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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Metro and Leeds City Council (‘The Promoters’) have undertaken extensive consultation throughout the definition and development of the NGT scheme to date. This has helped to inform the specification of the scheme, and to ensure that those who have a view on the proposals have had an opportunity to express those views.

Through the implementation of a comprehensive programme of consultation and engagement, a wide range of stakeholders were contacted in the early stages of the development of the scheme. As the proposals have progressed the Promoters have continued to build and maintain constructive dialogue with stakeholders and to reach new audiences wherever possible.

While consultation has taken place throughout all stages of the project, the main periods of formal public consultation activities can be summarised as follows:
- 2008 – Feasibility stage;
- 2009 – Development of business case; and

In terms of the most recent consultation activities, since late 2012, approximately 52,000 leaflets have been distributed to properties along the proposed route, 26 public drop-in sessions/public meetings have been held and have been attended by over 1,100 people. In addition over 500 people have submitted feedback on the proposals.

In addition to public consultation there has also been significant consultation with a wide range of stakeholder and interest groups throughout the life of the project. This includes:
- Politicians;
- Affected landowners;
- Residents Associations;
- Businesses;
- Disability groups;
- Environmental bodies;
- Transport Interests; and
- Statutory consultees.

As a result of the feedback that has been received through the consultation process, a number of changes have been made to the scheme design to ensure that where possible the scheme meets stakeholder expectations.

The Promoters recognise that while a significant amount of consultation has been undertaken to date, there will continue to be extensive consultation as the project moves forward and is developed in the future. The Promoters believe there is great value in maintaining an open and constructive dialogue with all stakeholders throughout the further development of the scheme, with the aim of seeking to identify appropriate solutions to specific concerns and ultimately adding value to the scheme.
THE LEEDS TROLLEY SYSTEM VEHICLE ORDER

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

1. INTRODUCTION

Scheme Background

1.1 In July 2012 the Department for Transport (DfT) confirmed the Leeds New Generation Transport scheme’s Programme Entry status and that £173m of government funding was available for the £250m scheme. The DfT also confirmed that in order to authorise the construction, operation and maintenance of the system, an application should be submitted for an Order under the Transport and Works Act 1992 (the 1992 Act). Accordingly, an application has been prepared to be submitted to the Secretary of State for an Order under sections 1 and 3 of the 1992 Act.

1.2 An Order is required under sections 1, 3 and 5 of the 1992 Act to authorise:-

- the construction, operation and maintenance of the trolleybus network;
- the carrying out of other works and the exercise of powers required in connection with or ancillary to the matters set out in item a) above; and
- the acquisition of land and rights over land required in connection with items a) and b) above.

1.3 The application is being promoted jointly by Metro and Leeds City Council (the Promoters). In addition, a request for a Direction as to deemed planning permission will also be submitted to the Secretary of State under section 90(2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is proposed that the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping of the trolley vehicle system should be subject to subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority to the extent and in the manner set out in conditions to the Direction.

1.4 A number of applications for Conservation Area Consents and Listed Building Consents are also being submitted in respect of works proposed to be undertaken along the route, as part of the overall scheme.

Brief description of the scheme development

1.5 NGT will comprise a North Line of approximately 10km in length running from Holt Park district centre (north Leeds) via Bodington, West Park, Headingley, the university campuses and through the city centre to Leeds Bridge at the River Aire. The 5km long South Line will continue from Leeds Bridge, through the New Dock area, Hunslet and Belle Isle to Stourton in the south.
1.6 The route will serve two new Park and Ride sites at Bodington and Stourton with over 3000 parking spaces between them. As well as enhancing public transport connectivity along the route, it will provide direct public transport links that are currently not available, e.g. from the Park and Ride and residential in the south to key educational and leisure destinations in the north. Approximately 40,000 households would be within a short walk (600m/7 minutes) of a proposed NGT stop.

1.7 The Vision Statement for the NGT scheme is as follows:

New Generation Transport: creating a modern, reliable and integrated transport system for Leeds and the City Region

One of the city’s key transformational projects, the NGT trolleybus system is key to creating an integrated rapid transport network for Leeds to support the city’s future development, transform public transport and offer a real and attractive alternative to travel by car.

NGT will be modern, accessible, energy efficient and clean, providing a high quality transport system that offers passengers improved journey times and a frequent, reliable service. It will connect people to key employment sites, education, health and leisure facilities, acting as a catalyst and driver for economic growth and regeneration.

