Crescent Road Bullets

These points relate to objections raised by analysis of the survey data presented in the Technical Note **only.** For other arguments, please see Ted's PDF on the Round Hill Society website (http://www.roundhill.org.uk/CrescentRoad.pdf) and his Round Hill society Facebook Group dated 22 January 2019.

Original Summary Table under paragraph 3.1, page 5 of the Technical Note.

			Tuesday 4th December 2018	
Street	Capacity	Parked	Spaces	Stress
Princes Crescent	78	77	1	99%
Richmond Road	58	54	2	96%
Mayo Road	24	22	2	92%
Princess Road	89	83	8	91%
Crescent Road	55	57	0	100%
Belton Road	18	21	1	95%
Roundhill Road	12	13	0	100%
Roundhill Street	10	8	2	80%
Totals & Average Stress	326	335	16	95%

Re-analysis of the survey data from the Technical Note (data re-calculated from tables, pages 17-21)

Street	Capacity/Spaces (5.5m)	Cars Parked	Parking Stress
Princes Crescent	74	77	104%
Richmond Road	51	54	106%
Mayo Road	22	22	100%
Princes Road	83	83	100%
Crescent Road	52	57	110%
Belton Road	17	22	129%
Round Hill Road	12	13	108%
Round Hill Street	9	8	88.9%
Total	320	336	105%

Key Findings:

- Current parking stress for the area surveyed as a whole is (336/320) 105%
- With addition 4 cars parked (developer's estimate for site), parking stress would be (340/320) 106%
- Average Parking Stress across the 8 streets surveyed is 106%
- Parking stress for Crescent Road is 110%
- Parking stress for Crescent Road with 4 extra cars parked would be (61/52) 117%
- Technical note claims parking stress for the all streets surveyed as a whole is 95%, which would increase to 97% with an addition of 4 more parked cars.

4 main points:

(1) Parking capacity totals are wrong, which results in an under-estimate of parking stress percentages for several streets, as well as for the survey area as a whole.

In the appendix of the technical note, pages 17 to 21 present the survey data by street and for the survey area as a whole. The total number of parking spaces available when correctly totalled from this data is 320, and not 326 as specified in the tables. This error has the effect of lowering the percentage measurement of parking stress for each street where the data have been totalled inaccurately (namely Princes' Crescent, Richmond Road, Princes' Road, Crescent Road, and Belton Road), as well as for the survey area as a whole.

(2) Current parking stress across the surveyed area is severe at 105%, not 95% as claimed

The true level of current parking stress is across the surveyed area as a whole is 105% based on the data contained within the technical note-- far greater than the BHCC's 90% threshold of concern. The accurate total for parking space capacity is 320. The accurate total of the number of cars parked is 336. The Lambeth methodology to measure parking stress, defined in the 2016 guidelines issued by Lambeth as "the number of vehicles parked in relation to the on-street capacity. This is usually expressed as a percentage figure of the overall capacity." Following this methodology, and the parking stress for the surveyed area as a whole is (336/320), which is 105%. The survey data, accurately totalled, shows parking stress on Crescent Road at 110% (57/52). Using accurate totals from the survey, all but one street has parking stress of 100% or higher. The methodology used in the technical note to calculate parking stress not only uses inaccurate totals but also compounds this error with an alternative methodology which systematically underestimates the true levels of parking stress, both at the street level and across the area as a whole. These inconsistencies cannot be deduced from the data presented in the summary table under paragraph 3.1 on page 5 in the main text of the technical note.

(3) Parking Beat Survey was undertaken on a single evening only, and it is not clear on what date

The Lambeth Guidelines 2016 recommend "snapshot survey between the hours of 0030-0530 should be undertaken on two separate weekday nights". The technical report presents findings from a survey

undertaken on a single night only. Moreover, it is not clear on which date the survey was undertaken. Page 5 of the technical report paragraph 3.1 states “A formal Parking Beat Survey, using Lambeth Methodology, was undertaken between 1.30am and 3.30am on Wednesday, 12 December 2018.” But the summary table on page 5 paragraph 3.3 gives the date of the survey as “Tuesday 4th December 2018”.

(4) Timing of the Parking Beat Survey, within the context of the year, is likely to underestimate true parking stress

The survey was undertaken at a time of year when it could be argued parking stress is likely to below the average when measured across the year as a whole. The survey was carried out in winter but given the location of the survey area, more visitor parking permits are used in late spring, summer and early autumn. The true measure of parking stress across the year is therefore likely greater than the results presented in the technical note (which have already been demonstrated to be inaccurate and an under-estimation), and above the significantly higher levels of parking stress suggested by re-analysis of the survey data.