

08/05/14

May 8th

OTHER OBJECTORS' CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DAVID HASKINS

ALAN HAGUE (chartered engineer)

Ah – standing – complaints about the crowding and standing. Why is the number of passengers seated and those standing (covered at 5.1.5 and 9.1.4 statement of case, 3.22 of his proof) – it is tucked away on the report is ratio of 3:1 – why was it not included on the statement of case and your evidence?

Dh – we have consistently stated that its 120-160 and why we can't be more prescriptive than that at this point in time. We haven't hidden anything – its in the public domain

Ah – why couldn't you have repeated the 45-50 figure on your statement

Ah – leaflet in july 2013 (picked up in briggets) – again I ask there's no reference to any people standing or how many seating. This is covered in the statement of case

Dh – statement of consultation a-0-1-3

Ah – no, it's in the statement of case... this was issued to the public (the leaflet) surely they would be interested in how many seats and standing

Dh – we held consultation events and people asked questions. If we didn't have answers to hand we directed to website or take their email details and respond to the questions. All info was on our website under FAQs.

Ah – yes, but, there is a tear off here asking for our views, if they don't know how many people has to stand there won't be able to object will they

Dh – with respect, there is a limited amount we can include in the leaflet (we did subscribe to e-newsletter and mailing list etc)

Ah – subsequently found the info, as I said. It gave a ratio of 1 to3 – 1 seated for every 2 people standing. The standing is 200% of the seating. For the current bus service what is the eqv percentage figure.

Dh – it was provided by first yesterday –

Ah – I calculated as 32% standing compared to seating capacity (22 standing and 70 seats?)

Dh - these are trolley vehicles, in same way articulated buses have diff seating standing ratios to double decker – this is a lower ratio than you'd get for light rail vehicle

Ah – what is the eqv % for trains?

Dh – I'm not aware for trains, in underground it is higher

Ah – PT policy is that if a train has 35% or more seating capacity it is classed as over loaded and train operator is expected to put in extra carriages

Dh- I wouldn't disagree, train is a different vehicle. Each vehicle layout is different to accommodate standing passengers

Ah – from 32 to 200% - you are introducing an absolute step change – massive change

Dh – we are looking at a different type of vehicle – in line with light rail schemes elsewhere – consistent if not more favourable

Ah – have you consulted with public about this change

Dh –I have consulted with a no. of public

Ah – response?

Dh – ideally, they would prefer more seating. But lack of recognition that it is a diff type of vehicle

08/05/14

Ah – you talk about comfortable standing. What standing density worked on to reach that conclusion? G-4-42 (and in your rebuttal to my evidence)

Dh – I'm looking at on page 5 – it doesn't say this. Oh on page 6 under rebuttal argument 8 – it does say this that it accommodates "standing in comfort" – it is essential the standing is of a safe nature

Ah – what is the definition of comfortable standing in terms of the density of standing – the number of people per sqm

dh- I don't have technical specifications. My understanding is that any vehicle will be required to be signed off as being safe – seating ratio will be agreed.

Ah – I found 3 passengers per sqm – and taking 140 people in a 18m articulated bus– your capacity will be well down

Dh – I'm not able to comment on that

Ah – why haven't you considered a conventional bus? I thought you'd go for 70 seats, 20 standing (90 max)

Dh – issues around hybrid vehicle and capacity will be covered in the proof of mr Robertson – in respect of signal priority issues. The extent in which you can have priority – there is a limit in which you can do that without increasing congestion. A greater no. of ngt vehicles because of a lower no. of capacity will lead to greater level of congestion.

Ah – is it that ngt can't get to the capacity any other way– they must stand to get that capacity

Dh – yes

Ah – park and ride bodington – tell me why anyone would want to get out and stand for 19 min on a trolleybus instead of use their car?

Dh – I don't think it's unusual – e.g. WY rail network and other systems around the UK. Evidence from light rail schemes else shows people are prepared to do that if it provides a faster and more efficient journey.

[asks where he gets off at – only 12 min not 19min]

Ah – maximum speed of the ngt vehicle?

Dh – unable to point to that – different speeds at diff sections – mr smith to answer

Ah – you would agree that it is safer to be seated than to stand?

Dh – I don't have enough info to know that – some people feel safer, yes

Ah – I've seen a lot of trolleybuses abroad (san fran, Greece, st Petersburg, Poland) – terrible ride, they all operate on a safe system similar to buses. You're using it as a RTS and speeding it up. If fully loaded with 100 people standing, driver slams brake on – what will happen?

Dh – mr smith with describe in detail and if there will be such issues

Ah – you must agree it's possible that people would be injured

Dh – possible in any type of highway incident that injury happen

Ah – don't you think that safety is an issue here

Dh – I don't see it – looking at light rail vehicles – no reports of injury in light rail vehicles

Ah – it's a bit different isn't it – I noticed in your comparison to Nottingham tram and London underground – ridiculous – these are guided. These trolleybuses move all over the place

dh – a small amount of movement under wires but insignificant. I disagree

Ah – concerns as a leeds council tax payer – in my opinion, a lot of these figures are dubious. To me it's very likely that this scheme will finish with a deficit. How would you deal with a 3mill annual deficit?

Dh – we put forward a business case and revenue projections covered in chadwicks proof and risks around them also covered. Deficit – that would be an issue for council and promoters as to what to do – we don't believe that will happen as plan is robust

08/05/14

Ah – “promoters will make up the resources with their own resources” = do you mean the taxpayers?

Dh – yes

Ah – are we open to risk?

Dh – there would be a level risk in any scheme of this nature – we’ve managed these risks

FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESSES, CHRIS LONGLEY

Cl – we have objected to the scheme. (I was a commercial manager of Sheffield supertram and also south Yorkshire supertram no. 2 ltd. – responsible for commissioning and operation of supertram etc.) – in your proof 3.1.4 – public transport capacity increased on the a660, the ngt will be more punctual than existing buses – will conventional buses travelling along the corridor travel more slowly because of the priority and all these features mentioned? how many minutes will be added to on board journey time of conventional buses?

Dh – G-4-41 – the transport case journey times – we set out the ngt and existing bus journey times (in 2020) and advantages of ngt. We are talking about a 13 min advantage from holt park to leeds for ngt. If there was no ngt in place bus journey time will be 42 rather than 29 min – some of the additional bus priority measures put in place will benefit other buses as well. In the outbound direction – bodington to leeds (31 against 33 min)- savings to buses as well from a situation where there would be no ngt – buses also benefitting from the infrastructure.

Cl – would you describe them as marginal time savings?

Dh – I would say it is a time savings

Cl – would you describe it as marginal?

Dh – trolleybus over bus journey times are significant. With ngt there is a benefit to bus journey times but to a lower extent.

[10:00am – 29:00 min into the mixcloud recording]

Cl – which places will trolleybuses be more attractive than car travel?

Dh – covered by hanson or chadwick (assumptions made for purposes of business case for impact on existing bus travel and diversion onto the ngt/smith (priority on highway)

Cl – can you confirm that it will be available to us later on in the inquiry?

Dh – yes it will be later on

Cl – where will bus travel be less attractive than it is now

Dh – issue covered separately in mr smith’s proof

Cl – can you confirm that the distribution of disadvantage will be made clear later in the inquiry?

Dh -if there is such a disadvantage – then it will be

[Jones: is this a suggestion there will be new information? Just to clarify – discussion where Cameron clarifies that it is not new and that DH is just saying that info will be addressed by other witnesses]

Cl – there are categories of disadvantage to particular groups of people – I am unclear as to whether they are identified and whether their significance is identified?

Cl – haskins proof 3.1.8 – states that trolleybus will have high level of priority – the question has come back from the members of the fed’s survey in late 2013 and also amongst a majority of small businesses along the a660 – which traffic movements along and across a660 will be slower if trolleybus priorities are in operation?

Dh – a list will be provided –

08/05/14

Cameron: there is information on other road users – produced by hanson and chadwick – effect on vehicles in commercial use on diversion etc... when haskins says a list will be provided – he means please ask another witness and he should not be volunteering what they'll give

CI – which witness will provide a list

Cameron: mr hanson deals with leeds transport model of the effects- please ask him and chadwick deals with the consequences of that model (taking into account of effects of other road uses) –

please indicate outside of inquiry what you need and we will do our best. I don't want to say "a list will be provided" – all I'm saying is that providing a "list" as such is unlikely to be possible

CI – knowing of this issue is significant – as I would ask how the cumulative benefits would be assembled... [if no one knows the answer to this, I'll move on]

CI – 3.40 of your proof – ref to the next best option is a plug in hybrid vehicle – higher delivery risk as needs bus contract [you say]– again when we conducted survey of members – 58% support amongst them in investing in modernised buses including hybrids. That was a very strong majority – significant minorities – but this was most supported alternative. Why is the choice of a trolleybus so essential to the performance of the scheme when the physical performance of a hybrid (electrical articulated) bus could be designed to be identical?

Dh – the issue around Voluntary partnership agreements or quality contracts in respect of next best alternative will be addressed by mr Henkel

CI – 5.10 – 2010 business scheme proposal which was approved identified a660 as an appropriate corridor for the scheme – again, in the survey work that we did it was very clear that the main issue that small businesses identified was not so much congestion on a660 – but the causes of congestion was the lack of capacity around the outer ring road – given that strategy put forward so far is to address real issues –we want to know why choosing a trolleybus scheme on a660 was more important than doing major junction and flow improvements to the outer ring road which would remove the problems in the first place.

Dh – there is a range of factors that give issues on the a660 – in respect of outer ring road as set out in the core strategy d-1-1 – map 9 (which we referred to yesterday) does show some enhancements to the outer ring roads (labelled as east leeds orbital routes) – these have been prioritised as part of the west Yorkshire transport fund proposals that was set out.

CI – is that info actually available?

Dh – prioritisation of the wytf scheme set out in g-4-26 – a prospectus for change – sets out the schemes that form part of the wy transport fund and proposed measures that are envisaged

CI – does the doc you refer to distinguish between proposed and committed? And if not, what point will the distinction between the two become available?

Dh – I believe that there are some committed schemes in there – e.g. leeds station southern entrance, further schemes have been prioritised but matter of local transport body to allocate funding to those schemes. In case of the outer ring road it hinges on some proposed development to the east of leeds

CI – so far as timeline is concerned you are seen as committing to trolleybus before you seek a commitment to outer ring road enhancements

Dh – the wytf is a programme of investment over a 10 year period – these schemes will come forward at some time within next 10 years. NgT, subject to being a programme we put forward will be open by 2020.

