

09/05/14

Last day of cross-examination of David Haskins **09 May 2014**

WEST PARK RESIDENTS

Douglas Kemp – Chair

Dk – significant role for ngt in terms of employment in Leeds – appropriateness of consultation taken with the SME sector

Dh – refer to Longley – leaflet drops, meetings held with local businesses, one to one meetings held with groups of businesses, I'm aware that FSB have opinions we haven't reached out far enough – but we have made strenuous efforts

Dk – west park residents – 900 households south of ring road and adjacent to A660 with schools and SMEs – 50 business owners – which year were they consulted?

Dh – around time of Twa order submission – once we had plans we met with west park roundabout area – we invited people to interact with us. When we wrote to people formally and notified them of submission – around 2012/13

Dk – draw your attention to 2009 survey and report – what % of respondents were classified as businesses

Dh – 69%

Dk – that's interesting as a detailed published on the ngt website talks about 1% of respondents were classified as businesses respondents

Dh – may be correct – as locals mostly residential

Dk – that equates to 26 out of 294... are you saying one individual is same as one business?

Dk – I would expect if you were classifying and counting up no. of respondents you would separate the two –

Dh – my figure I had was 69 --- if it says 26 then there is a discrepancy

Dk – low number of respondent - 26 and large gap in consultation in respect of SMEs in the south for example... does that not worry you?

Dh – we have tried to reach out... whether they come forward or not is choice for them – there is a high level of awareness

Dk – you still think you did a high level of consultation with SMEs?

Dh – I do think it is adequate

A660 joint council – CHRISTOPHER FORIN

Cf – you're the project director for this scheme and you've been in that capacity since May 2010

Dh – yes

Cf – you have a thorough knowledge of its justification and transport policy framework – that's not contentious. How many staff are there working on this - do you have in your team?

Ch – in my team employed by Leeds City Council/ combined authority – it is in the order of about 10-12 people

Cf – and also consultants from Mott MacDonald

Dh – a range of consultants were used

Cf – they come and go?

Dh – yes we use them as technical support

Cf – a firm of consultants assisted with the public presentations?

Dh – no, where a member of my team wasn't there for the consultation sessions – we would bring in a specialist expert to explain to public about the drawings etc.

Cf – how much money have you spent so far on the project?

Dh – there was a FOI request last autumn – that said it was £5 mill – overall project costs for development (and to take it through to delivery) in the order of (table 8.1 of my proof) £28.7 mill. In terms of the expenditure up to this point – not a precise figure but in order of around £10 mill currently spent.

Cf – £28 mill, is that before a single bulldozer turns up to do work?

Dh – yes that is normal for a project of this size.

Cf – wonder if you could look at promoters' statement of case – para 5.25 page 31 – you say that the scheme provides extensive cycle facilities with no. of links to Leeds core cycle network. You say that overall cycling facilities will be improved

Dh – I do – we've worked extensively with Leeds cycling consultation forum. The design 3-6 and 3-7 improvements have been taken forward

Cf – look at doc that I submitted ("walking and cycling" – page 18 policy implications – doc 1-0-2) – [missed 1 min]

"first it is essential for urban env to make safe – segregated roads – most non-cyclists etc will only cycle regularly if segregated lane" – its right isn't it that ngt only offers complete segregation on a relatively short stretch

Dh – please address to mr smith

Cf – you say you have a thorough knowledge in your proof. I suggest to you again that ngt route as planned doesn't offer segregation except for a short stretch

Dh – I'm not aware of any situation in UK that any town would have a higher level of segregation – to achieve that is impractical

Cf – we're talking about this specific project

Dh – this is not specific to Leeds

Cf – ngt over most of its route obliges cyclists to share ngt lane with vehicles – other buses and taxis.

Dh – that is correct. Significant provisions for cyclists built into ngt – we have talked to cyclist groups. It is a better level of facilities than the current level.

Cf – are you familiar with the Times cycling campaign – it makes the same points as I do here – make them feel safe in relation to their own space

[asks if we would feel safe if we didn't have segregated lanes]

Dh – address to mr smith in respect of these issues.

Cf – I am addressing to you as you have a strategic overview...

Dh – we have ensured that the max level of cycling provision has been provided as practicable.

Cf – what you are trying to do is to shoehorn cycling provision in without compromising ngt.

Dh – there's no shoehorn – address to mr smith

Cf- table 5.1 of the promoters statement of case – page 32 – "cycling provisions" – the figures are there, that in column headed type of cycle lane – "ngt with bus and cycle lane" – it's proposed 6.1km – it should say "and taxi" as well

Dh – that's correct

Cf – cycle only with 6.8 – that's not physically segregated isn't this

Dh – detail for mr smith

Cf – you don't know

Dh – I do

Cf- maybe you should tell inquiry. Do you understand what 'cycle only' lane means? It's not physically segregated is it

dh – for mr smith

cf – do you expect parents of young children etc will allow those children to use the ngt cycle provisions?

09/05/14

Dh – matter for individual parents to decide. I believe they have been developed in consultation of Leeds cycle groups to extent they are safe for purpose. Some would some wouldn't

Cf – your view that some parents would allow their children to cycle down the a660 in a lane shared with an articulated vehicle and numerous buses and taxis

Dh – I'm not clear as to the extent this happens at present – but it would be more likely with the provisions we are putting in place

Cf – the proposals you are putting with the enquiry don't make the roads objectively safe or subjectively feel safe for people who want to use their bikes

Cf – the width is 4.2m of the lane

Dh – best person is mr smith

Cf – turn to – print out from van hool website showing a trolleybus – relevant feature here is the width (2550mm) – that gives a clearance of 1.65m – that assumes the cyclist is cycling in the gutter

Dh – on the curb side...

Cf – it assumes the buses is at the extreme end of the ngt lane. I'd like you to look at a doc in the additional docs – "London cycling guide" g-04-75 – page 18 – a line drawing of a car and a cyclist – what that shows is that cyclists don't cycle in the gutter and assumption made that cyclists about 750mm wide and there is a 600mm gap between the cyclists and the car. What this would show, applicable to ngt figures, as here there is an assumption of distances of a cyclist. The figure is that there will be 600mm between a cyclist and articulated bus – 2 feet.

Dh – my calculations shows it would be 650mm gap.

Cf – what you're saying to those cyclists and parents of those – we will provide you with a non-segregated bit of road space where there is 2 feet between you and trolleybus weighing 20 tonnes un-laden. How many parents would regard that as a safe system?

