

20/05/14

20th May

Continuation - BILL MCKINNON CROSS-EXAMINING JASON SMITH

Bm – shared space in uni area – para 3.2.2 of your proof you state the design of ngt infrastructure has taken full account of relevant standards/guidance including ... [lists] subsection g) ltm1/11 shared space focusses on shared space in high street with emphasis on inclusive design (g-4-77). That doc is the local transport note from the dft – you state at para 5.2.3 of your proof “there are areas where ngt would run through an environment where all traffic shares the road space but restrictions limiting general traffic – this will be brought about by TROs and local traffic management. The environment will be a ped dominated one...” – so on. Para5.10.3 “all trolley vehicles will be fitted with a warning bell...use when approaching ped dominated shared space areas” and then at para 6.8.4 – sub para c) you say that speed limits accord with the guidance. Para 7.3.12 “shared spaces will be designed in accordance with best practice with 20/15 mile/hour speed limit” – that para lists the various shared space areas – around 12 areas. para 8.3.4 you refer to the shared space areas on wood lane. Will the trolley be occupying this shared space?

Js – on wood lane. No. it runs along the top and across wood lane...

Bm – in what sense is wood lane shared space

Js – between the pedestrians and the access traffic at Arndell southern entrance....and the medical centre

Bm – so that list – which ones are shared space that will be shared with trolleybus? The list at 7.3.12.

Js - holt park rise, southern end of weetwood lane (includes trolley stop and servicing), western end of wood lane (crosses wood lane – access traffic), when ngt comes off monument moor, woodhouse lane between st mark’s road and Portland way (shared with other public transport and with access traffic southbound on wood house lane to access Blenheim terrance properties), alongside woodhouse lane (only ngt and peds and cyclists), cookeridge st (predominantly ngt and peds but are sections which are shared with access traffic, city square, hunslet road (waterloo st – is ngt/peds), chadwick street – its peds/ngt/cyclists, whitfield way – only ngt ped cyclists, midland road also only ngt

bm – para 6.9.1 you’re referring to proposals for whitfields and you say at sub para c) “it would change currently ped st into one with motor vehicles although this would be considered a ped dominated env and 15 mile hour” – you said at para 7.3.12 that speed restrictions of 15/20 miles will apply in accordance with ltm 1/11 but para 6.7 of ltm 1/11 states that “aspects of street design encouraging low speeds of now more than 20 – and preferably 15 hours or less” – the speed restrictions you apply are not those recc by ltm

js –yes they are. We looked at 20 in areas with traffic. We looked at 15 in other circumstances like whitfield/millennium sq – it says up to – there is an upper limit. -

Bm – you say up to – but you say ‘15 mile per hour speed restriction’ – not ‘up to’

Js – that is the speed restriction – we state elsewhere. I made comment already about leeds city council giving recommendations for 10 miles per hour – and ultimately the council is who signs off on it so if they think 10 miles is appropriate and we discuss it – then we will reduce it.

Bm – he said he’s mentioned elsewhere that it states ‘up to 15 miles’ not ‘15 miles’ – please find it Inspector – is it necessary for him to do that? I think that’s been accepted...

Bm – numerous times in your evidence you stated the proposed shared spaces will be ped dominated – suggesting high level of interactions between peds and motorists

Js – yes

Bm –I go on to refer to para 2.8-10 of ltm 1/11 – look at para 2.10 and last part of 2.11 – “high level of interaction might be indicated by a ped beginning to cross a street without waiting for car to pass with expectation that it will slow down” – and 2.11 “as degree of shared-ness increases vehicle speeds tend to reduce” 1st part of para 2.10 – that means that in a ped dominated shared space the ngt will have to give way to peds?

20/05/14

Js - yes they equally have a right of way on the road as any other mode – the measures we have we have enforced the shared space environment...

Bm- this is the highest level of shared space?

Js – not necessarily. E.g. in leeds uni there is still access traffic to Blenheim terrace

Inspector – is the leeds uni ped dominated shared space the highest level?

Js – not necessarily there are different levels. Look at 2.12 table 2.1 – different levels of shared space design depending on traffic/curb/barriers. There is no one set design for shared space as it depends upon the type of street and exact circumstances. If you look at 2.4 – it says its more a broad set of design approaches to encourage sharing to improve street function. If we look at 1.2 in the Ltm doc – “there is no such thing as a definitive shared design and each site is different...”

Bm – but in your doc you described these shared space areas as ped dominated – you haven’t made a distinction

Js – there are different levels

Bm - you haven’t let us know what it is

Js – we are working on it with the ngt equality design access group

Bm – it is reasonable for lay person to presume we are talking about the most shared space

Js – there are different levels of sharing.

Bm – you said there would be a v. high level of interaction in these ped dom shared space

Js – yes there would be a high level of interaction – but there are different levels of shared space

Bm – as a matter of interest, what is a shared space that isn’t ped dominated?

Js – I was trying to get across not all shared space are ped dominated

Bm – for you ped dominated doesn’t really mean anything? Could just use the words ‘shared space’

Js – shared space is ‘ped dominated’ ...

Bm – you are saying all shared space is ‘ped dominated’

Js - yes as you would have limited no. of vehicles

Bm – in a ped dominated shared space there is no question of a trolley driver ringing bell for ped getting out the way – it is more to do with the ped moving in the path of the trolley and they will give way to the pedestrian

Js – yes

Bm – for this to be safe the trolley would have to move at a speed that would allow the trolley to anticipate this and stop in time – around 10 miles

Js – well...I think it says 15/20 miles for a ‘shared space’

Bm – you are taking this as a prescription from the Ltm – they are saying it should be that OR LESS – depending on the circumstances and you’ve said they were ped dominated. 20 miles is not a speed that allows it to stop quick enough

Js – it depends on the circumstances

Inspector – I’m getting confused – you’ve said that if there are lots of peds the trolley would stop until the peds get out the way – but that would be a long hold up

Js – the peds will see it and get out the way – happens in Manchester... it works in that way.

Inspector – so the trolley would expect ppl to move out the way

Js – but it would give way to peds – they should move on...

Inspector – so if there are peds in the way then they would stop and warn the peds to get out the way

bm– how is that different to what applies now in uk

js – lower speeds, demarcations etc added

bm – can I refer you back to the LTM – saying that a high level of interaction indicated by a ped crossing the street without waiting for car to pass with expectation it will slow down

js – yes

bm – suggests the ped has a right to expect this in a shared space

js – that should happen on any road

bm – you're saying the trolley is entitled to ring its bell for the ped to get out the way

js – yes – the trolley will give way – and then the ped should move off

js – so the ped should move out the way

bm – this is a ped dominated area – clearly everything we've looked at here is indicating ped has priority – trolley has to give way to peds and shouldn't be tooting its horn at them

js – you are correct – ngt should give way – but if the person hasn't moved then it make the person aware the trolley is there

bm – no that's not the same thing

inspector – if a child ran out what is the max braking force that the trolley bus could apply

js – on that one- it's different for each vehicle. If we take the worst case – it is 2.5 m per second squared – but other trolleys can do 3 or 4 metres per seconds square. The road would generate at least 0.25 G.

Greg Jones – I asked this witness to provide braking distances

Bm – I was interested in the braking force – what would the effect on the passengers in the vehicles be on this jolt of 0.25G?

Js -situation in cars and other vehicles more severe in those – other vehicles more towards 0.4G or beyond

Bm – what would effect on passengers be in terms of injury

Js – if you sat down there is no effect but standing up – unsteady on your feet

Bm – [how passengers react?]

Js – about 0.25...

Bm – what would the effect be on standing passengers – the braking force of say 0.4G

Js – well...certainly they will feel it – more unsteady on their feet and grip onto a handle.

Bm – any injuries

Js – we are talking about emergency situations and not the normal service brake.

Bm – no injuries?

Js – can't say that depends on who's in the vehicles – what they are doing

Bm – so you don't know the range of injuries that could be produced at that force

Js – don't know if uphill/downhill or have hand hold etc

Bm- you're creating lots of shared space along the route aren't you – but you've not created any on monument moor ? which is public realm/open space why is that

Js – there would be a level difference between the ngt alignment and the rest of the moor

Bm – what is the arrangement for the moor then in terms of safety

Js – there'd be a low height fence between ngt and rest of moor – mr walker deals with this – one that delineates ngt from rest of moor

Bm – will it be gated either end to prevent children from entering that fenced off area

Js – no

Bm – dangerous?

Js – no ... its low speed, if someone was wandering around the trolley will slow down and wait for them to move off

Inspector – is that a low speed area... its not got a speed restriction other than 30 miles?

Js – no

Inspector – so could effectively be travelling at 30...

Js – yes that's correct

Bm – child could potentially be trapped in that area

Js – they'll clear of the normal swept path of the trolley bus

Bm – (BRT standards) appendix bm89 in volume two of the appendices attached to my proof – what is the average speed of the trolley in shared space areas?

20/05/14

Js – check with chadwick as he's done run time assessments

Bm – if we could look at page 15 of my appendices – section 10 of your proof you give responses to objectors including in 10.7.2 response to mr anzir bodoo's submission for the CiLT – you state that 'ngt has been assessed by CiLT as passing the ITDP category and has been awarded a bronze award – bodoo suggests changes to put it well inside the silver category...some issues already dealt with so the ngt will gain points in this...." effectively you are saying there that it's not entirely relevant to the UK?

Js – yes

Bm – the bronze category is the score that mr bodoo awarded to ngt

Js – yes

Bm – BRT standards assesses transit schemes and can award up to 100 points – 85 – gold, 65 silver and so on

Bm – you seem to suggest that ngt deserves more points than that mr bodoo awarded?

Js – I'm happy with the score – but he suggests things which would help to get the scheme relatively easily more points.

Bm – page 16 of the BRT standards – bus way alignments – there is a table with various descriptions. Do you agree that the description which best suits ngt is the one second from the bottom 'bus ways operating by virtual lanes'

Js – I don't think I should be attempting to score the scheme myself – it's an independent scoring

Bm – but you've endorsed mr bodoo's scoring of the scheme - you're not prepared to go through the BRT scoring with me right now?

