

<b>APPLICATION NO:</b> 15/02269/FUL		<b>OFFICER:</b> Mrs Emma Pickernell
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 30th December 2015		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 30th March 2016
<b>WARD:</b> All Saints		<b>PARISH:</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Paul Haskins	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	83 Hewlett Road, Cheltenham	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Alterations and extensions to the building and conversion to provide 9 additional flats.	

### ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

61 Duke Street  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6BS

**Comments:** 11th February 2016

I request that the parking survey submitted pertaining to the application 15/02269/FUL is not considered as evidence of the availability of parking in the area of Duke Street, Princes Street and Leighton Road. I have the following reasons for this request

This is not an independent or impartial survey.

It is a snap shot rather than a comprehensive survey over a period of time with a detailed analysis of the results. There was no methodology presented to demonstrate how the samples and therefore the results would be free from bias

The actual survey lacks precision and accuracy. For example the photo captioned 'Free spaces along Leighton Road ...7pm 17th December' is actually a view south along Princes Street to the junction with Carlton Street not Leighton Road. There are spaces to the left in the photograph because the road has a white H bar marking across the access to 2 garages and a single gated driveway all with dropped kerbs and to the right because of a gated driveway and a garage. To park in these locations would obstruct access. However, in the table for 17th December 2015, 7pm, 3 spaces are recorded in Princes Street.

Alveston House  
St Annes Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 2SS

**Comments:** 10th February 2016

I propose that the parking survey submitted in relation to the above application should not be used as evidence of the parking capacity in the area of Duke St/ Princes St/ Leighton Road. My reasons for this proposal are as follows:

12<sup>th</sup> February 2016

- 1) The photographic evidence provided by SPF planning is not time or date stamped, and so there is no proof of what time/date these photographs were taken.
- 2) Evidence of one parking space being available does not support the fact that there were multiple spaces available.
- 3) SPF claim that the surveys were carried out over 6 days - 3 of these evenings were a weekend evening before Christmas when the schools had finished and many people would have left for the Christmas break. Two of the remaining days were in Christmas week.
- 4) The photo showing the spaces on Leighton Road at 7pm on Dec 17th isn't a photo of Leighton Road at all. Leighton Road is one-way, while the cars in this photo are facing both ways.
- 5) The two photos of Duke St shown (7pm 19th Dec and 4pm 22nd Dec) could very well be exactly the same photo using different flash settings. My reason for suggesting this is that the cars parked either side of the space are exactly the same, and in exactly the same position in both pictures.
- 6) The survey was carried out by the applicant, who has provided the results in an effort to support an application which will be of great financial benefit to themselves.

All these photos really show is that over the course of the 6 purported surveys, there were six (or maybe only five) free spaces on the roads in question.

The only accurate and impartial way to carry out a parking survey would be to have representatives of the local community, the council and the applicant do the survey together.

36 Duke Street  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL52 6BP

**Comments:** 10th February 2016

The parking survey that has recently been added was apparently carried out between the 17th and 22nd of December.

This is the week before Christmas, a time when many residents are away visiting family, and many people who park on the street whilst working in the area are off work.

So, even if a survey paid for by the applicants can be trusted at all, it is not representative of a normal week. It would be cynical of me to suggest that this is deliberate timing, but it does seem a very happy coincidence.

At best this survey actually backs up the lack of parking available; with a good proportion of the people and cars that are usually parked in the area being away there are still not enough spaces on Duke Street to cover the probable extra vehicles that will be brought to the street by the development.

12<sup>th</sup> February 2016