Dh – I couldn't say how many – I could say a greater no. than at present. Articulated buses do operate on the a660 at times so not unusual to introduce trolleybus on this road at this time.

Cf – other van hool vehicles also show same width.

Dh – I accept the width

Cf – your belief that some parents would be happy for their children to cycle in these roads – and also your belief that overhead wires are not ugly

Dh – my belief that some people don't think that, yes

Cf – will the cycling provisions encourage significant numbers of presently non-cyclists to take to their bike

Dh – yes, a greater level of provision

Cf – but it isn't any kind of step change is it

Dh – the project is to deliver the ngt, but also to make sure it is a safe environment

Cf – but it's not safe.

Dh – I've given you the answer – address to mr smith

Cf – you don't need to be an expert...

[inspector intervenes]

Cf – promoters statement of case para 8.37 – the first sentence reads 'ngt is a core element of wy's third **local transport plan**' – are you familiar with this local transport plan? It's an important piece of local transport policy.

Dh – not every paragraph but I am familiar, yes

Cf – folder 13 – page 35 – "safety and security in wy " the second bullet point – pedestrian, cyclists most vulnerable, safety of cyclists is a concern etc. the next paragraph states obesity is rising rapidly but few trips cycling and walking. On pg 36 – author points out that a 10% increase in green space reduces health issues

Cff – there is a large green space on top of headingley hill that will be destroyed by trolleybus

Dh – it will run through it – there will be a creation of an accessible **pocket park** in the area

09/05/14

Cf – sandwiched between the a660 and ...

Dh – its accessible

Cf – that's not right. There are fields in headingley hill where people can walk across them (walk into the church car park) and nothing to stop people walking up to the top [so it is also accessible if DH is using this argument].

Dh – it's not publicly accessible...

Cf – there is nothing to prevent public walking up there though. Its right isn't it that notwithstanding provision of this pocket park, most of that space will spoilt/tarnished by presence of the trolleybus (at 3 min arrivals).

Dh – address mr walker and mr flesher

Cf – I want you to address this – that land at present is open field mainly, that land is open space which will have a wide by-directional trolleybus track going through it

Dh – I don't dispute there is an impact but mitigation aspects should be addressed to mr walker

Cf – local transport plan page 39 – “have a negative effect on natural environment...etc.” that's correct?

Dh- yes

Cf – this is in the section “what will happen if we do nothing” – its correct, isn't it that the ngt scheme has been designed, **one criteria being that it doesn't take road capacity from general traffic**

Dh – yes we have attempted to keep road traffic levels neutral – address to mr hanson and chadwick. In terms of traffic flow, yes we are trying to keep it at a neutral level. If you were to penalise road traffic too much people would take other routes which may impact wider on other communities

Cf- no one is suggesting that drivers should be punished. What this plan does not do is to positively encourage active transport modes and positively discourage use of private car. You accept this in one of the information papers; b-8 – “congestion” – (g-4-45) – second paragraph under “how will ngt impact general traffic” – ngt will mainly keep general traffic capacity. That is a key failing of the project as the policy docs are consistent in saying we need to move to sustainable modes of transport and discourage car use.

Dh – well the pop is set to grow and we are providing public transport system and more attractive times and reliability attracting people to the vehicles

Cf – but it doesn't do anything to discourage car drivers

Dh – we are not seeking to penalise car drivers but we are considering needs of all road users

Cf- it can be open to 'wavering' car drivers to continue driving into town and back out even when ngt is put in.

Dh – there is a proportion who would choose to use the ngt system. It doesn't suit everybody.

Cf – there is a great no. of people in the middle who can be persuaded out of their cars to use their bike if it was safe.

Dh – I believe the scheme does provide the encouragement.

Cf – local transport plan – page 44 – paragraph headed 'safety' – the perception of someone who might want to cycle that there is only 2 feet between him and serious injury is a perception

Dh – it is a perception that some may have

Cf – page 49 of local transport plan – proposal 1 of what author's plan suggests – page 50 sets out a road user hierarchy of consideration. Top of that list is active cycles and pedestrians. Walking and cycling produces zero emissions of particulates etc.

Dh – it's a fact but not sure that's the reason why its top of the hierarchy

Cf – lots of reasons: healthier, reduces congestion etc.

Dh – if they were previously of a non-active road

09/05/14

Cf – second bullet point – public transport etc. car bottom of the table – do you accept that hierarchy is appropriate

Dh – yes, as a consideration

Cf – its right isn't it that the trolleybus plan doesn't apply that hierarchy – the consideration of cyclists is consistently pushed to one side – it's not at the top – only where possible

Dh – it is enhanced in comparison to present. We have provided what is practicable.

Cf – don't you think a plan such as the one you've been working on that accurately put this hierarchy where it belongs would include a completely segregated cycle track

Dh – only guidance – we have provided for it as practicably as possible.

Cf – you've provided it where 'practically possible' - there are trade-offs but here the cyclists and peds are getting the worst of the bargain. The system has been designed (in b-8) so as not to take any road space from the motorists. So motorists have their interest taken care of, the trolleybus passengers looked after, but people who suffer are the cyclists.

Dh – disagree with this – address to mr smith.

Cf – page 58 of local transport plan – proposal 10 – “measures to promote active travel will be tailored to individual as far as possible”

Dh – there are 50,000 individuals can't tailor to each person's need

Cf – it's been tailored for motorist and trolleybus passengers

Dh – I would disagree

Cf turn to page 59 – (under the photo) – first phase to develop reallocation of road space to cyclists and pedestrians – come back again to congestion paper b8 – it's not in conformity with the local transport plan is it

Dh – I disagree.

Cf – it's in black and white – it's your document on congestion. How is that not a contradiction of this **local transport plan which is a key strategic doc to reallocate existing road space** – doesn't reallocate from existing drivers does it?

Dh – some has been reallocated away in favour of cyclists

Cf – **but - in broad terms, the net deal for drivers is that they don't lose out**

Dh – I believe that to be the case

Cf – page 66 – proposal 17 – objective to 'work with local communities'

Dh – it does work with local communities – that is something that has been brought forward.

Cf – this is a point about the consultation, local communities have repeatedly and consistently and overwhelmingly objected to it in broad terms.

