

15/05/14

15th May

FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESSES - CHRIS LONGLEY – CONTINUATION OF CROSS-EXAMINATION OF JASON SMITH

CI – 5.11.1 in your main proof – states that traffic over the bridge at woodhouse lane would be reduced etc... what is the impact of traffic management restrictions and loss of car parking spaces? Some of the small businesses in the area may be displaced or relocated but the road works will have debilitating effect on small businesses. What is the estimated time for beginning and the completion of woodhouse lane west construction?

CI – 7.7.6 of your proof is about reduction of parking spaces. As we understand it, that part of your proof indicates (going against a fundamental point raised by our members in the survey conducted in 2013) that there will be a reduction of 274 parking spaces along the full route and 61 one of which are pay and display spaces in the city centre, the remainder are on the limbs of the route. As far as I'm aware, we don't know where these spaces are and it would be helpful if there could be an undertaking from the promoters that a list of where they are could be published.

Inspector – don't know where these are, does he?

Js – loss of parking generally more of the informal parking which is on the street where it's unrestricted e.g. a660 where there isn't formal parking. I can tell you what will be taken and what will be provided back. We can undertake to make a list of where they are.

CI – yes we could do it offline.

Inspector- only concern is that having a list isn't evidence that hasn't been put forward...

Cameron: yes, we can put it in as an inquiry note – for anyone to ask questions about it. If someone has a query we can try to deal with it outside of the inquiry.

Js – if you do look at 7.6.6 it indicates the sorts of spaces lost.

Inspector – might be helpful to this inquiry just for them to explain where this parking is – worth exploring in more detail at this inquiry now. It is a concern of ppl and businesses around Headingley area.

Js – if you look at the b-9 transport assessment, it goes through parking in a bit more detail. E.g. on table 9.3 on page 229 'parking provision, north line' – you've got the existing quantity proposed etc. it sets out per drawing what the provision is and the category of parking change e.g. online etc. it's a per drawing breakdown of the parking change.

CI – if it's pre-existing info we haven't found we apologise, if we've looked at it and not understood the consequences of it then that's a matter.

Inspector – do you know where these are indicated on the plan?

Js – not on this amount of detail but they will be set out in the TRO later.

CI – there is one specific example – a pub called the old red lion and there is proposal to put a substation on the car park. We're v. unclear about what the impact will be about the parking available and access etc. at that pub. There are a series of instances up and down the route, in the case of the pub it is the car park (behind the pub) ... we don't know how many spaces might be lost and once the trolleybus is constructed will it be possible to open the meadow lane car park again? And will it (the sub-station) need to be built on stilts as there is a possibility of flooding there?

Js – 5.9.3 on your proof and plan

(CI - e.g. we have an active Scottish region – we ran a survey about the Edinburgh tram and what we found was that 1/5 businesses along route saw a reduction of turnover of 20% - 1/12 saw more than 20% reduction - this is a really significant impact. This comes directly from the restrictions in parking and access to their premises.

[09:47]

Js – parking spaces will need to move from there as the substation will permanently occupy it and bit near it will need to be accessed for maintenance. We provide parking along water lane here, and there are some pay and displays which will be removed. It is 11 spaces that will be there.

Cl – is that a numerical equivalent?

Js - the ones in here are not for the pub – they are for the residents

Cl – so where would the customers park their cars –

Js -they wouldn't park in that area you specify but continue to park where they do now on meadow lane.

Cl – it's not the description of circumstances that I have received (By the business) [i.e. he doesn't agree that this car park isn't used by the pub customers]

Cl – the final layout is very different from the layout now – a lot of businesses currently rely on car access and car parking – restrictions would be a significant impact

Js – woodhouse lane west and east bridge side both would be constructed on – in the construction implementation strategy (a-o8-g3) that sets out what will be done

Cl – our concerns covers area west of ring road up to area where there is a turn-back.

Js – for the whole area in general (appendix A – construction methodology, section s-9 the university area) – the whole of the area including east and west bridges this sets out the anticipated construction sequence and what will be done. There is an accompanying set of drawings – if you would turn to appendix B the drawings, rather than going through it in detail the phasing is shown in a drawing format to show what's been open/closed and what's been done in each phase.

Cl – we have looked through all the doc as far as we possibly could – we can't find a specific budget allocation for the environmental enhancement – there might need to be some higher quality enhancements - e.g. different bus shelters and surface treatment, catenary coverings – given the sensitivity of some locations, appearance can affect people's attitudes etc.

Js – that budget includes all the mitigation in the environmental statement – within that it does include for the design and urban access statement – shows the surface finishes and the stop designs as well – it flags out the standard stops and which are the more bespoke stops – all of that is in the cost plans and specifically provided for.

Cl – so there are specific enhancements. It would be helpful to identify what the sum of those is.

Js – that is in doc a-8-k the design and access statement volume 1 – sets out the stops and whether they are bespoke (e.g. enhancements) – there was vol 2 which shows surface treatments. Since the application mr Walker has updated that set of drawings (in response to consultations). Mr walker has provided a set of drawings showing fairly clearly what's there and what would be provided in terms of all those enhancements –but there is no cost breakdown of all that.

Cameron – mr Walker is the landscape/townscape designer - app 10 of hi appendices shows boundary treatments etc.

Cl – my own personal experience in Sheffield – are you aware of any graveyards within the land take that would be covered by the TWAO order that would require special licence for exhumation and reburial – we were told it would take a limited amount the time and be easy (in Sheffield) and in practice it turned out to be the absolutely opposite. If you are, this is something you should take seriously indeed.

Js – we are not aware of any – what we've done is that we did searches (Enviro-check report) and other inquiries were made – none on the current route we are aware of.

15/05/14

COUNCILLOR BARRY ANDERSON

[10:04am]

Ba – 4.2.2 – five spaces lost [in Holt park] will be provided for in the sw corner – last time I spoke to the highways officers that hadn't yet been agreed – has it now been agreed?

Js – the Holt park doctors surgery connected to the district centre – a report was prepared and went to Mr Farrington to approve those spaces. Whether it has been formally signed off it has been approved

Ba – para 4.2.3 – can you actually show me on a map where this description of a change is? I would argue (I use this surgery) that there is concern that the surgery is going to become an isolated island because of the car park being closed off. Where will this second access egress of Holt Farm rise actually be?

Js – we only had the one access egress at the back in the original design – but after consultation we looked at the vehicles and how they'd turn around so in addition we put another one at the other end – there is a second access to make it easier for the vehicles

Ba – 4.2.4 – my understanding is that this area would be set aside for an old burial area – no alternative provision has been brought forward yet – are you aware of any on-going discussions or not?

Js – this has been dropped

BA – 5.2.3 – I've been approached by a no. of businesses that are concerned about the sharing of road spaces [e.g. going down from Lawnswood roundabout through Headingley]. There is great concern in terms of where people will park and how they will use some of those businesses without going to park on the side streets [which would aggravate the local businesses]. How much consultation and how much alteration has there been as a result of any consultation with these businesses to find a place for ppl to stop? There is unofficial parking on the bus lanes at the moment and now we due to NGT we will be rigorously enforcing restrictions – which might have an effect on those businesses.

Js – just in terms of the shared space (ref in 7.3 of my proof) – for specific areas, it's for Woodhouse Lane and other small areas, not generally on the A660 – listed out in 7.3.12, I put down all the areas where there would be some degree of sharing. In terms of working that up...that's been worked up by the NGT equality access user group (represent the disabled community etc.) coming out of that there are things we would do for shared space areas e.g. public awareness campaigns and driver training so they have to give way to pedestrians if they're in the way – speed is only at 15 miles per hour. Wherever we put in the shared space areas it's either just NGT or very limited traffic e.g. Woodhouse Lane – public transport only on the northbound, the southbound has limited access to get to Blenheim Lane. We limit traffic quite a lot and reduce speed limit etc.

Ba – are the stopping distances for vehicles the same size as NGT worked at the same mathematical principle of a car?

Js – we put it in the areas where there is good visibility – vehicle could stop a lot quicker than a normal vehicle because of the braking system.

Ba – I'm asking because of the concern over the amount of standing.

Ba – para 5.3.1 of your proof - what do you feel are acceptable walking distances between areas of NGT and non-NGT stops and do you think people will be enticed to walk between the two forms of transport as a result of distances?

Js – acceptable walking distances will depend on individual people. Generally walking distance to a stop is a couple of hundred metres – it varies. In para 10.3 of my proof – I set out where I thought

commercial and ngt bus stops were in close proximity[around 100m] given that in order to get to a stop in the first place people would have to walk several hundred metres. I looked at it in proximity of a 100m which gave 41 bus stops within a hundred metres of the ngt stops along the route.

Ba – Holt park– I am concerned at the potential conflicts with pedestrians. People coming out of Asda itself – there is a problem in the Holt Dales with ppl taking the trolleys with them. People will come and go across – at the moment they've got one-way bus traffic but once they get to bit parallel to where the surgery is there will then be two-way ngt. One of the complaints I got in the past was when First used bendy buses [they still use it and I wish they didn't] as that caused problems with pedestrians and the length of ngt is the same as bendy bus. Are you not concerned about the potential conflict with pedestrians trying to get from Asda into the Holt Dales or from Asda down into Holt Farm Rise?

Js – major changes we are making is 1) currently access to car park is around here, a lot of traffic coming out of there [points to map] – lots of vehicles in the street and lots of passers– we didn't want to get caught up with that so we moved it from here to over here [points again] on holt crescent so there are far fewer vehicles actually on that holt farm rise here....holt farm rise becomes effectively public transport only, with occasional access to kids academy which is further down. The amount of traffic actually on holt farm rise (particularly this end part here) is hugely reduced on the scheme.

Ba – but I'm talking about pedestrians – e.g. ppl are walking home with a trolley, we are currently trying to get a fence to block this...but are you not concerned that people walking to the nearby estates are going to have to walk over by-directional ngt traffic?

Js – ngt traffic through here is 1 vehicle every 12 min + the existing bus service. It's moving off a lot of car traffic and putting on one bus every 12 minutes going through there...

Ba – what about the ppl going to the doctor's surgery who park at the car park or park in the spaces most close to the car park at the moment – to get to the doctor's surgery – a lot of aged/infirm people – is there not a potential conflict there? Is there a possibility that with ngt coming in two directions that could lead to potential safety issues? Where would you park and then walk to the surgery?

Js- for highfield surgery, this is a change that has been made more recently – reflected on the updated TRO plans in a-13 we have looked at whether we can retain parking on holt dale approach and we have to accommodate that – there is now a 40m stretch of timed parking.

