Notes on Jacobs Traffic Report[[1]](#footnote-1) D Siddans 22/2/2018

Option modelled: Option 3a: Green Hammerton + additional growth[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. Number of houses modelled: 13090[[3]](#footnote-3). But Local Plan “makes provision for a total of 16077 dwellings”[[4]](#footnote-4) – a difference of 2987 (no explanation for this?)
2. Model shows 5081 additional trips[[5]](#footnote-5) in the matrix compared to do-minimum. 13090 new dwellings would be expected to generate 7500 – 8000 trips.
3. Traffic impact and flow differences: Diagram at Figure 6[[6]](#footnote-6) shows the following unlikely route assignments – all residential streets:
* Arthurs Avenue,
* Greenway/Leadhall Road,
* Park Avenue/St Georges Road
* Mallinson Way/Firs Crescent,
* Stray Rein/Tewitt Well Road
* St Winifred’s Road/Oatlands Drive/Wheatlands Road East/Tewitt Well Road
* Hookstone Avenue/Beech Avenue/Beech Road
* Eleanor Road
1. Junction Assessments: Junctions considered shown in table 10. Every junction is over-capacity[[7]](#footnote-7) in Option 3a: the majority being at or slightly above 100%.
* 14 junctions in the earlier report[[8]](#footnote-8) have not been included. All of these were over-capacity with lower development numbers.
* Not included in either report: Otley Road/Beckwith Road, Otley Road/Harlow Moor Drive, Otley Road/Pannal Ash Road, Otley Road/Cold Bath Road.

The conclusion in the report that “the network is … able to absorb the increase in demand” (section 6) is derived from a modelling strategy which allocates large increases in flow along residential streets (see above). Only a limited number of junction assessments are included, most of which show a VCR (volume to capacity ratio) of 100.0%.

Clearly what is happening is that the model has been set up to constrain the flows at critical junctions to 100% and flows above that are assigned through a variety of residential streets. This clearly ignores the social and political implications of directing through traffic through residential areas, let alone the practicalities. However, on this basis, Jacobs feels able to conclude that the network as a whole can cope.

Many junctions are not assessed in the report, for example all junctions on Otley Road between Crag Lane and Leeds Road. Curiously some minor junctions are listed, e.g. Leeds Road/Vernon Road.

Crucially, no alternative scenarios appear to have been tested and no consideration has been given to uncertainty across the range of model parameters as required by government guidance[[9]](#footnote-9).

There may be other reports which are not in the public domain, but these are my initial takes from what I have seen in the evidence base for the Local Plan. It is likely that we will challenge the soundness of this part of the Plan
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