Cf – this also relates to wider consultation of a bus provision generally – general views on public transport

cf – if you have listened to local communities you would have withdrawn this place

dh – we have amended parts in feedback

cf – I agree you have changed small details

dh – you can see changes to design in terms of cyclists – an example where we've clearly listened

cf- I agree that cycle forum are an important group (page 19 – 'do not base policies on cycling and walking on the views of existing cyclists etc.' isn't it necessary to talk to non-cyclists and potential/occasional cyclists and walkers to determine what would make them travel in these modes. In order to bring about a cycling culture it's no good just talking to the enthusiasts. Would you concede at present in leeds the environment for cyclists is a hostile one?

dh – I've cycled in leeds, probably not the friendliest in some places. A mixed bunch – it's not Holland

cf – you can understand the comments of the 'walking and cycling' authors

dh – I believe the provision we are putting in place is an enhancement.

09/05/14

Cf – proposal 22 page 69 of wy local transport plan – “cyclists and peds to be considered first”. You haven’t put their needs first. You are trying to fit the needs of active travellers where convenient around your trolleybus plans

Dh – I feel we have gone a significant way to accommodate the needs of these local cyclists etc.

Cf – page 19 of the wy local transport plan – under heading ‘policy context national context’ – says “gov’s big society agenda is giving local community greater control over their areas” – a lot of evidence about the views of the local community towards your plan – its right isn’t it, that imposing the ngt on the community especially in north Leeds is not in conformity with the national policy context as iterated here

Dh – that’s not correct

Cf – you think all those opinion polls are un-represented do you?

Dh – we’ve got a range of views and incorporated a number of changes as result of those consultation exercises etc.

Cf – we did an analysis on the consultation docs you gave us a few days ago – 22% of people were neutral or wanted further info. 15% of people supported it. 63% opposed it.

Dh – that was discussed yesterday. That sounds about right

Cf – if you exclude the people who are neutral – you have 51 ppl in favour and 219 against

Dh – a no. of neutrals didn’t express a negative view

Cf – when was an analysis carried out on that 2013 consultation feedback [by you], if any?

Dh – our staff would have read through those forms and dealt with responses – everybody would have received a response (even if they didn’t like it) explaining rationale of their objections/proposals

Cf – we did an analysis – did your staff do an analysis like that

Dh- I doubt we would have categorised them into support and objections – we would have got the feel – but more interested in responding to the comments

Cf – so they weren’t just put in a filing cabinet and not analysed at all

Dh – no. everyone got a response

Cf – so you’ve done some analysis of that feedback months ago.

Dh – I don’t recall having a % in front of me telling me who supported and who didn’t, but we got a broad feel of it. Our focus was on dealing with individuals and responding to them.

Cf – it took us a matter of hours to do this analysis – that could have been done some weeks ago by you

Dh – ...we redacted personal info from feedback forms [it took a long while]

Cf – it was open to you to deal with the increasing no. of calls to look at the feedback

Dh – we never did a poll – this is only people who attended events who filled in a feedback form – it is a selective sample of ppl who decided to write some comments in that event. It is not representative of support or lack of support for that event. It would not have been helpful to put out a figure of the feedback forms.

Cf – you don’t think it is representative?

Dh – it tells us a lot... – which we used subsequently

Cf – look at core doc b-9 ‘transport assessment’ – it is right, isn’t it that it shows headingley as ward with highest cyclist mode share?

Dh – yes

Cf – this provides a golden opportunity to put a proper cycling facility in. you are building on a desire which is already apparent

Dh – we are enhancing it – we have seen these figures and seen a potential for growth here so we have enhanced it in response

Cf – as you’ve said it’s not Holland.

09/05/14

Dh – sadly not

Cf - return to your statement of case – para 13.10 – under community you say that ‘sig community effects’ – you talk about provision of additional open space at headingly here – sports facilities aside- unless you demolish buildings you can’t provide additional open space – you are conjuring it out of nowhere.

Dh – best person is mr flesher

Cf – you are not providing any more open space, are you? – in terms of the fields you are taking it away

Dh – address to mf flesher

Cf – it’s a misleading [sentence] isn’t it?

Inspector: can you explain what is being said then?

Dh – the means by which this criteria is scored – deemed that the sports facilities at bodington park and ride and improvements to open space – best person to address the extent of these improvements is mr flesher...

Inspector – it does say ADDITIONAL open space doesn’t it, please identify?

Dh – the pocket park which is categorised as open space

Cf – the land on which that pocket park is being created on is already open space [how can this be additional]?

[Inspector intervenes and states that DH has admitted that ‘additional’ is not the right word]

cf – folder 10 – leeds council core strategy – d-1-1 – page 45 – para 4.9.7 – this is another important strategic doc isn’t it

dh – yes

cf – uk transport sector produces 33% of total uk co2 emissions. How does your ngt proposal address that point when it does very little to discourage/restrict private motorist?

Dh – provision of low carbon transport mode etc.

Cf – without restricting the rights of private motorists...how can you...

Dh – not restricting

Cf – further down 4.9.8 – measures also necessary to improve opportunities in walking and cycling – limiting production of greenhouse gases – again this shows another core strategic doc managing car use.

[Inspector intervenes: no repeating]

Cf – I have to make the point that there are numerous key strategic docs and ngt doesn’t conform.

Cf – page 57 on leeds core strategy – made in policy c-c-3 to make walking and cycling easier, safer and more attractive. I want to point out that this is a key strategic doc as well.

Cf – one last point on consultation – did you specifically (your team) consult existing bus users as a class? Did you hand out leaflets on buses/at bus stops etc.

Dh – work undertaken consultation was undertaken with various groups who were users and non-users etc. [no]

Cf – has ngt team itself undertaken those works?

Dh – we didn’t target those bus users

MALCOLM BELL

[missed 2 minutes at start]

Mb - Lack of funding – therefore ring road was not developed as you would have liked

Dh – there were other proposals put forward

09/05/14

Mb – you agree a predicate of the scheme is a lack of funding

Dh – what do you mean by predicate?

Mb – starting condition which is assumed before you started talking about thing itself

Dh – I don't agree – we put a bid in for funding after we formed the scheme

Mb – it would wouldn't it

mb – so [this scheme] is not about reducing pollution and congestion on the radials?

dh – not a stated objection to reduce congestion on the radials but it may be a consequence

mb – I'm lost ... what is the key objective of the scheme if it's not to reduce congestion/pollution

dh – set out in doc c-1 page 3-35 (table 3.8) 7 objectives are set out – one is maximising growth of leeds economy, supporting sustainable growth of leeds, and target regeneration etc. there is one about improving efficiency of transport but doesn't necessarily follow that it is through improved car journey times.

mb- I didn't say improved car journey times

dh – improved efficiencies of car journey times

mb – I'm not even saying that. I've come to understand you're in a very difficult position. But your first list of statements there – nothing in that list that anybody would support

mb – I want to understand the exact problem you are trying to deal with using this exact solution. You must agree that this project is a brave attempt of social engineering that will get the c-1s and above [the 'posh' cars] out of their cars which they have adamantly not done so far

dh – I've seen this done around the UK e.g. Cambridgeshire busway – got people from cars out of their cars

mb – I don't dispute that. I would think that if I thought the scheme would achieve that I would support you. The other aspect of this scheme – our bus services as they currently exist on the radials are actually pretty good.