Inspector – would that include specific parking for disabled people?

Js – not specific but they would be able to use it.

Inspector – you would be able to make space just for ppl with disabilities?

Js – well currently anyone can use it, but we could make provisions.

Ba – if we move up holt dale approach going in direction of the school – at the moment there is conflicts every morning with cars parking inappropriately. We are removing the two speed humps on holt dale approach and getting a crossing put in instead. Are you concerned that you have resolved all the concerns raised by local residents and the school?

Js – we are replacing the speed humps with speed cushions on the straight sections. Also along the stretch we have deliberately put in a lot of crossing points –drivers' behaviours tend to modify when they see lots of crossing points.

Ba – but people are concerned still about speeding traffic and about safely dropping children off at that location. If you've got cushions, a lot of the vehicles have got wide enough axles that you don't touch the sides of them ... can drive at normal speeds. Are we diminishing road safety?

Js- if we were to retain the humps unfortunately that leads to a risk of de-wiring of the trolley vehicles

Ba – holt park regeneration project which could have sig impact on the car park as it currently is outside highfield pub. Have you been briefed as to the current position of the negotiations going on?

Js – I was aware but not been briefed as to the latest negotiation is. One for mr Speak.

Ba – potentially a petrol station would be put on the car park. We are showing concern...

Js – that is another scheme you are talking about that

Ba – which scheme has got primacy – is ngt the prime scheme? Or is holt park regeneration the primacy and ngt will have to change to reflect the regeneration?

Js – this [ngt] is the scheme we are putting forward – any regeneration will have to coordinate with it

Ba – which one takes precedence? This could become a quasi-park and ride side

Js – this scheme sets out the parking provisions here – but if another scheme comes along they will have to go through the usual approvals etc.

Ba – page 66 1.8.3 para f) – closure of otley road end of weetwood lane is proposed – ppl who use no. 28 bus are concerned and also concerned about the amount of housing development taking place at bottom end of that lane – there will be a lot more traffic and most of that traffic would leave Addle and go diagonally across outer ring road and down weetwood lane – and go to the city centre. Are you satisfied that that will be a safer way of getting buses to turn right and traffic to come out – taking sharp turns etc.?

Js – yes I am. At this junction there is an accident problem at the moment – of those 22 collisions in last few years it included 14 carrying out turning movements. There is concern from residents. This scheme proposes to signalise the area – signal control movements in and out of weetwood lane. You spoke to mr Robertson about the right turn and I am satisfied that this will be an improvement on safety

Ba – page 88 1.8.3 – a) – southbound along otley old road – there has been confusion over that junction – how are we going to manage problem where ppl leaving that junction to cross over side of highway opposite police station – they come in there two abreast and also if we are getting ngt to turn left there ...people rat run – are you concerned about road safety of people doubling back in and jumping etc.

Js – it can be a problem as it is at the minute – signalising will make it work at capacity to help solve that problem

Ba – on page 121 of 1.8.3 – land at junction of otley old road and holt dale approach – I've been arguing that that land should be kept for housing as we need it in the area. Is ngt the primacy and any other council policy becomes secondary to that – I'm concerned that piece of lane will have effects on adjoining pieces of land

Js – Powers are taking out and the scheme would be able to use it but there could be a negotiation discussion if a housing development came forward.

Ba – pg 146 kids academy – the last time I heard things haven't been resolved with the academy – have all these road safety issues etc. been resolved?

Js – I've been to see the members and been through their concerns – we've recently issued info back to them. E.g. road safety – on street time parking has come from their discussions. We've been through how construction will work and how they will maintain access of their main door. Also talked about the wall structure during construction and gone through its height and what sits on top of the retaining wall. We've issued info back to them. There are on-going discussions but we have addressed all their points.

Inspector – I can't remember if they've objected

Js – they have.

Inspector- you're not aware of the possibility they might withdraw it

Js – there is a possibility

15/05/14

DRUMMOND AND CHRUCH WOOD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION and 13 individuals – Helen Pickering
[10:40am]

Hp – obj 1727 (their proof), para 2.7 and 2.9 – leeds metro uni headingley campus – we want to show you the kindercare nursery position on a660 – and the position of the garage and spa shops on the a660 and show you Richmond house and weetwood schools and st. chad's and the parish church and there is a cricket ground and club there. And at the top there is a tennis club at the top. Those are the main organisations in the area we will talk through.

Start with the campus – are you aware that the residents in our area have no other exit to our home except from the a660 as we are blocked in at the back by the campus

Js – yes

Hp – this means we are totally dependent on the success or not of this scheme and the residents have a great interest in it - can you talk through the road re-design on drawings 13 (a-11) please concentrating on traffic entering and leaving campus

Js – on to church Wood Avenue –it is proposed to put in a signalised junction and signalised pedestrian crossing – a right turning provided into road to the avenue.

Hp – which is the main entrance to the campus?

Js – along church wood avenue

Hp – do you know where the car park is – on the campus?...it's at the top of church wood avenue to the right

J s- yes I'm aware there is a lot of demand along church wood avenue from the campus

Hp – do you know how many students are actually at met uni who have access to this campus

Js – the no. of vehicles have been recorded on several occasions – the existing flows are known and also that has been looked to the future – that, coming from real actual data, has gone into the traffic modelling for that junction

Hp – could you tell me what your estimate is then?

Js – that is a traffic modelling issue which would be for Robertson

Hp – you will be familiar with the notion that this campus has (technically) access to 28000 students – are you aware of the no. of major events held in that campus (e.g. graduations/sports events) etc. – there are many visitors adult students using cars. Has your modelling taking into account that campus is hugely busy

Js – yes, it does take into account all the flows – looks at events as well. This is a signal control junction and an improvement on what is there at the moment.

Hp – we can see as you say that traffic signals will be placed there and priority will be given to a660 traffic?

Js – we have considered the side roads as well...intention would not be to have queues on the side roads

Hp – how long do you estimate queues to be in the evening rush hour?

Js – this would be a question for mr Robertson ... in the transport assessment – 5.5.3.3. pg 78

Hp – we would question robertson's assessment as to the variability as to the way the campus is used through the year. Do you appreciate that that road is subject to high variability and you have only done a survey at one particular time?

J s- the survey was done over a period of days – the whole thing works with capacity

Hp – have you done it over a no. of different periods in the year – subject to diff uses?

Js – not been done at school hols but in the months within term time. There is some capacity left in the junction, it's not at the capacity...so there is spare capacity available.

Hp – if queues do develop do you agree drivers will seek exit off the avenue and this will create rat runs as they are non-signalised junctions

15/05/14

J s- that's not what the models show – it will be easier to exit at church wood avenue as much safer to do it there

Hp – in our experience when there are traffic lights ppl are not likely to give way – do you believe that ppl are more likely to give way non signalised junction and there prefer these roads?

Js – varies.

Hp - can I turn now to the a660 southbound – drawing 13 – confirm that the current situation is that there are two southbound lanes (one for morning bus lane only) – these are to be replaced by one trolleybus lane and one traffic lane – do you agree that the shadow etc. will be removed within the scheme? These areas are those that facilitate residents and ppl entering our areas turning right (these safety pocket lanes that allow ppl to turn into our area, Drummond road etc).

Js – yes those will need to be removed to create space for the widened bus lane

Hp – why do you think they were put in in the first place?

Js – because there was sufficient to put it in in the carriageway so the opportunity was taken

Hp – that is a deterioration of the area, is it not – for ppl using the spa/garage/our area?

Js – still can turn right, just happened there isn't the separate right turn area – so some traffic might be delayed at that right turn...

Hp – so you can see there will be increased congestion and ppl will be blocking the only traffic lane going south into the city

Js- ppl give way to gaps in traffic as you said early...

Hp – do you know that traffic already builds up when trying to cross into that area? And do you think that by having only one lane it can only make it worse?

Js – same no. of cars trying to get in

Hp – but there is no inner lane anymore...

Js – yes because we have improved bus/cyclists facilities etc.

Hp – turning to the a660 north bound we can see the road design narrows from 6 lane wide highway to a 4 lane highway – stretch from st chads parish church to the area outside the kinder care nursery. We have a wide lane early on which is in effect a six lane wide highway going to a four lane wide highway in between this stretch.

Js – there are 5 with a central reservation.

Hp- do you accept the point that as the traffic moves into our area it moves from a wide road into a 4 way highway which will then will be a dedicated trolley bus lane.

Js – there is one for general traffic lane...

Hp – that's my point – does that form a pinch point that might cause congestion?

Js – no, there is one general traffic lane on entry and one general traffic lane coming out... it's been modelled by GR and is at capacity. I don't think it does form a pinch point for congestion.

Hp – you can see the point I am making – all traffic enters one lane and then all traffic shares one lane at that point.

Js – generally there's one public transport lane and one general traffic lane right the way through the junction at otley road– I don't see there are multiple traffic lanes going to a single lane on entry to the area...

[JS and HP miscommunicated]

Js – you are quite right generally there is a pinch – there is a short length between Drummond road and Thornberry avenue that doesn't have a bus lane – it must be shared (reason why is because there is a large number of trees that would have been affected, green space and also Yorkshire water facilities that would have been affected as well). Is it over a relatively short distance of around 250m - that is managed between signals – if it was a longer length and not managed by signals I would share your concerns but I don't think it will cause congestion as it is a relatively short lane.

15/05/14

Hp – yes but it is outside exactly where our residents are trying to get in and out of the area. Is it true that we actually have a dedicated cycle lane at the moment [yes correct]– and it will disappear at that point and all the cyclist will have to share one track with all traffic including the trolleybus?

Js – we discussed with the cycle forum/cycle campaign whether we put in a dedicated cycle lane over the stretch or not – the view was that if we did put it in it would have to truncate before the junction anyway so it was felt that it would be better to have it in the public transport lane so it would naturally merge into the road and go onto the junction

P – would you regard it as a deterioration for cyclists? – the road isn't wide enough for your scheme to properly work at that point?

Js –it is a short 100m length and the junction works at capacity, the lane picks up immediately after the junction. It is quite a pinch point and that's why we couldn't fit it in and that's why the cycle forum didn't think it was appropriate for that stretch.

Hp – our residents think it's a deterioration of the cycling opportunities in our area

Hp – kindercare nursery on the a660 – what is your understanding about how parents access nursery car park at that point?