Consultation Overview

1.8 This report is a summary of consultations undertaken by Metro and LCC in the development and design of the NGT proposals and has been prepared to comply with Rule 10(2)(d) of the Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure)(England and Wales) Rules 2006 (‘the 2006 Rules’).

1.9 A significant amount of consultation has taken place throughout the definition and development of the NGT proposals and this has taken place in a number of distinct stages as follows:

- 2008 – feasibility stage;
- 2009 – development of business case; and
- 2012/3 – development of TWA Order submission.

1.10 The Promoters have undertaken extensive consultations about the NGT scheme in order to ensure that all those who have a view on the proposals have had the opportunity to express those views. The consultation undertaken to date has been an essential component of the scheme development process providing valuable feedback on the scheme proposals and enabling the Promoters to identify issues to be addressed within the various design iterations.

1.11 The NGT scheme has been considerably shaped by the consultation feedback that has been received. The Promoters believe that this will ultimately result in a
scheme that more closely meets the aspirations of passengers, local residents, businesses and other stakeholders.

1.12 A wide range of stakeholder groups were contacted in the early stages of scheme development and every effort has been made to continue to build open and productive relationships with stakeholders throughout the development of the proposals.

1.13 Since late 2012, approximately 52,000 leaflets have been distributed to properties along the proposed route, 26 separate public drop-in sessions/public meetings have been held and have been attended by over 1,100 people. In addition over 500 people have submitted feedback on the proposals.

1.14 The Promoters recognise that while a significant amount of consultation has been undertaken to date, there is still a requirement for on-going consultation as the NGT scheme develops further. The Promoters will continue to maintain an open and constructive dialogue with stakeholders throughout the further development of the scheme, with the aim of seeking to resolve concerns wherever possible.

1.15 This report covers:

- Chapter 2. Consultation with The General Public;
- Chapter 3. Consultation with Politicians;
- Chapter 4. Consultation with Landowners;
- Chapter 5. Consultation with The Business Community;
- Chapter 6. Consultation with Specific Stakeholders/Interest Groups;
- Chapter 7. Consultation with Transport Interests; and
- Chapter 8. Consultation with Statutory Consultees.

Stakeholder and Communications Strategy

1.16 In 2007 in the early stages of the development of the NGT project, a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy was developed which set out the framework for all stakeholder interactions on the project. This overarching strategy included a Stakeholder Management Plan, a Communications Strategy and a Consultation Action Plan.

1.17 As part of the wider Comprehensive Spending Review, development of the scheme was paused between June 2010 and July 2012. During this period the Project Team was disbanded and all consultation and communications activities were kept to a minimum. This was on the specific advice of the Department for Transport (DfT) in order to ensure that expectations were not unduly raised while the future of the scheme was uncertain.

1.18 In July 2012, the project was remobilised and work was undertaken to review and refresh the project management procedures and documentation associated with the project. This included the development of an updated Communications
Management Strategy according to the requirements of the PRINCE 2 Project Management procedures.

1.19 The Communications Management Strategy is provided at Annex 1. The main aim of the Communications Management Strategy is to manage the expectations of the proposed NGT project and to ensure appropriate and effective consultation and engagement takes place throughout the life of the project. The key objectives of the Communication Management Strategy can be summarised as follows:

- Establish, develop and maintain active support for and understanding of, the proposed NGT project from key stakeholders, partners and ultimately the public, across Leeds and its City Region through planned, targeted, effective and consistent communications;

- Ensure that accurate and timely messages about the project are disseminated by:
  - Identifying key stakeholders and influencers who can support and champion the NGT project;
  - Considering how to communicate with the general public – the population of Leeds and the wider City Region, and how that population breaks down into sub-groups, requiring specific messages;
  - Establishing appropriate, accurate and relevant messages for each of these stakeholder and general public groups and the methods, or combinations of methods, by which they will be conveyed.

- Ensure that any consultation activities provide stakeholders with the opportunity for two-way dialogue;

- Ensure that consultation activities are planned and delivered in a manner that will reach the intended audience and will be accessible to all; and

- Ensure that consultation activities are monitored / evaluated and appropriate feedback provided to consultees.
2. CONSULTATION WITH THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Public Consultation Overview

2.1 Throughout the life of the NGT project a wide range of consultation and engagement with the general public has taken place and this is described in detail in this section. While public consultation has taken place throughout all stages of the project, the main periods of formal public consultation can be summarised as follows:

Up to 2010:

- Phase 1: November 2008 to January 2009;
- Phase 2: June 2009 to September 2009; and
- Phase 3: May to June 2010 (Holt Park Extension).