Dh - Issues in respect of journey times reliabilities on some of the key corridors – there are issues where further levels of priority would assist in the efficiency of that

Mb – buses do as well as they can within the ambit.../environment they are given. You're faced with two problems 1) you are not trying to reduce no. of cars but you are causing congestion/pollution on the radials 2) attempts so far have not got ppl out of cars so you needed to do something else – we agree the critical aspect of a new scheme is QUALITY

Dh – its an undefinable concept – no. of measures of a scheme that come about ..

Mb – two aspects to this 1) [???] 2) the vehicles themselves are of a high standard (e.g. vehicles which are coaches or railway stock standards

Dh – we could talk about a range of things in terms of standards

Mb – they have to be good enough for a guy in an Audi to want to get out of their car

Dh – different level sof the overall system that they may perceive they will

Mb – you're not getting ppl getting out o fbus to the trolleybus

Dh – offering the best possible we are believing we can provide

Mb – if you attract ppl from buses into the trolleys you haven't achieved very much have you

Dh – as a passenger you would achieve faster journey times etc

Mb – but you aren't the passenger – your objective is to make the SYSTEM OVERALL work better. If you move ppl from buses to trolleybus (you aren't intending to damage First) – you have scored

[??????]

Dh – I believe it will provide ppl with better journey overall than currently – whatever their mode of travel.

Mb – why would you want to spend 250mill pounds on making life pleasant for people who are already on buses etc.

Dh – It demonstrates value for money when it was.. economically appraised

Mb - you want to reduce pollution and free up car traffic – greatest objection from people who have [good car brands] – I understand there is a logic of putting a trolleybus in. I do understand most of what you have been saying. It seems to me that what you're actually trying to do is to put in a high quality 'posh' buses for the C1s and up (posh vehicles)

Dh – I've not stated that at all – anybody can be attracted to these vehicles. Not target any particular market at all

Mb – if you don't target, you won't get them out of their vehicles

Dh – if you provide right level of quality you can attract all types of people

Mb – but for a c1 person it has to be good enough

Dh – well maybe the c1 level – but others below that could decide to change to ngt

Mb – my question is that that strategy has all gone wrong

Dh – no it hasn't – put forward a system wide approach with a range of measures that will lead to a step change in the passenger quality experience.

Mb – do you understand that you don't seem to have got that message across.

Dh – I do understand

Mb – did you read my paper?

Dh – yes

Mb – was it all bad?

Dh – there was two – you submitted a statement of case in jan and a submission proof of evidence – there are some ideas in there as to how you see the scheme.

Mb – I'm anxious that projects should go ahead and I largely want to support the council in doing something positive – but it's just that this scheme started off in right place but it's gone wrong

Dh – I don't agree – we assessed problems and issues that existed. scheme has subsequently been enhanced in the process.

Mb - technically you have done a good job within your parameters.

Mb – why do you think the majority of councillors are not supporting this

Dh – they are- they voted in favour

Mb – you are contradicting mr farrington saying it wasn't whipped

Dh – they were and they voted in favour

Mb – in your judgement if they hadn't been whipped – would ngt have been approved?

Dh – in first instance they were not whipped and they approved it.

Mb – if the council themselves strongly supported this – they would have had a champion politician leading this inquiry

Dh – not place of politicians to act as an expert witness here

Mb – many of us are very frustrated as to why the councillors aren't promoting this scheme.

Dh – some have written to the councillors, some senior politicians have asked us to help them respond

Mb – do you understand that we want to be able to cross-examine councillors so we don't get there boilerplate standard answer

Dh – in the forum of this inquiry senior officers act as witnesses – but you are free to contact councillors. And we have met with councillors e.g. jun 2013 meetings in an open forum...

Mb – why are any of the labour councillors present here?

Mb – would it surprise you if I said that I think the council does not want this scheme to go ahead

Dh – yes they have voted through twa order process and committed forward expenditure to the project

Mb- do you know how much the council is in declared debt according to 2012 accounts

09/05/14

Dh – I'm not aware

Mb - 1.973 billion pounds. They are trying to cut their operation costs

Dh – I'm aware finances are under pressure. But council has approved the funding to go forward for ngt-leeds council executive board and two s239 votes.

Mb Majority of socialist councillors think it's fine to use money for these 'posh' buses when childcare etc is being cut.

Dh – government of both sides have approved this project.

Mb – the supertram scheme was thrown out with a qualifying note to go away and work a bus-based system in cooperation with the bus operators?

Dh – through work undertaken we developed a business case in 2007 –

Mb – but in some stage it's turned from bus-base to trolley base – not in cooperation with bus operators

Dh – address to mr Henkel

Mb – how did we get from the original instruction to approving trolley base system

Dh – thorough a level of analysis and looking at various transport system, looking at what potential is to provide best system – arriving at the trolley vehicle in that process

Mb – again, you had discussions of dft and you have said they have approved use of trolleybuses.

How did we get from bus-based instruction to trolley-based system

Dh – looking at top of the range bus –based systems – trolley vehicle comes under that category in a legislative sense and guided light transit also looked at. We have arrived at the best possible option.

[Cameron: he's covered all that in the evidence in chief]

Mb – given the council being virtually 2 billion pounds in debt when will scheme break-even –

[Inspector – it was 8 years wasn't it]

Mb – how much was budgeted to cover that cost

Dh – revenue issues have been provided and submitted to the public. We haven't had discussions in respect of any earlier shortfalls – but overall there is a net positive position.

Mb – the system you are proposing to operate the buses under is that you will get a revenue net off the costs and if there's a balance it will be shared with the operator.

Dh –partly yes. That is incentivisation for an operator. There is another clause where the dft might want a piece of the cake [Details in programme letter around how the dft is looking to share in those revenues].

Mb – the cost that we will net off the revenue – what will they include? [trying to under which bit will be paid by tax payers generally and which bit by ticket]

Dh – revenues will cover operating costs – with earlier shortfalls – there's no shortfall [predicted].