Js – we do need to make sure the main road is clear for public transport and vehicles to travel along there...it can lead to safety issues on a main road

Hp – do you know where entrance for the carpark is? There are 130 toddlers being dropped off

Js – that is on the main road. can still use the entrance of the car park on the main road – there is nothing stopping them doing that.

Hp – would you accept that because it's a small car park, frequently traffic backs up into that lane when parents drop off children

J s- I do accept that that does occur but it occurs in a lot in school areas during those peak times.

Hp – have you calculated what impact it would have on the ngt going along that route at school times?

Js – it's southbound in its own lane and north bound there are traffic regulation orders to stop waiting on the highways...

Hp – so they have to drive round until there isn't a queue?

Js – they can go into the car park if there's space but they cannot wait on the main road, yes

Hp – so we are agreed there is a blocking of that route when parents drop off children there

Js – yes, they have to go into the nursery carpark

Hp - yes but it is a very small car park – there isn't room for all those parents

Js – they can use the side roads as well

[11:07]

Hp – side roads - width of Drummond avenue side roads?

Js – proposals don't change anything on drummond avenue

Hp – confirm it is three lanes wide and parking on each side up to an hour

Js – the scheme doesn't change anything there

Hp – but when they are dropping off toddlers and they open their doors – on either side the middle lane gets blocked and no space to get into the avenue and that causes back up into the main road... which in your scheme will become only one general lane for all traffic

Js – I accept there is a problem there that this scheme doesn't necessarily solve – but it is an existing issue... it doesn't hinder that pick up/drop off on the side roads

Hp – trolleybuses will be held up going northbound and this impacts your business case

Js – they won't be held up as there is a traffic regulation order – preventing ppl parking there and blocking the route.

15/05/14

Hp – do you think the fact that this will be so difficult for the nursery to be viable, do you think that their fears are unrealistic as it will be difficult for them to use that nursery

Inspector – are you aware of the parking arrangement at the moment. Parking on the a660 to access the nursery?

Js – they are parking on the a660 - it is legal parking

inspector – in effect you are removing that facility to park on the main road?

Js – yes

Hp - that fact we have removed these shadow pocket lanes and changes to the design of the roads do you think that as traffic is trying to get across there may be a likelihood this will increase accidents in relation to ppl turning right into the nursery/spa/garage

Js – no, you are waiting to turn right...it is the same opposing flow you've got now.

Hp – but if you're coming southbound the traffic at the moment can go into the other lane [and wait patiently for a gap]...

Js – but still waiting to turn across the opposing flow that you were before

Hp – pavements – perhaps you could tell me the new width of pavements between st chad's church and Thornberry avenue

Js – from thornberry avenue to churchwood avenue – just on the east side – from thornberry it begins at 2 m and widens to 3m – it widens. Between church wood and Drummond avenue the width becomes 2 metre – between Drummond avenue and road the width will be between 2.5 and 3m....etc.

Hp – will you accept it is a considerable reduction?

Js – for the instance between church wood and Drummond avenue yes it would be reduced.

Hp - toddler's carriage used by kinder care – these carriages carry six children – the normal method that nursery uses. These buggies are just under 2 by 6ft long (1.8m long by 0.7m wide). They're being moved up and down these roads – they have to be able to turn on the pavements to get round. Do you think the new pavement widths will affect the ability for the nursery to use these carriages?

Js – certainly if they were travelling on the pavements – there is sufficient width travelling along – I don't know the turning circles of those so I don't know if there would be issues.

Hp – are you aware every week bins are put out on those pavements and that takes up some of the width on those pavements

Js – I assume you'd turn around away from the bins

Hp – you think safety issues are misplaced

Js – exactly what the turning circles of these buggies I don't know...I don't think there is room to pass these bins etc...

Hp – the new street furniture e.g. poles

J s- they will be 350mm in diameter at maximum

Hp – this is a major school pedestrian area for several schools.

J s- absolutely

Hp- so you are aware that boisterous groups of young ppl go up and down these pavements in groups of four/five etc. every time a school gets out

Js – not unusual

Hp – is it an issue if pavements are narrower

Js – it's adequate - it's useful to look back at g-4-74 para 8.5.2 page 42, that it is more than the legal minimum of 2m. sufficient to allow a person walking alongside with a buggy to pass another one comfortably.

Hp – we've got a combination of carriages, young people, bins and street furniture all negotiating next to now a busy lane which was previously a dedicated cycle lane

15/05/14

Js – here the lane is really quite wide – that is partly why we have provided greater than the minimum. Those multiple uses are found in lots of locations in the UK.

Hp – you've changed the position of the bus stops on the north boundary, haven't you?

Js – yes

Hp – you propose to site the stops such as the bus stop and the trolleybus stop will be separated by side road entrances both at st. chad's road and Thornberry avenue – is there a danger of ppl running across these roads to try and catch the first bus that arrives?

Js – no I don't – you'll generally know before you set off whether you will get a bus or ngt service. you know ngt service is punctual, reliable and good journey times – if you want to go for an ngt servie, it's a six minute headway – so average wait time is 3 min – it's a turn up and go service and you're not particularly disadvantaged if you see another bus at another stop as its only an average three minute way

Hp – you are expecting ppl to make a decision in advance as to which service they're going to catch – ngt or conventional bus

Js – no, I'm not expecting that but I'm saying that is logically likely to happen – to know what route you're going on or where you want to go. If you do it's a turn up and go service.

Hp – you describe this scheme as an integrated scheme to the residents of our area but it doesn't seem so that you have now created a bus stop that is much further north of Thornberry avenue from the other stop – which in effect you're trying to make sure that people can't choose buses and therefore how integrated can that scheme be said to be?

Js – just dealing with this location - the northbound is constrained by the trees, water equipment etc. so rather than being four lanes its effectively three – so given that there is only one northbound lane if we did have bus stops, say where it is currently, it would block passage in to the ngt stop itself. Yesterday I went through in chief the reason why we couldn't share bus stops and the locations of them downstream of an ngt stop.

The reason why we put the bus stop where it's shown now – it's the first opportunity whereby if the bus did stop there it wouldn't then block passage of other vehicles including buses and ngt as it is in the tail of the bus lane developing. If ngt came along or another bus it would simply overtake and by pass the bus and go back into the bus lane. In terms of integration – in 10.3 of my proof I've gone through the scheme area by area and looked at how many bus stops in the scheme would be in proximity to how many bus stops (41) – there are occasions like this where it is not possible to put stops next to each other...but the majority are nearer than 100m of each other

Hp – accept that it is further than 100m and you are saying it's not possible to do it because of road structure. Our residents would want only one common bus stop and believe that would provide a better integrated system.

Js – that view has been raised before – I've been through the 3 reasons as to shared bus stops. Here, in an earlier version we wanted to put a lay by near it – but it took out a large no. of mature trees in the area.

BREAK

[11:39am]

Hp – I'm still on bus stops. We've got two relocated bus stops. Did you mention you're expecting the trolleybus to be able to overtake a double decker bus at those bus stops

Js – it is possible. What would happen is the live wires will be positioned centrally above the public transport and general traffic lanes. It can either be in that lane or the adjacent lane – the trolleybus arms can move over laterally by about 4m. the wires would be between the two lanes so could then overtake.

15/05/14

Hp – integrated service at these stops – are you expecting a separate ticket system

Js – I'm aware the M card is coming up – but more for mr Henkel

HP – entrance to st. Chad's church – you've actually put a lane there so we can turn right – it is appreciated. The entrance is to the church and also to a v. busy parish hall with lots of activities. Lots of children around there - Have you modelled how much traffic actually uses this road up to the church e.g. cricket club /tennis etc.?

Js – I'm aware of the activities there – if I refer you back to the surveys and that the traffic modelling and flows were for GR

Hp – st chad's is also going to have a construction site, isn't it behind the parish hall?

Js – whereabouts?

Hp – to the right as you go up.

Js – useful to us to look at doc a-6 sheet no. 8 on the planning direction drawings – and may also be useful to look at my proof para 8.5.3 setting out the construction compound areas.

Hp – perhaps you can talk through the construction site on all the activities

Js – there is no construction site proposed at the st. chad's area – only the one on churchwood avenue. These are the plans of the application docs – we haven't moved them. This is the only one in the area for the purposes of constructing the substations

Hp – so it's just for the construction of that

Js – no, it's really for the substation and a bit of storage

Hp – can you tell me the impact on church wood avenue will be in putting in the construction site

Js – minimal – in terms of the actual flows of the site...for the purposes of constructing the substation they come in pre-fabricated units and not much to do – no earth works etc. whilst the vehicles would go into the site they wouldn't be on the road and wouldn't block it.

Hp – how long would it take to do that?

Js – it's going to be a couple of months – It is a basic building to direct. Not big work at all.

Hp – return to the kinder care dropping off of children. Is it true that as the parents are unable to access to get into the nursery they will not be parking on that road (nobody would park as clearly too dangerous) – the point I was making was that you will get queues of ppl in that lane waiting to get access to the car park or Drummond avenue sides

Js – I acknowledge there may be several cars waiting for right turns at one time – but unlike the existing situation because we signalise at st chad's junction and further up at church wood avenue – either side there will be signalised junctions and will create gaps in the traffic – therefore more opportunities to right turn there and not block the lane

Hp – overall how do you think the changes e.g. reduced ability to turn right, local traffic struggling to get in and out of a660, increased congestions, increased rat –running, separated bus stop locations, reduced cyclist space and narrow ped pavement s- do you think that that is not likely to improve the quality of life of the residents there?

Js – signalising st chad's and church wood avenue junction goes a long way to improve safety – in safety terms that gives a big improvement. It also improves cycle facilities – it is at 4.2m rather than standard width.

Hp – it is the residents' unanimous view that they are opposed to this scheme

Js – I'm not unsurprised there is a diff in view

Hp – do you agree that many of these changes actually could be done without ngt being put in place?

Js – just this stretch or generally?

Hp – particularly signalisation of the area and some other improvements locally

Js – I think clearly if you wanted to and you didn't have ngt you could do that – but there are issues around that...rather than having it in this scheme (value for money case etc.) – you would break it

15/05/14

into lots of little schemes and all those would have to compete with all other schemes for funding and prioritisation (the value of money case will be lower). Yes you could deliver it outside of ngt but you would be competing with lots of other schemes. At the end of the day it might not happen but delivery might be much later.

Hp – this scheme is disadvantaging many of the local ppl using roads in their area – many areas down the a660 – e.g. Cumberland road also blocked in, section of west park also blocked in and has to use the a660 – could this be a common problem all the way down the route?

