to allow us to continue to provide services for dental health to our patients.

The implementation of two 'permit holding only' times seems very illogical and appears to be a deterrent only to the Westmount Dental Surgery. It seems to be specifically targeting long stay parkers and I feel only the Practice is affected. Our Off Street Parking arrangement alleviates this issue, so I question its merit. The introduction of double yellow lines on the west side of the street means that there will be insufficient parking to allow everyone adequate parking space. Given the attitude and behaviour of the neighbours, I can anticipate that they will park in the permit only areas, first thing every morning, to prevent patients parking there. The national average of cars per household is two, as there are fourteen houses in the street, there should be a provision of twenty eight spaces to provide adequate parking space. As the residents fail to utilise their own drive ways for personal use, the proposed changes are actually going to worsen the current parking situation.

Many residents of the street will not be affected by any changes implemented as part of the proposed changes, however, the access to a much needed dental care services is going to be impacted greatly. Access to all healthcare services should be made as easy as possible to promote health monitoring for all. The parking limitation is likely to hinder patients from attending the practice.

Although we respect the rights of the residents, the dental practice has been established for over sixty years and parking has never proven an issue until recently. I would like to use this opportunity to highlight that several home owners within the street have repeatedly verbally abused our staff and patients, which is highly unacceptable. This matter has been addressed with the police, however I do feel it is important that you are made aware of the abusive and racist behaviour of the residents.

Since my last letter, I have spoken with you in relation to the survey which took place on Westmount over a series of days. You highlighted that it showed the majority of cars parking on the street were in fact cars belonging to the residents of the street. With this in mind, I

must reinforce that if the residents utilised their personal drive ways, there would be a lot less congestion on the street.

I strongly feel that with our new parking arrangements and residents using their drive ways that the only people parking in the street will be patients of the practice, who usually have a turnaround of one hour. I believe that the implementation of a 'two hours, no return in 1 hour' zoning for the entire street would be more appropriate, or something similar. The residents would be able to utilise their drive space for personal use, some of which are able to house up to three vehicles and the practice staff will use the allocated off street parking arranged and hopefully the limited time for parking would prevent people from hogging the street parking. I feel this is very reasonable and think it should be considered.

We have completed research into the topic and have engaged with staff, patients, visitors and neighbours, with the results in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

In the attached petition of signatures, we have 1024 respondents who would like to oppose the changes in parking within the West Mount area.

We also have signatures from twenty-six neighbours who would also like to oppose the proposed changes in parking within the West Mount area.

I have included all of the evidence as part of this letter.

I look forward to your response.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nicola Dunnett', written in a cursive style.

Miss Nicola Dunnett
Practice Manager

Appendix 1 - Staff Survey

QUESTION	ANSWER	AMOUNT	COMMENTS	AMOUNT
Do you currently drive to work?	Yes	18		0
	No	3		0
Do you feel that your health and safety would be compromised if you had to park elsewhere?	Yes	19	Late nights walking to car Wouldn't want to walk far in the dark Wouldn't feel safe walking to car late at night	4 2 1
	No	2		
Will this affect your daily routine?	Yes	17	Childcare routine will be affected Leaving earlier and getting home later will affect family Would be late for work due to nursery opening times Leaving home earlier and arriving home later Would be difficult to fulfil contracted hours Additional child care costs	2 3 1 2 2 1
	No	4		0
Could the change in parking arrangements make you consider seeking alternative employment	Yes	18	Unable to go home at lunch to look after elderly grandparents Would feel unsafe Wouldn't be able to fulfil contracted hours Couldn't guarantee parking, public transport from Gateshead Couldn't guarantee parking, public transport from Sunderland Don't want to pay for parking Stressful trying to find parking in rush hour Leaving home earlier and arriving home later	1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1
	No	3		0

Appendix 2 - Patient Questionnaire – Core Question Results

QUESTION	ANSWER	AMOUNT
Would walking from alternative parking areas cause you concern?	Yes	15
	No	2
If yes [to above] what kind? [one person ticked medical and safety]	Medical	4
	Safety	12
	N/A	2
Would this make attending the practice difficult?	Yes	16
	No	1
Would you be forced to seek alternative dental care?	Yes	13
	No	14
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		AMOUNT
Difficulty in walking distance and rely on being able to park close to practice		1
Wife has mobility issues, walking is near impossible		1
Father suffers from mental illness and relies on close parking		1
Mother has physical impairment and relies on close parking		1
I feel safe parking outside the practice		1
I don't know the area well		1
I suffer from panic/anxiety attacks when in unfamiliar areas		1
I am vulnerable to feeling threatened in unfamiliar situations and around strangers		1
I would feel threatened walking from another car parking area		1
I don't want to have this care taken away from me		1
I am a nervous patient and struggle to gain rapport with dentists		1
I struggle to walk long distances and inclines		1