Mb – will tickets pay for the entirety of the maintenance of overhead cables etc. which things are going to be life cycle – bits of the road which will be exclusively used by trolley – will it be paid by trolley revenues or highway authority (general council funds)

Dh –haven't looked at this fully but the costs of the resurfacing of that will be met out of the revenues of the ngt system

Mb – so the roads would be paid out of the tickets

Dh – that's my understanding – but details not looked at yet – no subsidisation by local tax payers in the costs we've established.

Mb – will the bus stops and special features be paid for out of the tickets

Dh – the initial capital costs are there – any subsequent costs will be met out of the tickets/revenues.

Mb – park and ride schemes –

09/05/14

Dh – the best person to address traffic flow is mr smith... I don't see issues of the flows arriving here. People will disperse to their cars and won't all uniformly arrive at the exit gate – there will be a spread. Looking at overall traffic flow exits – many park and ride sites of similar nature that work well. In Leeds there is no large scale park and ride (only in rail stations e.g. new Pudsey rail station with parking – junction reconfigured to deal with traffic flow at the exit there was successful) – Mb – there is a difference to a trolleybus as a train is arriving at large intervals – but here it is frequent. It may be a rapidly building backlog of people etc.
Dh – work undertaken to suggest that's not an issue

Mb – London has taken bendy buses off the street. I understand capacity issues – but if it doesn't apply in London, but not here?
Dh – London is different. Drive to remove bendy buses was a political decision rather than decision on the evidence. They do have higher capacity and perform perfectly well as buses
Mb – but as vehicles on streets of Leeds
Dh – route 72 is articulated.
Mb – do those buses weave around the bendy streets of Leeds city centre
Dh – not aware of issues in the swept part. Ask mr smith.

Mb – major systems installed worldwide – half of them are in serious financial difficulty, equally other ones are countries which have power supplied by hydroelectric (e.g. Austria, Switzerland) – which category do we fall into
Dh – I don't recognise those as categories. I don't see any of those as being a particular issue. In Geneva only certain proportion comes from hydroelectric – not exclusively.
Mb – but they do have considerable cheaper electricity
Dh – in some cases
Mb – exception is France but they have nuclear energy
Dh – but light rail systems in UK are drawn from same power and working successfully
Mb – there are many debates as to open electricity is not the best way for a transport network
Dh – I'm aware

Mb – do you dismiss my thoughts on platooning
Dh – no
Mb – every manufacturer of motor vehicles are wrong – is that something you can avoid happening
Dh – address Robertson or Smith
Mb – I want your views
Dh – in terms of platooning I don't have views as not relevant consideration here
Mb – it was a big matter in the Detroit motor show in the last two weeks
Dh – I don't see platooning being relevant
Mb – so you haven't looked forward as to active major investment in the motor industry is? Even though it's a 60 year scheme
Dh – we have looked at it and this is the proven mode we have chosen

Mb – con activity. this scheme doesn't connect anything very much – airport, railway, leisure centres (e.g. cricket club, arena) but it goes close to a lot of places but Leeds is little more than a large village – you can say you are connected to a lot of things
Dh – no efficient system can stop at the front door of everything
Mb – do you agree an easy walking distance of 10-15 min [referred to mr Farrington].
Dh – for Farrington it is but for some people it is less or more, depends
Mb – what about general population
Dh – that is a v. general question.

09/05/14

Mb – would people spend more time walking there to ngt so that they can have a faster journey time when there

Dh – ask smith/hanson

[there is a DISTINCTION BETWEEN COMFORT AND SAFETY]

Mb – safety of buses – increase of the crush risk on a wheeled bus than a train/tram. Are there any regulations from the dft for approving trolleybuses in the uk?

Dh – not aware

Mb – how long do you think it would take to put in place if they aren't there?

Dh – there may be some approval process there but not something we are concerned about. All vehicles have a process of approval... for type approval.

Mb – it can take a couple of years to get a car approved – that's when the approval documentation is in place. You haven't thought about this?

Dh – consideration we will take in due course

Mb – but it has to fit with the timing of your program

Dh – yes we will consider it

mb – it's a risk, isn't it

dh – I don't believe so

mb – on the internet any delivery of trolleybuses have been removed in the last three or four weeks some weeks ago the buses in bologna being delivered three years late.

dh – problem was with the specification of the vehicle in bologna – for some reason the vehicles were specified longer than legal 18m.

mb – reference to those were removed.

Mb – on consultation. You consulted and delivered leaflets up to 600m off the route – but did you not think that there would be collateral damage (I live at top of weetwood lane and you propose to close bottom of it) [which should mean that you should have consulted a wider area]

Dh – yes this was an issue that councillors who went on a site visit decided they were happy with giving a recommendation to go forward (Smith to deal with further). I know there was a level of opposition there and consultation was done to address this but a decision was taken to take forward the scheme.

CLAIR RANDALL

I'm a qualified art therapist and I teach the psychology of visual perception at a-level

Cr – around the consultation events that took place in late 2012 – referring to the one I attended at st. paul's church hall in island wood – I took the supporting photos there – I would like to ask whether he believes the graphic representations shown to the public at consultations should be clearly understandable and fairly shown

Dh – yes, I agree they should be. As engineering plans they were presented as clearly as possible

Cr – did you oversee the layout of the presentation

Dh – I did. We did have an issue whereby we realised plans did not flow as logically as it could it - so we put people there to answer questions. You did make a suggestion to change them and put them back up more logically – but there were logistical reasons why we couldn't do that

09/05/14

Cr – is it the case that you would agree the universal convention for maps is to have north at the top of the page

Dh – yes, generally. but it's not possible to do that on engineering plans – to facilitate layout to flow properly – it was logistically difficult (the route does not travel directly east/west)

Cr – would it not be easier for people to understand that north was generally pointing upwards.

Dh – we had ppl to hand (8-9 people) to explain to people what the plans meant and how they flowed. I don't believe people came away with issues

Cr – several people said they simply couldn't understand the layout

Dh – I did apologise at the event

Cr – did you initial try to defend it

Dh – I said there would be too much disruption to change the flow

Cr – you said there was no real difference there were maps facing one way or another

Dh – yes that was my initial view - we realised too late to change it (only 2 hour meeting)

Cr – you could get to several consultations in a line and laying out these maps – they were going as such that each one had no continuity with the map next to it

Dh – at this particular event there was an issue as to way it flowed

[he has accepted the point as to why it wasn't displayed clearly]

Cr – it was several consultations down the line and only when I drew it to his attention these maps were issues that he noticed it

Dh – I ensured staff were there to help people understand

Cr – you've said these were engineering drawings – whilst its important to have general info available its more important to have an image which is readily understandable in its context rather than too much detail?

