

Rebuttal Proof of Evidence - Highways & Transport Matters

334-340 High Street, Harborne

LPA Ref: 2022/06737/PA

PINS Ref: APP/P4605/W/23/3336011

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 This Rebuttal relates to issues raised in the proof of evidence submitted by Mr. Fulford (on behalf of Birmingham City Council).
- 1.1.2 It is prepared and submitted in respect of the appeal proposal at 334-340 High Street, Harborne.
- 1.1.3 I have focussed my evidence within this Rebuttal on the matters where I consider Rebuttal evidence would most assist the Inquiry and the Inspector. However, this should not be taken as a concession that I accept the other parts of the proof of evidence submitted by Mr. Fulford which I do not comment on here.
- 1.1.4 My evidence has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institutions and I can confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

2. Rebuttal

2.1 Paragraph 3.22

- 2.1.1 Mr. Fulford refers to and includes Emerson Road for consideration of surrounding streets for parking. Emerson Road exceeds the 200m walk catchment (or 2-minute walk) that I consider suitable and acceptable (as outlined within the Lambeth methodology) where this distance is referred to. For robustness, I do not consider or include this road within the parking survey or my assessment; which ultimately, could offer additional on-street capacity in retrospect.

2.2 Paragraph 3.23

- 2.2.1 Mr. Fulford refers to the Harborne Ward to support his claims that there is an increased likelihood of higher levels of car ownership. The Harborne Ward is not representative of the area where the appeal site is located and captures a much wider geographic and demographic location and is inclusive of all housing types. I provide a copy of the Harborne Ward map in Appendix A.
- 2.2.2 Notwithstanding, I have undertaken further analysis of car ownership levels for the Harborne Ward and focussing on the proposed development type (e.g. apartments/flats). This data highlights that only 42.98% of households in the Harborne Ward has access to 1 or more cars; a 24.29% reduction in contrast to the car ownership information presented Mr. Fulford. A copy of the data is provided at Appendix B.

2.2.3 For transparency and completeness, I have reviewed the same Census 2021 dataset within the immediate Output Area (E00045991) used within my submitted proof of evidence but have included all housing types (as per Mr. Fulford’s approach in his proof of evidence). This data highlights that 55.48% of households in the immediate Output Area has access to 1 or more car; a 11.79% reduction in contrast to the car ownership information presented by Mr. Fulford. A copy of the data is provided at Appendix C.

2.2.4 In light of the data presented, it is clear that Mr. Fulford’s approach is both oversimplified and deceptive, inferring the appeal site could generate higher levels of potential parking demand than would otherwise be reasonable.

2.3 Paragraph 3.26

2.3.1 Mr. Fulford infers that “up to 91 cars” will need to be accommodated on local roads [resulting from the appeal site]. This is incorrect. This figure refers to the ‘maximum’ number of parking spaces (not vehicles) that are identified when reviewing the Birmingham City Council (BCC) *Appendix 1 Birmingham Parking SPD*, not the number of forecast vehicles that would be generated from the appeal site.

2.3.2 This information presented within the BCC proof of evidence is oversimplified and misleading.

2.4 Paragraph 3.27

2.4.1 I acknowledge that within the Transport Addendum, Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan Addendum (CD2.1), I identify ‘erroneous/double parking’ at Ravenhurst Road (west) in Table 7.1.

2.4.2 Upon further audit of the survey results (as part of my main proof of evidence) and discussion with the survey company who undertook the parking beat survey, this was, in fact, wrongly surmised as ‘erroneous/double parking’.

2.4.3 The length of kerb identified for this section of Ravenhurst Road (west) (Zone 52) is given as 19.2m in length, and as per the Lambeth methodology, warrants 3no. vehicle spaces (based on the 5m vehicle length). During the parking survey, 4no. vehicles are observed to park in this zone; this is attributed to smaller cars requiring less than 5m to park, meaning that a greater number of vehicles can be accommodated than the ‘theoretical’ capacity. This is outlined within my main proof of evidence, that in some cases, over 100% occupancy can be possible.

2.4.4 Notwithstanding the above, and the acceptance of my error, I have contacted the survey company, Auto Surveys Ltd., to seek clarification on this matter. Auto Surveys Ltd. has confirmed that during the survey there was no evidence of double parking throughout the study area. A copy of my email correspondence is contained in Appendix D.

2.4.5 Mr. Fulford provides no supporting qualitative or quantitative evidence to support his position concerning pressure for parking leading to highway and pedestrian safety issues or that drivers can be distracted looking for spaces.

2.5 Paragraph 3.28-29

2.5.1 It is noted the Council’s Transportation Officer did not object to the application, subject to the request of 6 monthly parking surveys and financial contribution of £25,000 to undertake a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to address issues that may arise (of which the applicant has agreed to).