Js – I'm happy with the scoring mr bodoo's given it – it's for independent ppl to score the thing

Bm – but he's a supporter of ngt – he's not an objector is he?

Js – he's put in a representation

Inspector – do you know what mr bodoo's scored it?

Bm – I don't know the scoring ... I couldn't find it in the proof of evidence

Inspector – so I'm assuming you've put it in the second category to the bottom of the table

Bm – it's interesting that haskins thought to dismiss the BRT standard as a subjective test but it isn't at all – they are all questions with clear cut answers. I was interested as mr smith endorsed mr bodoo's assessment in his proof. You've not actually been through that assessment have you?

Js – I haven't seen mr bodoo's scoring, no ... he focuses on detailed changes for each area – he doesn't set out in detail he's scoring.

Bm – I wanted mr smith to go through the BRT assessment and award it scores so there'd be no question...

Inspector – you'd like him to make his own decisions but are you able to do that?

Js – I'm not happy to go through it now but it's been done independently by mr bodoo and mr mckinnon – they resulted in very different scores so clearly it is a very subjective view on the scoring. But it may be useful to get bodoo's scoring to see how he assessed it.

Bm – they're all v. straightforward questions which I think you know but don't want to answer.

Inspector – mr smith might not want to commit himself to these differences...

Bm- I assure you there is no subjectivity to these questions

Cameron – if you go to mckinnon's proof on page 52 – it may be that if we are going to proceed expeditiously mr smith isn't asked to carry out this exercise on the hoof but go away and do it and provide it later.

Inspector – the time would be better served without going through everything at this venue.

Jones – so far as we're concerned this witness has in his evidence endorsed an assessment and mckinnon entitled to ask if he's gone through it. He's said he hasn't – he is entitled to then ask him to go through it. He says he's endorsed it but actually he hasn't even seen the scores then....

Inspector – if mr smith is put on the spot now and he hasn't done the exercise, it's a waste of time. I don't see how we're going to go through it all now if he thinks he needs more time to consider it.

20/05/14

Js – let me clarify - what I said is that I recognise what mr bodoo has done and recognise areas he recommends changes in – I recognise that he has done this assessment and I am happy to do one myself and put a note in when I'm finished as a witness.

Bm – would I be able to come back and question mr smith on it

Inspector – you can make submissions etc.

Bm – while we're here, can we deal with the BRT basics...

Cameron – it seems now it's a half way house –

Bm – there are 4 questions asking if scheme can be called a BRT – I would say that this scheme deals with 2 ... page 18 deals with dedicated rights of way – mr smith do you agree that the description which best describes ngt is the one second from the bottom 'delineators only...etc...'

Js – yes I do

Bm – we can award 2 points to the scheme which then overall doesn't qualify it as BRT ... it's fallen down on that

Js – its 55% segregation – there are various definitions in terms of what BRT is.... It's 55%. Whilst physical segregation is 55% there are further lengths of coloured pavements/demarcations in the urban design plans which apply to other areas which might not be shared [hasn't been taken account of in that calculation] – you have to look at the urban design plans by mr walker.

Bm – what do you mean by coloured pavements

Js – reading it ... if these coloured pavements apply to over 75% of the scheme – 55% is not necessarily the amount of demarcation... actually there will be more of that if you look at the coloured surface.

Bm – when you were presenting your evidence you said there would be no need for segregation at holt park as traffic flows freely there

Js – yes

Bm – it flows freely where it crossed woodhouse moor as well no?

Js – it was other issues we discussed yesterday for the moor

Bm – you said that it had to go through the moor to ensure that the capacity increase will be catered for - shouldn't you be building segregated lanes in holt park now so that you are future proofing it there as well?

Js – at monument moor – the right turners and variability of them were a big concern – those might well grow in the future. But general traffic growth was not so much of an issue at holt park. It is a problem for hanson at a traffic level.

Bm – you're a civil engineer – when you're designing a bridge you do it to future proof the bridge

Js – you design it to cope with normal highway loading

Bm – you don't take into account projected traffic growth

Js – no you take that into account in the normal highway loading

Bm – so the answer is yet

Js – 8j loading is normal

Bm – so normal highway loading includes future growth

Js – it's not related to traffic flow...

Bm – so we're splitting hairs again aren't we...

Js – I'm just saying it's designed for normal highway loading and that's it.

Bm – my understanding that a normal project you would take into account future highway growth – and I suggest that this should be taken into account in all the highways changes here?

Js – it is a highways project ... but in terms of the regeneration of the scheme that's for another witness

Bm – when we were talking yesterday you said that Buckingham road would be regarded – as you know the ngt proposal is that the a660 will be widened by a metre at that point on one side of the road.

[11:08]

20/05/14

Bm – you told us yesterday it would be regarded as a660 will be extended southwards and that is a steep slope – what I'd like to know is how that will be done- entire length or top?

Js – part of the top (red and white lines) –

Bm – if just that area it will make it lot steeper isn't it?

Js – yes

Bm – more dangerous junction

J s- no we are improving that junction at the minute its quite steep but we are putting in a slacker corner at the top.

Bm- but I've used those slacker corners and still difficult junction to go on – increased traffic at this junction?

Js – that's considered –the p4 plans allow for a turning at Richmond avenue. But yes we do stop at Richmond road so there will be additional right turners here (Richmond avenue)

Bm – my concern isn't right turning traffic onto Buckingham road but the traffic coming up the road from residential are further south – there will be more traffic due to stopping up at Richmond road coming up to a junction

Js - I said that its improved in terms of the crest curve at the top that has been slackened – we designed this in 3D with a vertical alignment

Inspector – available in the evidence?

Js – no but we could make that available.

Bm- you refer us to one of your colleagues regarding average shared space speed – you must have some idea

Js – different in different areas... uni area is 20 and given that it will be at stops and other things like junctions... it will be 10/15 miles that sort of range...including stopping. That is the example of the university but if you take whitfield where its 15 at the max and it's got sight lines slowing down at the junctions it would be somewhat less than that.

Inspector – is this a convenient break?

Bm – just wondering if it would be alright if I asked a few questions on mr elsworth's behalf?

Inspector – mr Cameron sorted out something as a written response

Cameron – mr elsworth set out his questions in writing and we said we'll respond in writing

Inspector – if it's quite brief I've got nothing against you asking a couple of them...but I don't want to spend a lot of time

BREAK

11:30

Cameron: mr smith was asked about the plan drawing showing vertical alignment (slope) at Buckingham road and a660 – this info has been brought to my attention as already been in the Inquiry note s- Rebuttal to the moorley house trust obj/1608. We won't be putting in a note as its already there.

Bm – you stated that in the shared space areas the trolleys will be giving way to pedestrians

Js – yes

Bm – has that been factored into the run time reports – as that will slow the trolleys down

Js – mr chadwick did the runtime assessments

Bm – I've got them here – I asked you about the average speed – the uni area average speed is 15.5miles per hour not taking it into account...

Js – I haven't done runtime myself – there are two areas where it will come to a halt and wait – so it may well take that into account.

Bm – so it will be 15.5 miles where there are loads of students

Js – if you are stopping at stops and dwell time at 20 seconds that will reduce your average speed.

Bm – do you accept its topping the ppl in these shared space areas and it will slow the trolley down

Js – yes

Bm – it would have an effect on the run time

Js – it would

Bm – so it should be taken into account in the run times

Js – yes

Bm – if the trolleys are going to be slower then we need to have more trolleybuses don't we

Js – ask chadwick about what is included

Bm – we need to know as it has a knock on effect on the business case – to maintain to existing run time.

Js – speak to chadwick

Bm – mr elsworth is disabled but he is not here as he's unwell – these questions are a matter of great concern. You've put forward various things in ngt docs that should be happening with regards to the proposals – e.g. distinctive geometrics, high contrast type face. Mr elsworth is concerned that when it says 'should' it means 'will' or just an aspiration? – he's given an example here of (a-08K) high contrast type face that is easy to read in the distance. Why use 'should' instead of 'will'?

Js – doc by mr walker – my view on this is that it is part of the ES and the mitigation measures within the ES is part of planning condition 22.

Bm – we'll get more detail from mr walker. It's almost as if some rec has been given to mr walker and he's simply reproduced it here rather than saying that this will happen.

Js – not my work. But I do say that all the mitigation within the ES is a condition.

Bm – he's asking about induction loops – he is making the comment that it is not useful for blind ppl

Js – not my area

Cameron – distinguish between request for info and challenge on an assessment being made

Bm – page 3 of mr elsworth's questions – asking about artificial noise e.g. bell ringing. If the artificial noise system fail will the trolley bus cease to run immediately to safety is maintained?

Js – this system has been considered as part of a detailed consideration for the vehicle – those operational issues have not been determined yet but part of the detailed design...

Bm – you agree it would be dangerous for the trolleys to continue operating or something not considered yet?

Js – the artificial noise for shared space areas is being considered – e.g. in what circumstances it can be used...

Bm – the artificial bell could break down too?

Js – if it didn't have a bell/horn it wouldn't comply and wouldn't be on a road

Bm – which is it horn/bell?

Js – could be a bell or a horn...

Inspector – is the bell or horn part of the normal specifications? To make it road worthy?

Js – yes it wouldn't run without that

Bm – closing off of various turns in hyde park corner junction – do you know how many vehicles currently use the roads? How many vehicles will be diverted on to those smaller roads?

Js – matter for GR as it's a junction and capacity

Inspector – b-9 shows the actual forecast flows of traffic

20/05/14

GREG JONES CROSS-EXAMINATION ON BEHALF OF COLLEGE OF ARTS

Gj – stage one road safety audit dated march 2014 handed in last week (APP 106) – I want to be looking at the original scheme for the college which I find in a-05 technical landscape drawings and also rev-p4 march 2014 revised drawings. Also please have mr smith's proof and rebuttal to college of art (obj 1604), and also the proof and appendices of mr Stewart Wilkins highways expert witness to the college. Last week you remember I asked you the scope of your instructions/design brief etc. which you will provide when you're out of the cross-examination. We agreed certain parameters under which your role was set.

If we can go first to the design initially promoted by you for the college. Go to the September drawings on drawing m4-931/124 – were you here when mr Farrington gave evidence?