Inspector: if trolleybus didn't go ahead, would that affect any of these schemes?

Dh – if the ngT funding wasn't in place (172mill) decision must be made by local body to move priority schemes out of the list ... matter for local transport body to decide

08/05/14

Cl – not sure if that helps whether there is an order as to what schemes will come forward. Are you saying that trolleybus is coming forward as a priority item in a programme of other schemes? Or are you saying it will go ahead independently on its own track – and other schemes will form a separate programme.

Dh – ngt is independent of wy transport fund programme.

Cl – so it is an independent scheme independent on the content of that wytf programme.

Dh – it still sits in the overall strategy. But yes, funded directly from dft. wytf schemes would be funded by combination of devolved money and local gov money.

Cl – what concerns federation about the choice of the trolleybus as an independent and standalone project is really that the choice of the scheme is caused not by process of evolution of choices between alternatives but because dft is limiting use of that money to trolleybus route and it will be lost if not used like this?

Dh – the dft did give considerations to alternatives to the ngt scheme.

Cl – straight question, if you don't build the trolleybus we don't get the money?

Dh – yes, if we don't proceed with ngt we will lose 173 million pounds.

Cl – our members are concerned that this is a forced choice – we may well be discussing the best version of the forced choice, not necessarily the best choice.

Cl – let me develop question about priority. It is clear that in the thinking which has gone into the scheme that without the reserved stretches of the route – trolleybus wouldn't be quick enough to attract passengers? Would like be any improvements to current buses if the priorities not there?

Dh – I could say if we go to g-4-41 – we set out 6 reasons why ngt can offer quicker journey times – but this will be addressed by mr smith later.

Cl – without priorities would trolleybus be quick enough to attract passengers?

Dh – the benefit that ngt has is related – without the priorities in place the journey times would not be as good and not as many ppl will be attracted to the trolleybus

Cl – the trolleybus only roads are essential/crucial for the operational success and attraction of passengers to them?

Dh – they are one component

Cl – but could you do without them?

Dh – they are important to bypass significant levels of congestion especially in headingley centre as an example.

cl- I'm taking that as crucial then.

dh – I see them as important.

cl- does that means twa order will ban all other vehicles from those priority stretches

dh – on those segregated sections they will only be operated by ngt vehicle

cl- if another trolleybus system came along – will I be able to operate my trolleybus along your right of way?

dh – the issues is addressed by mr Henkel

cl- can any other trolleybus operate along your rights of way?

Dh – I believe not

Cl – in effect you're saying is that your twa order will create a monopoly trolleybus operator with a sole right to use reserve and dedicated highways

Dh – it will lead to an operator of the system in the same way as a light rail scheme

Cl – is there really a parallel between the two – that's a separate issue. Are you aware that the competition and markets authority take an extremely dim through that restricts level of competition between buses. Especially dim view of the restriction of competition in bus markets (with exception of London). And their predecessor OfT did as well.

Dh – this will be to mr Henkel.

08/05/14

CI – the two order you propose will create a monopoly bus service in otherwise statutory deregulated bus service network

Dh – separate system but not monopoly

CI – crucial difference between separate and monopoly – this is an elective and deliberate choice. As far as I'm aware, over many years, attempts to impede competition has been looked on extremely dimly by Office of fair trade and I assume now will also be taken (negatively) by their successors, the competition and market authority

Dh – this is covered by mr Henkel.

CI – we will want to cross-examine mr Henkel on this [revise timetable].

CI – what follows may also be asked by mr Henkel – in circumstances in which competition authority upheld banning other passenger holding vehicles from those reserved rights of way in the two order – would the presence of additional vehicles with the same priorities of travel time accorded to the trolleybus - would they abstract sufficient revenue from your trolleybuses to render the business case low enough to mean the balance between cost and revenue that you propose in your business case was not obtainable – and therefore there would be a call on public purse to support loss of trolleybuses

Dh – to be clear we are talking about ngt does not attracting enough patronage from buses?

CI – or other vehicles which operate over the reserved rights of way – IF it is found that that priority can't be held to only ngt (by the competition and market authority)

Dh – it will be addressed by mr Henkel

CI – as far as I'm aware, from looking at legislation, it was and it remains illegal for a passenger transport authority or executive to establish an entity for the operation of any transport services without the intention for the sale of that entity at a future known time? As I understand it, a combined authority can establish such a company but it has to be for the purpose of such a disposal Inspector: probably for mr Henkel

CI – 6.1 of your proof you make reference to consultation and engagement throughout ngt – we in federation dispute this claim very strongly – you did not meet with us until we arranged a meeting in sept 2013

Dh – this is true

CI – in light of damage that your ngt will do the business in Leeds – estimated that over period of operation we have estimated it will be negative impact of 200+ million pounds, do you not agree that consultation should have concentrated on the businesses on the proposed route as they would be directly affected

Dh – two issues 1) figure of 200mill will be addressed by mr chadwick, 2) consultation, we have set out in our statement of consultation the work we've undertaken to try to reach out to local businesses on the corridor – 2012 we distributed leaflets to properties within 600m of the route, and drop in sessions on the route to provide feedback etc. this is fairly standard approach which allows ppl to choose to engage in the process. We have met with a no. of small businesses along the route – over 60 landowners and also in contact with sig no. of local businesses – we have sought to engage as much as we can

CI – there is a sense that we were excluded because we might be difficulty

Dh – I find that you have no basis for that comment

CI – larger consultation events have not been held as they have been in 2008 – four years between the recent efforts in 2012 is too big a gap for there to be a residue in the public mind (in regards to the ngt proposal) in particular those along the corridor of what was being proposed

08/05/14

Dh – I disagree – previously we held larger scale events, we took the view after 2012 to June 2013 – imp we went out and consulted locally with people to refresh them and seek their feedback on local issues to give us opportunities to make amendments to the design before submitting the two orders. As a result we have made a substantial no. of changes to scheme design – the consultation was effective especially in terms of the extent of engagement

cl – again we disagree with caveat that some changes have been made but second caveat is that the level of detail in the plans available to public is not enough to allow appreciation of those designs for them

dh – I would accept that everybody can't understand the detail of the plans – we have made ourselves available as a team to help them understand the detail of these plans etc. its accepted detail is not always understood [by the public] but we have made ourselves available

cl – all the dealings we've had has been extremely pleasant – but issues here are question of substance, not the approach of his team

[10:38am – 1:09 hrs into the recording]

cl – in 9.4 of your proof – if revenue from ngt exceeds contract cost of operation the surplus will be retained by metro and if revenue falls short – metro will make up the shortfall and the rest will be made up by the WY combined authority – if metro is responsible for cash losses – that must mean that trolleybus scheme is under their direct control.

dh – it will be under the promoters (2 of them – Leeds city council and WY combined authority).

cl – as far as I'm aware, I believe that [transport act 1985 legislation] especially forbids a passenger transport executive from owning and controlling a transport company of any kind ----securing operation by any means other than open competitive tender. You are setting up an entity that will actually compete with commercial bus operators and losses, if there are losses, you as metro and combined authority will pay from the public purse

dh – the issue around the structure of the transport company will be addressed by Mr Henkel

cl – in the event there was a deficit on the operation of the trolleybus system and given the incredible downward pressures there are on central gov on business rates and community charge income – would it be the case that one of the possible sources of revenue will be further pressure on businesses along the corridor. Businesses on A660 corridor may then be expected to contribute to the ngt that will cause them detriment – DOUBLE JEOPARDY [as there is a significant period of major disruption as well as risk that they will have to "foot the bill"]

dh – I'm not aware of discussions that suggest there are solutions to use business tax sources. Mr Henkel will address your questions.

cl – as far as I'm aware there are no compensation arrangements for loss of business income incurred due to construction programme of ngt, is there?

Dh – currently no compensation in place

cl – to be clear - on top of the damage to their turnover and future businesses, also possibility there may be future additional impost of costs to subsidise trolleybus should it make a loss

dh – we've not forecasted it will make a loss

inspector: can you clarify what this impost is

cl – additional charge or tax being levied on businesses in Leeds, some of which on A660 corridor in order to defray losses of the ngt system

dh – no discussions have taken place along that line

cl – this scheme will last many years, and will have sig impacts. Its consequences need to be fully explored.

08/05/14

Cameron: I don't anticipate having a witness who can answer if there will be a future tax. That's a political decision. And Haskins has given answer that it is not contemplated. I don't see how I can call a witness to answer that.

Inspector: yes, it's a political decision as how the money will be made up if there is a loss. It will be looked at that time.

G Jones: we will be making a submission that there is no sensitivity analysis (to allow prospect) in the case of the revenue forecast not being reached. None has been carried out [sensitivity analysis] as position of promoters is that their business case will succeed. It will be a matter of a submission.

Cl – is Mr Haskins aware that late yesterday the Fed of Small Businesses put on the inquiry website its evidence? And that a major component relates to the experiences of the South Yorkshire Supertram system between 1995 – 1997 and thereafter? I just ask whether he's aware that that info/proof has now been posted

Dh – I'm aware, appropriate person is Mr Henkel to address competition questions

BREAK

COUNCILLOR BARRY ANDERSON

Ba – who is accountable for this project, is it an officer or someone from the joint authority or elected individual? Who needs to be brought to this inquiry to be held accountable to explain rationale and reasoning?

Dh – Mr Farrington was able to discuss strategic need, I'm the person in terms of strategic need for the particular transport mode etc.

Ba- the analogy that I use is that the hospital passes are getting closer and closer to end of the queue – why do you feel that the political views are lukewarm towards this program in the north of the city. The politicians are lukewarm at best.

Dh – it isn't my place to pre-judge what politicians take a stand with a particular issue. They are accountable to local people and authority – they base their decision on a range of factors

Ba- you believe we do consult with our residents and when we speak we do speak after having consulted with them – our views are usually given after reflecting back the concerns of our electors

Dh – that may be the case

Ba- 3.2 of your proof – you set out various factors and highlight greater capacity accommodating a growth of demand. You are saying that trolleybus is only way to meet growth and demand...?

Dh – in para above – it gives four key factors – greater capacity is one of those

Ba- but is it the only way?