2012 onwards:

- Phase 4: Nov 2012-March 2013;
- Phase 5: May-June 2013 (Belle Isle route variant); and
- Phase 6: June-July 2013.

2.2 The programme of public consultation has been significantly shaped by the prolonged pause in the development activity while the case for the scheme was re-examined as part of the wider Comprehensive Spending Review.

2.3 A high level overview of the main public consultation events undertaken throughout the course of the project to date is provided at Annex 2. A more detailed summary is provided below.

Phase 1 Public Consultation: November 2008 to January 2009

2.4 An initial phase of public consultation on the NGT proposals took place over an eight week period between November 2008 to January 2009. The focus of this consultation was to present the initial ideas for NGT to as wide an audience as possible and to gather feedback on the key attributes that people would like to see in a new public transport system for Leeds. At this stage initial route proposals and mode options were also presented in the consultation materials.

2.5 The consultation period commenced with the launch of the NGT website (www.ngtmetro.com) in November 2008. This website was established in order to provide general scheme information, regular project updates and to enable people to provide feedback directly to the NGT team. The website was also used as a means of advertising forthcoming consultation events.

2.6 During the initial period of consultation, public exhibitions were held in a staffed mobile exhibition unit at a prominent location in Leeds city centre (Victoria
Gardens, shown at Figure 1). These exhibitions were held over four consecutive days and included evening and weekend opening (See Annex 2).

2.7 The exhibitions were widely advertised on the NGT website, in the free Metro newspaper and in the Yorkshire Evening Post. In addition the consultation was also promoted through existing networks such as the ‘Leeds Travel Plan Network’ (representing major employers in Leeds) and ‘Leeds Voice’ (representing community, voluntary and faith groups).

2.8 An NGT leaflet and questionnaire were produced and distributed at the public exhibitions for people to complete during the event or to be taken away and returned via a freepost envelope. In addition consultation packs (containing a leaflet, questionnaire and freepost envelope) were available at a number of public libraries and LCC ‘One Stop Shops’ along the proposed NGT routes throughout the consultation period. A copy of the Phase 1 NGT consultation documents are provided at Annex 3. The documents can be summarised as follows:

- An introductory leaflet explaining the outline NGT proposals (including proposed routes and vehicle options);
- A questionnaire seeking views on public transport on Leeds and feedback on the outline proposals; and
- A freepost envelope for people to return the completed questionnaire.

Figure 1: Public Exhibitions in Leeds City Centre, November 2008

2.9 The consultation materials focussed on presenting initial outline proposals for the NGT routes and the rationale for these, as well as covering the potential vehicle options and the next steps in the process. The question of why a tram system was no longer being proposed for Leeds was also addressed. The NGT leaflet and questionnaire were also available in other formats (e.g. braille and large print) and in other languages.
2.10 During the public exhibitions promotions staff were employed to distribute consultation packs in Leeds city centre and to encourage people to visit the exhibition unit for more information. These staff were also engaged in December 2008 (following the exhibitions), to distribute further consultation packs in the city centre.

2.11 Through the NGT website an on-line facility for people to complete the questionnaire was provided. The deadline for return of the questionnaire by post or completion on-line was the 9th January 2009.

2.12 In total, 1,820 responses to the first NGT questionnaire were received. There was a particularly high response from visitors to the public exhibitions with 84% of those who attended the event completing the questionnaire. 28% of the response resulted from completion of on-line questionnaires through the NGT website.

2.13 Over 95% of questionnaire respondents thought that public transport in Leeds could be improved. The most popular requests in terms of improving public transport services were:

- more reliable services;
- cheaper fares;
- more frequent services;
- more bus lanes; and
- less crowded services.

2.14 85% of respondents thought that existing bus vehicles could be improved and on-board information was the most commonly requested improvement.

2.15 Further comments about the NGT proposals were invited (in an open question format). The comments received from respondents were broadly supportive of the proposals and a desire was expressed for high quality and environmentally friendly public transport.