Js – part of it

Gj – it's fair to say that the position of the college, certainly until they put their objections in, initially overlooked by the promoters

Js – the consultation dealt with by mr Haskins – I appreciate could have been greater consultation...

Gj – we can all agree that. For example, it does relate to the design of the highways treatment because you also have to consult with the colleagues when you design something in terms of what impacts going to be...

Js – yes

Gj – it's fair to say that I don't think the team working on it appreciated there was a college of arts there rather than office block

Js – they did appreciate the college was there but maybe not the rooms e.g. the library etc. certainly that initial team was done as a starter for 10 as discussion for consultation with the college. You are right we need to consider all the impacts

Gj – the scheme was at an advanced stage wasn't a starter for 10 – that's a matter of fact. But we can agree that the college wasn't identified as a sensitive receptor e.g. for noise

Js – mr Forni will deal but yes

Gj – you don't design in a vacuum – just to see the degree of understanding and thought that went into the initial design – if we look at the original proposals a-05 – its important to know the function of the receptor (i.e. my clients - e.g. highways and noise), you also need to know the layout and also know how that layout works together in terms of space and whether if you're going to compulsorily acquire it what that function is and if you give space in return whether that's useful

Js – that's correct

Gj – this initial design you hadn't been fed by the team really v. much detail had you about the various internal functions of the college? We see that a sig section of what is the sitting out section/recreational area of the college – it was due to the taken and also we see that the curb way of the ngt scheme comes up to a couple of metres from the main entrance of the college – where there is considerable footfall. Once you appreciated that is it fair to say (we see the reaction from Farrington's evidence) – the meeting 'hit the fan' that was a serious oversight in terms of the planning of the scheme?

Js – I think consultation could have been better we started off with this proposal and we then looked to see what we could change in response to that

Gj – knowing what you know now, there is no way in which this proposal would be advanced as a proposal that would be regarded as acceptable to the college of art.

Js – yes not to the college

Gj – even further, that degree of unacceptability is reasonable and rational

Js – there are impacts on the college

Gj – those objections were entirely reasonable and rational

Js – they were from that perspective

Gj – from any one's

Js – I think it could be improved

20/05/14

Gj – answer the question – it is not a scheme that you would be advancing as a good scheme in so far as its treatment of the college of art – as a highways engineer?

Js – in terms of college it is subjective view – should have been improved

Gj – so the answer is yes.

Js – as you can see with the additional info we got for the use and function of the building we have moved it away from the building.

Gj – we will come on to that. It is something that I recorded you as saying as something that could and should have been improved.

J s- yes

Gj – the key question is whether these improvements are meaningful. Do you recall evidence in chief in respect of the land lost? You said ‘I think promoters are trying to be helpful to objector’s if you can....etc. communal seating in Blenheim walk....total of land space taken is offset by more land being offered back’ – in terms of whether land has been taken and offered back – whether that is regarded as an improvement depends upon the function and use of the two pieces of land doesn’t it?

Js – yes

Gj – if we have a look please at the proposed alterations – you’ve pulled away from the entrance and also pulled away from the loss on Blenheim walk of the loss of the seated area – I want to focus on the area of land gain that is offered by the promoters on the side road – that is being referred to in that more land was given back in comparison to being taken away. In terms of performing any useful function – what useful function do you envisage the college putting to that?

Js – circulation space outside the main doors, space for gathering and events also outside main entrance

Gj – grass verge area extends back...I’m particularly interested in that...looks like a liability. Do you expect students to sit out and have sandwiches there?

Js – really to replicate the existing use.

Gj – well...the existing use...the recreational area is all along Blenheim walk...on the north east side road it’s just brick wall isn’t it?

Js – yes

Gj - There’s no access or egress for students or any particular views overlooking that road...no interrelationship between users of college and that road.

Js – well there is on the corner... as you go further up it does get to the college wall.

Gj – so that land going towards the north east has no function for the college does it?

J s- as you go further up st mark’s road I agree that the land area does get smaller

Gj – I’m not putting it getting smaller but whether you count it as you do as providing any benefit to the college?

Js – well it can be used as you said for sitting out and eating sandwiches

gj– what benefit does up the side by the wall provide - you are suggesting students will sit out on that grass verge there?

Js – look at the landscape drawing – app 10-3-4 page 8 – appendices to mr Walker’s evidence – Inspector – this one doesn’t show the existing situation... whichever explains it best...

cameron – there is an existing OS11 in mr walker’s docs

gj – whilst we are waiting for that we can look at the map and compare the two areas – we need to consider if this is going to be used as a meaningful sitting out space or to be enjoyed in conjunction – we can agree this, it can’t be enjoyed in conjunction with the existing sitting out area of the college on the other side which you can’t see?

js – that’s right it’s around the corner

gj – when they are having their lunches – we can agree there is no relationship at all in terms of use sitting there as one does at the moment ... you won’t be able to see whatever it is at the corner?

Js – yes we can agree on that

20/05/14

Gj – so far as any additional space up st mark's beyond the entrance – that has no functional relationship with any college space – there is no access or egress in that area

Js – no not beyond the main entrance

Gj – do you know whether it will be grass or concrete?

Gj the grass by the red mini in the picture that has no use so far as the college is concerned...it doesn't even expect students being there. That won't be used as a recreational space for the college

Js – mr walker shows there is a plaza area from the main entrance on the side – then he stopped at that point but he could put it further down if college wants it

Gj – it has no relationship to the function of the Blenheim walk side which does have recreational space. Even the plaza area...won't be used. The immediate space next to the main entrance is a lump of concrete – you suggesting it will be plaza?

Js – mr walker is suggesting it will be.

Gj – how do you think it will be used as? You said it's a great advantage and you are actually giving more land than that taken away

Js – circulation space which was previously curtailed...the discussions that have been had with the college on how they will use that space was through mr walker – this is a suggestion and will be developed further as to how to use the space.

Gj – there is no problem as to the circulation space in the original – it's not been developed in consultation with the college has it?

Js – the plaza on st marks?

Gj – it's not been developed in consultation – you put forward scheme a and they rejected so you put forward scheme B – there was no consultation between that

Js – mr walker was in consultation

Gj - after you presented them not whilst they were being drawn up, am I correct?

Inspector – was the design looking at another engineering way of doing this junction?

Js – absolutely – feedback from the college, then we wanted to move Blenheim walk highway as far away as we could whilst still having a functioning junction – we also moved st. mark's area to make it available even college doesn't use it.

Gj – the position was that in engineering terms you hadn't appreciated how the college operated. The college objected to scheme A, and then scheme B was presented but there was no consultation with the college between scheme A and B being presented to the college and indeed in your jan plans?

Js – I don't think I can answer the question – from scheme A I got feedback from the college...

Gj – no, please answer the question. It's a very clear question.

Inspector – are you aware of consultation between the two before you arrived at this final B scheme?

Js – scheme b is in response to the initial feedback

Gj – the objections from the college

js – mr haskins is the one to talk about consultation – we got feedback for scheme A then we moved it and then there were lots of meetings around scheme B

gj – the feedback were objections to a scheme were a CPO had been served – scheme A am I right? Scheme B, there was then, as far as you're aware, there was no meeting/consultation after scheme A had been objected to in which there were discussions about an alternative scheme until the January transport assessment was produced

js – not being directly involved (mr haskins) – I can only tell you what feedback we received as a design scheme and moving forward with scheme B

gj – yes – I'm suggesting to you what didn't happen was a meeting which instead of being presented with Scheme B there should have been discussions

inspector – can you be a bit more discussions

js – I'm aware of discussions with the design scheme...

inspector – so you are not aware of the meetings with the college

20/05/14

js – no I'm not aware of them

gj – so far as you are concerned you never met with the college before scheme A

j s- I didn't personally but members of the design team that drew out the layouts did

gj – that's mr haskins...but after scheme A you (And any juniors within Mott Mcd) did not meet with the college?

Js – so mr walker has met with the college – we can give you the dates of that...

Gj – is he a highways engineer

Js – he is part of the team

Gj – that was to present the scheme in jan 2014 –

J s- we can get you the dates of the meeting – I'm aware of the fact that mr walker did meet but don't know when

Gj – my team is very clear that you've not met with them, and mr walker met to present in Jan 2014 scheme B which appeared then in the transport assessment?

Js – ok if its jan its jan – we can check on the dates but I'm happy.

Gj – if that's right, that suggests there was no consultation at all

J s- again in terms of consultation with the team....

Gj – if that's right?? Assume that my instructions are right? That suggests that there was no consultation with the college between scheme a and b

Js – it does suggest that but we will get the dates of the college

Gj – it's been a source of great concern so much so that farrington had to have a meeting with the college

Gj – if the inspector takes the view that the additional space (green space/fence behind the bushes) on the side has no function or use for the college that would be a material point against the argument you put forward that in fact the college was gaining more land that it was losing – you've got to look at whether there's a functional use yes

Js – yes – and as far as I'm aware that is being discussed with the college.

Gj – is it you that it is going to be a piazza?

Js – walker

Gj – if again on the face of it it's been produced as an engineering response – is it right to say that when faced with the college's objection I suggest that the team meeting went something like this?

What can we do within the confines of the red line? You were faced with the fact you had to deal with the entrance from a highways engineering point of view – the curb was coming right up to that main entrance... that was a key concern

Js – yes it was

Gj – the second key concern you were taking a substantial amount of the outdoor recreational seating area –

Js – yes

Gj – if we look at this college it isn't blessed with lots of open space – it's the only open space for any recreational activities it has

Js – yes

Gj – it's of a premium value for the college and there are no obvious place around the side which one can reconfigure short of massive demolition to create alternative usable space around the college

Js – yes

Gj – priority one – no go in terms of the entrance, and second point in terms of the recreational space. That is the driving force for the new scheme. Creation of the st. mark's space is not in any way a design outcome in order to create any

Js – brief was to put two roads as far away to the college as possible – ti was to create usable space but also main point was to decrease noise etc.

20/05/14

Gj – you weren't aware of the footfall in front of the entrance did you when you designed the first scheme

J s- no

Gj – no competent highways engineer would have come up with scheme A if you knew what the footfall was?

