

29/04/2014

29th April

MARTIN FARRINGTON

Main proof read out
[why Leeds needs a rapid transit system (RTS)]

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF

QC – main proof – your qualifications and experience are set out on page 2 – development and leisure dept of local gov. you are the council's nominated director of Yorkshire county cricket club. And you also state that you have led a number of schemes for the city council, including first direct area, sale of Leeds Bradford airport, development of Ellen Road overground, Victoria Gate development, and HS2 in Leeds

Mf – that's correct

QC – job title – director of city development at city council since 2010. Wide range of services for which you are responsible – including transport and highways, regeneration etc. a very wide range of areas

Mf – that's correct

QC - Proof 5.4 where you note Leeds is second largest metropolitan local authority in England – appendices economic contribution appendix 3 centre for city city's output report 2014 page 10 – figure 4. Indication of size of Leeds' city region economy

Farrington- scale of gba (Leeds economic output) national significance to the UK– figure 4 exemplifies scale of the economy - 55 billion pounds output from Leeds region (larger than Wales and Manchester city region)

QC – turn to 3.4 where you make the point about Leeds being well placed to coordinate activity over a wide front – indeed range of your responsibilities certainly under your role in the city, a coordination of different functions to achieve shared objectives – you refer to complementary interventions (is that part of the focus of Leeds city council?)

Mf – absolutely. Leeds city council is the lead agency and the planning authority of the city. And the largest land owner in the city –to deal with the combined and complementary effects of those elements have to bring forward schemes and proposals which enhance Leeds' contribution to the national economy.

QC – turn if you can to Mr Turner's rebuttal para 2.1 – and also look at Mr Cheek's appendix 4 doc review of wide socio-economic benefits para 2.2.3 – concludes that construction of NGT will deliver little or no improvement between transfer of con network in areas of high unemployment and areas with low social economic activity – challenging NGT's benefit and con activity to those areas.

mf – many examples we could give of how they could coordinate areas that city councils responsibility for – to highlight, our promotion of Southbank as major regeneration opportunity – extended area is 136 hectares eqv to Edinburgh New Town – Leeds has successful city centre and one that is naturally expanding and needs to expand in a planned and coordinated way (on major area is the Southbank which has lots of brownfield sites capable of being redeveloped). NGT runs alongside

29/04/2014

the southbank and is adjacent to a number of regeneration proposals. The council's role brought forward planning framework for ngt as it is clearly a major area of regeneration and looking carefully at the transport issues that the southbank has – taken together (the regeneration of southbank and ngt) it would be significant impact on the economy etc of Leeds.

Qc – d-6-6 southbank planning statement – we start at page 6-7 which has map showing the area – we see the eastern part – Tetley's brewery – how does ngt relate to that?

Mf - ngt runs along northern boundary of Tetley's, it is a longstanding brewery in Leeds closed about 2-3 yrs ago, now is a site that has a temp consent for long stay car parking for 5 yrs pending it being brought forward for redevelopment

Qc - if we go to (in this doc) pg 10 para 2.3 – how does ngt relate to the planning strategy of this area?

Mf – ngt provides vital links to the business centre, city centre and hospital – ngt plans to run through the south bank area from Leeds bridge over to Clarence dock. What I would say at this point is that it is extremely important to understand the geography of Leeds. Leeds city centre traditionally has had a focus on the north bank – the north bank is what ppl recognise as the centre of Leeds because of the east – west access of railway and river Aire – there has been a separation traditionally. The southbank sits adjacent to the northern part - issues of con activity are critical to bringing forward that area for regeneration. Ngt will enhance the con activity between the two and complementary to the broader regeneration of that area.