2.16 Following analysis of the questionnaire responses, a summary report to highlight the key consultation findings was published on the NGT website. The NGT Project Team also contacted all questionnaire respondents who had provided an email address with an overview of the findings. In addition details of the findings were disseminated via those networks that had been used to originally advertise the consultation events.

2.17 A copy of the report into the findings of the Phase 1 public consultation can be found at Annex 4.

2.18 A number of issues arose during the first period of public consultation which were then fed back into the design process. The key issues can be summarised as follows:

- Requests for a tram instead of a bus based solution;
- Improved/more bus routes in Leeds;
- Improved customer services on public transport;
Faster bus services;
Provision of Smartcards;
Providing more bus priority; and
Restrict car use/car parking.

2.19 A more detailed analysis of how consultation feedback has shaped the NGT proposals can be found at Annex 5.

Phase 2 Public Consultation: June 2009 to September 2009

2.20 The Phase 2 NGT public consultation took place over a 12-week period between June 2009 and September 2009 to inform the development of the Major Scheme Business Case. This included a series of public exhibitions held in a mobile exhibition unit in the city centre and at various locations along the proposed NGT routes, which during this Phase included an Eastern route to St James’ hospital and a city centre loop. The exhibitions took place at six venues in all and evening/weekend opening was included to ensure that people were given appropriate opportunity to attend. Annex 2 provides more details about the dates and locations of the exhibitions and Figure 2 shows the interior of the mobile exhibition unit.

2.21 The second phase of NGT consultation was advertised using the same range of newspapers and existing stakeholder networks as previously used for the Phase 1 consultation. Letters were also sent to all schools along the proposed routes advising them of the consultation and offering separate briefing sessions/presentations. Prior to the start of each exhibition, promotional staff hand delivered posters advertising details of the venues and dates to businesses and community facilities along each of the routes.

2.22 The Phase 2 consultation events also attracted significant media attention leading to coverage on various local television and radio programmes.

2.23 An NGT consultation pack (containing a leaflet, questionnaire and freepost envelope) was again produced for distribution at the public exhibitions and these were also made available at public libraries and LCC ‘One Stop Shops’ in Leeds throughout the consultation period. The consultation pack contained:

- An NGT leaflet presenting the preferred routes and mode;
- Questionnaire seeking feedback on the proposals; and
- Freepost envelope for the return of completed questionnaires.

2.24 A copy of the Phase 2 NGT consultation documents is provided at Annex 3.

2.25 The consultation materials focussed upon presenting the Promoters’ preferred route and showed alternative route options in some areas with details of the issues associated with these. Trolleybus was presented as the preferred mode of transport to operate NGT and further information about this mode was presented
in the consultation materials. A summary of the results from the previous public consultation exercise was also provided along with an update on the next steps in the process.

2.26 During the exhibitions, promotions staff were once again engaged to distribute consultation packs in and around the vicinity of the exhibition unit and to encourage people to attend the exhibitions. The presence of these staff in NGT branded clothing, served to increase the profile of the public consultation event and also resulted in over 18,000 consultation packs being handed out to passers-by during the exhibitions.

*Figure 2: Public Exhibition at Morrisons, Penny Hill Centre: June 2009*

2.27 As part of the second period of public consultation a computer generated animation was developed to show a trolleybus travelling along certain sections of the proposed NGT network. This was developed to help people visualise what a trolleybus might look like on the streets of Leeds, as through the earlier consultation, it had become apparent that people had varying perceptions of what a trolleybus is. The animation was made available on the NGT website and was also on display at the exhibition venue and feedback on this was very positive.

2.28 Over 2,500 people completed the Phase 2 NGT questionnaire with 72% of these being returned by freepost and 14% completed on-line via the NGT website. Analysis of the responses demonstrated a very positive reaction to NGT, with 77% of all respondents supporting or strongly supporting the proposals (see figure 3 below).
2.29 Analysis shows that the greatest level of support came from those people who attended the exhibitions. The evidence therefore suggests that face to face communication and explanation of the proposals was a valuable way of helping to alleviate concerns about the scheme.

2.30 The main reasons cited for supporting the NGT proposals related to the potential for reduced car use/congestion; environmental reasons and the provision of a reliable/quick/good quality, modern public transport system.

2.31 The questionnaire responses also demonstrated an extremely high level of support for the use of trolleybuses (76%), which were primarily supported on environmental grounds (see Figure 4). Over 70% of all respondents supported/strongly supported the introduction of Park and Ride sites at the end of the North and South routes and support for Park and Ride was much higher amongst car users.
2.32 A full report of the findings from the Phase 2 consultation exercise is provided at Annex 6.