- 2.5.2 Mr. Fulford states that *“Whilst it is not considered that this sum will be wholly effective in addressing the substantial concerns, the Council has accepted the inclusion of this financial contribution as set out within the Statement of Common Ground on viability matters”*.
- 2.5.3 Mr. Fulford relies on his defence that it is questionable whether a TRO could satisfactorily address any parking problems in these circumstances however, it is documented within the BCC *Appendix 1 Birmingham Parking SPD* at Page 16, ‘Controlled Parking’ table, Item 1, that:
“1) The City Council will implement parking control schemes, subject to funds being made available. This will include Controlled Parking Zones and Residents Parking Schemes in order to manage on-street parking in areas experiencing parking stress or where parking problems are likely to occur due to land use changes”.
- 2.5.4 Furthermore, Paragraph 5.10 (Page 21) of the Council’s *Parking Standards Evidence Base* document continues:
“The ability to enforce on street parking is a key component of successful parking management. Where parking controls exist, it is possible to allow development with lower levels of parking availability and at the same time ensure this does not create ‘overspill’ onto local streets”.
- 2.5.5 Further reference is made to other locations in the Evidence Base document where options to encourage lower level of parking provision include developer funded implementation of Controlled Parking Zones (e.g. Liverpool and Newcastle).
- 2.5.6 It is BCC’s own policy that the implementation of controlled parking TROs on local streets is used as a mechanism to support lower car parking provision and reinforces the position that vehicle ownership is not a requirement.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1.1 This rebuttal should be read alongside my main proof of evidence that has been submitted.
- 3.1.2 I have read nothing in Mr. Fulford’s proof of evidence that justifies the refusal of permission on highways and transport grounds or provides supporting evidence to substantiate this position.
- 3.1.3 Contrary to Mr. Fulford’s proof, I am firmly of the view that sufficient evidence has been supplied to allow the Inspector to conclude that the appeal development will not result in unacceptable safety impacts or a ‘severe’ residual impact on the road network.
- 3.1.4 I respectfully request that the appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for the appeal site.

Issued by



.....
Adrian Simms

Approved by



.....
James McGavin

Third party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by TTC at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. TTC excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

Appendix A

Harborne Ward Map

Harborne Ward



Scale: 1:10,000 @A3

- Ward Boundaries (Valid from April 2018)
- City Boundary

North Edgbaston

Edgbaston

Quinton

Harborne

Bartley Green

Weoley & Selly Oak

© Crown Copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey 100021326. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.
A-Z Street Map. If present, reproduced by permission of Geographers' A-Z Map Co.Ltd. Licence No. A1243.

Appendix B

Harborne Ward – Car Ownership: Flats / Apartments

Electoral w	Electoral ward	Car or van	Car or van availability (3 categories)	Accommo	Accommodation type (2 categories)	Observation		
E05011144	Harborne	0	No cars or vans in household	2	Flat, maisonette, apartment, caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1880		
E05011144	Harborne	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	2	Flat, maisonette, apartment, caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1417		
						3297		
						No cars	1880	57.02%
						1 or more cars	1417	42.98%
HARBORNE WARD						3297	100%	

Appendix C

Harborne OA E00045991 – Car Ownership: All Housing Types

Output Areas Code	Output Areas	Car or van availability	Car or van availability (3 categories)	AccommodAccommodation type (5 categories)	Observation	
E00045991	E00045991	0	No cars or vans in household	1 Whole house or bungalow: Detached	0	
E00045991	E00045991	0	No cars or vans in household	2 Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached	1	
E00045991	E00045991	0	No cars or vans in household	3 Whole house or bungalow: Terraced	14	
E00045991	E00045991	0	No cars or vans in household	4 Flat, maisonette or apartment	54	
E00045991	E00045991	0	No cars or vans in household	5 A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0	
E00045991	E00045991	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	1 Whole house or bungalow: Detached	4	
E00045991	E00045991	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	2 Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached	3	
E00045991	E00045991	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	3 Whole house or bungalow: Terraced	34	
E00045991	E00045991	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	4 Flat, maisonette or apartment	45	
E00045991	E00045991	1	1 or more cars or vans in household	5 A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0	
					155	
					No cars	69 44.52%
					1 or more cars	86 55.48%
					ALL HOUSE TYPES LOWEST OA	155 100%

Appendix D

Email Correspondence – Auto Surveys Ltd

Adrian Simms

From: John Burton <john@autosurveys.co.uk>
Sent: 15 April 2024 15:13
To: Adrian Simms
Cc: Neil Clarke
Subject: RE: 12685 Harborne Parking Survey

Hi Adrian

All well thank you.

Thanks for your enquiry. I have just taken a look at the data provided, and as I personally undertook the surveys I can confirm that at no point did I observe any double parking. The 4 cars observed were all parked legally within the 19.2m of that section of kerb for Zone 52.

I trust this clarifies your query but should you require any further information please let me know.

Regards

John

John Burton
Managing Director

Auto Surveys Ltd
07894907112
[autosurveys website](#)

From: Adrian Simms <adrian@ttc-transportplanning.com>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2024 3:00 PM
To: John Burton <john@autosurveys.co.uk>
Cc: Neil Clarke <neil@autosurveys.co.uk>
Subject: 12685 Harborne Parking Survey

Dear John,

I hope this email finds you well.

You may recall this survey you completed for us in September 2023 for a site in Harborne, Birmingham (I attached the supplied survey results for info).

I have a question concerning the observed parking beat at Ravenhurst Road and my interpretation of the results.

With specific regard to 'Zone 52' [excel row 62] Ravenhurst Road (west), the kerb length in this zone measures 19.2m. The excel table shows that based on the Lambeth Methodology, this zone can accommodate 3no. vehicles. During the survey days, I note that 4no. vehicles were parked in this zone – greater than the identified theoretical capacity.

Can you please clarify if this was a result of double parking and if is observed in this zone, and/or, can you confirm if this observation is a result of smaller vehicles parked within this 19.2m kerb length (as is noted within the Lambeth methodology where theoretical parking can be exceeded on the basis of smaller vehicles).

If you have any questions or need the above clarifying, please do not hesitate to get in touch at your earliest convenience.

With kind regards,
Adrian

Adrian Simms BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI MCIHT
Director

The Transportation Consultancy Ltd
27 Park Street, Leamington Spa, CV32 4QN

M: 07704 662865
T: 01926 776097

adrian@ttc-transportplanning.com
[ttc-transportplanning website](#)