Dh- perhaps other ways but range of factors taken to decide on this mode

Ba – even if trolleybus is less accessible and less connective than the bus services highlighted yesterday. You've only consulted with ppl within 600m within the route. Mr Farrington said a 15min walk was acceptable to him – if you are losing bus services in Cookeridge, are you saying that it is more accessible?

Dh – we have looked at the overall case, it leads to an overall increase in public demand

Ba – ppl in Cookeridge will walk up the steep hill in the area to access NGT and they wouldn't prefer to have access to the bus, is that what you are saying?

Dh – I'm not saying those specific ppl will make that choice – some ppl might make choice to use bus services

Ba- but you are saying that bus services will be reduced. Surely, you have to make NGT more attractive so ppl will use it?

08/05/14

Dh – yes it has been made more attractive

Ba- transport journey times – differences between ngt and buses – shorter times as not stopping as often. Only reason you can offer a faster journey time is because ngt is stopping less.

Dh – that is one of the factors in improvement of journey time but also other factors.

Inspector: on journey times you referred to previously, how have you assessed the bus journey time (are they for express services or every stop)

Dh – they are for buses that stop at every stop – set out in transport model

Ba - do you agree then if we introduce express bus services that would have beneficial increase in shorter journey times?

Dh – already the x84 is clearly a quicker time –there is a range of diff services that ppl choose to use.

Ba – but people from cookeridge e.g. an x6 and x1 – would that not improve their journey times if they had that facility?

Dh – ngt will provide stop spacing at certain stops – and the bus services will have stops elsewhere – people will choose.

Ba- do you accept that ppl should walk longer distances to catch ngt

Dh – people make a choice – a trade-off

Ba- so if the residents in the north decided they didn't want this trade off of quicker journey times and the bus services were still operating at same levels – that would have a detrimental effect on your business case, wouldn't it?

dh – chadwick or hanson to answer

Ba – if they made a conscious decision to continue using bus service – it is a detriment [can't meet the predicted revenues]

Dh – yes we would have a lower level of demand

Ba – so that means my tax payers would have to pay more, either on council tax or business rates or fare hike. The gov won't give you a greater subsidy.

Dh – that's right, gov won't give us further money. Any funding will come from local sources but it has not been looked at [as we don't forecast this happening]

Ba – in paragraph 3.54 – have the student numbers living in north not changed significantly since this case was first put together.

Dh – it has changed. The appropriate person will be to Hanson in terms of demographic changes.

Ba- are you saying viability of ngt was not based initially on no. of students who regularly use it.

Students will use the fastest and cheapest routes. You must have anticipated a lot of patronage from students. Do you not agree that students like new things?

Dh – some students like vintage ... issue around students have been taken into account in the business case.

Ba- since 2009 there hasn't been a significant case of profiling of the city?

Dh – business case updated since 2009 – there was a 2012 submission and a jan 2013 business case review [these were updated].

Inspector: did you update the other features like the demographic changes? Were you using older info?

Dh – up to date info incorporated where available. Mr hanson will give more detail.

Ba – fifth bullet point – ottley outer ring road – would you agree that a large % if not majority of congestion originate from ppl who live outside of the bodington park and ride.

Dh – I am not in position to know that – mr hanson to address

08/05/14

Ba- you must have a view. Whether or not you will have ppl from Harrogate/skipton etc. who chose to drive in from a660 – a lot of senior ppl in business in the city live outside of leeds. I would ask you – do you not think traffic on a660 originates from outside of leeds metropolitan boundary

Dh – yes, but those [people] will be attracted to park and ride.

Ba- you say that someone who gets in car at Harrogate, listening to radio, will choose to stop car at park and ride – hope there is a space for parking and there are seats on the vehicle?

Dh – they are from a range of corridors. Ppl from Harrogate can use rail etc.

Ba- the residents from addle etc. – because a65 clogged up more people on a660 – do you think they will volunteer to stop off at bodington?

Dh – evidence from other schemes shows it is possible

Ba- no evidence from this country they will change habits to go on trolleybus. Yes from trams, rail etc.

Dh – no trolleybus system in uk –but it is akin to other RTS.

Ba- para 3.19 – you point out about permanency coming from overhead line equipment. Are you really saying that overhead lines are a virtue.

Dh – in sense of permanence, yes I am

Ba – as opposed to permanence of stops etc.

Dh – to users, permanence is an indication that it will continue to be there

Ba- if in future years, tech will be improved and when it comes to extend ngt would you then take out the overhead wires at that point if tech was available in 20 years' time where there is no longer a need for the wires – would you then remove those overhead cables?

Dh – not something we have considered doing.

Ba- yesterday in your evidence you said it wasn't a good idea to have wires overhead if vehicle wasn't using them

Dh – yes, if vehicle didn't require them

Ba- you would leave them up for decoration?

Dh – that would be a matter for politicians to take a view on in 20 years' time.

Ba- para 3.21 – projected pop growth – concerns expressed in city over the use of these pop growth figures for housing purposes – ONS has reduced them down recently

Dh – I am aware there are issues

Ba- is there any need for you to amend your figures?

Dh – my understanding is that ONS figures were revised and taken into account in updated business case review

Ba- 3.25 – did you do any soft market testing – did you say to entrepreneurs out there to ask what kind of system they could design - what the market could produce to you?

Dh – you market test based on a proposition.

Ba- did you ask any companies if they were doing research and development [on new vehicle technology]

Dh –I've tried to keep informed about the alternative technology –

Ba- so all of us who believe there will be new tech coming in in short/medium term are wrong

Dh –most of them are still evolving, not yet in commercial operation. Unclear as to when risks [to do with those new technologies] will be minimised so that we can have large scale take up

Ba 3.30 – do you feel that there is the need for connectivity to ngt. E.g. small hopper buses to take people from locations they used to get their bus to a ngt hub etc. Do you feel that should be a part of your system? If people do decide they want to use the ngt, let's say.

08/05/14

Dh – the hopper buses that exist at the moment (e.g. Nottingham hopper buses introduced feed into tram networks with various degrees of success) – something to consider. To see if commercial operators can serve that market.

Inspector; has anything progressed on this at all?

Dh – we haven't

Inspector: how do you see ngt scheme integrating with public network?

Dh – it will run opposite along existing bus routes – within 100m of existing bus stops. Also services railway stations – good con activity with key links.

Ba- which of the railways are close (e.g. horsforth) to an ngt stop.

Dh – none are in a typical walking catchment.

Ba- ngt is not a proper integrated transport system. Do you agree with that?

Dh – there are a no. of things to do to provide fully integrated system – address to Henkel.

Ba- so you do not want a fully integrated transport system

Dh – we are called 'integrated' transport authority... [DH says it is inherent in the name]

Ba- do you feel ngt will lead to greater integration of transport?

Dh – I believe that it is a step towards it

Ba- you have agreed that the bus services will probably reduce as a result

Dh – it is an assumption

Ba- it would be less integrated then

Dh – I would say overall it would be more integrated

Inspector – how do you envisage the existing bus services integrating with ngt?

Dh – we are not able to integrate in terms of one can turn up and meet another arriving. But we can integrate through smart card system and proximity to other stops etc.

Ba – para 5.27 (page 31) – bodington sports pitches which are to be constructed – need for an extension to wandsworth cemetery – I was looking at those sites to improve this cemetery. This has been removed. What is more important – enabling ppl where they can breathe properly or putting in something ppl don't want i.e. Ngt.

Dh – ngt side at bodington – we have made a decision

Ba – is it your evidence that council decided not to proceed with this wandsworth development prior to ngt submission

Dh – I can't say

Ba- that option was withdrawn

Dh – I am unaware as to when the timing of this withdrawal was. Providing ngt – not connected to the cemetery

dh – we sought advice as to the location of bodington park and ride site...it was accepted

ba – holt park, some of the potential impacts of regeneration of holt park might have in terms of needing to reconfigure the car park?

Dh – the appropriate person is mr speak

Ba – you are saying that you have not been advised of potential regeneration works here, they were mentioned to me.

Dh – I am aware of it –it is in the pre-planning stage

Ba- don't you think ngt should have a view as to what should be happening here

Dh – for the proposals of holt park district centre, ngt is complementary

Ba – even if this included putting a petrol station in when ngt is coming down the slope [in holt park]

08/05/14

Dh – we will have appropriate discussions with planning authority as to how we deal with it [when the time comes]

Ba – 6.1 apart from ppl who live within 600m, did you do consultation with people who live in the holt park?

Dh – we would have done leaflet drops in 600m area... but not gone to their houses. We have held no. of events in holt park area.

Ba- people in addle, did you do anything there?

Dh – we held events in city centre where ppl in addle undoubtedly came to. The wider area – they would have seen those advertisements...

Ba- nobody looked at the demographics of the area and looked at the methods of engagement

Dh – we used a range of methods to do so, in statement of consultation

Ba – you are satisfied you have engaged with people. That the majority of ppl would know what ngt is and understand it and understand that bus services will be reduced?

Dh – I couldn't say that the majority would be aware. If people choose to engage then they did so.

Ba- so when I bring it to their attention and feed it back to you – and it doesn't make a jolt of difference...

Dh – I'm aware there are articles in local publications – ppl can choose to engage or not.

Ba – do you acknowledge that the distance between bus stops and ngt stops may not be conducive to people transferring from one mode to the other

Dh – they may choose not to do so – distances have been taken into account in the analysis and the forecasts generated

Ba – para 11.25 – when I asked for info on anticipated demand I was told it would come, when I asked questions on behalf of residents about what services would be affected, and how much charged in terms of fares – I was not given any direct answers. My maths, if the road is almost at capacity and you are putting ngt into the system it is taking capacity away from other uses just now. You have stated that cycling is priority (that will take a greater %) – so the only way you will get capacity for ngt will be taking it from cars.

Dh – evidence suggests that's not the case – address to chadwick and smith.

Ba- you are increasing the size of the cake?

Dh – the scheme has been designed to increase capacity. Mr chadwick sets out impacts on overall congestion levels.

Ba- to conclude, do you agree with leeds city council about improving partnership working. Do you think ngt has been an exemplar by ignoring views of local residents and not working in partnership with the north of city.

Dh – we have evidence that we have engaged strongly with local residents – what was practical for us to do. I believe we have consulted well.

WEETWOOD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION – MR JOHN DICKINSON

Jd – questions arise from oral evidence last Friday and today. Question of permanence versus flexibility. I refer to your proof at 3.41 bullet 3 and in para 11.13/15 of permanence report. You draw on the experiments with FTR vehicles on the no. 4 route as an instance of impermanence. Is the no. 4 route still being served?