2.33 The results from the Phase 2 consultation process have been made available on the NGT website and have also been disseminated by post and email to all those questionnaire respondents who indicated that they would like to be kept informed. In addition details of the findings were also disseminated via those networks that had been used to originally advertise the consultation events (e.g. the Leeds Travel Plan Network, Leeds Voice etc.).

2.34 A number of issues arose during the second period of public consultation which were again fed back into the design process. The key issues can be summarised as follows:

- Further work on the alignment options in the vicinity of Woodhouse Moor;
- West Park area – concern over the proposed changes access rights;
- A desire for more NGT routes and wider coverage across Leeds;
- The need for low fares to encourage use;
- The need for competitive Park and Ride pricing to encourage car drivers;
- Concern about how NGT would integrate with existing bus services; and
- The impact of the scheme on traffic, with some concerns that NGT would create additional congestion.
Phase 3 Public Consultation May 2010 to June 2010

2.35 On 22\textsuperscript{nd} March 2010 the DfT announced that the NGT project had been awarded Programme Entry Approval. This approval did not cover the proposed East Route or the whole of the city centre loop, but did include a prospective extension of the North NGT route to serve the community of Holt Park.

2.36 The provision of the Holt Park extension had not previously been put forward as a core part of the NGT scheme, but had instead been included in the 2009 Major Scheme Business Case as a possible future extension that could be delivered through local funding.

2.37 As such, whilst the future aspiration to serve Holt Park had been clearly highlighted in the consultation materials that had been published prior to Programme Entry Approval, specific feedback on this proposal had not been collected in a structured manner. Accordingly, following the Programme Entry announcement, a further period of public consultation was held to consider the Holt Park extension in more detail.

2.38 A four week period of public consultation on the Holt Park route was held between 20\textsuperscript{th} May and 18\textsuperscript{th} June 2010. This included holding a three day public exhibition in the Holt Park area during May 2010, the purpose of which was to present the proposed route in more detail and to collect feedback on this.

2.39 The exhibition took place at the Holt Park District Centre between Thursday 20\textsuperscript{th} to Saturday 22\textsuperscript{nd} May. Information was also made available on the internet, in the local library and was distributed to members of the public on street.

2.40 In total around 400 people attended the exhibition over the three day period and information packs were handed out to passers-by. These packs contained the following:

- An NGT leaflet presenting the preferred routes and mode showing the Holt Park extension as a core part of the route;
- Questionnaire seeking feedback on the proposals; and
- Freepost envelope for the return of completed questionnaires.

2.41 In total 140 people completed and returned the questionnaire.

2.42 The questionnaire responses showed a positive reaction to the proposals and 65% of all respondents supported/strongly supported them. The main reasons for such support related to:

- Reduced car use/congestion;
- Environmental reasons; and
- Provision of reliable/quick/good quality, modern public transport.

2.43 A similar level of support was shown for the use of trolleybuses, which were primarily supported due to environmental reasons. Over 70% of all respondents
supported/strongly supported the introduction of Park and Ride sites, such support was even higher amongst car owners.

2.44 The feedback questionnaire asked about potential use of NGT and 71% of those living within a ten minute walk of one of the routes said they would consider using it. 39% of car owners responding said they would consider using the Park and Ride services.

2.45 A copy of the findings from the Holt Park consultation is attached at Annex 7.

Phase 4 Public Consultation: October 2012 to March 2013

2.46 The NGT scheme was put on hold by the Government from June 2010 to July 2012 so that the case for the scheme could be re-examined in detail as part of the wider Comprehensive Spending Review. During this time the Project Team was disbanded and there was very limited activity on the project other than the preparation of revised funding bid documents as required in line with Government guidance.

2.47 In placing the scheme on hold the Government also advised the Promoters to exercise caution in any public communications during this review period in order to avoid unduly raising expectations. As a result the Promoters avoided public engagement activities during this period while the project was on hold.

2.48 The NGT scheme was re-awarded Programme Entry Approval in July 2012. Over the following months the internal Project Team and wider advisor team was re-established and public consultation activities resumed.

2.49 Following the reactivation of Programme Entry Approval it was necessary to develop a programme of consultation and engagement activities that would both revive awareness of the scheme and in particular reach those people along the proposed routes who were most directly affected by the scheme.