Js – you've still got an amount of space outside the front door

Gj – if you'd had known about the footfall no competent engineer would have designed it like that

Js – clearly...

Gj – I'm giving you the opportunity – that you didn't know that the college foot-fall was as such

Js – no, we didn't

Gj – that's the main priority and the second issue is Blenheim walk is it?

J s- yes

Gj – in that context, well as a result there is some additional space created along the side road – we see there in the photo have you taken into account when assessing your evidence about the value of it – advice on whether or not the land is largely to be in the shade/sun when compared to that land being lost?

J s- no, I haven't looked at that

Gj- we'll see that the side road is the shadier side isn't it

Js – yes it appears so

Gj – that might also explain when the original architect designed it they put the amenity space on the sunnier side

Js - that may well be

Gj – can we look please then in what the new scheme B does – in terms of highways we go don't we from what is one way traffic to two way traffic?

Js – yes

Gj – there are a number of factors – can we take up app106 – there's a couple of things – its dated march 2014. But as I understand it, we see that it's revision B – 18th March (Mr Weir and Mr Smith approves it). We have to be clear about this – this is Mott Mcd's response to the stage one safety audit during June/July 2013. Is para 1.1. is the wording yours or LCC?

Js – ours

Gj – it says that it recommends more safety assessments should be done in relation to the amended p4 drawings – there have been amendments so when are we going to see the supplementary audit dealing with these?

Js – it's not in evidence but LCC has issued us the safety report and we can write a response to it.

Gj – it is very important – I need to cross-examine in respect to any amendments made

Js – no designer's response has been done in respect to road safety yet

Gj – no, so far as I'm aware, LCC bit of the audit...when did you get that? The supplementary?

J s- in the last couple of weeks

Gj – why wasn't that explained when this doc (the LCC audit) was put in? and why wasn't it put in if you have had it for weeks? Why was it not explained that this June response didn't cover the revisions/amendments?

Js – it is explained there that there will be a supplementary road safety audit – we haven't done a designer's response but we are happy to put it in

Gj – answer my question – why wasn't it put in?

Js – it should have been introduced...

Gj – can I suggest, that on the face of it, this is essentially a highways scheme being promoted...

Js – correct

Gj – so how long is the scheme running for?

Js – 15 km

20/05/14

Gj – this audit seems rather thin and general for a scheme of that nature. Just because it's a long scheme doesn't mean that the details of the junctions etc. should be treated in a general sense

Js- this is done by LCC – independent road safety audit team...this is what they've given us and I'm sure they've done a thorough job.

Gj – I put that the audit seems, I suggest, rather thin in terms of detail for a scheme raising so many issues

Js- I don't think so...there is some detail in some areas.

Gj – 2.5 of the audit doc app 106 – the issues are raised in general non-specific ways (e.g. ped accident problems for roads converted from one to two ways running) – where does the audit identify which of the areas of the scheme that has changed from one to two ways which are of particular concern?

Js – that is the total of the text for that particular issue...

Gj – if we look at issues raised – you are looking at this but it doesn't actually identify any particular stretch of the ngt where the auditors have particular issues – just raises a general point

Js – no, the general points are in section 2 and specifics are in section 3 relating to each drawing.

Gj – but if there's a general point I understand that should then not be ignored it

Js – that's correct

Gj - we've seen that there are more accidents from roads that have been converted from one to two way running. When we're dealing with the college of art one particular issue is that a high volume of pedestrians particularly during term time will be students?

Js – yes

Gj – in terms of the audit having raised as a general problem in the city centre accident problems arising – in terms of students who enter and leave at fixed points that is a peculiar factor isn't it that doesn't apply generally?

Js – I'd agree

Gj – so has there been any particular analysis of whether that poses any particular challenges over and above the norm

Js we clearly have the measures on there in terms of the speed limits/widened footways

Gj – answer my question – I haven't found where the fact that this problem (relating to college of art pedestrian patterns) has been addressed. Do I find it set out anywhere? In terms of the extent in which road signs etc are effectively within different types of ppl and also the differences in ped flows.

Js – it's addressed in the design –

Gj – do I see these issues set out and addressed

Js – it's addressed in the design

Gj - please take me through it

Js- this is evidenced in the drawings you're looking at

Gj – your answer is we have dealt with that in the design – how is the design different in any way because it is a student body than it is if it was just a general ped body.

Js – we put in more ped crossings, wider crossings and walking route through wood house lane

Gj – I suggest there is nowhere that you identify the particular requirements of students. The only design response is simply to pull the route away from the building. Can you point me to any written evidence where you've identified those student concerns which we accept are different to the normal ped flows.

Js – the flows have been accounted for in the designs.

Gj – my clients have actually produced ped counts after your scheme was designed. My understanding from GR was that the promoters didn't carry out any flows prior to the design of scheme B

Js – yes

20/05/14

Gj – so you are not being accurate when you say that the scheme was designed with those pedestrians in mind

Inspector – answer the question and then clarify

Gj – I'm suggesting to you that your answer which said you had particular student flows in mind when designing you scheme B – especially when taking into the fact that you hadn't done any ped counts...

J s- we didn't have ped counts at the scheme A stage. For Scheme B we got the ped counts from the survey that mr Wilkins...

Gj – no you'd already designed scheme B then

Inspector – did you have ped counts when you designed df 7?

Js – no we didn't have specific ped counts at that point

Gj - and you only got it when mr Wilkins put in his proof of evidence. When did we exchange it?

Js – 1st April.

Gj – scheme B was January 2014. So not right to say the scheme was designed with any regard in respect to the ped flows of the student body at all.

J s- we did know there were lots of students and so we put in wider crossings and two crossing routes.

Gj – the widths we put in for the split islands are the min widths under standard road traffic guidance on Blenheim walk

J s- the desirable width is 3 m but many go down to 2m. this is 3m at the southern end and 3.5m at the northern end.

Gj – the min desirable width is 3m isn't it?

Js – yes if you can put that in

Gj – we haven't even got on to the particular student needs and how they respond to conventional signs and fact that the flow is controlled by lectures etc. just looking at the gen guidance the min width is 3m. that's not evidence is it that you've designed the scheme to accommodate the particular needs of students as that is the min desirable width for the general populous without regards to the student pop.

Js – we are then putting wider islands on the northern side of the junction – towards the student accommodation there... the flows will be split across the junction

Gj – in terms of whether this can be counted as a benefit of the scheme – the point is that your initial evidence is on the basis of the old infrastructure (island crossing)– the junctions have been improved haven't they. They've been improved to the standard that Leeds city council regards as appropriate and satisfactory...

Js – it's a straight level crossing and we can't replicate that because of two way traffic

Gj – you're not suggesting that LCC put in anything other than an appropriate response – they've improved the junction situation

Js – yes they have

Gj – because of the constraints of the ngt you can't maintain that level of improvement – it is less good than what is currently now in place

Js – rather than crossing in one place you will have to cross in two

Gj – so answer is yes. Can we agree that whatever are differing view may be the ngt proposal does not result in a benefit in terms of ped treatment of the island arrangement outside college entrance. We may say it's worse and you may say it's not different.

J s- I would agree for that particular crossing although others will be improved.

Mckinnon – would it be possible for me and mr smith to go through the BRT standards

Inspector – you have to discuss it with the applicants – to be recalled? I won't be recalling him based on what has been questioned so far but if any new info comes out ...then maybe so.

20/05/14

Cameron: Mr boodoo's scores are broken down in representation no. 5 of boodoo's representation (page 6) – a table.

[1:00pm]

LUNCH BREAK

[2:00pm]

Cameron: App 115 – response from leeds city council to the march 2014 design changes – supplementary p4 audit

Gj – I recall that mr smith had indicated that his team has not done a response as I don't see a point of putting it to mr smith

Gj – we've got there on plan 24-25 we can see the college up on the top corner – we will look at Blenheim walk and wood hose lane. If I'm right, from your traffic assessment as matters stand at the moment if we look at the right hand turn at wood house lane to the western leg of wood house lane – dropping down in front of the uni if you're coming southward – that does not give way to northbound vehicles on the A660 – as a consequence we looked at the TA (b-9 page 106) the degree of saturation is 42% and one's looking at a mean max queue of 4 vehicles during the am peak. And then you've got a degree of saturation of 21% and mean max of 2 vehicles during the pm peak. Cameron – from the do minimum – looking at pre –scheme as it is now.

Gj – there is currently a right turn.

Js – yes I've got that

Gj – post ngt – the do something results – because of the change in alignment elsewhere and Blenheim walk you've now got a two way flow and GR described it as transferring the queue to here...running along outside the college. Post scheme for the same stretch looking at wood house lane outside the university - We are then seeing a degree saturation of 89% - I touched on this with mr Robertson and a mean max queue of 8 vehicles during the am peak and 77% and mean max of 5 during the pm peak. the "western leg of woodhouse lane"

J s- yes

Gj – in so far as that stretch – there is a materially worse position in terms of queuing and saturation isn't there

J s- yes there is a conflict of movement moved to Blenheim walk

Gj – but before we get onto Blenheim walk just looking at pre and post ngt on wood house lane that has got worse also hasn't it... we've got a queue in am peak of 4 to 8 etc – it is materially worse isn't it.

Js – yes that is the wood house lane right turn

Gj – then we see the position for Blenheim walk. Your modelling predicts a degree of saturation on Blenheim walk of 89% and a mean max queue of 23 vehicles in am peak in the northbound. And a degree of sat of 77% and a mean max queue of 15 in the pm peak.

J s- yes

Gj – as we can see currently there is no queuing as there is no northbound route on Blenheim walk

Js – yes that's correct

Gj – as you now know as well of course, the inspector will see how close the scheme is to the college, not just of the college which is a sensitive receptor – we've got the library facing Blenheim walk as well haven't we

J s- yes that's correct

Gj – if we look and compare the current northbound movements on western leg of wood house lane – we can compare that to post ngt northbound on Blenheim way – a saturation of 70% and queue of 12 in am peak– and a 63% and 9 vehicles in the pm stretch.

20/05/14

Js – yes

Gj – you are ‘transferring’ the queue from one side to another – which is what mr Robertson said – we are looking at in respect of Blenheim walk on the northbound we are looking at 23 vehicles in the am peak compared to 12 currently at woodhouse lane – almost doubling.