Dh- yes but not by FTR vehicles

08/05/14

Jd – and was there an interruption of the service in changeover?

Dh – I don't know

Jd – I don't believe there was. Can you tell me if the vehicles are still on a route

dh – they have been transferred to route 72.

Jd – would you not agree this reflects an operational flexibility befitting a commercial enterprise.

Dh – the figure of expenditure was significant to accommodate those vehicles but there was a flexibility.

Inspector: is this infrastructure improvement being made use of?

Dh – they were made to accommodate articulated vehicles a new bus station built in Pudsey 5 years ago to accommodate articulated vehicles at additional costs. Subsequently FTR removed from route.

Route 72 – not aware what infrastructure changes, if any, were made

Inspector: infrastructure changes weren't necessary without the FTR buses?

Dh – expenditure became abortive.

Jd – but the infrastructure is not un-usable, is it? It's not at full capacity but still being used, am I right?

Dh – yes

Jd – you claim that power delivery system will give sense of permanence. do 150 year old trees and boundary walls and buildings not give a sense of permanence and continuity in an area.

Dh – this isn't related to overhead wires.

Jd – would you agree that use by community of appropriate legislation to list features and protection orders suggest a commitment by the community to continuity and permanence...

Dh – the appropriate person to address this is ...

Jd – I am trying to establish the continuity – you are proposing to modify an area that has naturally evolved [permanence] ... etc.

Dh – I'm not able to comment on how long it would take to re-establish this

Jd – is it not for our community reps to reflect those community

Dh – matters of environmental issues have been taken into account in this inquiry.

Jd – would you comment on council trying to ignore communities' expressed wishes on something that might be there for 60 years

Dh – council has taken a view to approve this order – including reps to planning panel in regards to local planning issues

Jd- 3.4.41 third bullet – you claim that the permanence offered by ngt will encourage ppl to locate to these areas. What problems in attracting ppl to locate to a660 are you aware of?

Dh – I recall that somebody stated the view that as students have moved out of that area of a660 – number of empty houses, difficulty in attracting ppl to those houses – ngt permanence could assist on this issue.

Jd – are you aware of the state of those properties – converted to houses of multiple occupation, not suitable at this time for families who want a permanence residence

Dh – it will adjust back to family homes after a certain time

Jd – you are implying there are problems in attracting ppl to locate within a660 corridor – evidence you say yourselves that developers are building large property developments along that corridor

Dh – those developments would lead to an increase in value...

Jd – trolleybus working group – when did it come into being?

08/05/14

Dh – runs under UITP – I don't know – I attended meetings from 2006 and I am asked to speak at some of those meetings

Jd- you have a particular interest in trolleys, then?

Dh –I am not a trolleybus spotter – I have an interest in that I have to understand how they operate and transfer that knowledge to the project of which I am director of

Jd - Written evidence 3.14 bullet 1 of your proof – you say buses only operating at 60% relating to unfilled bus capacity – would you agree that there are very particular problems on the a660 – firstly, university time and secondly, to do with beginning and ending of teaching sessions.

Dh –they are two issues

Jd – those are demands you can't manage/ameliorated in any way

Dh – yes, it can be. They can do so by replacing public transport mode instead of cars if it is more attractive

Jd – please estimate of proportion of bus movements that are actually at or near capacity on a660

Dh – I can't do that

Jd – its less than 5% from our estimates

Jd – para 3.41 – second bullet, we note the phrasing that the “a660 on ottley and a61 have demand characteristics necessary and fulfil criteria of a RTS and opportunity to implement one” – that reads that the aspiration to build ngt was more important than consideration of whether corridor was needed one – dft webtag guidance para 2.8.3 submitted as a doc [nwltf 106] is this proposal for an ngt system a solution looking for a problem?

Dh – no it wasn't

Jd – we note in your ref para 3.4 – to the framework doc c-4-2 – dated 2009 – which you advanced a summary of systematic review. The doc includes a statement that ngt is “at the heart of our approach” – this supports that ngt preceded the need for this scheme.

Dh – it includes the former supertram corridors – 2009 case set out a preferred solution but we did subsequent analysis beyond that to demonstrate there was a clear strategic case for a range of diff interventions on those corridors. Ngt was one such intervention – the strategic case demonstrated it was appropriate

Jd – how would you respond to the proposal that trolleybus was just a revision of bits of supertram?

Dh – there are no. of differences – only serves a similar “spine” but no. of variants incorporated to make more appropriate for trolleybus. No it is not just a substitute for supertram, there is clear rationale for this project

Jd – the east and south routes – they were removed from the case

Dh – not the strongest part of the scheme so dft didn't award funding for that part. The strongest part in terms of meeting problems and scheme obj are the routes we have put forward for the twa order.

Jd – is it not the case then that the northern line is primarily justified by the revenues it will yield?

Dh – no, it meets the scheme objectives

Jd – para 6.10-14 proof – note that there is a decision not to seek public feedback for the scheme in 2012-2013. Was that your decision?

Dh – I approved it and thought it was the right decision. We had been given programme entry of the decision in 2012 – the next stage was to proceed with twa submission. As part of that, the project had been paused by 2 years, there was a need to look again at aspects of the scheme to refine proposals to take into account views expressed locally by some ppl as to whether scheme could be improved.

Jd –we'll come back to the quality of info you put out

08/05/14

Jd – you said that “nothing had substantially changed” in those 2 years – but the removal of east/west route was not a substantial change??

Dh – its true east and city centre loop removed by dft – that had consequences and we were required to update the business case and design. We communicated those changes as part of the consultation

Jd – what would you regard as a substantially modification?

Dh – if we moved away from these corridors entirely. [talks about dft approval]

Jd – para 4.9 in proof- one of the aspirations of the transport strategy is the help reduce the complexities of travel- what complexities do those refer to?

Dh – d-4-48 – I believe ngt accords well with the aspect set out in executive summary.

Jd – would you interpret which system you choose, deciding how far to walk to get to the stops, as either to wait longer or to negotiate two different fare structures etc.– would you regard these as an increase or decrease of complexities?

Dh – I don't see it as increasing – overall ppl are inclined to make rational choices.

J d- is there a good fit between this ngt scheme and national door to door strategy

Jd – we have concerns as to the business case and resources to defray capital or revenue shortfalls. But others have explored this. [moves on]

Jd – refer to para 9.14 and 9.16 – refers to gateway corridors – claims there's independent external confirmation of deliverability of ngt – we note in 11.61 (answers to objectors) – no evidence to suggest gateway reviewers were anything but impartial. Given that reviewers' identities have not been revealed

Dh – they have been revealed – it's not particularly helpful but they can be seen. The gateway reviews were subject to a FOI. There is a council published summary of the review, showing we were transparent in showing the findings of the review.

Jd – Para 3.4 refers to framework report c-4-2 – conclusions taken from it. It seems to me that conclusions that were drawn should be different.

Inspector: is it worth looking at this report now?

Jd – yes. I would like to take you through some aspects of that report – it seems to me that the conclusions drawn are so blindingly obvious that really only an idiot that someone [should point it out...] page 11 – this looks (independent SDG report) that they plot out the areas of leeds which have the greatest or the least need for transport intervention. Please point out the corridor that shows the least need for intervention on that map?

Dh – corridor which shows the least?

Jd – yes

Dh – I'm looking at the lightest coloured... there is a huge range of them outside urban area. The a660 is identified there as having the strongest need.

Jd – from the city centre outwards there is a clear [reduction] in need. Would you like to turn to page 16 – this is to do with rail services. And it clearly lists two aspects in which – various rail routes into leeds are listed accordingly to whether rail service crowded and car park facilities. Its said that the worst affected corridor, its confirmed, is the Harrogate line.

dh – the worst and least are in no particular order

jd – are they in no particular order?

Dh – no particular order – clockwise direction around the city...

Jd – you may be right

Dh – I am

Jd – certainly the Harrogate line is stated elsewhere that it is worst affected. On the preceding page.

Inspector: carry on with the question

08/05/14

Jd: I assumed the way the report was written you were listing in order of degree of affection.

Dh – it's not in order of worst or least

Jd – go back to pages 14-15 dealing with road congestion – v. significant that the implications is that the worst affected corridor is the a61 harrogate road-

Dh – no we didn't say which is worst affected – evidence at c1-1 shows congestion at some corridors over 100% of their capacity and the a660 was highlighted as one.

Jd – [it slightly undermines my case] but I was going to say that impression from this report is the ottley a660 was least affected of any of the corridors...

Inspector – I think you may have misunderstood this

G Jones – I asked where the info from this doc is – I'm waiting for other witnesses to identify it. This witness is wanting to know the hierarchy of the worst affected corridors

Inspector – what is the question on this?

Jd – if it a660 was the LEAST affected (which it now might not be) and it carries the least traffic of the radial routes (known from the Leeds Central Cored Accounts – established by leeds city council highway dept – supplementary appendices to leeds transport model)

Dh – its true that capacity is lower than some of the other corridors. But it is one of the two corridors in leeds where congestion adds to 80%+ of journey times (c-1)

Jd- however, from a city wide perspective, intervention on this route may be less justified than on other [more congested] routes.

Dh – the strategic case demonstrated the need for intervention on this corridor

Jd – para 4.21 and 4.22 proof – note that the UDP identified need for RTS. Statement of case in section 4 on ngt vision – it states that para 4.2 that ngt system is key to creating an integrated RTS. Para 4.3 – modern, accessible etc. such aspirations have appeared widely in this doc and promotional literature. Can we pick this apart. When you use the term rapid transit –what image are you trying to project to public?

Dh – modern system, high level of priority and punctual more efficient service, shorter journey times etc. and range of other characteristics

Jd – are you aware of any legal definition of RT

Dh – no

Jd – I couldn't either under TWA etc. so what is the interested citizen whose interested is arisen to do to find out more? Website is unhelpful. Internet reveals something through encyclopedia and Wikipedia – which as a source might be reasonably unbiased etc. (the paper I just gave you on RTS) – please read definition

Dh - [reads out]

Jd – this definition might have some standing, am I right?

Dh – it is most expansive than this.

Jd – what comes out of these is two common factors which a transport system has to exhibit in order to be called RTS. These are 1) guided and 2) absolutely totally segregated from other traffic.

Dh – a trolley vehicle system is a guided system

Jd – excuse me??