QC – can we turn to Leeds city council's response to HS2. Can we take out G4-100 – relatively new doc (there is an extract of it in Mr Speak's appendices). [struggles to find – states that they will come back to it later]

Qc – let's concentrate on the south. Let's turn to G4-98. The strategic economic plan page 138 – answer to the criticism made that ngt isn't complementary

Mf – local enterprise partnerships were asked to submit their economic plans. What you have in front of you is the Leeds city region strategic economic plans – within that a no. of key note regeneration schemes area highlighted. One of them is the Leeds southbank highlighting point that 136 hectares of land to the south of the centre can deliver lots of regeneration, potential to deliver 10,000 new jobs e.g. like Asda etc. Work is underway to enhance the con activity to the area and major education hub activity underway making it a focus of further education sector in Leeds (Leeds city college phase 1 complete on southbank and college of building also on the southbank side and it is also the location for HS2 station) – in the context of that background is the importance of the Leeds ngt scheme to address issues to bring forward the Leeds southbank as a major opportunity of economic led regeneration.

[31:30 minutes into Afternoon session of the recording]

Qc – let's go back to HS2 – G4-100 – how does this connect to ngt.

Mf – on Pg 3 of the glossy mag – Highlights Leeds southbank again in summary form. The true regenerative opportunity of the south bank is much broader – page 6 this plan shows the scope of development to Hulbeck urban village and the location preferred for the HS2 station and southbank central (Tetley site incorporated), close to Leeds city college, also proposals to make an academy nearby. How it runs alongside Leeds dock – when looking at the regen impact – my point on Clarence dock is that many would judge Clarence dock's development in the noughties a failure – leading to

29/04/2014

the owners selling it about three years ago. It is currently going through a process of redefining the uses/purposes of that site to give it a new lease of life. One of the critical areas in con activity. ngt has a relationship to a number of these opportunities mentioned.

Qc – again in response to con activity criticism - What about the northern route? Respond to the criticism that ngt will not do anything for socio-economic – show in design access statement b-12.

Mf – in terms of the northern route - Characteristics of northern route is diff to south – again the point I'd put across is the complementary nature of ngt to planned proposals which are due to come forward on that corridor. On page 21 of that doc – I'd highlight the bodington student resident site which is due to be brought forward as a residential area. Page 47 – I would highlight the interrelationship with former leeds girls school site with ngt – proposals for housing dev there. Look at the sites beyond the extent of the ngt route to pick up on the strategic importance of bodington park and ride and how bodington park and ride relates to housing development on wider a660 corridor.

[approx. 38 minutes into recording]

qc – where do we need to go

Mf –d-2-8 (folder 11) – maps which accompany the udp (not on the list)

Mf - Planning application is for new housing area, also housing sites being constructed – points highlighted on those proposals is that they evidence the principal issue of leeds as a growing city where the population is forecast to grow and which needs to meet the growth in terms of the housing need - there are a no. of a660 housing proposals – which ngt scheme in terms of park and ride will be complementary to facilitate those housing proposals. I'm aware, the Inspector of the core strategy noted the complementary nature of the ngt to the proposed housing in those corridors (mr speak MAY be able to provide the evidence for this note by the inspector).

QC: we've looked south (seen employment, development sites) and looked north – turn to your proof – this is all on the same theme in response of the criticisms – 5.23 of proof, you refer to G4 70 – rapid transit systems can support and facilitate those developments (southbank and the north). Take us to the Volterra report, explain to us how you will facilitate this with ngt (in those areas you have identified)?

Mf - I refer to volterra report pg 16 making reference to jubilee line extension – it was a scheme that wouldn't have been brought forward under trad appraisals but under the directions of marg thatcher – and secondly it opened up the docklands for redevelopment. In parallel to southbank of leeds is the docklands in London – both strategic economic growth points. Both had or have a lack of con activit. He sees southbank as key economic area and blocked by railway and river position which can be improved by ngt scheme. Manchester metro link pg 19 – this demonstrates how the development of a RTS with a no. of lines developed over a period of time has contributed to economic growth of a large UK city. Sulford investments into the RTS - I feel that that development would have been compromised if those RTS had not been integrated in those cities.