Dh – we provided engineering drawings as they were those available at that time – landscape drawings hadn't been produced.

Cr – I noticed at events after, with landscape plans, this problem was corrected but was did my comments to you about inappropriate placing of maps have any influence on the next phase (design 3-7)

Dh – it was conceivable.

Cr – a number of graphic images were presented for before and after – is it not the case that the before pictures shown with autumn/winter characteristics and after ngt ones shown with spring/summer?

Dh – there were two sets of photo montages produced – best person to address would be mr walker. However, the most up to date set of montages produces more accurate montages and they (as most recent set) do present comparable basis as terms of time year etc. but showing growth 10-15 years later after scheme. No intent to mislead.

Cr – why is it the case that the four sets produced – is it not a curious coincidence that all of the before were in November etc while all their comparative after ones were in summer/spring. Is it not a strange coincidence that it was the case with all four sets of the montages.

Dh – no guidance put forward to suggest we should suggest different states of attractiveness

Cr- would it not have been more straightforward to produce images based on the same time of year. Is this not a prejudicial use of associations? Or are you suggesting that people prefer maps of winter or summer or upside down

Dh – I don't think anything was prejudicial

Cr – even though from point of visual perception [it is important]

Dh – it was rectified particularly in the montages

INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

Ins- statutory undertakers/utilities – when you were asked about the risks there wouldn't be substantial amount of undertakers – I noticed on page 42 of the statement (16mill pounds for them) – isn't this substantial?

Dh- that is a less significant amount in comparison to light rail. We don't see that as significant risk. Address to smith

Ins- I just wanted to point that out as you were saying there wasn't going to be a sig amount of statutory undertakers

Ins – route that was chosen – are there any parts of that route that are not currently served by an existing form of public transport?

Dh – new sections to hunslet and south not served by public transport. Clearly no. of buses serving parts of the routes...long or short. Henkel to address con activity of bus routes.

Ins – woodhouse moor – a lot of the mature trees along side of road would be removed?

Dh – some trees on monument side (address to walker) – will be removed.

Ins – has anyone looked at an alignment that doesn't remove these trees

Dh – i don't know – address mr smith

Ins – as an aside – I went along the a61- there seems to be a guided bus route there.

Dh – it's in operation

Ins – how long has it been operating

Dh – I think 1995 phase 1, second phase a couple of years later

Ins – is there any reason why such a guided bus could not have been introduced here rather than trolley?

Dh – guided bus sections were looked at e.g. around ardell centre in headingley – mr smith to address questions why we have looked at guide ways but did not proceed with it - Also looked at for the south route as well - prior to announcements of the HS2 route.

Ins – have you any idea as to differences between costs of guided and trolley bus

Dh – I don't know

Ins – would you say guided bus might be cheaper

Dh – there are issues with guided bus – some people see that there is an impact in regards to concrete [flooring?] and requirements are connected to the extra width [of the guided buses].

[Cameron: guided bus counted as a next best alternative]

[jones: witness is supposed to answer questions – we don't agree.]

Inspector: we'll look into it later with mr smith.

[Cameron: on monument moor it is dealt with specifically in mr smith's evidence]

Ins – why is it possible to have a higher capacity with a trolleybus compared to other vehicles?

Dh – in terms of articulated vehicles it is because it doesn't have the engine in the same way as a diesel vehicle – so more floor space layout overall, that's my understanding. The electrics are mounted on the roof.

LUNCH

CAMERON RE-EXAMINATION

09/05/14

QC – mr haskins – about sec of state letter nov 2005 – c-6-1 – and also asked in relation to that the Atkins report g-4-55.

Qc – you were asked about 4 factors that the sec of state identified (2-3rd pages of the letter)

QC - What was contemplated at that time in this letter with the reference to 'no system quite like this in the uk'?

Dh – it would be the best possible quality bus-based scheme that we could come up with designed similar and delivered similarly to a tram network

Qc – were there any specific requirements set out by sec of state at that time?

Dh – no – **Atkins set out recommendations but no specific recs in the letter.**

Qc – asked about the Atkins report, go to page 2-10, table 2.3 para 2.31 – you'll see that that you were asked about the difference in total journey time between BRT and tram (and in-vehicle time you were asked in particular about). Can we take up c-1-13 please, 'run-time' – there if you could go to table 4.1 on page 23 – summary run-times – table 2.3 is the north line contemplated as running from bodington at the time. Was that southbound or northbound in the atkins report

Dh – southbound – in bound towards leeds – (looking in the AM peak run-time – bodington to city 21.9min, if PM-peak southbound it will be 20.6min.

Qc – you are taking the 21.9 from the northbound?

Dh – sorry I mean southbank am peak is 19.6 min.

QC how does that compare to bus de minimum

Dh - 32.5 min is the de minimum from bodington to city)

Qc – what advantage will be derived by ngt

Dh – around 13 mins.

[IMPORTANT]

Qc – you were asked about the re-adjustment of bus services (how they have been taken into account)–where are the re-adjusted bus services. You said doc c-1. You weren't given the chance to go to c-1 and show us where they were. Can we go please to 11-20 on page 11-11? What were the assumptions made?

Dh – if we look at 11.23 is says the bus network rationalisation will ...reduce 1 and 6 routes by 10 vehicles. 1 and 6 route looks like a halving of frequencies (in the table below).

Qc-11.21 shows it says that frequency will be reduced for no more than 3 buses per hour for service 1 and 6.

Dh – for service 1 we said it would still run at a consistent frequency between Beeston and [inaudible] in south leeds

QC - in terms of the economic impacts, can you go to table 21.3 on page 21.5 – is the assumption that has been made been carried through in the economic analysis

Dh – yes it has.

Qc – you were asked a large no. of questions about doc c-4-2 (strategic doc). Page 13 – the right hand side there's a box – text in orange – 'to address current transport problems experienced in leeds and support the city's future growth, a framework for public transport is needed' – which you were asked in particular about three. Under this heading 'a framework is for pubic transport is needed...which...' – points 1 to 7, what is the purpose of 1-7 in relation to the framework which is referred to in the introductory sentence

Dh – sets out the overall types of solutions and measures required to address current transport issues

Qc – are the framework specific policies?