2.50 In order to do this an update leaflet was sent to all properties within 600 metres of the NGT route. This provided a summary of the proposals and set out the process going forward. A feedback form was also included as part of the leaflet in order for people to provide their views on the scheme.

2.51 Following the distribution of the leaflet a series of public drop-in sessions were then held over a four month period along the NGT routes so that local residents and businesses could find out more about the proposals. In total 12 different drop-in sessions were held. More details about these drop-in sessions can be found at Annex 2.

2.52 These were advertised through a variety of existing contacts and networks which included contact with the following groups:

- Local ward members;
- West Park Residents Association;
- Becketts Park Residents Association;
Glen Road Residents Association;
North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association;
Spen Hill Residents Association;
Weetwood Lane Residents Association;
Church Woods and Drummond Residents Association;
Holt Park Residents Association;
Hunslet Carr community group;
Central Park Management Committees; and
Headon business group (Headingley)

2.53 The events were also advertised on the NGT project website, via facebook, Twitter and in articles which appeared in the Yorkshire Evening Post.

2.54 At the drop-in events the Design Freeze 6 engineering drawings for the locality were displayed and copies of all the engineering drawings for the full length of the route were also available for inspection. Members of staff were also on hand to discuss the NGT proposals in detail.

2.55 Visitors to the drop-in sessions were asked to provide feedback on the engineering plans, or the project generally, through a feedback form which was available at the events or alternatively submit their feedback by email/letter following the events.

2.56 Figure 5 below shows the drop-in session held in central Headingley in early 2013.

2.57 In total approximately 700 people attended the drop-in events and a total of 127 feedback forms were received from people who attended the events. In response to these feedback forms individual responses were sent out to people and a comprehensive ‘Frequently Asked Questions’ section was added to the NGT website to address common themes that had arisen.

Figure 5: Central Headingley Consultation Event: January 2013
2.58 In response to the feedback received, a number of elements of the design were changed to take account of issues raised. These included:

- Changes to the design at West Park including the removal of a one way restriction at Kepstorn Road which had been proposed;
- Various improvements to cycle facilities along the route;
- Removal of some bus lay-bys on Otley Old Road to reduce land-take;
- Provision of parking bays/loading facilities to serve shops at Weetwood Lane/Cottage Road;
- Revised design at Shaw Lane to retain pedestrian facilities close to their existing location; and
- Improvements to access and pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of St Joseph’s School.

2.59 A full list of design changes resulting from consultation feedback can be found at Annex 5.

Phase 5 Public Consultation: Belle Isle May 2013

2.60 In early 2013 the proposed High Speed 2 (HS2) route between Leeds and the West Midlands was announced. This included a section in very close proximity to the proposed NGT route, along the rail sidings at Balm Road in South Leeds. No indication was provided by HS2 ahead of the route announcement that it would impact on the NGT corridor.

2.61 After further consideration of the potential risks around the interface between the NGT system and the proposed HS2 route it was agreed that the potential for an alternative alignment in South Leeds should be considered in detail.

2.62 The best alternative alignment was initially considered to be in the Belle Isle area and as a route through this area had not previously been proposed, it was considered appropriate to consult the local community. An updated NGT leaflet was distributed to all properties within 600m of the proposed route through Belle Isle, which amounted to approximately 5,000 properties. This leaflet included general details of the NGT proposals and specifically the proposal to revise the route in South Leeds. A copy of the leaflet is provided at Annex 3.

2.63 Following distribution of the leaflet, two public drop-in sessions were held in the Belle Isle area in early May 2013, at the Belle Isle Family Centre and West Grange Church. Further details of these events can be found at Annex 2.

2.64 These drop-in sessions were advertised in the following ways:

- NGT project website;
- Via local ward members;
- Belle Isle Tenants Management Association;
2.65 At the Belle Isle drop-in sessions members of the public were able to view the draft engineering plans (including the new engineering plans showing the route through Belle Isle) and speak with members of the NGT project team.

2.66 In total 27 people attended these sessions and 6 feedback forms were received from attendees.

2.67 In terms of the feedback received the following issues were raised:

- Concern about the level of local traffic generated by the Park and Ride;
- Concern about the change in traffic restrictions at Winrose Grove;
- Suggestion that there are not enough NGT stops on the Belle Isle section of route;
- Suggestion that further measures are required to ensure cyclists are not adversely affected by the proposals; and
- Issues regarding existing bus service – including the impact on services and the re-siting of bus stops.