QC: Mr. Turner's rebuttal 2.10 – he says that you referred to g4-70 (volterra report)– he said those two above are not trolleybus based system (the examples you gave were tram/metro based systems etc.) does that undermine your point in any way?

29/04/2014

Mf – I don't believe show – illustrating RTS being complementary to developments - they all are implemental in bringing forward economic revival/regeneration

QC: how important is over-head lines etc. (i.e. the appearance of permanence) in stimulating activity?

Mf: in my view I think inward investors will look at permanence of infrastructure, it is a consideration. When you look at how cities have developed e.g. london's deep underground system – geography of London has become defined by the stations of the London underground – considerable degree of permanence. Ngt can help to embed the permanence and therefore confidence of investors that those routes are there in the long term.

QC: C1-12 “permanence of public transport systems” – 2.12 – it is noted in the literature that developers and homebuyers are attracted to the rail-transit. It says bus routes do not need extra infrastructure. They may not be attracted to a new site on the basis there is a new bus route. There is a reference to light rail. In terms of economic activity, how important is perception of permanence for people making decision as to where they live, or locate business?

[Around 56 minutes into the recording]

Farrington: it is important for people moving there to reside and businesses moving in – issue of commuting permanence is, in my view, clearly important. And in terms of inward investment decisions, they are similarly influenced.

QC: 2.20 – Turner states that buses are flexible – 2.20 there is acknowledgement of that point but then states that permanent systems have a sense of security and people can therefore plan there lives using that system. What is benefit of a system (ngt) which is described as some as looking as flexible?

Farrington: issue of permanence - reduces the risk of the decision to relocating.

QC: flexibility of buses (page 8) - FTR was a branded bus service intro in leeds in 2007 running on specific route. In 2012 vehicles were re-branded and moved to a diff route between leeds and bradford. If you base your business decisions on FTR route would you do it again if it suddenly moved?

Farrington: It would be a key concern for anyone making an investment

QC: do you know who operated this?

mF: no

QC: we will come onto that later

QC: now move onto predicted benefits, 6.36 of mF's proof – you refer to the wider economic impact. Does that info come from mr chadwick's evidence? Is he the person who is able to answer any detailed questions?

Mf – that's correct

QC - are they [wider econ impacts] an important aspect of the scheme?

29/04/2014

F: they are a v. important in terms of the economic impact of the scheme (jobs, transport, wider econ benefits). All imp elements that relate to ngt.

QC: those are plusses. Lets look at minuses. What happens if leeds doesn't have a modern RTS. You point out in your 6.8 that leeds leeds not in top 30 big cities to locate which doesn't have a RTS. What is consequence of that?

F: at best, leeds stands still and by that, it goes backwards. Leeds is one of the eight core cities of England – para 6.8 refers to a list. As an imp business centre in UK and wider Europe needs to ensure it has the infrastructure to compete. Without RTS puts it at a considerable weakness in comparison with its competitors.

[Around 1.02 hours into the recording]

QC: NW leeds transport forum rebuttal para 2.5 – states that if you go to your appendix 4 pg 22 leeds is in top 10 by 2011 rank by ease of getting around despite fact it doesn't have a RTS - so they say why does it need an RTS?

F: I'd go bk to position that leeds is a growing city and there is a danger of complacency by saying ppl perceiving transport in leeds as satisfactory and we don't need to do anything. wakefield report is a perception based survey. Page 6 of the doc – when looking at the totality of all factors - leeds in 2010 ranked 23rd (with London at the top) and in space of a year fallen to 28th – (its actually stood still but in comparison to other cities has fallen behind). Imp to be forward thinking and plan ahead in all aspects of development. We need to create extra space for the economic growth – to ensure its competitive in a European competitive market.