Js – on the road crossings, I think for pedestrians the scheme represents an improvement due to signal control. For traffic, as I explained because of the proposals we're signalling these junctions which creates gaps for right turns etc.

[12:00pm]

MICHAEL BROADBENT

Resident of Ottley old road (responsible for traffic management for the police)

Mb – to go back to yesterday, you said that one of the busiest bus routes in the country is the a660 – is that by the definition of other traffic than buses or by bus patronage?

Js – bus patronage. I understand it by the modelling for that has been done by mr chadwick

Mb – app 3-1 page 3, para 1-10 of the summary. You say during the development of the trolley, where possible provision improved for highway users and recognise the hierarchy of road users. Isn't it the case that the scheme reduces footway to 2m.

J s- that minimum is 2m but there are areas with wider widths. Ltm 2-8 guidance.

Mb – that width really relates to more residential streets under the guidance?

Js – relates to most roads, it says you should consider additional width some places

Mb – this is a strategic road and heavy traffic – do you not think that this 2m width is not reflecting what goes on on the a660

Js – it's a balance of all the competing interests. There are others that have quite wide pavements – varies along the route. we do need to think about other traffic e.g. reduce generally traffic lane to around 3m. I was concerned about the cyclists in particular as the existing bus lane comes down from lawnswood right down to shore lane – that is three metres in width. Buses have to edge into the right lane to overtake cyclists – which is a big safety issue – so we widened the inbound bus lane which is where the width of the footways go to. Because we've got new bus lanes northbound it pushes the general traffic e.g. hgvs – pushes them away from the footways that they would otherwise be (pushed 4.2m over more towards the centre of the road). It produces the ambience of the footways, not that much heavy traffic near you.

Mb – nevertheless 2m is a drastic reduction from that that is there now. It is reflective of the effect of the ambience of this road

Js – we would want to have more than that but with competing interests we have other considerations to think about. We've followed the guidance. I acknowledge we have areas of narrowed foot ways but for good reasons.

Mb – where are widened footways from lawnswood to headingley

Js – its narrowed in this area, but widened in other areas

Mb – so the area here, which is not so much student populations (where it is widened) – get the narrowed footways

Mb - Para 1.13 page 4. You state that the reduction in parking is kept to minimum. How can if you look at the proposed 24 hour restrictions from holt park to city centre, how that can be supported?

Js – from parking and re-surfacing – we really do need to have bus route clear of other traffic. We've looked at what can be done in particular areas e.g. cottage road area we have put in brand new

parking bays. (on a-11, sheet 14) for businesses they can park inbound in this area, the bus lane is a morning peak hour. Where we are able to we have tried to provide parking facilities.

Mb – TRO drawings seems to show loading with the joint ability for permit parking. How does this permit parking work in terms of monitoring and use.

Js – parking is intended to be for customers in shops – exactly the arrangement is to be discussed. It is the intention you can park there. We were flagging up that the businesses there may want to put some provisions up – exactly how that would work is something that we have to discuss with the businesses

Mb – app3-1-1 page 4 para 1.1.5 – you state there that the extensive traffic regulation orders are appropriate for safe running of the trolley. Where would it be un-safe?

Js – in a number of places on the approach to signalised junction and pedestrian crossings – it wouldn't be safe if there isn't restriction on those areas of the highways. We want to make sure the highways area regulated and not just have parking on all side of the roads. It reduced visibility of ppl crossing etc.

Mb – the other element you say is to provide the effective operation of the trolley – is it the primary aim to clear a passage for ngt/cycles/taxis etc. is that the main drive given the depth of this project

Js – it's to do both

Mb – as a consequence of these extensive TROs, residential and businesses needs are affected

Js – we've tried to mitigate that as much as possible.

Mb – was the decision to have TROs for these areas taken to eliminate any likely interference of the trolley even though it can move 4m out of line

Js – we wouldn't want to have a situation whereby buses had to regularly move out of their lane because of parking etc. and into adjacent congested lanes

Mb – otley old road – subject of a no parking restriction for 24hours a day running from holt park through to the junction. It's a long stretch of road. Down this road it's proposed to ban waiting at any time on both sides of the road. From my experience, there is very little parking which takes place apart from delivery vans etc. is this scheme so delicate that it can't afford for the odd vehicle to be parked. Why do we need the level of no waiting restrictions – is it a catch all?

Js – it is to ensure the way is clear – not just for ngt, for all vehicles. If there is so little parking on here it won't make that much of a difference to many people. There is parking on the side roads. And on holt dale approach there is parking a bit further down. For this section it is important to keep it clear and make it clear where ppl can and can't park.

Mb – to go to para 5.10.2 in your proof on page 37 – could you tell me who will enforce the speed limits you have indicated to be either 15 miles an hour in totally segregated areas through to 20 miles in the shared space.

Js – speed limits – moving fences are still with the police in leeds

Mb – what have they said about the enforcement

Js – they are aware and there would be an enforcement arrangement for those moving TROs

Mb – have they agreed to do this?

Js – it is part of their duties

Mb – is there an agreement and understanding as to the demands to be made? Do they understand the impacts to the police?

Js – these TROs will be made as though they were made in the usual way – so they will enforce it in the usual ways. No difference between TROs made under this order and those normally made by leeds city council.

Mb – what I'm concerned about is the finite use of resources of the police. Do they understand the demands that might be made?

Js- they do understand

Mb – para 4.2.9 page 16 sheet TDO19 A-11 relating to headingley lane –this relates to rose court nursery of headingley lane/Buckingham road. You said the right turn pocket into Buckingham road is deleted from the scheme as a result of negotiations with the nursery. You say that the design change will 'occasionally' delay general traffic in bound on the headingley lane, this will of course also inhibit the flow of the trolley. How would you quantify occasionally, particularly at peak times?

Js – clearly in terms of operations it would have been better to have a right turn pocket in there but that had major implications for the nursery as they use the site for play based areas. We had to unfortunately then withdraw that and go back to this. In terms of the impacts, it was considered to be an average of 8 sec per vehicle. There would be great variability – some delayed for longer some for less, v. difficult to quantify what that variability would be. But we do recognise that some vehicles will be delayed by right turners but that is the compromised that has been reached because of the impact on a third party.

Mb – were the nursery objecting to the proposals originally outlined?

Js – yes they were

Inspector – are they still objecting?

Js – yes but it's an on-going negotiation.

Mb – do you know how many actual vehicles going to there is turning right on a peak period

Js – they will be in the TA... I do appreciate there will be some delay on the right turn there. We've actually provided specific space down Buckingham road for that but I do appreciate ...

Mb – but you've put further restrictions on Buckingham road, in effect you've prevented loading on the northern side and on the southern side you've made restrictions for loading and I think you've provided in the latest drawings to put two disabled parking bays there

Js – that's correct

Mb – is it not just the issue of turning in but traffic emerging from Buckingham road back into headingley lane – is it not a further exaggeration of the issue at that particular location?

Js – traffic emerging from Buckingham road and turning right will have to wait to find a gap in the usual way

Mb – you've shut richmond road. Lots of vehicles coming from that estate going onto Buckingham road

Js – there is an alternative way...richmond avenue

Mb – that's even more contentious, I think as it's not a particular junction I will want to emerge from to turn right

Js – it may be helped by the traffic signal we will put in. there is a pedestrian crossing there which will also create gaps on demand. The flow northbound will be stopped by ngt which will also create gaps.

Mb – para 5.2.2 page 21 relating to para 7.2.1.1 (app 3-2) – where the trolley is in a shared bus lane these lanes will in general be 4.2m wide and provide adequate space for vehicles to pass cyclists. When this will not be possible what widths will be provided in those locations where you can't achieve the figure. Whereabouts will there not be 4.2m widths?

Js – only one location a-11, sheet 23, on the approach to clarendon road there is a bus lane there.

This is the only one but the width provided is 3.65m. this is the only occasion where they are below 4.2m. There were options of choices (we discussed with the cycle forum) – options were to have a 1) 4.2m outbound cycle lane and have no inbound cycle lane, 2) was the layout here. The forum's preference was to have the second option shown on the sheet. G-4-74 para 6.2.2 says that widths below 4m are not recommended for bus lanes unless it is over a short distance. Forum's view was that it was under 100m and they felt that it would be appropriate to put it in. this was the agreement struck with the forum.

15/05/14

Mb – so then you rely on the good drivers of buses/trolleybuses to remain behind any cyclist who is already in this new bus lane. You rely on them staying behind for around 100m and not taking the chance to overtake.

Js – they won't try to pass them unless it's safe to do so.

Inspector – has that been allowed for in the actual journey time?

Js – yes they have been allowed for in the run time assessments.

Mb – the options you provided above, causes me concern.

Js – not having a bus lane at all would increase congestion (ngt would become more unreliable as they wouldn't be able to transit through in a single signal phase) therefore we had to choose between those two options

Mb – so the bus lanes stop short of clarendon road junction by about 30ms?

Js - yes

Mb – that allows the vehicles that are going to turn left in clarendon road to go from the outside general traffic lane to turn left into that junction. That doesn't have any implication in terms of stacking of other vehicles on the outside lane?

Js – What you're doing is that you're bypassing all the traffic in the ahead lane to get to the head of the queue – you come out of the bus lane to continue straight forward

Inspector – have you looked at the time difference in the delay from being behind the cyclist and the delay in missing a green cycle?

Js – I don't know, for mr chadwick.

Mb - Para 5.3.2 page 23, this is about bus stops. Can you just clarify some things – when there is no bus lane and traffic is heavy, you will or will not go into the bus lay by?

Js – where there is heavy traffic and where there is no bus lane, traffic will need to pull from the lay by back into a general traffic lane that is busy – we haven't provided lay by's in these locations as it will be v. hard for vehicle to pull out when it is congested. We have provided lay bys where there are light traffic flows (e.g. holt park) or there are bus lanes so they can pull out with more ease (as there will be more gaps in a bus lane).

Mb – it seems that the drawings are in contradiction to that you just said. A-11, Sheet 24 for instance, outside 188 woodhouse lane, that is shown as a bus lay by on a road I would say is very heavily trafficked

Js – but the distinction here is that there is a traffic signal junction just upstream which will create gaps in the flow so not particularly congested in that point. It's a general principle we've tried to apply everywhere. We have to consider that it is a single lane there, if we put an on stream bus stop that would block the general traffic. It is because we have an opportunity due to the created gaps that we put the lay by there.

Mb – drawing 02 of a-11, is it not a similar situation there?