**Phase 6 Public Consultation: June 2013 to July 2013**

2.68 Following the completion of the most recent design freeze, the engineering plans were updated and published on the NGT website (on 11\textsuperscript{th} June), ahead of the scheme’s consideration by the LCC Plans Panel (see paragraphs 3.6 to 3.11 below). At this time further updated information was also available on the NGT website including the updated journey time predictions for the scheme.

2.69 In June 2013 an updated NGT leaflet was also produced showing the revised route in South Leeds serving the Belle Isle area and the updated journey time information. This leaflet also included a pull-out feedback form with a freepost facility for people to provide any comments.

2.70 A series of eight public drop-in sessions was held between June and July 2013 at various locations along the route. The purpose of these events was to provide people with the opportunity to view the updated engineering plans for their areas (if they hadn’t seen them online) and to discuss these with members of the NGT Project Team.

2.71 Copies of the draft landscape plans were also provided at these drop-in events which was the first time they had been displayed in the public arena. As these were still initial draft plans they were not made available online at this stage.
2.72 The drop-in events were advertised by an NGT e-newsletter sent to all of those people (around 450) who had registered to be updated on scheme progress. In addition the following means of advertising the events were also used:

- On the NGT project website;
- Via local ward members;
- Via local residents associations (as listed at 2.52);
- In the North Leeds Life magazine;
- South Leeds life website;
- Local media (through articles on local radio and in local newspapers);
- Via posters distributed to city centre businesses; and
- Email to 160 business contacts.

2.73 At the drop-in events people had the opportunity to discuss the plans and wider project issues with members of the NGT project. Feedback was collected via a feedback form which was available at the drop-in sessions.

2.74 In total approximately 289 people attended this round of public drop-in sessions and 111 feedback forms were returned.

2.75 During this phase of public events, direct letters were also distributed to properties in close proximity to the various University of Leeds sports pitches that are planned to be relocated as part of the project. This followed detailed negotiations with the University of Leeds in the preceding months, to identify exactly where the upgraded facilities (to replace those that would be lost as a result of the Bodington Park and Ride site) should be provided.

2.76 Once the preferred location of the replacement sports pitches was agreed in principle with the University, it was necessary to disseminate information about the proposals to local residents. A letter and a fact sheet about the proposals were distributed to approximately 2,000 properties. These set out details of the proposed alterations to the existing sports pitches (which includes some changes to access and provision of new lighting). The letter also provided local residents with details of the drop-in events that were due to take place in the vicinity of the University sports pitches.

2.77 In addition to the public drop-in events, two city centre events were also held in July 2013. This involved siting an NGT exhibition unit in prominent locations in the city centre on two separate days (a weekday and a Saturday). At these events members of the NGT Project Team handed out approximately 5,000 leaflets to people and were available to discuss the proposals in detail with people who required further information. Feedback forms were also made available for people to complete at the event and the leaflet included a feedback form which could be returned by freepost. Figure 6 shows the promotional event at Briggate in Leeds City Centre.
2.78 The purpose of the city centre events was to more widely disseminate information about the scheme and to reach those people who do not necessarily live along the routes, but who may have an interest in the proposals.

2.79 During this phase of consultation the Promoters also distributed two e-newsletters to those people who had been in contact with the Project Team and who had stated that they wished to be kept updated on scheme progress. The first of these newsletters was distributed to approximately 400 email addresses in June 2013 and the second to approximately 500 email addresses in August 2013.

2.80 It is intended that these e-newsletters continue to be distributed throughout the development of the scheme, in order to highlight important scheme information. The Promoters are actively encouraging individuals and organisations to sign up to this newsletter to ensure that the distribution is as comprehensive as possible.
3 CONSULTATION WITH POLITICIANS

Local Member Briefings

3.1 Throughout the development of the NGT proposals, regular liaison has taken place with Leeds City Council (LCC) Members on key project issues. This has included provision of written updates, open information sessions and detailed briefings. In addition exhibitions about the scheme have also been held in the Council ante-chamber, prior to full Council meetings, in order to provide local members with the opportunity to discuss the proposals with members of the Project Team.

