

## File: JAlcombination.DAT

This TRANSYT data file is an amalgamation of two other files that were previously submitted to the Inspector:

- 1) 01-187 PR WD PM + KF + A65.DAT
- 2) Weekday 17-18 with committed, with dev optimised timings.DAT

File (1) was prepared by traffic consultants in connection with the Kirkstall District Centre development, and was submitted with their Rule 6 Statement by Kirkstall Valley Community Association in 2007.

File (2) is the basis for the output file bearing the same name in Appendix 11 of John Vernon's Proof of Evidence. The original data file was not included in the proof, but it is possible to reconstruct it from the published computer output.

The accuracy of this reconstruction has been tested. The reconstructed data file produces identical output to the results exhibited by Mr. Vernon in his Appendix 11.

Large sections of files (1) and (2) are identical, and both appear to be derived from the same computer model of the existing situation (3):

- 3) 01-187 EX WD PM.DAT

This file was submitted with their Rule 6 Statement by the Kirkstall Valley Community Association, and the output from file (3) was exhibited by Mr. Vernon in his appendix 10.

All three files refer to the weekday evening traffic peak.

Both file (1) and file (2) are said to include the estimated effects of the Kirkstall Forge Development. File (1) also includes the estimated effects of the redevelopment on the former Kwik Save site (often called the KDC development) whereas file (2) includes the estimated effects of the BHS development.

In combining these files I have simply taken the largest traffic flow on each link. This will **underestimate** the total flows, because the traffic contribution from the minor development on each link will be lost. Nevertheless the scheme still "fails", with large queues on Wyther Lane and internally. This is hardly surprising because the present situation without development is already saturated at peak times, so it would be amazing it worked as well as the appellant claims with new development in place.

It was important to include junctions 5, 6 and 8 on Beecroft Street because the need to synchronize these signals, and to accommodate the inevitable traffic from the KDC development constrains the designer's flexibility on the rest of the network.

I have carried out two tests, with and without the dangerous "pinch point" for cyclists at the proposed BHS exit signals. There is no advantage in retaining this pinch point, because flows are constrained elsewhere in the network. If it were omitted it would make little difference to cars, but the network would be much safer and more convenient for cyclists. A cycle feeder lane and advance stop lines could be included, allowing cyclists to position themselves correctly for the difficult right turn onto Leeds and Bradford Road.

Since the network is incapable of carrying the predicted numbers of cars, it would be sensible to make better provision for pedestrians, bus users and cyclists. This would be in accord with the revised UDP policies and government advice. It also has all-party political support in Leeds, as evidenced by the resolution passed by the Inner North West Area Committee. In addition to a contribution to the A65 Quality Bus scheme, it would be appropriate for the developer to contribute to similar bus priority schemes on Wyther Lane, Broad Lane and Leeds & Bradford Road, to contribute to the dedicated riverside cycle track along the valley floor, and to cede more land to cyclists and pedestrians on Bridge Road.

It is unfortunate that this work was only ready at the opening of the Public Inquiry. This information could have been circulated much earlier with the cooperation of the Local Highway Authority. TRANSYT is an expensive program and the latest version is beyond my limited means. Leeds City Council has ten copies, but refused to make *any of them* available to one of its own members in order to test the traffic scheme submitted by the appellant. I have had to persuade the Transport Research Laboratory to let me use an "educational" copy licensed to Leeds University in order to carry out these tests. This may indicate the degree of confidence that the local authority has in the "Statement of Common Ground" that is being submitted to the Inspector.

Cllr John Illingworth  
20 February 2008