Js – it is, the general principle we try to apply has exceptions. Again if we put it on a single lane there we will block traffic. There are cases where it would be harder to pull out of the lay by – this will be one of them

Mb – drawing 02?

Js – it's immediately following a signalised junction and ped crossing so creates more opportunities for gaps to get out. The principle holds good but their particular cases where there's no option or there is some opportunity.

15/05/14

Inspector – I'm assuming this has been taken into account – the possibility of delays of trolleybuses that can't get into the traffic from laybys?

Js – this is for GENERAL buses, not trolleybuses.

Mb – what consultations have been taken with the other existing public transport providers?

Js – I believe that Mr Haskins covered this to some extent and Henkel to cover to more extent.

Mb - you're not aware of any consultation in terms of your design?

Js – we've had feedback from Leeds City Council and certainly they have consulted with us

Mb – but has the consultation been made with the other public service providers

Js – I know there have been discussions with First and others – Mr Henkel knows the details

Mb - 5.3.3 page 23 – you said where it's not feasible to provide a layby bus stops have been located downstream of NGT stops so during peak periods they are less likely to delay a trolley. Is this because delay to buses is considered to be less important to delay to NGT?

Js – Delay to NGT will delay other buses following it as well. But I do think given the substantial level of investment being put up for this scheme - that it is right to protect NGT service punctuality as well as other services

Mb – is it because trolleys will spend longer at stops – greater dwell times

Js – no actually they have short dwell times. Conventional buses may have longer dwell times in general.

Mb - Para 5.10.3 page 38 – we know that trolleys are to be fitted with bells etc. you have said you have taken consideration of those disabled. My wife is deaf and has no perception as to where sound comes from. This is important in safety terms...what is the view of deaf and hard of hearing in regards of this provision?

Js – it is on going engagement – the NGT equality access user group has been in putting into the design and continue to do so – delineators as to safe spaces and planters. They'll continue to do so. Clearly there are concerns and we are working through those with them. We have speed restrictions etc.

Inspector – do you know how other systems have applied to ppl with hearing problems?

Js – yes, such as Exhibition Road in London and quite a lot to be learnt from them. We did a review of the UK and elsewhere of what was best practice.

Mb - Para 7.5.7 on page 89 – could you tell me within that summary it makes no comment as to the impact on buses – or any reference to delays of buses that will suffer as a result of trolleys standing at trolley stops

Js – that's going to be more than outweighed by considerable bus lanes that have gone in. Key constraint on traffic and also right along the route is that – the bottle neck is at the junctions (that's where all the queuing is at) – again we have huge investment in terms of upgrading these junctions and making them work within capacity which is what GR set out the other day. That will have a huge effect on buses. There may be occasions where buses do have to wait behind an NGT at a stop but as I said the boarding and waiting times are actually shorter than with a conventional bus. I appreciate that may change with smart ticketing etc.

Mb – yes, the Routemaster has double doors...

Mb – Mr Chadwick at his app 7-2, para 3.44 page 20 bullet 3 – it states that you were responsible for all the maintenance and renewal costs of this scheme. Please tell me as to what allowance you've made for relocation of bus stops

Js – it has been made for that. Cost for removing those and associated footway repaving – full allowance made for all relocations

15/05/14

Mb – that will also apply to tree maintenance?

Js – yes, if a tree dies in the first five years it will be replaced.

Mb – a five year failsafe. What about mitigation of heritage lost

Js – anything the scheme is doing including env statement mitigation works and design and access statement is included

[12:58pm]

LUNCH BREAK

HEADINGLEY CASTLE MANAGEMENT – IAN BARRICLOUGH, CHARTERED SURVEYOR

IB - Representing residents and families who live there – Grade II listed building. Majority of questions are related to heritage but also engineering issues

[land at the rear of st. Columbus church – please 18 under a-11]

My questions relate to an advice note presented by ngt to us number g-4-91, which we have responded with a response note OBJ/461/2. It is about the alignment. Our principal concern is that although every resident has objected to principle of ngt, collectively we had some comfort in the early designs that the route of the ngt would be sitting in a cutting at the front of st. Columbus church. On design phase 2 the ngt route remained within the cutting at a lower level in front of our castle building. The route of the tram was further to the west i.e. closer to st. colombus church in a cutting. I want to question the calculations appeared in the advice note. On this note page 7, second paragraph, the 3rd sentence – df7 alignment will be slightly elevated compared to df2 – it says it will be barely seen by residents at headingley castle.

Our engineers advise us that it will be 2.4m difference. I'd like him to advise me and confirm whether the info in this advice note is his understanding of the level difference?

Js – yes it is, in terms of df2 we did 3D model – that largely had it at existing ground level (although it was slightly above in some bits) – we did another design at Df7 – certainly yes it is we've got this modelled in our annex software – we have looked at it...0.44m difference at headingley castle and looked further down towards the church where it was 0.75m difference.

[IB shows him DF2]

This is a different location from headingley castle – it is pointing to the headingley hill stop – we come off street and there there is a particular raised area – map is 1.9m and actual 1.5m with our DF7 – we come out of the raised area and the level of difference drops from 0.75m. the question in relation to headingley castle which is much further up.

[IB doesn't agree with the advice note – df2 was on a raised area, not a car park area. So at df2 we were raised not running at car park level.]

Js - These figures are all correct

IB - Access drive and calculation of gradients on the access drive – we've waited for clarification about what the proposed gradient will be following ngt coming in. Are your references in %, mr smith

Js - %

Ib – note from ngt saying it will be no more than 5%

15/05/14

J s- yes, the lower part varies between 5-6% and steepens up to 7% up near the castle – we would cross in the shallower part between 5-6%. The design shows it is between 5-6%.

Js – I can confirm the gradient will be around 5%

[2:15pm]

JS – just clarified the Broadbent question in the morning about removal vehicles in the TROs – I understood him to be private vans etc. which would be prohibited and not allowed in TRO – if it was a contractor removal vehicle then those are exempt. Private vans and cans not permitted but contractor vehicles, whilst doing removal, are exempted.

NWLTF – DOUGLAS KEMP

Dk – what considerations were you asked to give to road and junction layouts - a660 between Almer road and headingley hill?

Js – On the main road, the layout remains largely the same other than bit on Richmond road. (sheet 19) the traffic modelling looked at junctions on either side of that, looked at the flow along headingley lane but there wasn't any changes there. Flows into either side were looked at and provided for GRs model

Dk – sheet 10 a-11 – a660 just north of lawnswood roundabout towards the far left hand side – you have traffic lights at junction of ottley old road. Traffic coming out of leeds and into those dual carriageway – is there any right turn allowed by the TROs off the ottley old road junction?

Js – if you come up the slip you can turn right.

Dk – but also the right turn if you remain on the main road. The layout doesn't allow you to right turn there.

Js – also no right turn from further down on the main road

Dk – if ppl wishing to head into the city where do they find the capability to make a right turn to go to the city centre.

Js - There is woodland courts and rainswood gardens – two choices of right turn available. If you are further on actually on the slip road...have to continue along ottley old road – on that one you would go to winford avenue back on the outer ring road. That will be a diversion and slightly longer, yes.

MARTIN FITZSIMON

Mf – resident from belle isle. There's certain park and ride system – I understand there is an issue as far as old mines and streams in that area – can I ask if you've had any discussions on it and what you propose to do?

Js – stourton park and ride – drawing 43C – that site is a former quarry in filled – there has been ground investigation done, determining the quality of material is variable so it wouldn't be suitable to put a major building on – acceptable for parking but need to have significant retaining structures to get in the parking and also significant retaining structures which are around the back of the depot and also between the two tiers of parking. We recognise it and have done a report on it identifying these features and in terms of the engineering that has taken account of the needs in the design of the walls so no reliant on the ground for support and general improvements need due to the poor quality grounds.

Mf – concern from ppl living in the area about park and ride in that area – recommendations laid down?

15/05/14

Js – a-12 (and in application drawings themselves A5) – it shows the landscape mitigation and tree planting and screening around the site. Looking from the point of view points from residents around the area. This has been discussed regularly with Leeds city council. The landscaping will surround the site to block the view. It is within the bowl of the former in fill quarry and the depot on the southern end is cut into the hill – it's much less prominent – it's cut into the hill so it's not on a high point.

Mf – only in the last couple of weeks that ngt confirmed there was a problem.

Js – certainly ground investigations were done in 2008-09 – along with desk studies - Interpretative report done on the ground conditions. The ground conditions have been well known for a number of years.

WEETWOOD RESIDENTS obj 1354 – MARTIN THOMAS

Mt – look at drawing 15 – take him north woods along the a660. we come to junction with burton crescent in the middle of the map – is north bound traffic able to turn right into burton crescent

Js – no it isn't

Mt – move to drawing 14 – cottage road – northbound traffic, is it able to turn right

Js – yes it is

Mt – egress from cottage rd onto ottlye road

Js – not restricted

Mt – neither north bound or southbound

Js – can left or right turn

Mt – park terrace – is northbound traffic allowed to turn right from ottley road

Js – can certainly right turn in – there are no restrictions can right or left turn out

Mt – hollin road – northbound traffic, is it able to turn right into this road

Js - yes it is

Mt – communities of weetwood etc – all off weetwood lane. Approximately 1200 dwellings, the issue is based upon accessibility by those communities to and from the a660. Currently we have access 6 options – ngt plans reduce that to 3. Do you recognise that?

Js – yes, I recognise we close in so the access options are reduced

The six options:

-northbound junction of weetwood lane with the outer ring road (the scheme doesn't affect that junction)

-glenn road (that will be traffic light controlled) – no prohibition of the right turn

-Hollin road (no longer able to do that – traffic will move to st. chad's road – 70m south of hollin road)

-st. chad's road (currently uncontrolled, will be traffic light controlled – can right turn in and out, and left turn out but not into it from the a660 – displaced to Hollin road 70m up to road)

-weetwood lane junction at the south point of weetwood lane with ottley road – (that is to be closed, no movements and displaced to st. chad's road)

-Moor road doubling back down cottage road – (that isn't affected)

Js – I'd agree the number of access points are restricted (because the give way junctions there are safety concern...consolidated into a signalised junction at st. chad's road)

Mt – the planned closure of weetwood lane junction – based upon 'it is an accident black spot'. If I can refer to your main proof (3-2) para 6.5.1 – you refer to 22 accidents and you conveniently

15/05/14

include Holin and cottage road in that total – if you look at the junction of weetwood with the a660 using your figures, the number of accidents over a five year period is 6 – 2 of which were defined as serious and no fatalities. Do you still regard that as an ‘accident black spot’

[inspector – where do these figures come from?