Dh – within the TWAO it is defined as a guided system.

Jd – it defines where it might or might not go... you would agree that rapidity is achieved due to the segregation. Which is just as well in view of the characteristics of the performance of ngt.

Dh – indeed speed will be 13 miles an hour – 60% quicker than bus part due to segregation. [explains the speeds of RTSs around the UK]

Jd – [mr Mckinnon appendix evidence] to do with BRT standard. Are you familiar with the work?

Dh – yes

08/05/14

Jd – have you undertaken scoring of ngt with this standard

Dh – it scores 41 in this evidence. But mr anzir budoo – scored it at 70. There is a level of subjectivity attached to the scoring of BRT standard

Jd – yes there is a difference in subjectivity.

Jd – do you know how many European RTS qualify on that scale?

Dh – no I haven't

Jd – I would draw attention to the Cambridgeshire bus-way - in fact it only comes in the lowest category of approval.

Dh – where is that?

Jd – in a Wikipedia article – listed as scoring low (bronze)

Dh – this is a system guided for a large proportion of its system. It's not similar to ngt.

Jd – however, are inquiring citizen has looked at disparity with ngt between promotional claims and aspirations and the reality – esp compared with internationally refs. It is not demonstrably rapid or transit and it is vaguely a bus rapid transit system (not at a high standard) and nor is it (compared to bus network) a bus rapid transit NETWORK. And then he becomes aware of the downsides particularly for a660 and headingley. The downsides have not been mentioned in your promotional literature. There has been a degree of hyperbole in promo material and meeting info, am I right? It might approach misrepresentation...can you realise there might be a trend from support for the scheme years ago to opposition now.

Dh – we have consistently tried not to mislead the public and provide clear info. We have updated that info where new info becomes available. Ppl are still quoting old info even though new info is provided.

Jd – you acknowledge there is in fact a trend from support to opposition

Dh – there has been a level - evident through sessions and we have communicated to ppl to relay their concerns.

Jd – have you been surprised as to the growing amount of opposition

Dh – I'm not surprised in respect of communication of info.

Jd – has this caused you to reconsider if this is right?

Dh – the decision has been made to take the scheme forward based on objective evidence put to people

Jd – although you claim to have met the general public in fact you declined to send an officer to address our 2012 annual general meeting (weetwood residents).

Dh – I did decline that meeting. The single meeting we did. We were in a number of public consultation events [DH explains he was otherwise occupied] – I was offered opportunity with a couple of weeks of notice (feb 14th) – I was not in the position to go – I offered my apologise and offered an alternative to do so in a future point of time. There were good reasons for doing so

Jd – you've confirmed today that you understood that leaflets delivered to all business residents within 600 m. most weetwood residents live within 600m – few or any recollect receiving this info.

Dh – our records show that we appointed an organisation to deliver leaflets within 600m and that it was successful. I do get things through the door that I don't read myself.

Inspector: do you have record of which roads this organisation sent on this road. Just to show if some streets were missed off

Dh – this was only one form of a range of methods

Jd – it might be helpful for haskins to say if he was aware of any responses arising from that distribution

08/05/14

Dh – yes

LUNCH

NWLTF MR BONSALL

Bonsall - e-3-1 – introduction describing process of bringing forward solutions and problems. Mr Hansen refers to figure 1 – [describes process commenting on fact that it's about half way down the page – the top half of the page sifting through what the problems are and so forth – can I take you to para 1.4.4 on the next page – describing what a study should do talking about agreements on a set of objectives etc. meeting all the objectives and selecting]. Has your responsibility [as project director] covered the whole of this process?

Dh – this is a familiar process which I had responsibility for and followed.

b- remind us of what the problems on a660 are?

Dh – poor accessibility etc. [lists]

B – refer us to doc g-4-5 presented during your evidence in chief (strategy report) – this is about as close as we will get to an assessment of problems and potential solutions on the a660.

Dh – doc c-1 table 3.7 as well

B – we are talking about the particular problems on the a660

– the inspector will note that this is a draft and may surmise that we are unable to find the final version shows the attention given to this doc – lets assume the final version is the same as draft. Para 3.11 onwards – describing the situation in north leeds/north leeds route – says the supertram route would have served the congested a660 corridor and catering for two distinct markets: local trips (students etc) and longer distance commuter markets with the provision of bodington park and ride. It goes on in paragraph 3.12 to talk about the solutions to the problems for LOCAL trips. It talks about a package of measures to improve conditions of conventional buses that would be required - In order to adequately serve demands for local trips along the corridors – involving increased/extension of bus lanes, provision of bus priority and other complementary measures [improved vehicles etc.] It also refers to approaches to tackling rat-running opportunities. This was January 2006 – now 8 years later – can you tell us what progress has been made on this first batch of recommended solutions?

Dh – this report was put forward to the politicians to seek feedback and direction on the way forward – as a result a scheme was developed which then became the ngt project.

[this paragraph refers to solutions for local traffic]

Dh- it was viewed that the timescale for developing wider proposals would mean that the beneficials for providing conventional buses would not be great –

B – I interpret that as: “because we're going to do ngt we don't need to bother with this – there's not enough time/benefits that come from it”

Dh – by the point you implemented some measure for conventional buses – you would get into the process of delivering a wider project to solve the problems, it would impact on the measures that have been introduced – they would have to be withdrawn

b- I think we are saying the same thing

B – if these measures had been put in what impacts would that have had on your business case

Dh – mr chadwick to answer

B – please hypothesise – if there was a de minimum case?

Dh – the differential between the two schemes would have been less and impacted on business case

08/05/14

B – so what we’re saying is the business case wouldn’t have been as strong if we hadn’t gone through this [matter]

Dh – nobody said we weren’t going to do it because we were going to do ngt regardless...

B – para 3.13 – refers to possibility of a bus based park and ride with express services to the city discussing need/measures to allow this express service to avoid congestion e.g. headingley bypass. Goes on to 3.14 – discusses possibility of another solution which goes only from city centre to hyde park.

Dh – again, these were suggestions as put forward in the report

b- you yourself did raised it as evidence that it had been put forward as to the alternate. Can you tell me what consideration was given to these recommendations in 3.14?

dh- consideration certainly was given in 2009 business case to a truncated hyde park route

b – what consultation was there with the public to go ahead with the full scheme – [how did you come to the view that] and decision that instead of the express bus “we’ll have a trolleybus”

dh – decisions set out in the 2009 consultation

b – 2009 consultation asked the public if we wanted a trolleybus – I don’t recall/it did not mention whether it would be better to have an express bus from bodington park and ride

dh – no consultation was taken on this particular option

b – you are not following dft advice on formulation of options then [guidance on looking at reasonable alternatives]?

Dh – it should not be taken so literally to the extent that every idea put forward should be consulted on. A lot of analysis would have been undertaken to look at various options before deciding on a shortlist of options.

B – can you tell us how the recommendation for a express bus service morphed into a trolleybus with 11 stops between bodington and city centre?

Dh – I’m not sure it did ‘morph’ into a trolleybus

b- that’s what we have got in front of us. We haven’t got an express bus as proposed in this review.

Dh – this report set out potential options to take forward in terms of the express service.

Subsequent to this work was undertaken which resulted in ngt type approach to the a660 corridor.

B – is there any documentation of that process of the comparison of those two options?

Dh – unless its set out in 2007 initial business case – I can’t point to it

b- I couldn’t find it myself... it would be unfair for me to restate that you said you were responsibility for this area... I won’t go down that line...

B – do you agree this review establishes there is a problem with local trips in a660 corridor and proposed solution to that didn’t mention a BRT, headingley bypass or trolleybus etc.

Dh – it did set out there were problems with local trips – it does talk about need for improvements/measures e.g. priority bus lanes – this report was based on an initial level of data analysis and review.

B – last week, you first presented this as evidence as having done analysis of alternative solutions

Dh – this was done within 2 months of leed supertram cancellation – subsequently a wider piece of work was undertaken reflected in doc c-4-2 (strategic case)

B – that doesn’t talk about particular issues in particular corridors – it seems to have lost site of this differentiation between two different markets. But let’s move on - we’ve established that the problem of local trips in this document are identified and it doesn’t suggest BRT or headingly bypass or trolleybus as a solution

Dh – it doesn’t in that point of time

b- I know it’s a draft – are you saying the problems have changed since this report has done?

Dh - Further analysis done to show that particular solutions are required in this corridor. And these aren’t necessarily the best solutions to solve the problems.

b- solution identified for local trips were not implemented

b- now look at solutions for long distance commuters – it says we should have a park and ride. The doc looks at options as alternative to the headingley bypass.

B – dr Dickinson drew attention to the phrasing in the tag guidance – where it specifically says we should avoid adopting solutions in search of a problem. He draws attention to phrasing of 3.2.1 in your evidence where you say ottley corridors have the demand characteristics necessary and they fulfil the criteria to support and present opportunity to implement one. It does sound like a solution in search of a problem.

Dh – this conclusion was one which was reached three years subsequent to the publication of this report in 2006.

b- we are now dealing with 3.41 where you say these corridors have the demand characteristics etc. I'm putting it to you that it sounds like you've decided: "there's a place we can put our NGT"

dh – I have greater professional credibility than just searching for a problem. I don't believe it reads like that at all

b – mr jones has questioned you on the considerations of the alternatives but do you believe this consideration was in line with dft advice?

dh – I do believe so – as thorough as a consideration of alternatives I've seen in my career

B- draw your attention to a few phrases from it - same doc that Dickinson drew to your attention to **nwlft-106** – overview of transport appraisal process – mr Cameron thought that it would be in the E-series (the earlier version). In 1.1.5, it says in the summary "the following key principles should be followed through the appraisal process e.g. a clear rationale for any proposal and based on a clear presentation of problems and challenges that establishes need for the project." We agree that a660 has two problems – local and long distance commuter issues [that need to be solved]

Dh – 2006 report sets out these issues – subsequent to this, there has been series of iteration around the issues e.g. table3.7 doc c-1 sets out a range of other issues applicable to a660

b- we are blurring the lines between a problem and a need (as identified in the first doc).

dh – we've clearly set out both problems and needs of the scheme

b – we'll have to differ on that

b- the second point states – there must be consideration of genuine discrete options and not an assessment of a previously selected option against some clearly inferior alternates (second bullet point)

dh this is the case and as we have submitted in the 2007 business case we did have some discussion with dft around that requirement in the guidance to ensure we comply with guidance in terms with setting alternates – did lead subsequently to 2009 doc which did look at alternatives and was approved by dft – on that basis.

b – we are relying on dft having say it was ok

dh- dft are people who oversaw reviewed of the technical work undertaken ... this need for the project was also reviewed through the gateway review process to show there was a need.

b- I thought there was a very nice distinction between the case for the project and the need for the project

b- can we turn to 2.8 of the same doc – describing in more detail the process of option generation. It talks about how you form your lease. Have you got an audited trail from having moved from the wider range of options down to ngt?

dh – there will be a trail but not presented in the documents- work was undertaken though

b – it is not important to put this up to us now?