Js – yes

Gj – and again going from a queue of 9 on woodhouse lane to 15 outside Blenheim walk for the pm peak.

Js – yes

Gj – even if mr Robertson is right that you are transferring the queue to outside the college – we’ve also got a considerable increase in terms of mean max queuing

Js – for the ones you described yes – but for instance on the top line there, there is a decrease

Gj – but not only a transfer but a sig increase over what is currently outside the uni – even if one looks at it as a straight transfer

Js – yes

Gj – in terms of the college the inspector can see in the current location one doesn’t have ... you’re not suggesting are you that there are any equally sensitive receptors at the university? No immediate juxtaposition of library and recreational space outside the road do you?

Js – I agree

Gj – working off the promoter’s own evidence the current situation is that you’ve got one way traffic going along Blenheim way and other the ngt scheme you’d have buses and trolleybus going along wood house lane (the western leg) – and then it comes up under the new scheme and turn left – they come up to the junction with Blenheim way and they can turn right.

Js – that’s correct

Gj – under the ngt scheme Blenheim way becomes two way – and buses and trolleybuses could go along wood house lane straight into the city centre without turning left

Js – yes

Gj – let’s look at journey time benefits – the extent of the works done on Blenheim walk. Please go to mr Wilkins proof and appendices plan SCW4 – there are two aerial photos.

[14:23]

[sorting out the documents as inspector is missing some of Mr Wilkins’ appendices etc.

Gj – this shows the current position in terms of junctions in and out of Blenheim walk and shows the back of Blenheim terrace and the interconnection between the two. We also note that there is an in and out junction serving on the college side of the road – not only the college car park but also other ones including a student medical centre ‘blenheim court’ – we see two substantial buildings and car parks served by junctions of Blenheim walk

Js – yes

Gj – if we flick over we can see in terms on the impact on junctions with the ngt – so far as the movements are concerned its really when these side roads all become entrance only junctions...junctions which are left in left out (one way) in the existing situation they then become junctions of all movements on the college side

Js – yes

Gj – one of the consequences is the impacts on traffic flow and congestion which mr Wilkins raised. It is that now whereas there is no conflict there will be conflict because you will have drivers who are coming in a northbound direction who will want to turn right and certainly someone who wants to go down eg. Malborough gardens - who comes in a southerly direction will want to turn across to these areas...

Js – there are conflicts with the exits

Gj – in terms of what work has been done we can't find out any assessment being done in terms of impact on capacity and flow

Js – in terms of junction spacing what you have there is two access egress points

Gj – is it right that I don't find evidence of any analysis carried out in respect of those three junctions or have I missed this

Js – there is no capacity junctions of those junctions – in terms of safety we followed the guide in terms of junction spacing.

Gj – so I am right that there is no safety/flow/capacity assessment set out?

Js – I believe that to be the case –

Gj - we calculate that there are seven junctions. We find there are differing degrees of conflict with the traffic flow but no assessment?

Js – there is no capacity assessment I'm aware of but I just want to double check...worth pointing out there are two access and egress junctions and goes to one that is access and egress and two that are access and two egress after ngt. These access arrangements are spread out in these junctions

Gj - we know there is a doubling of traffic flow on Blenheim walk and the introduction of two ways – new conflict coming in from northbound which doesn't exist at the moment. We need to carry out an assessment before we know what the extent of the adverse impacts area, wouldn't we?

Js – in terms of capacity but even though you have two way traffic there, there will still be the same demand from those areas – the demand won't increase and those no. of vehicles going in and out of those roads there are now more opportunities to get in and out as there are now more junctions.

Gj – I'm not sure – if you were coming from the city at the moment you wouldn't be able to drive up Blenheim walk and turn left say at Marlborough grove – you just wouldn't

Js – yes you'd have to use Blandford gardens.

Gj – you wouldn't be able to come up there as it's one way

Js – you would come southbound and right turn at Blandford etc...

Gj – there are trips you would and wouldn't do depending on how easy it is – only when you carry out an assessment that you will know whether that will increase flows etc... one needs to carry out an assessment to know what the impact on the junctions would be – when you are carrying out something as dramatic as one to two way

Js – a capacity assessment would give you those answers

Gj – which at the moment hasn't been done.

Gj – can I move to what the impact of that is? We know that in terms of our mean max queues – an increase so that on Blenheim walk northbound let's take the am peak at 89% (p106 of the TA) with mean max of 23. So we're near the 90% capacity – which is the level of saturation that one should be seeking to not go beyond.

Js – on Blenheim walk northbound yes

Gj – we have to factor in ... what the impact would be of the conflict with the junctions of vehicles particularly on the am peak. particularly in relation to the tutors and workers at Blenheim court medical centre – that has a potential of having an impact on the predictions for queuing on Blenheim walk.

Js – I would imagine some ppl queuing before a right turn

Gj – there is a real prospect that we will be going beyond the acceptable degrees of saturation in terms of capacity and queuing once we carry out an assessment – particularly at the car parks which are facilities which may well have cars coming in and out in the am and pm peaks

Js - i'm not the modelling witness so I don't want to venture down this path

Gj – you the team hasn't carried out the work to deal with this important question – we are right at the cliff edge at 89% - it's not that you can say it doesn't matter we haven't carried out this work...as it is so near the saturation point of concern 90% - we are right at the threshold. I am putting to you that it's pretty clear to anyone with highways experience that that threshold is likely to be exceeded when the work is carried out

20/05/14

J s- not sure as to how much queuing will affect the main junction capacity

Gj – you can't say to the inspector that that is a concern that he need not have

Js – it's certainly a question that needs to be raised – I'm not sure if GR raised it but it's certainly a traffic modelling capacity issue.

Gj – frankly it's for the promoters to present their case. If they haven't done the modelling and haven't come to proof on their case...I haven't found any evidence in GR's evidence that he has carried out that assessment – are you aware

Js – no I'm not

Gj- he doesn't deal with the impact of capacity/flow/safety on that junction only signals? My understanding is correct?

Js – yes

Cameron: two points – one relates to analysis of in and out movement on Blenheim walk and the other is the consequential effects on the main junction. Consequential effect on that main junction is for mr GR.

Inspector – it wasn't raised under his evidence/cross-examining

Gj- I am not telepathic...at the end of the day the promoters have to prove their case – this is an issue that we raised in our evidence and the rebuttal was put in...and the opportunity could have been put in the rebuttals but it wasn't dealt with.

Mr Wilkins will give his view.

[14:45]

Gj – we were looking at the existing situation and the proposed situation – drawing 25B – so I just want to explore with you in terms of highways design and the benefits in relation to ngt with this configuration we have now, single flow, bus comes down wood house lane and turns left then right – in the ngt world where you move the traffic and push it up to Blenheim walk we then have the situation where ngt and buses come down wood house lane into the city.

Js – yes

Gj – one option that mr Wilkins raised (he looked at the transit modelling) at the left junction which sends you up to Blenheim way from woodhouse lane (blackman lane)– that there is a degree of saturation of 35% and a mean max queue of 2 vehicles am peak, 42% and 2 vehicles in pm peak. We are looking at the TA page 109-111. When you turn right from blackman lane to eastern leg wood house lane etc.. .mean max of 3 or 4 vehicles in the peaks. So if you kept those existing arrangements there would be no real case that the existing arrangement causes sig delay

Js – you'd need to add the ngt vehicles to that –

Gj – but that won't make a sig impact on capacity is it

Js – defer to GR for the modelling

Gj – you are looking at ten vehicles per hour roughly – I don't think that changes the capacity so much?

Js – don't forget the ngt vehicles will be wanting priority at the junction... that will take out capacity from the junction. I'm a bit hesitant to talk about it.

Gj – so not an exercise you've done – as in we don't find that carried out in your rebuttal of Wilkins' proof

Js – no

Gj – one alternative was to widen the bridge as Wilkins' evidence indicates and have three lanes, retaining the north lane ...

Js – if you've got all the north bound traffic on wood house lane remaining then no public realm for the university

Gj –from the college's pov we've looked at a restricted site – the huge impacts on the college as a sensitive receptor e.g. library/amenity space – and then they look over to the university which doesn't have these receptors in such close proximity – we are asking the question as to what is the

greatest benefits – and it is said that it's the benefit to the public realm around the university. We need to test what those public realm benefits area. We have to remember as to what is still going down the road by the university – the ngt, and the buses, and also all the service vehicles for the university...

Js – that would only be the northern part of the Parkinson steps (for the service vehicles).

Gj – in terms of all the other office and commercial facilities along woodhouse lane they will be allowed to service themselves, no?

J s- yes for Blenheim terrace etc. access still there – it's really anybody who needs to be on the street will be able to access it. But any bypass travel will go onto Blenheim walk.

Inspector – public transport would be two way but the access will only be one way. Northbound is public transport.

Js – yes

Gj – we know that the intention is that it's going to be a ped dominated area isn't it

Js – yes

Gj – ped takes priority. The inspector will have to take a view on how well that's going to work. It's a benefit which is relied upon in respect to this part but also for the wider scheme. Elsewhere in the promoter's evidence the inspector is asked to weigh the pros and cons which are provided for by the scheme. -in order for it to be successful as a shared space it's got to be ped dominated hasn't it

Js – yes it has

Gj – and also ped dominated space where ped's feel safe and in control. It's an example of the hierarchy of consideration

Js- yes but I did point out there is no definitive design for a shared space. E.g. LTN 1/11 – table 2.1 goes through the degrees of sharing.

Gj – that's very helpful – is there a convenient doc or not in your area where I can go to the degree of traffic movement in the university area ... am and pm peaks.

J s- all should be set out in the TA.

Gj –we were asked by mr mckinnon about the predicted run times for the area outside the university and you said that that was the transport modelling and he looked at it and said it was 15.5miles per hour. He was concerned about the safety implications for that. You pointed out that that was an average which includes the stopping/dwelling and that all goes into the average of 15.5 miles per hour.

Jg – I do remember this but I don't know what that average is taken from ... I don't have the doc. I don't know whether that 15.5 relates to the whole route or between stops.