Dh – no, just items to address a problem, not policies

Qc - if you have a framework which includes these 'items' – is it appropriate to test individual proposals against each item which is to contribute to the framework

Dh – you wouldn't test against every individual items but would test where they would fit in the particular framework. We have tested a no. of these against the evidence. You would look across a range of these...

Qc – page 21 (c-4-2) headed 'potential solutions' – is the framework which you've referred to – is that to be addressed by one particular solution

Dh – some corridors there is a range of solutions – tested as appropriate

Qc – you were asked about corridors in relation to c-4-2, take out c-4 – page 2.1 'preferred option specification section 2' – you'll see there there's a preferred option alignment. What does that mean?

Dh – an alignment is a route you would want to take in terms of the solution you would come to.

Qc – 2.2. – preferred option alignment discussed in a number of...

Dh – it would show that these are the routes that have been proposed for (coloured in red/green)

Qc – you were asked about whether there was any analysis and comparison of modal shift between hybrid bus and trolleybus. Can we go to c-1, to para 5.16 first of all –

[Jones: witness told me that they couldn't refer to any document. If you introduce a doc in cross-examination then it wasn't a doc you knew about in cross-examination and I didn't ask you any questions on it]

[inspector: is it possible if something comes out of this that First west can ask something of anyone else on it – he can't ask this witness...]

[Cameron: I'm happy for it to be explored...but equally I'm keen that the inquiry is properly informed]

[Jones: I asked him this point and he didn't know – that's his evidence. If someone else comes forward or you make submissions that's fine but it's not the way of re-examining witnesses on evidence they DIDN'T give]

[inspector: another witness to pursue this then?]

[Cameron: mr chadwick – but I'm anxious you have the info you need]

[inspector: but if mr chadwick answers that]

Qc – I would like to ask about management of risks – to go back to the c-4 series of docs. C-4-56 – the qualitative PFI assessment in the KPMG report. It comes in the c-4 series of docs and if we look at the index we can see that they are appendices to the c-4 business case (2009).

Dh – yes there were around 50 or so appendices

Qc – can you assist if whether or not this doc would have formed part of the submission made with the dft with the 2009 submission of the business case

Dh – this was appendix 56 of the submission for the 2009 business case to dft

Qc – in terms of raising money concerns in respect of procurement – was that info before the secretary of state when he made the decision in response to this business case

Dh – it was. This formed part of the submission which was put in front of the sec of state.

Qc – you were asked questions by professor Bonsall and also Mr Jones about benefit cost ratio – in that the dft assessed it at 2.7 (initially submitted at 3.68). go to c-6 series of docs – go to c-6-15 – the terms and conditions of funding – roman III in the second page – the BCR as assessed by DFt falls significantly below the level which we judge to be 2.7 ...

Dh – correct

Qc- then take up g-4-94 – letter from ngt to mr sunderland at dft. March 2014 – second page – “ we previously discussed how dft came to view of the 2.7 when they granted approval” – and then “I've provided more details below regarding refinements” “e.g carbon benefits adjusted to be consistent with the approach by dft when deriving the 2.7” “J – the dft increased the schemes optimism bias and further work has been undertaken” and then you said “as I've noted the changes we've made to

09/05/14

the modelling of the appraisal have sort to address the matters that led the dft to adjust the BCR – therefore we see that the adjusted 2.9 addressed the risks etc.”

Can you assist as to whether 2.90 is comparable to the 2.7 that the dft set?

Dh – yes it is – comparable to the bench line that bcr was 2.7 – we updated it to a comparable level so when we come to point to gain further approval it was clear we complied with these further requirements.

[DH doesn't answer mr bonsall's question in regards to the misrepresentation by farrington of the BCR]

Qc – you were asked a no. of questions by mr jones about various trolleybus schemes in the world – **fwy 111** 'Leche' – page 42 of 65 – you'll see about journey times... "electric operations re-commence" – it says that even though sgm operates the local traffic lights the trolleybuses don't get the benefits of priority signalling which contributes to more lost time and there is a problem with maintaining the service pattern – whats the proposal for leeds?

Dh – ngt will get priority signalling – worked closely with leeds UTMCT – **we will show that we have developed run-times for ngt together with UTMCT to produce a robust figure of the operation of the trolleybus vehicle** –

Qc – is this proposal comparable to Leche?

Dh - this proposal is not comparable in respect to the traffic signals and the issues with parked cars in the city which results in frequent blocking.

Qc – you were asked about whether you considered companies which might be able to supply trolleybuses – included van heul, hess, skoda etc. you mentioned Right Bus as well. You said there are 2 uk manufacturers that are interested – “I can provide the pre-existing information” – will you provide it now or later?

Dh – not now, but I can provide it later [**NOTES THAT HE WILL PROVIDE THAT INFO**]

Qc – you were asked about permanence – can you take up c-4 – business case 2009, go to page 8-3, table 8.2. you'll see there the objective: maximise growth of leeds economic to facilitate pop growth and employment. Under the preferred options you'll see in the last sentence 'infrastructure associated with pref option will add a sense of permanence on the route' – has or has not permanence been a matter to which regards has been had throughout this project, or just recently?

Dh – it has been in regards for some time. Permanence should be attached where it's possible to do so

Qc – which objective is it specifically addressing?

Dh – on maximised growth of the economy etc.

Qc – page 12-11, para 12.39 – can you assist as to whether or not permanence was regarded as a benefit or not?

Dh – I see it as a benefit – but unquantifiable. It can't be included in the guidance for the dft. We are not able to model it.

Qc- consultation issues – you were asked questions about the statement of consultation. A-01-3 annex 3 page 40 (leaflets) – the questionnaire – if you go to page 41 looking at items 13 and 14 – what do they give respondents an opportunity to do??

Dh – give them opportunity for suggestions and comments.

Qc – page 43 (2010 leaflet) – is there any info given to people so they can see what trolleybus is

Dh – there is a section which sets out 'what are trolleybuses'

Qc - you were asked about a letter from parliament (mr mulholland's) – you were told he opposes the scheme – c-2-28, folder 6 – this is a letter to mr phillip Hammond after the coalition gov were elected. Third paragraph – long awaited ngt will provide a step change delivering a transit system

09/05/14

that a major European city is crying out for – in our roles as Leeds MPs we collectively fully support these three (and two others) urgently required transport projects.

[Jones: I put it on the basis that he had been a supporter and he changed his mind later]

Dh – he was a signatory of that letter though.