Dh – I didn't see that it was relevant to the case.

08/05/14

B – even though the first principle states...

Dh – it was a culmination of work that took place between 2006 and that time.

B – 2.8.2 – talks about a wide range of options including all modes and pricing etc. – reducing options that reduce the need to travel...

Dh – there was discussion with dft where discussions took place as to whether ngt should be subject to some form of demand management [like a congestion charge??] around 2007-8 – transport for leeds project was in process – looking at whether some other interventions reduced need to travel. It was discounted ultimately I imagine because of the way the Manchester project (like congestion charge) – which only 20% of people voted in favour for those types of proposals – public said we don't want to support this type of charge. This led to cancellation of those types of measures – leeds were looking at a similar approach through a study dft supported. Discussions did take place around whether there was a need for pricing/demand management to be introduced in leeds

b- the conclusion is that when the people of Manchester were asked they didn't want it and it wasn't proceeded with. The same debate took place in leeds and they said they didn't want to do it
dh – there was no referendum

b- so leeds concluded “we better not go down that route as there is no public support”

dh – yes, that's correct

b- interesting parallel with the situation we're in at the moment – there is no public support but that fact is being ignored. You use a referendum if you have to – but not if you don't?

dh – we don't have referendums on every issue that comes up.

b- my recollection is that leeds thought there was no way they would get through with that so the work stopped – I was involved with that work.

B – another piece of guidance from dft – it says that discussion sources of ideas for options generation (para 2.8.10) – feedback from local stakeholders, colleagues etc and public – useful to seek views from people travelling in relevant areas.

Dh – the 2006 report we did hold a brainstorming session which led to a generation of a no. of those ideas.

b- people living and travelling within the geographical area?

Dh – within 2 months of leeds supertram cancellation ... no local engagement ... we hadn't formulated proposals to consult on yet

B – in the longer term?

Dh – in 2008 we did a consultation with the transport for leeds ... picked up in 2011 submission of business case. We undertook these aspects in terms of 2.8.10

B – my memory of the 2008 consultation was that it was looking at the sorts of things ppl would want for solutions – but didn't ask them for ideas

Dh – certainly did ask them

B – unfortunately I don't have that in front of me at the moment so can't pursue it...

b- division of responsibilities – I understand that much of the analysis has been done by external consultants – I want a clarification of their brief. Mott mcdonald – was it limited to advice and analysis – did they have power to make decisions.

Dh – out of that advice we formed a view as to what direction to take. They formed reports to go to our project boards. The decision would be made as to what was taken forward for recommendations ultimately by me.

B – clearly for major decisions. What about when we get down to operational details (e.g. models etc) – would you have made decisions on those?

Dh – we operate with our advises whereby we request some technical work to be undertaken in response to a question we seek to find an answer to – they provide advice and we review it – whether it's in the direction we want to take.

08/05/14

B – did you indicate what sort of info you wanted them to get out of the models? Or did you let them [get on with it]

Dh – depends what point in time – we needed to comply to guidance and provide the information that would satisfy the dft as to validity of work undertaken

b- if we are talking about specification of the model to help us look at impact of ngt in a660 – what sort of issues did you alert them to to decide what outputs to have in the model?

dh – address this to mr hanson – but in terms of the specification of the model... partly it [inherently] was specified within the leeds transport model. A model was developed covering the leeds area – I wasn't involved directly – one of the requirements was that we should be able to model diff types of interventions etc [?]

b – I'm interested in issues like e.g. what is the revenue? Would you leave it to them [the consultants] to realise that?

Dh – people we appointed were people who were appointed because they knew what they were doing...

B – they “obviously” knew what you wanted in their advice – would you have specified to them what you wanted in terms of what the impacts of congestion would be.

dh – we needed to provide a model that satisfied guidance and one that could feed into the economic model. [saying that there was no specific instructions/parameters given but that consultants knew what to model from the guidance they had to comply with]

[congestion levels discussion 14:35]

Dh – the information we've put out for levels of congestion based on experience than...

B – assessing the future

Dh – to assess the future we would model to take account of factors such as demographics, changes in highway etc. if your model is robust and complies to guidance then you would be able to

B – did you specify that among other outputs there should be some useful modelling of congestion [in the future]

Dh – we would have specified it –

b- did you specify

dh – it falls out from the analysis

bb – I was assuming that you'd have wanted to be assured that the models showed congestion with or without ngt.

Dh – we do have a model – I pointed to info relating to ngt and bus journey times.

B – what I'm asking you is about the specifications. Did you say to him “obviously we'll need to know what will happen to congestion, with or without ngt”

Dh – I didn't ask that question

b- what about with rat running

dh – I did request that information about rat running

b- when?

dh – I don't remember it was within the last number of years...

b - there were key objectives in the ngt project and you would have wanted to ensure the modelling would answer those questions – did you specify that the model should answer those questions?

What did you give Hanson [as your consultant] as a brief?

dh – yes, that's the case – I did not give him a brief ...

b – so mr Hanson did not get any specific....

Dh – there was a BRIEF PROVIDED TO CONSULTANTS TO COMPLY WITH GUIDANCE [didn't go beyond any of the guidance – it wouldn't have been that succinct]

B - your memory is you gave no particular guidance in the brief to enable you meet the objectives of the project.

08/05/14

[missed a small part around 35min into recording]

B – presentation on ngt case to councillors, is this appropriate to you

Dh – yes

B – would you be concerned that councillors were concerned that the latest BCR is higher than the 2012 BCR

Dh – I don't believe I would – we've refined the scheme in a number of areas

b- isn't it true that it's lower now

dh – it's an indicator – nevertheless, it falls in the range of acceptability in eyes of dft

b – it's one of those indicators that gets headlines to the extent that even farrington stated it was 2.9 and now 2.7

dh – dft's view on that business case in terms of Benefit cost ratio after risk – they decided to adjust it and it came down to 2.7

b- mr farrington was very careful to say that BCR was 2.9 and that compares to the dft assessment of 2.7 in 2012. It is factually correct – leaves impression that BCR has gone up

dh – BCR is a benchmark.

b- mr farrington's statement led people to assume that it's gone up

dh – this information is not hidden [one could have clarified by looking at public info available]

b- it leads to the impression that it has gone up – but it has actually gone down if you compare like for like. It was at 3.18 in 2012 and now 2.7

dh – 2.7 is good comparator to 2.9 as we have taken on board issues dft wanted us to look at.

b- the point I was making was that the presentation made it look like an increase. I'm also aware that the councillors believe that the BCR has gone up. Would you be concerned that councillors thought that BCR has gone up when it hasn't?

dh – I wouldn't be concerned

b- I'm comparing your 2012 and 2014 business case

dh – can't convey BCR straightforwardly. We have provided a fair comparison in our business case.

b- would you be concerned if councillors thought that ngt would provide 600 million pounds of time savings (in the appraisal summary table in c-1 (table 17.12 – which says 2.9 in BCR – jan 2014 appraisal has subsequently been amended)

dh – I wouldn't be as the councillors would know what the current number is.

B – lets just say they are interested in time savings – would you be concerned they interpret this table as saying there is 600 million in time savings

Dh – I don't believe this level of detail would be a concern for councillors

b- would you be concerned that the inspector thought this?

Dh – my understanding is that this appears to be set out in a way consistent with the way you set out cost-benefits in a scheme

b- I'll take it up with mr chadwick – there is an issue with these tables as how these are labelled. Haskins says that councillors wouldn't be interested in this level of detail. I'm a councillor, what would you do if I told you this is what I interpreted?

dh – I would try to answer them by requesting from my advisors to provide a short note to provide clarification as to what those numbers mean. If I see councillors misquoting numbers I would call up that councillor and offer advice as to what it actually means.

B – would you be concerned if the inspector was under the impression that disruption during construction had been taken into account?

Dh – if he was then we would seek to address that impression.

b- you would draw his attention to that fact he hasn't

dh – mr chadwick has drawn attention to it in his rebuttal

08/05/14

[DH says that if councillors' weren't aware of all this we would tell them]

BREAK

B – councillors are aware I assume that 172 mill pounds is at risk if twa fails

Dh – yes

b- can I turn to c-1 para 3.101 – this relates to the identified key constraints and deliverability of the project – key issues including no. 2 (page 3-34) concerning deliverability mentioning public and political support influences delivery risk. Do you see any risk in that respect emerging?

Dh – always risks – elections the week after etc. so far the politicians have taken the project forward and I see that continuing subject to demonstrating

B – is it at more risk of other projects that are similar?

Dh –it's a bigger project we've undertaken but other than that no

b- leeds council – allocated funding – based on their understanding of deliverability of the benefits?

As we discover the reduced fit, is there any risk of their support reducing?

Dh – no, no reduction that will risk their support

B – you've just answered that you think this project isn't greater risk than others of similar type – can I draw your attention to **appendix H-1 of Nwlft statement of case** (extract from dft response to treasury concerns). What it identifies is dft responding to treasury concerns about why this should go forward in the then spending review. The dft pointed that the deferral would push it into the next spending period – this scheme will take four years from initial approval to spend – “it's very likely that local promoters will abandon the scheme etc.”

Dh – this is the view taken by dft as to why they needed to take the decision now (15 may 2012 – ahead of the approval in july 2012)

B – **I asked you whether you thought this project was at any greater risk from losing support from politicians. I'm just pointing to the fact that dft thought that politicians might abandon the scheme.**

Dh – that was the view of dft at the time – not an indication of any particular concern. Just view as to what could potentially happen if they didn't review it.

B – this was in response to the dft from the treasury. They thought it was necessary to point it out – they made a particular point in saying this. Why do you think dft thought it necessary to draw attention to it?