Gj – you gave a clear answer when he said 15.5 and you said yes but include stop and dwell times.

Js – but I'm not sure if that includes the stops or not...

Gj – it's just a calculation but I want to deal with it as a matter of principle. If the average is 15.5 miles per hour and it includes the stop times, yes

J s- yes

Gj – then the actual speeds and dwell times will be higher than 15 miles per hour – if it doesn't include the stop and dwell times it is still higher than 15 miles per hour.

Js - yes

Gj - On either view it suggests that the speed it's going at is unsafe

Js – no its 20 miles

Gj – so you say that the safe speed for going through these ped dominated areas... can we go back to our safety audit... 2.1 of the audit they were recommending 10 miles per hour and then we see the design response which says that for shared speed no more than 20 miles but preferably less than 15 miles per hour.

Js – yes

Gj – if we're then just looking at your own evidence, the preferable speed is less than 15 miles per hour isn't it

J s- it's got high levels of sharing. You pointed out here that there is other traffic so therefore there will be a lesser degree of sharing here than somewhere where there is less traffic.

Gj – sorry I suggest it is a high degree of sharing here. A low degree is lots of peds and very few other things in the vicinity. If you've got sharing with not only trolleys, buses and also vehicles in a ped dominated area – you are having as ped to look out for ngt/service vehicles and buses (including commercial property's vehicles). So it's a high degree of sharing

J s- yes – but it depends on the no. of vehicles that are actually on the road. There is limited traffic.

Inspector – would you count this as a high degree of sharing or moderate/low? This area?

Js – a high degree of sharing with a limited or moderate level of traffic I think

Gj – ok – do you point to any guidance as to how you define levels of traffic?

J s- no just that the main traffic is taken up on the bypass route

Gj – bear in mind context we are looking in – no one would describe an ordinary two way road as shared space. It's in the context of where peds dominate – like this area

Js – that's correct

Gj – difficult to suggest that there are instances where you can get any higher level of traffic and still maintain it is a ped dominated zone

Js – there are considerable no. of peds from the uni – so they would dominate even if there is more traffic on the street

Gj – not if it's going to be flowing with buses/ngt and service and client vehicles... along Blenheim terrace etc. it's difficult to imagine pedestrians dominating – and here you've got a flow of ngts/buses and not insignificant no. of service vehicles to university and Blenheim terrace. We've got two way flows of around 672 movements in the am peak and 470 movements on the pm peak (TA page 105). In the context of a ped dominated shared zone which must be safe we are not looking at moderate flows but high ones...

Js – if it's in connection with 5.5.8 is it the flow diagrams you are referring to?

Inspector – looking at page 105 – there is the turning movement on that

Js – looking at d) – looking at arm D – in the northbound direction on woodhouse lane there is 179 in the AM and in the pm 186 northbound and coming southbound from A it is the right turn – 241 in the AM and 168 in the PM. So that's my reading of it.

Gj – but also C as well

Js – so you've got 213 in am etc...

Gj – I'll tell you the figures we have...include B as well. reads out figures] = gives you the am peak of 672 in the am etc.

Inspector – I follow that.

Js – I see where the figures come from

Gj – I suggest that when we are looking at context of shared space where peds must dominate – not right to describe it as a moderate traffic flow as if you get much higher it's hard to see it as ped dominated.

Js – if you've got more traffic the measures for the shared space will then alter. You'd have a different response.

Gj – you then have impacts on the journey flow predictions. You're sticking by that it's a moderate flow are you

Js – yes – certainly what we were just looking at are for this section which is intended to be treated in a different way to the main length of this section – a lot of traffic into the uni – treatment to Parkinson step section will be different to the main length coming up from the city. There was knowledge that the northern section will be busier because of traffic to and from the uni main entrance.

Gj – first of all whilst you'll have in the more southern park of wood house lane, you'd have the two way trolleybus and buses

Js – yes

Gj – so you'd still have those and so far as all the vehicles that are not that – they can only go southwards. All the ones coming in at the top will be going out that way...they can't get out through the north

Inspector – did you explain where they went? I understood they wouldn't be going all the way down to the south. you said they would go down there and turn left up there –

Js – that is in connection to the service vehicles for Blenheim terrace (all have to go south as it is one way and north bound for public transport), but at this point [points] all other vehicles are two way – [inspector and gj – we did not know that... you gave the impression that all other vehicles were one way]

Gj – but it's not a special privilege for the uni – is there any way if I was somewhere else that I could do that too?

Js - there is a TRO

Gj – so we've got the uni – if you're going into the uni flow area you can go north or south – if you're not in that flow area, you go south then left. The bit that you are talking about... you say there will be less traffic along the area south of the uni as there may be come uni vehicles that choose to go north rather than south, is that what you are saying?

Js –not only that but we are looking at the southbound bit – I'm saying that that traffic which is southbound a large amount will turn into the university main entrance – it's the main attractor

Gj – and when it comes out it will either go north or south – has the flows/work been done?

Js – well...I don't know if those flows have been done

Gj – I don't want to belittle your point but in terms of the public realm – we are talking about a fairly minor ... you are talking about a difference that comes down to this: South of the uni before the left hand turn you still have two way traffic and all the traffic going to Blenheim terrace but not as much from the uni as some of it traffic will go up north? Is that what you say

Js – major amount will as this is their main entrance. It's a huge uni employing thousands-

Gj – but you don't know whether they will go out north or south do you?

Js – no but certainly coming in they have to come on this bit and route through here [points to map] – irrespective of where they go out, this link shows they can only come in that way and right turn into the uni main road

Gj – but how much busier it is depends on how many vehicles of the uni come out and go north rather than south.

J s- or how many are going into the uni and therefore are on the top bit there on the link and right turn on the Parkinson steps-

Gj – or who never come out...

Js – or go out another way.

Gj – so the flows is not your area... we'll look at if any flows have been done.

Gj – in terms of public realm it's those steps (it's an important aspect if there is to be improvement on the public realm) – and a sense of an academe feeling on the steps area – it is principally on those steps and around that area that there is a focus and the greater sense of public realm there.

Js – we need to distinguish between two points – public realm in front of the steps and how it interfaces with the master plan and also the other is the purpose of the function of the shared space...the main focus is on the whole length of the street and how that works and fits with cyclists and peds...it's not really about the Parkinson steps and some grand urban design...

Gj – not about that? That's not a focus?

J s- it might be for mr walker, but it's not exclusively there but the whole length of the street

Gj – where is the main decanting point of the students?

Js – be at the leeds met stop and also university stop.

Gj – so one of the main decanting places will be at the uni steps

Js – it is

20/05/14

Gj – just going to take you – you weren't sure whether the 15.5 miles figures included dwell/stop times. I've had some assistance on that.

Js – I wasn't sure if it was between stops

Gj – in the run time assessment c-1-13 appendix, page 40 –

[Cameron: north line southbound am 2016, you get df7 p2. If you go to no. 19 –

Js – yes it doesn't include stop/dwell times

Gj – you would need to factor in if it doesn't include these times...the actual average speed (how far it does go when it's going as opposed to when it's stopped) is going to be higher than 15 miles per hour

Js – this is the average speed between going off at the Leeds met and the uni stop

Gj – [so we know from that that 15.5 miles is less than the average ACTUAL speed that it is running between those stops.]

Gj – one that is relevant for you – if we go to the LCC audit at 2.1 and your response – we see certainly for shared space, 2.15 ref to local transport note, you refer to it being desirable to have speed of less than 20 and preferably less than 15 miles per hour... 'there are many roads where it would be unwise to travel at the speed limit...' – looking at these passages, we have agreed high level of sharing and design speed should be as above. The design speed is looking at whether it's comfortable that it's safe to go at.

Js – yes

Gj – for high levels of sharing it's preferably 15 miles per hour or less

Gj – it is predicated on a design that doesn't seek a prefer of 15 or less but it is more than 15, isn't it?

Js – yes but there are different degrees of sharing...

Gj – but we've agreed its high levels of sharing

Js – not necessarily the level of measures that go with that

Gj – what's been shown and relied upon is that the average speed will be 15 miles per hour.

Js – I agree that's the case on the average speed. What we've done in the design is that we've put in the upper limit in accordance to the guidance (20) and what we've then had to do (including Whitfield) is to discuss with LCC and reduce the speed to values before those we've put down. It could be less than 15.

Gj – first point is that what you should be aiming for is 15 miles or less, but the second point is that you're aiming with future discussions (laudable) to get the speed down to a lower level. But of course for the rest of the promoters' case it's heavily reliant on journey times and differences – which relies on the 15.5 miles average over that section. Let's just stay with this section. And to get to an average – sometimes it will be going at more than 15.5 miles per hour... that's right?

Js – would be...could have a fairly consistent speed though so not much over

Gj – that's highly relevant...in terms of how we deal with how successful the shared space and improvements to public realm will be – as won't be successful if not safe

Js – yes speed is clearly a factor

[15:37]

INSPECTORS QUESTIONS

Ins – turn to your proof, there are several properties at the corner of Victoria Road that you are saying that needs to be demolished to design that junction. TD-21 (or urban design 121) – shows the land take.

Js – yes

Ins – looking at the plan of that junction – what I'm interested to know is that it seems to be quite a large area left in front of that church – can you justify the properties at that junction? Whether all that land is necessary?

20/05/14

Js – yes, Victoria road has a high accident record and in LCC's collision clusters as a concern – in his evidence mckinnon raised it. Part of it is that the current cycle lane stops at Grosvenor road – they terminate there ... to improve safety we need to extend the cycle lane to the junction but also through the junction on that side and have our bus /cycle lane continue through. To make sure we've got the requisite widths to do that is to have a staggered ped crossing we've got in here. It's a function of the widths we've got for the bus and cycle lanes – you can see here that it takes off the buildings here...

Inspector – so all these buildings is one property?

Js – we do physically conflict with these buildings that we take...

Ins - in effect you don't necessarily need the gardens/rear parts of those buildings for your design?

Js – there are grounds to the building – that would remain – opportunity for this space has been used for urban design.

Ins – because you've got to take the whole of the property.