QC: Mr. Turner's rebuttal 2.19 – if one looks at 2.25 he makes ref to First wests new bus for leeds proposal - he suggests the bus priority package measures would create a better perception of growth – is that right if you are an overseas business person considering locating here? Which is going to create a better perception - a permanent trolleybus or bus enhancements?

F: in my view is that leeds needs a to deliver a RTS and that ngt is the scheme we're promoted and that is the better way to achieve inward investment and economic growth that leeds needs for future

QC: you say at 5.22 your proof – still on regen opportunities – you said that this isn't just new facilities, but you say that access to many destinations and opportunities is often constricted by traffic congestion – nwltf in their rebuttal at 2.4 don't accept this and they say that they don't accept your “unevidence assertion that ngt is key to continued success for leeds economy” – are you able to give examples of how opportunities to enhance existing facilities are restricted by congestion etc?

mF: in my opening summary, I highlighted that I am a director of Yorkshire county cricket club. Headingley is an international venue for cricket. It is adjacent to headingley cricket ground home to leeds rhinos etc. and also rugby league internationals. It is a sig part of the sporting infrastructure of this city. On an annual basis attracts sig no. of spectators. ngt provides additional transport infrastructure from city centre to the sports spectator venues (headingley etc) – leeds is a test venue, any analysis of these in recent years shows that England has 6 test venues but now has 9 venues for international cricket and is becoming an increasingly competitive market to attract those kinds of events. Yorkshire county cricket club does not have a right to host those matches beyond 2019 and certainly in terms of the future of those matches the provision of infrastructure will be a

29/04/2014

key consideration in decisions as to whether or not those kinds of activities continue to take place at headingley. Those points are supported by both Yorkshire county cricket club and leeds rhinos – support the ngt scheme.

Qc: thanks for that example.

QC: D Alexander's rebuttal para 2.1 – he asks how the scheme will be a key driver for regeneration – you have responded already. He also states in 2.8 that the promoters claim the economic benefits of ngt stem from linking deprived southern areas to the city centre – he says that belle isle only added to business case in July 2013. (Mr Turner 2.5 and 2.11 – Hunslet and belle isle already served by buses and ngt will bring little benefit to inner city deprivation). Can you explain the extent to which ngt will serve areas which suffer from social deprivation and how those who live there will benefit?

F: one must understand the geography of Leeds. Leeds has a vibrant city centre, an economic powerhouse already outlined but in close proximity to that are a no. of south Leeds inner areas where there are relatively high levels of deprivation. What is also clear is the barriers of con activity which exist between those inner areas and the city centre. E.g the impermeability of the south bank. M621 creates a separation with those key areas in the south from city centre - ngt provides additional infrastructure and con activity between those areas to enhance and enable the regeneration proposals they are bringing forward

QC: belle isle, and Middleton – there is a framework doc D-6-5 (folder 13) – it may be that we haven't got the whole of the doc – this demonstrates how ngt will contribute. You were illustrating how ngt will benefit ppl in areas that suffer from social deprivation.

Mf – the doc is the belle isle Middleton neighbourhood framework approved by the council's board – pg 9 it shows how the ngt line comes into belle isle and relationships with no. of housing proposals.

Pgs 20 outlines:

Site 26 newhall gate

Site 27 former Merlin Reese school

Site 28 Winrose drive

Site 29 Middleton road

Site 30 Lower Grange view

All of those sites are within close proximity to ngt line. Doc pg 32 – "Connections" ngt's place in framework is highlighted

QC: can we go to D6-9 – 'vision for Leeds 2013' doc – D Alexander's rebuttal para 2.7 states that there is no objective evidence to show how the top priority (as to what factors were perceived as important to make Leeds a better city i.e. it was transport facilities) was reached. I'd like you to explain how those priorities were established?

F: the Leeds initiative oversaw the development for the vision for Leeds on behalf of the city – a broad-based consultation process was undertaken, included 200 individual events that were held... (the Leeds initiative consultation report is G4-101 – pg 4). The report analysed the e-consultation that was undertaken. The consultation was then reviewed by QA research and their report is in the same doc undertaken in Feb 2011.