Dh – I don't see any particular importance attached to that

B – c-1, para 3-101 – drawing attention to the identified risk on public and political support. Public support is another issue – **a lot of objections and number of surveys suggesting less than unanimous support. Do you think this risk is moving up the agenda?**

Dh – it can influence political support. The level of opinion on ngt is the same as it was this time last year – when it was taken to votes at council

B – a few of these surveys have come out in the last year

Dh – yes, as in mr farrington's proof (Yorkshire evening post) and other surveys to gauge opinions

B – all pointing in the same direction

Dh- suggests there is a level of opposition

b- 3-101 – risk on potential for scheme expansion – saying that no barrier to extend – procurement etc

dh – I'm happy we have managed the risks

b- outcome realisation? Level of influence of promoters in delivering the outcomes etc.

Dh – happy we are managing that one as well

b- the sensitivity analyses shows the assumption on economic growth is fairly important – showing low growth reduces revenue by 7% and operational surplus by about half. That is something that you would say the promoters have no control over?

Dh – we can report appropriately as the project proceeds – I’m not concerned at this point in time

b- competition – there is no way of ascertaining what the competition will be – does it not concern you that your revenue streams depends on their being no competition

dh ...no

b – what actions taken to manage that risk?

Dh – set out an assumption in henkel’s proof – so address to him

B – turning to the question of consultation addressed in section 6 of your proof. – excerpt of nwlft statement of case page 34 – “it must be a two-way flow of information based on proper dialogue”

Dh –I’m satisfied that we’ve done it – the consultation papers given yesterday is a small sample of this dialogue with the public

b- page 34 – first principle of consultation– “must listen to the views and be prepared to be influenced by them...etc.” you’re happy your consultation fit this principle?

Dh – I’m happy that it did lead to some changes and I’ve accepted we haven’t moved onto a diff corridor or developing an underground – but where practicable we have incorporated feedback. I’m comfortable we have complied with our duty to have a dialogue etc.

b- you weren’t able to listen to comments about the principles of the scheme

dh – there is an extent as to modifying the project – there are parameters around the funding approval so we have to work around this. Changes are not always possible but significant measures to cycling measures etc. since earlier approval are reflected as a result of consultation with these cycle groups.

B – 2008/2009 – were you prepared to listen to views on different solutions?

Dh – largest single idea in 2008 was why it couldn’t be a tram. That came through strongly in the consultation then. We weren’t in a position to take a tram scheme forward and we explained reasons for that and why we couldn’t.

b- a-01-3 which is your communications management strategy (first objective of this strategy)– on page 7 para 1.19 – this summarises the first objective of your communication strategy – “to establish, develop and maintain active support for and understanding...etc from stakeholders/public etc.” you don’t see any inconsistency between that and proper consultation. This is a communication not consultation

dh – we have engaged extensively with a range of stakeholders – we seek to establish and maintain that support and understanding

b – the communication was about developing and maintaining active support – nothing to do with what people thought...

dh – we have endeavoured to maintain active support

b- well, we are drawing a distinction between that and extensive consultation

b- we discussed surveys of various sorts, in one line, indicate what your reaction was? The hostile reception of info events – cause you to doubt accuracy of 2009 survey?

Dh – no it didn’t, approach to go in at very local level – showing plans at local area. We anticipated there would be some issues arising out of that. Not surprised. When people choose to engage at that detail level you will get diff responses as they have diff issues. We weren’t seeking a barometer of support – there is a spectrum of support.

b- how would you characterise the feedback form?

Dh – more negative than positive –I’m not prepared to say exactly

08/05/14

B – our analysis suggests around 63%

B – what was your reaction to the number of objections

Dh – I made predictions as to number of objections – its typical for a scheme of this type – less than Cambridgeshire guided busway. Its not a numbers game in my view. Its about how we react to it and how we seek to resolve these issues. I wasn't surprised about the results of the nwlft survey – I see that it was an indicator of opinions of people in nw leeds. [goes on to say that parameters in their surveys were more comprehensive than those in the nwlft survey and others]

B – are you saying because you analysed survey by age and sex its more valid?

Dh – it represented a population mix.

b- there's a difference between stratifying the results and the sample

dh – we compared the mix of response to the population of leeds

b – what reason are you to believe that nw leeds are not equally representative, you just assume it wouldn't be?

[dh says they took a range of measures to gain opinion at that time]

Dh – in area of nw leeds the response seemed to reflect the view of those people who partook. The format of the leaflet says that “you need to object to this scheme.” Etc. [DH may be saying that it was biased]

B – no, it did not say that

b- you didn't put that nwlft survey on your ngt website as it was not favourable? Or the Yorkshire evening post survey?

Dh – no, Yorkshire post one was a poll [therefore not representative etc].

B – I doubt you will put mr mulholland's in as it's not a “proper survey” as well. There is one survey you've placed on your website which relates to leeds student union which mr farrington thought was important enough to draw attention to – 30,000 students. Do you know how many students took part in that vote? It was a meeting of 90 students. This survey was 'important' enough to actually go on your website and put press releases out. Are you suggesting that was a more valid survey than these ones? Two surveys, which happen to be in favour happen to go on your website. It fits well with your communication strategy but not so much a reflection of opinions.

Dh – I didn't know the student union survey was on the website...

B – you thought visual impact was less of an impact in leeds than wellington as there are more power cables etc. in wellington.

Dh – I formed basis on the picture I saw.

B – surely if there are already wires there it is less of an impact to add more.

Dh – depends on the situation – in Geneva there are tram and trolleybus wires. A hundred metres away a street with only trolleybus wires which is not as intrusive

B – you are saying the change from 0 to 2 wires will have more impact than 0 to 1 wires.

Dh – it might do if not planned properly

b- your support of T-bus? [fans of trolleybuses around the world]

dh – I haven't said I support it. They are individuals who are pro-trolleybus and collect facts and figures around the world. I have attended meetings – I will speak to them for technical information.

B – it's been suggested that it's [the t-bus group] been funded by trolleybus manufacturers

Dh – don't know

b- when exactly did you join trolleybus working group?

Dh – around sometime in 2006 – at that point we had been looking at a range of options and looking at tram train schemes etc. and it was suggested that trolleybus working group would be useful to attend.

08/05/14

B – did you join any of the toher working groups betwee UITP?

Dh – my knowledge had to be expanded in the area of BTR – which I was chair of that group and trolleybus working group

BREAK

DAWN CAREY JONES

Asking questions on behalf of myself and bill mckinnon

Dj –in para 3.14 – journey times – yes 2012 business case shows time savings of just 1 or 3 mins.

Why did you proceed when showing such insignificant time savings

Dh – work in 2010 has been superseded by new numbers (jan 2014) – case submitted in 2010 of a benefit cost ratio which was adjusted to 2.7 – took into account journey times of bus journeys

Cj – paragraph 3.19 of your proof – you claim that OLE conveys the sense of permanence. where did you hear that there were positive rather than negative associations

Dh – c-1-12 – positive image is derived from presence of fixed infrastructure. In case of heavy rail – it's the "sparks effect" – which leads to a boost of patronage

Cj – it's one of the marketing planks of the t-bus group – sure you didn't hear it from them?

Dh – no, heard in 1990s

Cj – in presentation to leeds uni – 18m is the legal limit of the length of buses

Cj – proposed trolleybuses will hold 160 ppl on an 18m vehicle – why in 2012 leaflet it said that it will carry 200 passengers?

Dh – we did have to consider whether a by-articulated vehicle (3 sections) should be considered. It was viewed by some members of our board that this would portray a stronger sense of being akin to light rail but subsequent analysis was not taken – the view is that that longer vehicle would not be needed. We didn't pursue it as well as fact that we found that it was not at a legal length.

Cj – if you could have found a loophole that'd be a precedent?

Dh – there are pros and cons around that longer vehicle – wasn't deemed to be cost effective to provide that vehicle...

Cj – in a presentation to leeds uni you stated there were loopholes to have a longer vehicle –

Dh – yes, but we decided not to pursue that option

Cj – at para 3.2.3 – trolleybuses will minimise carbon emissions – doesn't it transfer the emissions to the area around the power stations

Dh – let me qualify – it would minimise in the area around the vehicles etc. – please address this to mr lever

Cj – paragraph 3. 28 – 18m articulated battery power buses – in Brunswick Germany – Solaris manufacturer introducing it – have you been made aware of this?

Dh – i'm aware, there are inherent risks [this would be a trial]

Cj – is it the case that because they can't overtake each other trolleybuses are at more risk of platooning/bunching?

Dh – at level of 6 per hour – we don't envisage these vehicles will be catching each other up. Based on the work we've looked at we don't believe this will happen.

08/05/14

Cj – are they able to overtake each other?

Dh – I've been on a trolleybus in Lyon – vehicle navigated obstacle around without even coming off the wires. The vehicles here could navigate around even in the segregated lanes if vehicle is not coming in other direction.

Cj – 3.0 – isn't it the case that when considering the next best alternatives you failed to consider others – do you think that trolleybus would be slower when mixed with other traffic

Dh – work undertaken has shown that trolleybuses, if mixed into congestion, would be slower but most of route is segregated from general traffic

Cj – at para 5.1 – you state that you have been involved in dev of ngt (for 10 years) – there have been numerous sec of states since then, various govs – should you be following a recommendation this old?

Dh – numerous sec of states have been met since that time – discussions have been consistent across the two govs.

Cj – 5.27 – design rationale report (b.1.1) – trolleybuses around woodhouse moor – it doesn't give you reasons to run it across this area. Why is it necessary to run across this area?

Dh – please address your question to mr smith – in my opinion across woodhouse moor avoids the fact that vehicle could be stuck in congestion – it also future proofs against deficiencies of journey time savings later on if there are congestion problems in the future.

cj - Its not to preserve the right hand turn to...[?]

dh – that's for mr smith...

cj – one of your colleagues said that it was to enhance traffic stacking – do you agree with what your colleague said?

Dh – no I don't agree that it was to enhance traffic stacking in this area. Address to mr smith. Not in my view.

Cj- where the road – widest part of the a660. Are you aware that people are upset in respect of [constructing on woodhouse moor]?

Dh – I'm aware, we are encroaching upon it

Cj – to encroach upon the monument part of woodhouse moor – it's being allowed to become [even] lower quality area [than it already is] – do you think this is acceptable?

Dh – I do think it's acceptable. Significant levels of mitigation have been proposed to enhance areas locally due to the scheme

Cj – can you tell me what those are?