Ins – lawnswood gardens (near otley old road), in your 7.6.6 you mention that ppl can use the roundabout to get in – so really you've said that ppl wanting to go into leeds from there can go up the road and use a gap to turn.

Js – yes

Ins – where is that gap?

Js- plan 9-b – where you've got the access track coming out the uni here, there is a gap in the central reservation there. It's just about 50 m north of the ngt park and ride access junction. Shown on the plans. There's a note that points out the access track from the uni.

Ins- I assume that junction would be able to cater for a U-turn

Js – yes it would

Ins – you said around 200m there and back? What would be roughly the additional journey distance?

Js – 200m from lawnswood garden from the gap to the junction...

Ins – so effectively 400m journey increase

Ins – another objector concerned about fixing to bridge end building – he suggested that the tram had looked at fixings to this building and it wasn't possible. Are you intending to fix it to that building...no. 1-13...

Js – we've taken out powers to build fixings but we still need to do the structural surveys...I haven't seen the trams doc that ruled it out.

Ins – you haven't taken that into account

Js – I haven't see that but if it's unsuitable there will be a pole instead. We want to do a structural inspection to verify.

Ins – you've mentioned applying guidance on tramways g-4-73 – how much of that applied in this?

Js – here and there para 3.4.8 mentions the jerk rate of the vehicle which rate of change of acceleration and for that...0.8 m per second cubed which is the type of value we want to provide for the trolley giving a measure of passenger comfort. Because it is an electrically powered vehicle you can control that more finely.

Ins – so not much of it applies

Js – no it's basically a highways scheme

Ins – if you were designing it for a tram with same alignment would you still require roughly same amount of land take and would the widths and stuff be the same? Can you say? If it was a tram?

Js – it would be difficult to say – but the structures e.g. headingley lane, have been designed to accommodate a future tram loading (more onerous) to try and allow for that possibility in the future. But in terms of the street – could be quite different... I wouldn't be able to say – as trams are fixed and guided. A tram might get away with narrower lanes if they are exclusively for the tram.

Ins – if it was designed for a bus or hybrid bus or even guided bus would that make a big diff to land take etc.

Js – not much different on street – still a bus... are you referring to an articulated bus

Ins – yes equivalent

Js – comes to next best alternative – using the same infrastructure as ngt without the overheads.

Ins – would you be able to get away with different standards of design?

Js - it would be the same.

Ins – light pollution. It seems to have raised a lot of objections. In particular relating to park and rides more – are both going to be lit.

Js – yes they are...lower level and directional lighting. The assessment of that will be the environmental witness. But they will both be lit.

at the smaller park - conditions there is that the lights will be switched off at 9 at night – equivalent to lawnswood site...an inspection of lighting spill done at the lawnswood site.

Ins – park and rides would be lit all the time

Js –not sure in the night - speak to env witness

Ins – in terms of a trolleybus driver – can a bus driver drive a trolleybus? Same licence?

Js – same service vehicle licence but you'd give them additional training for the vehicle

Ins – street were going to ask some question as to access by HGVs – you were looking to modify the designs...I'm assuming you looked at that as Street are not here?

Js – they asked for ped island to be cut back to accommodate a 12 m rigid lorry

We've done that and done a check on the swept path – I'm hoping that's acceptable to them

[15:55]

BREAK

RE-EXAMINATION OF JASON SMITH

Qc – inspector asked you about land take in Victoria road – works and land take sheet no.11 (big plans) – you will also need doc a-07 so we have the owner's land etc. you can see the additional land to be acquired marked in blue which is the area the inspector is referring to – if we go to the book of reference a07 – who is the freehold owner of that land 11-053 an 11-055?

Js – west Yorkshire passenger transport executive and various other interests

Qc – go back to mr Longley's questions – he asked you about spreader plates/fixings. Can we take up g-4-52 please - F-3 land property building fixings and overhead line equipment. Does this provide info as to the type of fixings which is intended to be used

Js - yes

Qc – in terms of the legal powers sough we don't need to look at the draft order itself – is there a ref as to the type of deed which will be entered into.

Js – yes

20/05/14

Qc – you were asked about utility diversions and contingency to cater for these diversions and you said that an independent assessment was arrived at, you added a 20% premium and you went into the capital costs etc. go to doc c-1 business case review page 19-2 – table 19.1 see the preferred option implementation costs – there is a figure for utilities and risks – your 20% premium – at what stage in the process did that go in

Js – inclusive within the 15.9 ... so risk is in addition to that.

Qc – you were asked by mr Longley about parking spaces and you were asked about 7.7.6 of your proof – you referred there to b-9 the TA. Can we go please to table 9.3. I think you were asked about this later in relation to weetwood lane. Table 9.3 north line (page 229) and table 9.4 is south line – but what do these tables show in relation to parking

J s- shows per td drawing what the changes on each drawing is – the existing/proposed and differences so you can clearly see for each area.

Qc – now going to turn on to questions asked by mrs Pickering. She asked you questions about the area of her association's concerns. A-11 td-13 – you were asked about there being no north bound dedicated lane for this short stretch between Drummond road and church wood avenue and you were asked about the kinder care nursery. You were asked about the TROs that would be made in association with the scheme. Ask you about the existing position – take up app 107 you'll see the photo of the sign. What is the current restrictions that apply?

Js – no loading and specifies the times on the sign there

Qc – so will there be any difference to the ability for ppl to stop and wait there

Js – at the minute you could wait there essentially

Qc – effect of TRO

J s- no waiting or loading

Js – actually – the sign in yellow says no parking permitted between 8-9.15 and 16.30-18.30 – so there is no parking in the peak periods.

Qc – so can you park there at the moment

Js – no parking or loading – no difference between the restrictions now and what is proposed. The scheme no waiting and loading would be 24 hours though. There would be a difference outside of those hours. [inspector clarifies]

Qc – you were asked some questions by mr Broadbent – this seeks clarification on one issue – you were asked about consultation with people with disabilities.

Js – yes

Qc – can we take up the consultation statement a-01 divider 3 – and go to para 6.8 where you referred to consultation with ngt equality group. If we go to this para – how many equality and community groups were consulted

Js – broad rep range from the LCC disability hub

Qc – were any steps taken in addition to consultation

Js- writing to the 70 groups, the representative group was drawn from the LCC hub and came into the ngt scheme and became part of the scheme looking at shared space measures. Their input continued to be used in the design. So consultation and direct involvement.

Qc – 6.12 –do we find a list of particular equality related orgs who were consulted

Js – yes

Qc – and ref to equality impact assessment doc a-08H divider 2

Qc – mr martin fitzsimmmons asked you about park and ride at stourton – you were asked about ground investigations and asked whether there was awareness to the fact that there were old mines in the area – take up a-08c section 6 please – if you go to pages 28-29 which shows a table 3.14 – can you help us to whether any steps were taken to investigate ground conditions

20/05/14

Js – yes – we looked at existing historic bore hold records and also geo-typical ground investigations – to determine what the makeup of the ground was

Qc – 3.67 – the last bullet point – were the promoters aware of the matters that mr fitsimmons referred to in relation to caste mining

Js – yes they were – a coal mining report always requested. The likelihood of subsidence etc.

Qc – mr martin Thomas on behalf of weetwood residents – you were asked about junction arrangements. A-11 td-14, we have the junction of weetwood lane with the a660 and various other junctions coming onto it. You were asked about the effect of closing weetwood lane – you said that weetwood lane was connected to Hollin road and part of the same junction complex – what did you mean

Js – yes it is connected in terms of turns in and out of both roads – the sight lines connect to each other – the movements all connect to there... if you turn into one it could affect routes through the other three areas...

Qc – your opinion as to whether the arrangements would be more or less convenient /safe before or after ngt proposals and signalisation

J s- my view it will be safer as currently a priority junction and there were 22 collisions between 2008 and 2012 and 14 carrying out turning manoeuvres. Also we put in there signalised ped crossings as weetwood lane and st chads.

Ins – what about the convenience?

Js – I think it would help for peds and car convenience in that you know longer wait to try and get out of weetwood lane and chance that but you have a signal controlled exit on the road.

Qc – rose court nursery – by mr nackhurst – td 19 buckingham road and junction with a660 – you were asked about distances and also about your rebuttal statement on this issue. Can we take up the rebuttal to obj 1608 – you were asked about why you did this in the df7 proposal and you said it was to accommodate cyclists. If you go to 2.4 of the rebuttal you said in oral evidence that the effect of df7 was to move the wall closer to the nursery by 2m. in 2.4 have you got the figures there for the difference between df6 and df7?

Js – df6 required setting back of the wall – goes more towards the corner between 0.5 and 2.2m. and then df7 that increased generally to 1.75 to 2.7m width for the same stretch. For the maximum extent it is half a metre difference.

Qc – is that in the same place

Js – yes

Qc – so the difference is 0.5m - what does it achieve

Js – it achieves a bus lane inbound and cycle lane inbound of 1.5m (4.2m together?) and bus cycle lane outbound. That was the difference between df6 and df7.

Qc – he also asked you about td 20 – a660 and Victoria road development– Is that something that has taken place or proposed?

Js – proposed

Qc – so if it is proposed is there any opportunity to adjust the development to take account of any additional land take

Js – indeed developers have been reviewing their master plans to take the df7 plans in to account.

Qc –is there a physical impact (other than the stables) or just impact on potential future development

Js - just potential future impact

Qc – you were asked about decision as to whether to go north/south in this part of headingly lane – you said that the plans panel had briefing notes – can we take up g-1-4 please - says plans panel presentation may 2013 –

Js – it's a presentation which looking at various issues along the route – it's looking at bodington/lawnswood and includes headingley lane.

Qc – if you get to headingley lane (hill) introduction part of it – can you explain what were the options that were put before the plans panel in relation to this area

Js – the options put forward are to widen along the southern side (first set of slides there with pros and cons) and the next option was to widen on the northern side only (again pros and cons and visualisations) and then option to widen on both sides (southern side for first bit etc.)

Qc – you referred to widening on the north side and to impact on listed buildings and impact on gradient. If we go to headingley lane and hill widening on north side only photo – what are the consequences if you go north and not south

Js – those roads are already on a steep gradient in excess of 9% - v. steep and if we widen on that northern side the geometry will mean we would substantially steepen up those roads and we would need to either look to close or regrade those accesses on the side there.

