

Redrow Homes Limited

265 Burlington Road, New Malden

Summary - Proof of Evidence Mike
Savage

Final | 9 November 2020

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 247852-00

Ove Arup & Partners Ltd
13 Fitzroy Street
London
W1T 4BQ
United Kingdom
www.arup.com

ARUP

Contents

	Page	
1	Experience	2
	1.1 Mike Savage	2
	1.2 Declaration of Truth	2
2	Summary Evidence	3

1 Experience

1.1 Mike Savage

- 1.1.1 I am a Chartered Member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport. I hold an Honours Degree in Civil Engineering; a Master of Science in Transport Planning and Management and I am also a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- 1.1.2 I am a Director at Arup working in the transport team based in the London office. I have 30 years' professional experience providing transport planning advice to clients in relation to development proposals and transport strategies.
- 1.1.3 I am instructed by Redrow Homes Limited (hereafter referred to as Redrow) to act as an expert witness in matters relating to transport and highways.
- 1.1.4 I was approached by the client to provide expert witness evidence for this Inquiry in March 2020. Prior to that stage I had not been involved in the project.

1.2 Declaration of Truth

- 1.2.1 I confirm that the evidence which I have prepared and provide for this application in this proof of evidence is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institute. I understand that my duty is to provide my untrammelled professional opinion to the inquiry, irrespective of by whom I am instructed. Accordingly, I confirm that the opinions expressed within this proof are my true and professional opinions.

2 Summary Evidence

- 2.1.1 My evidence covers transport issues relating to the proposed development.
- 2.1.2 There were no transport related objections raised by London Borough of Merton officers to the proposed development and officer recommended approval within the committee report dated 13 February 2019.
- 2.1.3 Councillors at the committee resolved against the officer's recommendation and subsequently have drafted reasons for refusal which I have considered in my evidence.
- 2.1.4 My evidence relies upon the work undertaken by Mott McDonald in preparing the Transport Assessment [CD 8.5] and associated documents in support of the planning application. I have however taken the opportunity to review the assumptions and agreements reached in the course of negotiations with LBM and TfL. Where I have developed an alternative approach to the conclusions I have sought to explain the reasons for that approach within my evidence.
- 2.1.5 The northern part of the site comprises commercial buildings with extant permission for B1(a) use and a total floor area of 3,880sqm. These commercial facilities are served by 100 existing on-site car parking spaces. The southern part of the site is currently used as part of the existing Tesco car park and is no longer required to serve the store and Tesco have confirmed that the remaining spaces are sufficient to serve their customers' needs. The site utilises an existing access onto Burlington Road which would be retained and enhanced with the development.
- 2.1.6 Overall the site has good access by walking, cycling, and public transport, having four frequent bus routes that serve the site and access to a number of rail stations. The site has a PTAL of 3 but this does not take into account access to Raynes Park station which is just 16 minutes walk (but over the threshold walking distance for PTAL). The site is accessible with access to a range of local facilities. This will help to

deliver sustainable travel patterns in line with the Mayors Transport Strategy.

- 2.1.7 The recommendation of the Planning Applications Committee 13 February 2019 (Agenda Item 7) was to grant planning permission subject to s106 agreement and s278 agreement which provides a number of contributions towards transport improvements.
- 2.1.8 At the TA scoping stage it was agreed with LBM officers that the whole site (3,880sqm GFA) would be treated as Office use utilising trip rates derived from TRICS. Some of the sites selected for review included sites with zero parking and I have revised the forecast to better match the location and availability of parking (some 100 spaces) at the site.
- 2.1.9 The 2019 Transport Assessment explains in paragraph 6.2.2 that the approach to estimating the trip generation associated with the proposed development presented in the TA Scoping Report was based around the application of vehicular trip rates, derived from TRICS, to the proposed accommodation schedule. Once the vehicular trips had been established, a mode share derived from Census (2011) data would then be applied to estimate the proportionate trips expected to be made by other modes.
- 2.1.10 Journey to work mode share data is not considered to represent actual residential mode shares as this does not take account of other journey purposes such as education, retail and leisure, which form a significant proportion of peak hour trips. I have therefore set out an alternative approach to more accurately forecast the proposed development trips. The mode shares for private and affordable units follows more closely the methodology proposed in the TA Scoping report. The mode shares for car driver, taxi, walking and cycling have been derived using the multi-modal trip rates for these modes as a percentage of the all person trip rate (2-way daily) which accounts for all journey purposes.
- 2.1.11 Table 16 of my evidence shows that there would be an additional 24 vehicles per hour, (equivalent to a vehicle every 2 minutes) in the morning peak hour and an additional 15 vehicles (equivalent to an additional vehicle every 4 minutes) in the evening peak hour.
- 2.1.12 This net change in vehicle trips between the alternative proposed and alternative original land uses are significantly below the 56 AM and 39 PM net change in vehicle trips forecast in the 2019 TA. That scale of

change had been accepted by LBM and TfL officers as acceptable given the mitigation in place. The revised AM forecast net change in traffic is half that considered in the Transport Assessment and one quarter of the PM forecast net change. The actual net change in traffic flows would therefore be well below that already accepted by LBM and TfL officers.

- 2.1.13 It should also be noted that the revised forecast for the proposed development shows that the proportion of trips by foot, cycle or public transport (as a proportion of total daily trips) is in line with the Mayor's Transport Strategy for 80% of travel demand to be by these priority modes.
- 2.1.14 I have considered the reasons for refusal in turn, dealing firstly with the traffic reason and I concluded that the development is in accordance with policy and that the residual effects of the traffic are not severe. Indeed far from member's concerns being warranted – my assessment has concluded that the original TA over-estimated impacts and that there was no proper highways reason for refusal.
- 2.1.15 Road safety conditions were assessed in the TA and the access was subject to a Road Safety Audit. I have reviewed this data, new more up to date accident data and a new Road Safety Audit commissioned by Richard Lancaster of PWLC on behalf of Merton. I have prepared a designer's response and amended plans that in my judgement address those RSA comments. Having reviewed the second RSA and our response I do not consider that there are any outstanding road safety issues and none that would warrant reason for refusal.
- 2.1.16 In relation to car parking the provision on site is in accordance with policy as accepted by officers, and s106 funding is intended to be made available to enable LBM to implement a CPZ. London Plan and LBM policy supports the implementation of CPZ where required and the Intention to Publish London Plan states that *'An absence of local on-street parking controls should not be a barrier to new development, and boroughs should look to implement these controls wherever necessary*

to allow existing residents to maintain safe and efficient use of their streets’.

- 2.1.17 I have considered the Rule 6 statement of case from Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents Association and do not consider the proposals to be contrary to policy.
- 2.1.18 In my judgement the proposed development accords with national, regional and local policy, the net change in traffic is negligible, the travel demand can be accommodated on the transport network and there are no transport reasons why this development should not be approved. I consider the first (putative) reason for refusal to be unfounded therefore.