Dh – ask mr walker

Cj – do you think these enhancements could take place without a road being built through it?

Dh – I'm not aware of any source/proposals to undertake those enhancements other than those we propose with this scheme.

Cj – they could be done in principal, couldn't they?

Dh – the monument side of the moor has been in the state for a while

Cj – it's been like that because of the threat of supertram hanging over it and it has been deliberately neglected.

Dh – mr moor / mr speak to answer

Cj – in your statement of consultation – at that presentation to leeds uni (oct 2012) you list some key stakeholders – network rail, local bus operators (first/areva) and others (gen public, friends of woodhouse moor etc.) – but when you go to the statement of consultation where you've listed who you consulted – page 27 – why is friends of woodhouse moor not mentioned anymore?

Dh – nothing to read into this – presentation I gave to leeds uni students – its non-exhaustive and doesn't include all stakeholders.

Cj – you put through two options for woodhouse moor – we repeatedly ask you choose the route which didn't go through it (as you had an option which kept the vehicle on the main road) – [didn't listen to friends of woodhouse moor] – annex 5 – only a limited number of sources and friends of whom wasn't included again.

Dh – you're right in some respects we could have included friends of whom in there. However, we didn't incorporate due to practicability and various other reasons

Cj – you've told me in your rebuttal to me it contains findings in annex 5, phases 4-6 (DCJ is talking about statement of consultation?) – contains absolutely no reference to belle isle (in the south) but does concern ref to uni meetings and issues raised by cycling groups but no issues in ref to destruction of woodland and green spaces – doesn't it seem to you its missing a lot?

Dh – you're right in that it's not picking up some issues that were expressed.

Cj – there's nowhere else in this statement of consultation that deals with phase 4 to 6 findings. The rest of the report deals with findings that are pre-2010

Dh – that's correct

Cj – how many resident groups south of leeds did you contact?

Dh – set out in 6.6. that we met with belle isle tenants association etc. my memory doesn't serve me well.

Cj – that's a lot less than the north ones. Earlier in your statement of consultation you list – para 2.5.2 – page 16 – many north, 1 in the south

Dh – it's a record of where we've had meetings with the groups

Cj – you list 10 resident groups you use to advertise your consultation meetings. You only advertised through one community group in south.

Dh – I can't recall how we advertised that – can't remember if we contacted local residents groups

Cj – it says – the only community group is the belle isle tenants management association.

Dh – 2.6.4 says we tried to contact as many as possible

Cj – seeing the way that ppl in north were made aware of this – did you not see as important residents in south of route also were made aware

Dh – we did give leaflets as well

Cj – but leaflets didn't say when they were going to be and also lots of ppl didn't get them

Dh – I understand that we added a sticker as to when they would be

Cj – I haven't seen a leaflet with a sticker on

Dh – that was my understanding

Cj – where? For what consultation event were stickers were added?

Dh – can't be precise.

Inspector – do you have examples of these stickers?

Dh – I'm not sure it was...

Cj – what company was it who delivered your leaflets

Dh – can't recall

Cj – did you carry out any spot checks?

Dh – they were undertaken but don't specifically know – we should have a record somewhere

Cj – it would be good to know – anecdotally people I spoke to didn't receive the leaflet. They wouldn't have known anything about the scheme if they didn't receive it. Isn't it the case that phase 1-3 consultations that there were fancy trailers etc. and they were advertised better – but in phases 4-6 there was a significant lack of advertisement

Dh – yes subsequent phases we went more to local community halls etc. [different method of advertisement]

Cj – but unless someone contacted them ppl wouldn't know about it

Dh – the events were advertised widely on local media, tv where possible. We did our best.

Cj – when were they advertised on tv?

Dh- look north did an article on it to make people aware.

Cj – was that an article on Calendar (eqv to ITV local news)? Was it ngt-metro or the promoters that arranged for this?

Dh – they contacted us. In some cases we contacted them.

Cj - [just to tell you] when calendar did the article that was because **someone from a660 joint council asked them** and something similar probably happened where someone contacted look north as well. You are saying you're advertising the event well enough but I disagree – [it was through the public's own actions that there was even any tv advertisement].

Cj - The events themselves from phases 4-6 approx lasted 2 hours (each event) – each event showed maps that were relevant to the particular area from where the event was held.

Dh – yes we put out as many as possible.

Cj – at most of the events the rooms weren't large enough to display all the maps. If for those two hours the local person didn't get to see relevant maps – how would they get to see it?

Dh – they would sit down with us and members of our team were told to show those maps asked for

Cj – how many maps/docs bound?

Dh – 2/3 copies and 7ish members at hand at each meeting.

Cj –if a person couldn't make a 2 hour session (20 over 8 month periods) then they couldn't see the plans

Dh – yes, as the plans weren't released to public at that point. Alternative was that people sat down with us separately and we explained to them. Engineering and landscape plans weren't finalised at that point so we couldn't provide them publicly.

Cj – so you think that the consultation events you ran were advertised well enough for ppl to get a good idea of the scheme

Dh – I believe that's the case – ideal would be a bigger venue and more members of staff there. They were adequate in terms of what you'd expect from consultation and engagement.

Cj – at paragraph 6.7 proof – why are you relying on consultation that is almost 5 years old.

Dh – the scheme did gain programme entry approval in march 2010 – and paused by coalition in june 2010 – pause of around 2 years – during that pause we were instructed by dft not to go out to consult on the scheme and we complied – following re-approval in 2012 we did then go out and consult at more local level in terms of engineering design. Within the timescales we did so [consult].

Cj – but para 6.12 you talk about budget pressures- 32 mill pounds – couldn't some of this be allocated to consultation

Dh- biggest driver was the timescale (and twa order submission date). Budget issue – we brought more work in house using own team to do leg-work rather than external resources. We still achieved the same outcomes albeit on reduced budget.

Cj – so you're saying because of time pressure you thought it was better to spend more on consultant and less on consultation?

Dh – we didn't spend money on consultants we used our own staff.

Cj – you didn't spend money on consultation?

Dh – sometimes we got specialists to come along in those events and explain the designs. We made sure the appropriate level of resource was put in to the events.

Cj – para 6.6 – **why did you refuse to give people copies of these design plans?**

Dh – the plans were still being worked on – sometimes you need somebody to be there to go through plans to understand them so not taken out of context. Best practice suggests you wouldn't do so when still working on it. We didn't obstruct ppl taking pics of plans in the events. We published them as soon as they were finalised even though no formal requirements to do so.

08/05/14

Cj – is it not the case from summer 2012-2013 ppl wanted to see the plans so they could try and work out what was going on. A 2 hour session in a crowded room etc with some of the plans etc....

Dh – mr smith to address those – these plans were finalised around spring 2009 – design changes had been made to those plans but plans not updated at that point therefore my view was that it could have been misleading to issue those plans to the public.

Cj – you are saying the plans you showed to public were misleading?

Dh – they were most current plans but not the most updated – I made a point of saying they were still being updated.

Cj – if ppl couldn't see the plans how could they tell you what changes needed to be made?

Dh – majority was the same but some were different. We didn't want ppl to be confused. If they pointed to a particular junction we told them

Cj – I don't think you've given me a good reason as to why the plans couldn't have been sent out – just with a caveat saying that it was a draft plan.

Dh – there was a school of view where we were not going to show those plans

Cj – so that's why they were only 2 hour sessions with only some plans, then? As you didn't want ppl to see them?

Dh – no, we were offering to go through plans separately.

Cj – para 7.8 – you state trolley will be quiet – however you stated to north hyde park neighbourhood association in a presentation that it will be fitted with a bell and audible queue – how can you say both?

Dh – in terms of the noise it would be quieter than a diesel bus – address to mr lever.

Cj – you don't know how noisy it will be.

Cj – para 8.3 – ngt has benefits to cyclist and pedestrians – sharing pavement with cyclists a benefit?

Dh – mr smith – I believe it is a benefit in their proofs...

Cj – narrowing widths of pavements

Dh – address to mr smith

Cj – para 8.5 – cost of ngt is 250.5mill pounds – why is projected cost still the same as it was in 2008

Dh – we have been working in affordability parameters set out by dft and local affordability constraints etc. in terms of both's contribution. The direction is to work within the affordability constraints – changes to design, recosted etc ultimately between 2010 and 2012 we evaluated it to remove some items of costs of the scheme (south stop on old barn road) – we have value engineered the scheme to take out elements of risks through better design (e.g. not going down barn road sidings route, and interface with network rail) – recosting the scheme was above the affordability level. Some of the options to deal with it were looked at – e.g. leasing the vehicles instead of buying out right. At the end it was more in line with the affordability parameters...

Cj – in your statement of consultation para 3.2 (a-01-3) – it says there “have been sig no. of meetings etc. then in para 3.4 it says members of ngt project team have attended meetings and transport sub-group meetings.... Etc.” yet if you look at each area committee in term – minutes from the north west outer area community indicate that the ngt team had reps in 2 meetings from 2012 to 2014 – and ngt was discussed in three of them. Minutes showed that the committee was concerned – that area committee comprised of conservative/liberal members – it shows that labour was whipped [?]- minutes from north west area committee showed that ngt members on went to 1 meeting and ngt was raised in 4. [explains more on these meetings and how ngt members did not go to many of them – especially not at the regularity stated in haskins' proof of evidence]

How can your assertions be correct in that they regularly attended these meetings and they were used to provide feedback to the local committees?

08/05/14

Dh – my view here is that we did regular liaise with the chairs of these committees – we approached the chair before every meeting and ask if they needed us. The agendas were set by the chairs and it was for them to decide whether to include ngt as an agenda item. We have liaised to the extent that we were able to attend these meetings for every project but not all we were needed.

Cj – you saying that you tried but you were not allowed?

Dh – we spoke to chairs about whether we were needed. For us it was more efficient for us to attend these meetings... [DH saying they weren't trying to shirk it]

Cj – so why in your statement did you not put that? Why did you put that you 'regularly' attended. It's just not true is it.

Dh – [agrees] it's incorrect in the wording

cj – ngt was hardly ever discussed. It was discussed in sept 2012 in one south inner area meeting and then not at all. It was never on the agenda again unless public including friends of whm raised the issue.

GET THESE DOCUMENTS

OBJ/1015 – letter from mr Mulholland

Nwltf 106 – dft guidance

appendix H-1 of Nwltf statement of case (not on website)

promised copy of the consultation given to foreign yesterday