Qc – grade II listed structures affected – do you know what they are/

Js – shown on planning direction plans affecting kirklage boundary walls etc. at the minute its behind that tree belt but it would be opened up and affect the settings of those buildings if you do that option

Qc – the south widening – there is a another sheet in the presentation with a table of advantages and disadvantages in the preferred option – what is the comparable position in terms of impacts to heritage aspects?

Js – compared to the northern side we would affect sig more listed buildings if we widened on the northern side and set back curtilage boundary walls.

Qc – mr Fahie g-1-4 – she was interested in the impacts on whitfield way and square. If you've still got this plans panel report/presentation if we turn on section headed whitfield sq and way – shows the options on it. During the course of your evidence when you were asked by mrs Fahie you said there were four options. They all had pros and cons. You went through a no. of these options and that mr walker had done a visualisation. If we see this heading options, are these the four options?

Js – yes I referred to these

Qc – were these options put before the plans panel

Js – they were in this presentation

Qc – Mr Forin's questions – he asked about stopping distances at 15 miles per hour and you said there was a formula ... I'll draw attention to this and ask you and your team not right now to carry out these calculations. The formula is set out at table 7.1.

Qc – you were asked about the events in millennium square and shared spaces. You refer to Ltm 1-11 (g-4-77) – 2.15 on page 13 you were asked about traffic flow and speed. We see at 2.15 the reference to design speed – it is a target speed for designers not to exceed. Can you just explain from the designers' perspective the approach you've taken to design speed in terms of the way you've designed the scheme in the shared spaces

Js – looked for measures to slow vehicles down or restrict them in terms of how they move along the street e.g. planters/how the carriageway is arranged and ways for pedestrians e.g. demarcations.

The design speed itself is different to the speed limit on the road.

Inspector – is the design speed more or less than speed limit

Js – always less

Qc – what is the distinction between the design speed ... and speed restriction

Js – what the vehicle can realistically achieve ... a speed restriction is higher

20/05/14

Qc – you were asked about local transport note 2- 2008 g-4-74 – at one stage he suggested that it was not up to date... can I take you to doc g-4-16 – but he didn't ask you any questions on it. "manual for streets 2" – this we can see is sept 2010 – is this up to date

Js – yes

Qc – go to page 45 on 6.2.1 – he was asking you about this in relation to cyclists. Does this manual supersede the local transport note?

J s- its complementary to it

Qc – any implication as to whether or not 02-08 is out of date

Js – no it points to the note in the manual

Inspector –sorry to go back I always thought that the design alignment and the design speed is always higher than the speed limit

Js - not always the case.

Ins – you're referring specifically to this instance rather than generally.

Qc – now to mr jones' first cross-examination – asked about integration and bus stops. You were asked about buses on headingley lane and through headingley. You said there were more than 20 per hour but you said there was good integration but other difficulties

Js – I was referring to the headingley lane stop at eastern end of wood lane. Difficult to get stop in close proximity to the existing stop – we put at close as we could but not possible to get a stop closer than that because of the physical separation e.g bypass and main road.

Qc – asked about safety audit and the doc called the designer's response to it app 106 – para 2.1 – and your attention was drawn to the fact that LCC safety auditors said it was urged that ngt be limited to 10 miles an hour in these areas – ref to shared space areas...but if we look at issues raised..."our experience of accidents within the city centre...suggests safety issues relating to intro of near silent trolleys to these areas" – which areas do you understand they were referring to?

Js – they mentioned the city centre so I assume they are referring to millennium square

Qc – you were later asked some questions about the details in the run time assessments – look at c-1-13 the run time assessment. "table of average speeds" - You were asked about the north line south bound am 20:16 – which section is millennium square on that?

Js – it is on the arena cookeridge street link number 23 – average link speed is 8.8 miles an hour.

Qc – you were asked about 15.5 miles per hour... going back to app 106 (you gave mill square as an example through city centre) – what is the response – if we look at stage 3 – it says 'we have taken cognicent and assumed speed limit in order of 15 miles an hour' – what is the appropriate design speed?

Js – a speed less than the 15 miles per hour.

Qc – is that the approach you've taken

Js – that is the approach we've taken

Qc – we've got stopping distances – also you were asked a question about the traffic commissioners target and bus punctuality – you would seek to agree that they are outside the required /target.

Qc – move on the mr mckinnon's questions – interchange/bus stops and accessibility – can you just take up b9 TA page 221 table 8.1 – in terms of accessibility to the number of residential house sites – we see the source of these – what difference will ngt network plus amended but network have on numbers

J s- looked at various time bands e.g. 20/40 mins – it showed an improvements on all time bands

20/05/14

Qc – you were asked question about woodhouse moor and the options – can we just go back to plan panel doc (g-1-4) – can you find where woodhouse moor is? There is an option analysis with advantages and disadvantages – were those matters presented to members

Js – they were

Qc – if we go to g-1-5 we have the minutes of the plans panel meeting in june 2013 – 12th page – woodhouse moor part of it – did you attend this meeting

Js – I did attend.

Qc – we see that an objector the scheme raised concerns about wood house moor – do you know who?

Js – I don't remember

Qc – were objectors allowed to raise issues

Js – yes allowed to speak for several minutes

Qc – g-1-5 minutes of it at g-1-7 – we have woodhouse moor on the 8th page – was this considered

Js – yes it was

Qc – you were asked about demolishing buildings – if you take out a-11 td 23 – you were asked a question – talking about need to make provision for right turners who wanted to turn into clarendon road and you needed to make provision for right turning traffic and ngt southbound

Js – yes

Qc – as a result you needed three lanes (right turn/straight ahead and ngt) – you were asked why not demolish buildings from the other side – the holsworth building

J s- yes I can see it on the map (the uni main building)

Qc – the buildings on the either side from the holsworth building numbered 75 etc... if you are trying to accommodate right turning traffic there can you explain how or give your view as to how or whether or removing those buildings are likely to be of assistance?

Js – those buildings are beyond the junction so wouldn't really assist the case

Qc – is that a reasonable option

J s- no as it wouldn't create any more space at the right turn which is the other side of the junction.

Qc – you were asked about extent of consultation with the college and you said that you would get mr jones the dates of the meetings. We can see in the rebuttal – are you prepared to do what you said you would do

J s- yes absolutely

Qc – you were asked about pedestrians crossing from the college of art to cross the road with the new Blenheim walk arrangement. Can we have in front of us a-11 td 24 – the proposed ngt plans – if you go to page 27 of Wilkin's doc (a photo was shown) – this showed that the arrangement of the road had changed since the photo was taken. Go to robertson's appendices etc. of the junction and there is a diagram which says leeds city council scheme – on the right there is the proposed junction layout of ngt

Js – that is a scheme that has been recently completed

Qc – if you are a ped walking from college to opposite side of road – how many roads do you have to cross

Js – cross in two phases

Qc – if you look at the proposed scheme how many phases to cross?

Js – again 2 phases to cross

Qc – so when you said that it was a straight over crossing and can't replicate that ...

Js – I was referring to the crossing on the main road. It's two crossings as you have to cross the st. mark's left turn lane.

Qc – in terms of convenience...

20/05/14

Js - it's the same – still crossing in two movements.

Qc – you were asked questions about junction capacity – we've got Robertson's appendices at hand – pages 28 and 29 – in terms of overall impact on congestion do you get on the arms...if you look at the do min –the highest degree of sat that appears in the do min or do something?

Js – in the do min

Qc –where

Js – on wood house lane southbound movement

Qc – so in terms of congestion – how does what is proposed compare to what would otherwise be the case

Js – congestion – the proposed scheme works within the design threshold of 90% whereas the do min current scheme has 99% there as that would not work and cause queuing there. 29 mean max queue.

Qc – if you take blackman lane/Blenheim walk page 29 – same question about the do min and do something?

Js – do min has higher congestion ... 98% degree of saturation

Qc – you were asked about the priority junctions which intersect with Blenheim walk and Marlborough gardens, blandford gardens etc... you said in relation to safety that guidance in relation to junction spacing had been followed – what did you mean?

Js – not advisable to put junctions within 20 m of each other as it compromises sight lines

Qc – do these proposed junctions comply?

Js – yes they are all 40m apart

Qc – your opinion as to whether or not proposed arrangements will give rise to safety concerns?

Js – no don't think so as it's not an unusual arrangement – it improves the functionality of the side roads.

Greg jones – I was referred to mr Robertson on that matter – he confirmed no safety assessment had been carried out.

Inspector – refer to it in your submission

Gj – I will but in cross-examination he said he couldn't give it. I put to him about the safety assessment and he was unable to give answers on it which he's now giving in re-examination. The witness ducked the same question by me. I don't object to the earlier question but the latter only.

Qc – can I ask you this – you were asked a no. of questions about the capacity assessments and we just looked at them in Robertson's – can you assist as to whether or not those capacity assessments were based upon the highway arrangements as set out in the drawings in a-11

Js – they are, yes

Qc – you were asked questions about woodhouse lane and the turning movements into it (near the uni steps) – td 24-25 – what you explained was that much of the traffic turning in from the north was servicing the university – can you explain what you meant by that and where you were anticipating the traffic servicing the uni would go?

Js – this is the uni's main entrance and this is into their site – whilst it's got other entrances this is the uni's main entrance – so I envisaged that a lot of traffic coming down here would go to the main entrance – exiting and mainly turning right or left and this stretch is much busier because it's connecting to the main access

Js – if you go south – it would be much reduced going southbound – it is more about servicing Blenheim terrace properties – therefore the amount of traffic is much less on that stretch.

Qc – if you are a ped walking from city centre td25 – woodhouse lane bridge is marked public transport/cycle and peds only – how would you use this space?

20/05/14

Js – as a ped this is the main walking route up and a block to general traffic – and by that block it would limit the amount of other traffic that can be on this northern section. Going south it forces the access traffic to left turn as you can't come down and cross the bridge up here.

[5:30 pm]

Cameron: I have a new document to put in the inquiry - Wsp report app -116
Gj – there is a full bundle of the Wilkins' proof and appendices as well

Mr Henkel at 10am tomorrow.