Mt - b-9(2) ‘transport assessment’ page 240-1, table 10.3, ref 8]

Mt – I am referring specifically to the weetwood lane junction.

Js - I think it is connected to Holin and cottage road – same network and can’t divorce it from those areas – can’t simply isolate them in that way. Council is concerned about safety at that location.

Mt – they were so concerned they came out with a proposal to close that junction, 14 months ago? And the residents en masse rejected that proposal?

J s- yes, I’m aware

Mt – your main proof page 66 para 6.5.2f – I quote ‘the potential closure of weetwood lane junction is proposed in the draft neighbourhood design statement – you are aware of the resident’s rejection.

J s- I am

Mt – the proposal to close that as not neighbourhood led, was it, it was council led?

Js – it was around the time the city council was looking to close weetwood lane towards end of 2014 – safety concerns. In terms of ngt, whilst it would help with safety in those areas, it was more other factors such as stop position, urban design etc. Leeds city council had one scheme with safety, and this ngt scheme was to do with other factors as well.

Mt – if we take the do nothing scenario, what are the plans for this junction under that scenario?

Js – if ngt doesn’t happen – Leeds city council did propose to close weetwood lane, they reduced that proposal due to rejections and also it was felt that ngt proposals was pre-empted – Leeds city council withdrew those proposals bearing in mind ngt was going to happen.

My view is that they would still close it.

Inspector – but under the do nothing scenario?

Js – the traffic modelling doesn’t allow for the closing of weetwood lane

Mt – we have had discussions about an alternative for weetwood lane junction with ottley road to make it a southbound only and retain the planned northbound entry through st chad’s road – are you aware?

J s- yes , the response has been – whilst it would go some way to reduce collisions it wouldn’t then allow for that stop.

Mt - it would do nothing o change the accident figures. The accident figures are pertaining to northbound traffic - it would be eliminated by the signals

Js – I don’t think it would entirely solve that issue

Mt – issue of parking spaces. A-11 and appendices associated with it – go to drawing 14 – ‘provision for short stay shopper and visitor parking is considered more important than commuter parking’ is what it says (from the SPD) – do you accept that that statement applies as much to the suburbs as the city centre?

Js – I’ll take it as that.

Mt – we residents who are users and customers of local businesses should strive to protect those businesses. You declare a reduction of 16 uncontrolled car parking spaces in far headingley (page 229 b-9). We would contend that it is considerably more than that because you have told the inquiry this afternoon that the row of shops north of cottage road will have their parking converted to loading and permit parking. Currently the only restriction there is 7.30 to 9.30 in the morning. What is permit parking?

15/05/14

Js – exact specification of how it works is to be discussed by business owners - Intended for business use.

Mt – we the residents would welcome a great deal more discussion about the opportunity to influence permit parking as it is important.

Inspector – would residents be involved?

Js – absolutely, it is for the purposes of the shops there so they should and will be involved in that.

Nb/ Lawnswood school – they were going to inform the programme officer that they wouldn't be cross-examining Smith.

LEEDS AND YORKSHIRE HOUSING

Stuart Nackhurst chartered town planners, objectors on the headingley lane

Sn – we've made objections on behalf of headingley land – we also rep moor house trust and leeds girls high school and land between those two. Questions based from the rose court nursery site to hyde park corner. 3 objectors on southern side of headingley lane (referring to 3 rebuttal evidences that Smith made to rose court nursery, headingley business park and the main school site obj 1608 (2 under that) and obj 1613)

Sn – impacts on those sites:

Sn - Rebuttal relating to Ford house nursery – first point you make in rebuttal is to do with impact of the classrooms and main hall. What are your thoughts on dominance – wall moved back 2m into the site. There will be a dominance issue and impact on loss of light.

Js – I can go through the dimensions and walls – but not sure what you mean as dominance (maybe for mr Walker)

Sn – the wall coming in within 2m and will start to block out light. Just that there will be an impact on the classrooms?

Js- yes 2m – yes that's agreed.

Inspector – can you agree the level difference as well

Js – its at the highway level – the difference in level between the highway and play area is about 2.8m.

Sn – fourth point in the rebuttal, para 2.8-2.10 the school has a system whereby deliveries are made by the northern road access. Children have free reign in the car parking area. The children know when they can move around safely. Its noted there is a functional replacement by providing onstreet delivery. Would you agree there is an operational harm by requiring th southern access as a potential delivery area

Js – certainly, we have provided loading areas on the highway from Buckingham road.

Sn – but if the southern access had to be used, it would be an impact

Js – I accept that

Sn – rebuttal argument no. 5 – in terms of timing is there sufficient flexibility within the programme to enable works to take place outside term time.

Js – the works are fairly substantial – some works will need to be at certain times but other works which then wouldn't happen for a period of time e.g. poles etc. and urban design finishes. So there will be some phasing – are you referring to those major works to the wall etc.

Sn – yes the removal of the retaining wall. That would be disruptive. Could it be negotiated to be in the summer holidays?

15/05/14

J s- depends upon length of out of term time. Difficult – look to start the work during that time but there will be risk factors around that and couldn't guarantee finishing by then. Promoters would be willing to discuss reasonable endeavours to do those major works outside of term time.

Inspector – how long without unforeseen circumstances, do you foresee it taking?

Js – difficult, contractor methodology is unknown. Looking at quite a few months. Depends if you're referring to bit right next to school or all the way along there

Sn – immediately on the school grounds – the clearly disruptive elements to it

Js –looking at realistically 3-6months.

Sn – confirm that you've been on the site?

Js – I was there

Sn – you've seen it from the external areas – look at appendix A page 4-5 – the site is a constrained site and uses the best of what it's got. **Given that the school is a fee paying school and has to promote itself – would you agree the school needs to maintain as good as environment as possible?**

Js – yes, it is a commercial enterprise and needs to attract students

Sn- one key thing listed is the play facilities – would you agree that what's there at the moment is a good use of the existing space

Js – yes I would

Sn – your rebuttal, page 7 table 2.1 – this table purely looks at quantitative impacts on the facilities and alterations that need to take place?

Js – yes

Sn – does it take account of deliverability? Is it only aspirational?

Js – there were 5 alternatives looking at potential to re-configuring the space. Of the options, the one presented here option 4 – offered the most area back. Drawings were discussed with the school and what would be where etc. so there are layouts for that play area within the options where things had been –

Sn – it is a desk space

Js – but ppl have looked at the levels etc

Sn – but again it purely looks at the quantitative rather than qualitative that could be provided

Js – we looked at all features e.g. outdoor classroom etc and where each could be provided

Sn – in order to provide option 4 – it's noted that the southern play area has been increased by 32sqm as well. That's purely done on providing spaces with existing nooks and crannies around the areas – again not a qualitative assessment, is it?

Js – I agree there is additional use of the southern area

Sn – with regards to design 3.6 the previous scheme – would the impacts I've outlined above have occurred using that scheme?

Js –there would be a greater area of take – around 2m difference

BREAK

[15:42]

Sn – headingley business park (obj 1613) rebuttal page 4 argument 1 – refers to the demolition of the property – you say it is a small area demolished. Would you not agree it is sufficiently great area?

Js – it is a small area at the northern end of the property - in terms of the size of that building

Sn – but then you go on to state that it is 25% of the property – is this not significant

15/05/14

Js – the term significantly demolished meant the majority of the building – that’s what I thought it meant but, yes, 25% will be taken

Sn – it says remedial works would be required - any assessment as to what those would be etc.

Js – makes good the demolished building and building will look like it does not- we need to do a full structural assessment

Sn – rebuttal argument 2 – loss of access/parking. There will be an impact on the site in terms of manoeuvrability and access and turning spaces?

Js – I agree with that

Sn – argument 16 (page 13) para 2.16.2 – can I confirm that you para is correct and ngt wouldn’t prejudice future developments of that site

Js – in terms of whether that will be made into a single access – it won’t be precluded by this scheme at all.

Sn – effectively if an application were made the simply principle of a two way access with a wider space wouldn’t be precluded as a result of ngt

sn- rebuttal 19, page 15 – with regards to objections on the widening or cycle lane in the area – the design freeze 6 did not include a cycle lane

js – you’re right. The settled position is DF7. I’ve been involved in all the designs

sn – in para2. 19.1 – you say that cycle facilities are essential for ngt proposals. Why it took till df7 for such an essential element to come in at such a late stage?

Js – it was always recognised as important – the corridor is heavily constrained so earlier proposals did look at whether we could squeeze something in there. Certainly sub-standard facilities were in, we decided after the project paused in 2010 and after it re-engaged in 2012 –following that we had meetings with the cycle forum etc and decided we did want to put in the full provision (g-4-47).

Sn – in terms of what is proposed now is that just meeting standards or over?

J s- it is just meeting standards

Sn – obj 1608 – former leeds girls school rebuttal – can we turn to page 4 – rebuttal argument no. 2 – confirms that the physical impact of df7 – require 2 buliding demolition and set back of retained wall – referred to 10 properties lost from the planned planning permission – also confirm removal of trees

Js – yes

Sn – differences between df6 and 7?

Js – widening of 2m or so along the lane –taking additional land compared to df6 (in 2010).

Sn – is the additional 2m what is required for the cycle lane

Js – no, it is what is required to have a safe layout for road users

Sn – as I said when I came back in 2012 we reviewed the situation – we wanted to make sure we had latest standards – we wanted to have the right guidance

J s- but did df6 have safe facilities for all road users

Sn – df7 has safer facilities for all road users. But df6 was safe too...but clearly df7 is safer.

Sn – rebuttal argument no. 3 – demolition of properties – what are the physical impacts on the site?

Js – it is about 3m – df6 was there to avoid these buildings as best as we could – we had to take some buildings further over and set back the wall with design free/3-6[??]– we were trying to avoid some of these buildings here...such as the launch and former stable block. Things were reviewed from that 2010 design. We knew that there was redevelopment of that site and intention to engage with developers about how masterplan of the site could be re-configured

Sn – rebuttal argument 7 para 2.20 – it looks at the headingley lane summary options report – it suggests that because the site was being redeveloped it created opportunities to amend ngt

15/05/14

proposals – are you aware that when the site obtained its planning consent it was designed with full adherence to design free/3- 6? The approval didn't have any regard to a cycle lane going in and the additional 2m of land take. Would you agree?

Js – yes I'm aware that it was based on the earlier design.

Sn – so at the time of design 3-7 taking place, redevelopment of the site already had planning permission, would you agree with that?