QC – if we look at the QA research reports and section 3.1 on page 7 'quantitative data' – 'what Leeds needs' survey – figure 2, what does this show?

29/04/2014

Mf – well it highlights that public transport and need to improve it was the highest individual return at 15%.

Qc – if you go at page 16 figure 10

Mf – highlights public transport and need to improve public transport, being again, the highest return at 20%

Qc – so what were the top priorities? It seems improved public transport was even higher than bringing in more jobs. So D Alexander's point – this doc explains that for the inquiries benefit?

Mf – I believe so.

QC: move to funding – central and local gov funding. Explain a point that Mr Alexander takes up with you at 2.34 of your proof – you say there that to achieve fully the aims of the SEP (strategic economic plan) – the Leeds city region has requested more freedom to invest in facilities – it's asked for to devolve ring fenced ngt funding. 2.5 of Mr Alexander's rebuttal says that the promoters fail to state why this is necessary?

F: earlier in my evidence I highlighted the Hesselstine report and requirement of economic plans to come forward. The Hesselstine review is part of an overall gov approach that recognises the need for greater devolution of spending on a whole range of areas, transport being one. Bringing forward the concept of a single gov pot for gov spending across a range of what would previously be gov departmental priorities. What I outlined in para 2.34 is simply complementary to the gov approach on greater devolution of spending and how the individual management of that spend is dealt with at a local level.

QC: so with the local funding – at 2.6 of Alexander's rebuttal, he refers to the WY transport fund which is a 1 billion pound investment project and he says at 3.31 of your proof that you say that one of the potential schemes identified with support of the transport fund is the extension of ngt in the future (including into Aire Valley – not before this inquiry) – Alexander's rebuttal says that there is no indication as to how this is assessed? How are these schemes that put in bids for WYT funding assessed?

F: this is assessed through a common appraisal framework which is overseen by what is now the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.

Qc – would any extension to ngt be subject to different criteria to other transport schemes?

Mf – it would be assessed on the same basis as any other scheme that goes through the WYTF.

QC: 5.15 of your proof – the figures come from your appendix 7 page 2 – what we can see from these figures is that the proportion of people accessing the city by public transport (bus/train combined) has remained at around 39% (the total) but uses of buses has fallen from 28 to 22% whereas rail share has increased. Can you express opinion as to the cause of these changes?

[1.33 hours]

F: we have reached a position where Leeds city centre mainline station is busiest station in northern England – experiencing sig passenger growth. My opinion is that it is to do with punctuality and

29/04/2014

people's reliance on buses as a choice for determining their transport choices and how they are to move which is different to the position with trains.

QC: 6.22 of your proof – you refer to bus travel in the city and you state that bus travel experiences the effects of congestion on the road and makes bus journey times less punctual. It states that the promoter will provide greater punctuality by priority – you give examples of improvements. Do you see NGT as competing with or complementary to various measures taken to enhance bus services – in particular by improving bus punctuality by giving buses priority.

F: I see it as complementary. In para 6.22 I highlight the A65 quality bus scheme which we brought forward with the support of DfT funding which provided improved dedicated space for bus transport on the A65 corridor. NGT from my perspective is a complementary measure to address transport in the city.

QC: Alexander, 2.11 states that NGT doesn't improve congestion activity within the wider city region or beyond. Is NGT the only transport intervention and does it prevent other congestion activity e.g. HS2 and other wider measures within the region.

F: no we are working in terms of the transport plan for the city and city region on a whole range of measures. NGT is part of a wider regional and nationwide plan.

QC: we know that the first group has advanced a suggestion as to how bus travel might be enhanced in the city – new bus for Leeds. Is there any reason why new bus for Leeds, or something similar and NGT couldn't be complementary?

F: no

END OF EVIDENCE IN CHIEF