Qc – park and ride – you said that in the UDP Bodington and Stourton are protected as park and ride sites.

Dh – yes

Qc – take up UDP, d-2-2 – actually go to d-1-1 for the moment, and go in the core strategy draft page 47 - the spatial priorities – does that give indication as to whether to not park and ride supported

Dh – yes, it says so

Qc – you were asked question about fwy 114 – the table regarding capacities – it was put to you that there was a reduction in total seats per hour and you said you disagree with that.

Dh – I did – this was from the assumptions we were making.

Qc – you gave an explanation – assuming service 1 and 6 were halved etc. explain why you disagreed

Dh – looking at the numbers, the suggestion was that if you completely remove bus services you would get a reduction overall. If you look at the number of seats of total passengers per hour for service 1 and 6 only and reduce the frequencies of those – because for the double deck vehicles accessibility seats are those downstairs and not totality in the seats there would be a reduction in those seats in comparison to the NGT system which introduces a large no. of accessible seats.

Qc – what about total passenger carrying capacity – look at your **rebuttal to Dave Alexander (2.22)**

Dh – you say that it's indisputable that NGT will lead to increase in corridor passenger capacities of 850 passengers per hour, why?

Dh – there will be **fewer no. of services 1 and 6 but if you overlay the NGT – it will lead to the an overall increase of capacity**

Qc – asked about an information paper – g-4-41 on journey times. go to page 5 – shows what will happen to traditional bus when NGT is introduced. Go to the second para – what are the assumptions that have been made?

Dh – on south route no rationalisation and low level of replication. In north, service 1 will be reduced to 3 buses per hour and service 6 to no more than 3 buses an hour...

Qc – they said you would have no way of knowing due to the deregulated private bus market – you agreed this was right. But despite the fact, **have you been able to make assumptions and made them?**

Dh – we have made them based on info we had at the time

Qc – if you go back to c-4 – 2009 business case – page 11-4, para 11.17 – it's been assumed frequencies will be halved between Holt Park and city centre. That assumption was set out in 2009 – as far as you are aware, have they [the bus operators, First in particular] come back to you to say that that is a misplaced assumption?

Dh – I'm not aware of them doing so/there was any correspondence

Qc – was it open for them to do so?

Dh – yes, it was – we shared the business case with the bus operators, in particular we were showing the business case so that when we issued a version on the website, there would be a version that could be redacted to not include any particularly commercially sensitive info – and that was carried out.

Qc – doc a-1-3 – were bus operators amongst the people you consulted?

Dh a-01-3 – they were included – section 87 - bus operator forums/considerable meetings

Qc – mr Hague asked you about the number of people standing/seated. Page 5 of info paper g-4-42, you refer to trams, what is the equivalent figure for trams?

Dh – a trolley vehicle has a more favourable seating standing ratio to trams. In Nottingham rail – it is a ratio of 1 to 4.

Qc – UDP park and ride, go to d-2-9 page 127 and 128. Planning permission will be granted for park and ride associated with RTS –

Dh – no. of sites contemplated including stourton north (one we have identified for ngt) and bodington (also identified) – no. 5 is the new Pudsey station I referenced earlier.

Qc – mr Anderson asked you questions about project governance. Section 25 in c-1 business case review. Do we have there, set out in table 25.1 the responsibilities and promoter obligations and page 25.7 – a diagram of projectees. Inspector asked question as to assumptions as to bus times – can I ask you to go to c-1-13 the run-time assessment, 2.26 of page 6, does that tell us how the buses have been modelled as running?

Dh – yes, it shows what services in operation now

Qc – if we wanted to know about low cost and next best alternatives we can see 2.31 – saying that there is a bus which has a limited park and ride for the low cost alternative and the next best alternative saying there was identical infrastructure as ngt (run times assumed to be the same). Remind ourselves, if we go to c-1 and table 5.1 page 5-7, what the assumptions are as to the next best alternative (plug in hybrid) and other specifications. This table summarises the position apart from the inaccuracy to this vehicle to the low cost alternative – which is dealt with in the rebuttal to mr Bonsall. Is there any difference assumed as to priority stops/park and ride?

Dh – no, no difference assumed.

Qc – mr Anderson asked about consultation on Holt Park – a-01-03, annex 2 page 24, was any consultation there?

Dh – phase 3 consultation- 3 events held at Holt Park district centre

Qc – phase 4?

Dh – 2 events – one at St Paul's church and a school and also on page 26, a further event at another school in Holt Park.

Qc – page 79 same doc, annex 5 – consultation and design process – we can see Holt Park terminus issues raised by public – were changes made in response?

Dh – yes there was quite a bit of change around that area and flow of the route in front of that area

Qc – annex 7 – doc which deals with what was consulted

Dh – we do indeed

Qc – Dickinson's questions – he asked you about c-4-2 – suggested that this was a point observed by a small boy [and idiot?]. Areas of greatest need. He made his colourful observation. Transport needs index – c-4-8 – page 21 – what does this index measure?

Dh – 5.4 it is a tool that classifies a relative need....[FILL IN] etc cars per adult household, income, and ruralness.

Qc – Dickinson shows there's no need for ngt in the A660 but does this index deal with congestion or not?

Dh – no it doesn't

09/05/14

Qc – you were asked some questions by prof bonsall – you were asked about the audit trail/mode option selection. You said there will be a trail. Please take up b-11 (design rational report with various flow charts)

Dh – three flow charts, route/mode/depot selection

Qc – if you want a trail is that where you look?

Dh – yes that would be where you look

[DH doesn't answer bonsall's question]

Qc – ms Dawn Carey Jones – one point, Belle Isle – can you take out the statement of consultation – annex 3 page 50 of a-01-3 – suggestion was made that leaflets didn't identify belle isle and that some stickers had to be put on – as far as these particularly leaflets concern do they refer to belle isle?

Dh – yes, we've done better than stickers

Qc – questions about cycle lane provision by mr Forin. You were asked about the transport assessment in this connection – b-9 – section 6 page 193/194 – you can see the approach and design of the cycle lanes. Do figures 6.2, 6.3 and so on to 6.5 show the before and after effects in relation to cycle provision

Dh – supports what I said about enhancement on these corridors

QC – you were asked by mr Bell about funding and assumptions made about funding. Take up c-1 please – go to paragraph section 11.34 on page 11-16 – preferred option annual operating costs and savings. This shows maintenance of stops, which is what Mr Bell asked for.

Dh – indeed, this is what I was seeking this morning.