Js – yes

Sn – therefore what opportunity arose at the time for design free/3-7 to take place given that pp had been granted?

Js – it was to look at whether the site could be re-organised and reconsidered to take account of the additional widening and what opportunities for that there were

Sn – just to wrap up – the harms we've identified – would it be safe to say that without a cycle lane the additional requirements of demolition, removal of trees, impact to property etc. wouldn't occur?

Js – I don't think so – because it also affects the traffic lanes – we've got different widths in design 3-6 and design 3-7, can't look at it simply as if you drop the cycle lane you don't affect our site. Must consider safety for all road users.

Sn – g-4-90 headingley land options summary report – turn to page headed 'issues and revision record' – confirm that the person approving all the versions was yourself?

Js – yes

Sn – first version is dated sept 2013 – exactly when in sept 2013 was this?

Js – I don't recall exact date – but it wasn't a completed version (a draft) and it was in discussion with the promoters

Sn – the application for the TWA was lodged in sept 2013 and this doc was first completed in sept 2013 – would it be fair to say that it was done in a similar time? Or was it at the very beginning of September giving a couple of weeks for people to consider in drafting the submission doc?

Js – bare in mind that this is the doc that reports what happened but there were many months of discussion before this doc where all these issues were considered e.g. plans– it was definitely considered well ahead of September

Sn – this doc was produced well ahead of sept or just the docs that went into it were produced before sept?

Js – first working draft was produced in September which is essentially the end of the study period which was quite a few months ahead of that. These things were looked at for at least six months whereby we had drawings/looking at potential impacts on the site – the study period was before that ... this was when the first draft doc was produced for discussion with the client.

Sn – that's interesting because section 6.1 – conservation area consent applications specifically refer to this report and states that this report demonstrates that those conservation area consents represent the most beneficial option in terms of limiting the impact of designated heritage assets – this doc would have had to been produced well before sept 2013 in order for those doing the consent applications to fully consider it in their submissions, is that not correct?

Js – working draft was produced before application was made and circulated to those doing the heritage/ the team/ doing the heritage etc. that's why they've been cross referring to it. Although revision would have been made to it.

Sn – so it would have been circulated in early sept as a working draft

Js – although actually the widths, drawing etc. was seen well ahead of that. This was just the reporting.

Sn – but they specifically refer to this doc as being why they made those consent decisions. When I first saw this doc I thought it was a doc made well in advance which considered all the assessments that were given to people.

Sn – why delay between sept 2013 and march 2014 when this doc was then updated again and then in april 2014 – why was the original working draft not completed upon submission of the twa order.
Js –that was in connection with on-going discussions with the objectors, as you've seen we've actually changed things for the rose court nursery and whether things should be amended before the doc was finalised

Sn – and why was the doc not submitted as part of the evidence base?

Js – it has been submitted now as part of it, but in terms of why it couldn't have been submitted earlier – we see where the first issue was produced...

Sn – ok...thank you...

Sn – page 8 of the doc – I've just referred to the conservation area consents which referred to this doc saying that this report demonstrated all the options. However the second para on page 8 says this report has been prepared to summarise the design process. Is this simply what this doc is, just a summary of how decisions have been made or was it a doc that was integral to determining how the site/this development should take place?

s – this is the doc of the process, the study was the thing that determined the infrastructure

Sn – at bottom of page 8 –para 1.2, confirmation that design freeze 6 here didn't include the cycle lane in the area

Js – correct no cycle lane – it was a widened traffic lane

Sn – page 9 – need for cyclist provision. The bottom para states that it was identified that if further widening of the south could be achieved then it may be possible to accommodate an inbound advisory cycle lane beginning at Richmond road and in bound towards hyde park junction. Alternatively widens of the south and north of headingley lane would also provide the necessary facilities. It appears to see if you could do anything in southern park of headingley rather than take a full assessment of all the options in the area and what the harm would be in a north/south option, a purely south option or a no cycle lane at all option, is that correct?

Js – no all those options were considered, part of consideration was e.g. far more listed buildings on the northern side, far more side accesses etc.

Sn – I don't have any issues with the doc in terms of –

Inspector – so in terms of the listed buildings are we looking at the whole of the stretch of headingley lane rather than just the bit by the school

Js – yes it's the whole length – looking at whether we widened to the north or the south or a combination.

Sn – what might help is page 12, photo 1 – an overview of the study area. [sites I've referred to cover approx. 80-90% of southern part of the study area – the eastern park has the main school building, in the eastern part is headingley business park, left is rose court nursery]

Inspector – I just wanted to clarify about which bit you amend when you say there are more listed buildings...

Js – that is on the eastern or northern side – opposite to the school

Sn - Can you confirm if widening took place to the north of headingley lane would it physically impact on the listed buildings?

Js – the curtilage walls and setting for listed buildings but not necessarily the main building.

Sn – but also in terms of the southern part of the site it also has an impact on the curtilage of the listed buildings, is that correct?

Js – are you talking about the south...

Sn – e.g. main school site – there is a listed buildings and walls

js - yes

Sn – in terms of northern part of the site, would it have an impact physically upon any other buildings not listed – that I have identified heritage assets in the conservation area?

15/05/14

Js – no there wouldn't but it would have physical impact on all the side roads there which would all need to be re-graded which is quite steep – some on 9% or above. Makes them considerably steep – but in terms of buildings the access to some might need to be altered due to the re-grading and retaining structures. But not to the main building itself – only demolition of curtilage wall.

Sn – page 20 of the doc para 4.2.1 – stable block – you say that the structure has 'some' significance associated value has been lost by its use as a gymnasium use – you refer here to it having 'some sig' but in your proof you refer to it as having 'sig beneficial impact' - is it not correct that that building is listed as a positive building in the conservation area?

Js - direct to mr Ward

Sn – in terms of the second part of the stable block – it confirmed that the building could be partially demolished. Is that simply just looking at the property or has further work been done to identify that that could take place and remain structurally sound

Js – we went into the buildings, we did a structural inspection on both inside and outside of building Sn – have any plans been drawn up for the building to demonstrate if it were to be partially demolished the remainder of the building could be made good? And could be used in a functionally way?

Js – accompanying that structural inspection there was a report – saying that partial demolition could be feasible. In order to fully confirm that we would need to do more inspection. The findings of the report are that it could be partially demolished

Sn – page 24 options appraisal– para 5.1 looks at 5 different options – am I correct that df6 1a and 1b were those considered for df6 and the others after that for df7.

Js – at df6 – lots of options looked at e.g. impacts on buildings, a cycle lane etc. all those options have been looked at at various stages and also we reviewed it at various stages as well.

Sn – I was trying to understand myself as to what stage these reviews actually took place – my reading of this and could be wrong but it was that df6 1a and 1b were almost two options considered prior to the df6 being developed being that effectively df6 1a was chosen which was the widening of the south side of headingley lane. I then envisaged that further discussions took place which resulted in a cycle lane which resulted in the debate in options 5-6 which included discussions about a cycle lane going to the north and south – is that correct?

Js – df 6 – lots of options were looked at. Yes those were the two prime options that were look at. At df7 was looked at again, it was reviewed. Cycle lanes were a big issue and we wanted to ensure we followed the guidance so on that basis the df7 was changed.

Sn – at the point this doc was written, was it written in advance of df7 being determined or is it a retrospective assessment done to justify why that had been determined

Js – as I said the studies were ongoing the whole of summer when the application was put in.

Sn – I appreciate the discussions were done. But what I was led to believe this document was, was the doc which determined which option to take.

Js – that's not correct, this doc is simply reporting those things and making sure there is a doc that reports them and sets out the facts and the figures

Sn – so wording in the conservation area consent applications is incorrect?

Js – it's perfectly correct in that this is the doc that reports those facts and figures – I do stress to you it was a doc produced in advance of the order applications to which the heritage applications related to – the studies and work to determine df7 were done quite a way in advance of that

Sn – so it almost is a retrospective report (showing how those decisions were led to) as opposed to a proactive report. I'm just trying to get my head around how the decision came to changing the south. I would have expected that this report was done, put to project board to asses saying that 'there's our two options' but it appears they were given every single doc to review and this doc created afterwards to wrap up all the discussions.

Js – it is a separate reporting to project board and that is done by leeds city council officers producing briefing notes for them – as part of that these options here were put to the plans panel and were put to the project board. We couldn't have proceeded on a major option like this without that.

Sn – so effectively, this doc didn't form the basis of the decision making? When they decided to widen the south. This just reports how they came to the position, as opposed to guiding them to making this decision.

Js – I think that is correct. In terms of the guidance in making the decision that is in the reports that went to project board.

Sn – can we look at page 24 – high level environmental review – is this referring to ppl looking at the ES etc.

Js- yes they looked at the environmental considerations e.g. an additional tree survey was done, and as part of that work there it would look at how many trees would be taken on the southern side etc.

Sn – page 26 – traffic performance – I wondered what the background to that statement is

Js – if you've got narrowed lanes not enough for vehicles overtaking a cycles – that will invariably slow down the main line traffic flow

Sn – is that a subjective assessment

Js – that's correct

Sn – page 29 – 5.2.5 construction cost – so all costs were taken into account. Putting cycle lane into the south has resulted in a no. of impacts that wouldn't have occurred. E.g. demolition of buildings, putting extra playground facilities in the nursery – have they been incorporated?

Js – e.g. yes they were included in the costs

Sn – given that the buildings on headingley office park and the stable block haven't been established - how have costs been identified if nothing has been identified yet as to how they will be remediated?

Js – as I said work has been done – structural inspectors determining what the making good might be. Not detailed design stage yet – cost allowances have been made.

Sn – in assessing the impacts going north or south – often stated that the only ppl impacted are the two schools but doesn't recognise the business park. Is that material to determine how many ppl will be impacted to work out which way it will go?

Js – this study did take account of all affected parties on both sides of the road - extensive discussions with the girl school site developers as well as rose court etc. we are well aware of the issues

Sn – it doesn't mention the potential future residents of the girls school –

Js – they were considered – the master plan for the site has been reviewed – it continues post application to be reconfigured. We are well aware of all the impacts along that route and all considered.

Sn – page 43 – the city plans panel decided that it should be widened on the south but not north side of the lane. It appears that this very useful concise doc that takes in all the huge amounts of evidence on the various env impacts have been condensed into a report to identify how that decision was come to- but it isn't a report that was made in advance of the decision to guide ppl. In terms of the comments made by the plans panel – they would not have had sight of this doc is that correct.

Js – what they would have had sight of was the briefing paper briefing and additional briefing papers for the project board

15/05/14

Sn – did the briefing note have a clear guidance on what the impacts would be going to the north or south of headingley lane??

Js – it would have given the information

Sn – looking at the whole document it looks like it makes the decision that a cycle lane is needed on this small section in front of these properties – from df6 to 7 the inclusion of the cycle lane from the nursery to the school has sig impact which I will explore with other witnesses

Sn – but generally, was there an assessment carried out as to the balance of the benefits a cycle lane would bring against the negative elements that would come from impact on trees, listed buildings and conservation area and a decision taken on this route whether it was necessary to have that cycle lane and the impacts that would occur on this particular route?

Js – certainly the impacts were considered by the panel etc. but it is not just the question of putting in a cycle lane but for the safety of road users.

Sn – this doc 5.4.1 page 34 states that reduced lane widths are required at places where further widening cannot be achieved e.g. rose court nursery – should reduced lane widths occur where it cannot be achieved or in situations where it should not be achieved. i.e. where there is substantial harm to heritage assets?

Js – in terms of that balance - speak to mr ward

Sn – from a deliverability point of view –if it was considered that in this area the impacts upon the heritage assets/usability of the nursery etc if it could be proven that they would be reduced by the insertion of a cycle lane in this small section, could that be carried forward?

Js –its not advisable to drop cycle lanes in short distances as continuity does affect cyclists – not appropriate

Sn – so it could theoretically occur then

Js – it would introduce a conflict

Sn – so at no point have you actually done such an assessment? Its never actually been put in place to establish what the harm of putting in a cycle lane is balanced against the harm of not having a cycle lane. You just explained what the harm would be but if at the end of this process putting in a cycle lane would have sig detriment to this site – has that ever been balanced

Js - in terms of the engineering layout it is appropriate but in terms of a balance of heritage you need to speak to mr ward about that

Sn – finally, this report doesn't make that assessment does it?

Js – no it isn't intending to be.

Sn - As a report that chronicles what is discussed, it hasn't chronicled what I've just discussed which implies that it hasn't taken place, is that correct/

Js – in terms of that balance the discussion has taken place but it isn't in this report as this report is looking at engineering particular and lane widths

Sn – in any report you're aware of?

Js – in the application statement and the environmental statement. You need to look at the LBCs and the CACs – that is where the heritage points are considered

[16:31]

WEST PARK RESIDENTS – DOUGLAS KEMP

Dk – map 10, A-11 – in some respects its not a symmetrical route junction?

Js – yes

Dk – major concern is that coming down from the north to the south heading into the city you start off with 2 lanes and end up quickly into a merge lane situation

Js – if you are referring to the exit from the roundabout – the exit is 70m long clear with a further 40m overrun margin which is hatched off. That is satisfactory in my view

Dk – but around 50% reduction as to what is currently available

Js – that is beyond what is needed

Dk – but the currently situation in morning rush hours means traffic is queueing up to that sort of stage

Js – mr Robertson went through the roundabout traffic signalisation showing that it is working at capacity – the re-design will change things in that area

Dk – I fail to be convinced. Were you aware that a ped survey was carried out in lawnswood school in jan this year – (yes) – around 3 there is an outflux of children. The ped crossing at that stage has to cope with almost 150 students – given that these students will be using the trolleybus do you consider this to be a safe designed environment? I'm concerned about the ability of 150 pupils crossing within a 15 min period and also have space to wait for the trolleybus on the platform that has been designed.

Js – I'm aware of the survey undertaken on the 29 jan covering various periods including morning peak. we liaised with the school on this – it is set out in the rebuttal to the school obj 675 point 1 – that goes through the results of the ped survey and using those figures it looks at the no of peds that could be expected to use the crossing at any one time. It goes on to look at the available area on the traffic islands there (25sqm) and looks at how much space you would get per person. It takes that space and compares that with the Fruin level service categories. From that for the queuing it's category A (the best). I concluded there was sufficient space on that island at any given time.

Dk – you talk about a figure on average 11 pedestrians to use the crossing – are you using the average or worst figure? They will hardly be likely to cross in an orderly fashion. Are you correct in using an average rather than a max figure?

Js – it is the max figure – if you look at 2.10 in the survey, it says there is a peak 15 min ped demand with a two way flow of 158 peds. If that is the peak, the cycle time for the crossing is 60 seconds. If we look at how many ppl are in each crossing – that gives 10.53 (in the peak demand)

Dk – you talk about a two way flow but pupils all leaving in one direction

Js – it is using those peak max figures from the survey

Dk – in your doc app 3-2, rebuttal in respect of right turn concerns. Page 152 – your streets identified in 10.15.3-5 are all partially incorrect.

Js – I believe those to be the correct roads

Dk – in 10.15.3 – west park drive does not abut otlely road – I think you mean weetwood park grove in this para.

Js – we can certainly check the road names.

Dk – spen road not spen lane in 10.15.4 and 5. The implication for each of those roads is that you can turn left coming out of them but prohibited from turning right

Js – that's correct

Dk – if prohibition wasn't there, one could cross the ngt lane there and turn right

Js – yes

Dk – could I query the advice that came back to the rebuttal of a mrs Margaret Bell obj 08 – if I could refer you to page 6, point 2.4.2 – original issue was concerning the ability of the vehicle to come

from city centre to make right turn to their property, forcing residents who live there to [option 1] drive up the roundabout and do a u-turn around the roundabout... it's not as straightforward given the alignment of the roundabout. your rebuttal makes the point that she could stop in the outbound traffic lane and cross – technically possible but as bad as forcing people who come out of weat wood road to make a right turn there

Js – there is a possibility if it is there and easy to do so. We suggest that if that was not a comfortable manoeuvre then they can go through the roundabout.

Dk – the issue is that you are creating a traffic queue behind you while you are looking to cross over and although signals create gaps it is still not properly addressed.

Js – I acknowledge that the residents are there and want to turn right into the roads – but these vehicle no.s are extremely low – therefore no. of vehicles held up by them will be low – not as if it's a side road.

Dk – if it was a side road it'd be more of an issue?

J s- we'd design a junction if it was

Inspector – is there anything physical to prevent right turning

Js – in some locations there area

Inspector – so people could do illegal right turns

Dk – map 12 – west park roundabout – there you have otle road running around it and to the west spen road. Do you consider that the ped access across spen road has been adequately deisgned to protect their safety

Js – it has been improved on the current situation – right now v. wide crossing area with parked cars at the end of the crossing area. You cross between parked cars. We have made a build out to allow peds to have a good sightline beyond those parked cars to improve safety.

Dk – I'm not arguing that it has bee improved. Issues of the bus stop proposals being moved – it is a junction that will have more ped footfall in the future. I'm concerned as it is an uncontrolled ped crossing. It simply means the curb edges are dropped. Cars coming up from the city centre may not always signal and simply swing round – it is a junction that will still be a danger to peds

Js – in terms of cars coming through you do get good sightlines, its uncontrolled so clearly you need to watch out but its worth pointing out that this junction was looked at in 2010 and came up with a signalised arrangement for the crossing. But as soon as you start to signalise it it becomes a bigger junction with land take and further impacts. The df6 proposals had loads of feedback from the residents about retaining the current form – this was an attempt to retain the current form whilst improving on it. This was done in response to the West Park residents.

Dk – my concern is that I'm not convinced that that area has been designed to the best standard. It is enabling a large entrance and exit out of spen road. I'm still concerned that more can be done especially given the greater footfall.

Insepector – have you looked at the width of spen road?

Js –yes we have – this is an improvement, as you agreed

Dk – but not necessarily the best

Dk – one of the changes sheet 12, bus stop to be relocated to the north (black rectangle) – that bus stop now has moved across a junction which takes a fair degree of traffic into the village hotel complex. Again you are putting peds at risk causing them to cross unnecessarily.

Js – we covered shared bus stops. We looked at this location – the ngt stop is here, constrained by the boundaries surrounding it. We did have a bus stop immediately south of it – it was reviewed and felt that in terms of sight lines for the junctions it would be better to be relocated. That's why we can't put it immediately next to the ngt stop.

Inspector – so they're both relocated

15/05/14

Js - yes

Dk – bus stop on the outbound route – you made the point about not sharing buses and ngt stops but could I refer you back to 5.3.2 when you were discussing laybys. You said there may be a general principle involved in terms of how you use and site laybys but there are exceptions. I put it to you that this outbound stop might be an exception – no geometry problems, curb side capacity (this location is primarily a drop off point for buses and trolleybuses – unlikely it will pick up passengers here at the site as only site its heading for is p & r) so in fact this is a stop where its unlikely there will be conflict between ppl using bus and trolley but you are rigidly refusing to combine the two stops. There are other reasons – such as the network identity showing that ngt is a separate mode. I accept here there is no geometrical constraint, in the current bus stop usage data (Lancaster road) – both have 20 departures an hour, they are quite busy, if you had ngt services it would cause capacity issues even if some services are withdrawn. Its worth pointing out that what the scheme does – it still provides a stop here albeit an ngt stop – but also now provides you a bus stop here which is outside another line of shops. That means that they've now also got a bus stop right outside that parade in addition to the parade which ngt covers – it provides better coverage.

Dk – it perhaps represents a misrepresentation of this area – ppl who use these shops are those who travel by car e.g. for takeaways etc. again you are removing car parking space for businesses for these bus stops. Is it safe to say that the removal of the bus stop originally disadvantaged the 97 bus route.

Js – it doesn't in the application scheme put forward.

Dk – is it true in fact that putting the 97 in that area removes parking spaces for visitors

Js – we have put it as close as we can there. In terms of the road itself – there is still parking but there is also a bus stop

Dk – but it removes parking spaces?

Js- yes reduced but there is unrestricted parking all down here.

Dk – could I refer you down to Lancaster road – shown on the map there – did you feel there was anything specific about Lancaster road that warranted more consideration? Lancaster road is a major park and ride road for leeds metro uni – therefore more traffic coming in and out there including traffic turning right. Has this been allowed for?

Js – also traffic coming out of church wood from met uni – it has been considered. In terms of getting out of there it may be difficult at times but again there are signal crossing further up that will help break it up

Dk – there is a difference between there –

Js – yes no signalling on Lancaster road

Dk – so no gaps created from these junctions so there will be delays

Js – at times, inevitably one will have to wait. But just down from there you have Thornberry avenue and church wood avenue 100 m down with junctions that have signalling will break up the traffic flow.

[17:11]

END OF DAY