3.2 There have been a significant number of meetings and briefings with local ward members representing those communities through which the trolleybus is proposed to run. Through the life of the project this has included meetings with members representing the following wards:

- Adel and Wharfedale;
- Weetwood;
- Headingley;
- Hyde Park and Woodhouse;
- City and Hunslet;
- Beeston and Holbeck; and
- Middleton Park.

3.3 Ward member briefings have taken the form of meetings, presentations and site visits as required and the feedback received from members has helped to shape the design of the scheme.

3.4 Members of the NGT Project Team have regularly attended LCC Area Committee Meetings (and their designated Transport sub-group meetings) in those areas through which NGT is proposed to run. These public open meetings have been used as a forum to provide feedback on the findings of the public consultation exercises and to consider any specific local issues or areas of concern. The key Area Committees covering the route, which the Project Team have regularly attended include:

- Outer North West Area Committee (Adel and Wharfedale);
- Inner North West Area Committee (Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Headingley); and
- Inner South (City and Hunslet and Middleton).

3.5 The NGT proposals have also been regularly reported to local Councillors through appropriate formal channels including the full Council meetings, Leeds City Council Executive Board, the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority and the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority Executive Board.
Leeds City Council Plans Panel

3.6 Following the remobilisation of the project in July 2012 a significant amount of engagement has also taken place with the LCC City Plans Panel, as the local planning authority, to brief members on the scheme and to take account of their views in the development of the detailed proposals for NGT. Several workshops and site visits have taken place with the Panel members to provide them with a detailed understanding of the project and to seek their feedback on the proposals.

3.7 In addition to the above mentioned events, a number of separate briefings have also taken place with the Chair of the City Plans Panel and regular updates have been provided to the LCC Planning Board following remobilisation of the project in Summer 2012.

3.8 Given the scale and complexity of the NGT scheme, a special public meeting of! the LCC City Plans Panel took place on 25th June 2013. The purpose of this full-day meeting was to exclusively consider NGT and review the planning implications of the project. Members of the public were able to attend this meeting and to make verbal representations on planning-related matters. Panel members could make recommendations and ask questions of the Promoters’ project team and consultants.

3.9 LCC advertised this meeting widely through their normal procedures. In addition they also sent an invitation to attend this event to people on the NGT project mailing list at that time. This mailing list was comprised of people who had attended NGT consultation events or directly contacted the team since Summer 2012 and had indicated that they wished to be kept informed of the development of the NGT proposals. A copy of the invite letter that was sent is provided at Annex 8.

3.10 At the close of the public meeting on 25th June 2013 the Plans Panel passed the following resolution:

(1) That Members’ views on the draft planning conditions as set out in (Appendix 1), the draft design statement as set out in (Appendix 2) and the siting of sub-stations together with views on the planning issues identified in order to inform the progression of the Transport and Works Act Order application be noted

(2) That the Panel support in principle the completion of a S106 agreement, or other suitable mechanism, to provide local training and employment initiatives which arise from the construction, management and operation of these NGT proposals

(3) That the Panel support proposals for taxi parking at Meadow Lane on a temporary basis only, as this land is required as part of proposals for the city park, as proposed in the South Bank Planning Framework, and a replacement permanent facility will need to be identified and provided

3.11 A copy of the full minutes from the City Plans Panel meeting of 23rd June 2013 can be found at Annex 9.
Local Members of Parliament

3.12 As part of the Phase 2 public consultation held in June 2009, a briefing event was also held for Leeds MPs in order to provide them with further information about the scheme and to answer any queries. In addition a number of individual meetings with MP’s also took place prior to the scheme being put on hold in June 2010.

3.13 Following the remobilisation of the project in 2012 further engagement has taken place with local MP’s this has included meetings and correspondence with the following MP’s and groups:

- Greg Mullholland MP, Leeds Central;
- Alec Shelbrooke MP, Elmet and Rothwell;
- Hilary Benn MP, Leeds Central;
- Ed Balls MP, Morley and Outwood; and
- Team Leeds – a cross party group of the Leeds MP’s.
4 CONSULTATION WITH LANDOWNERS

4.1 Throughout the development of the scheme design the Project Team has undertaken direct consultation with landowners along the full length of the route.

4.2 In January 2013 bespoke letters were issued to over 60 landowners who owned land and property which was anticipated to be directly affected by the proposals by way of land being acquired either temporarily or permanently, or otherwise because the proposals would affect access routes.

4.3 The letters offered landowners an opportunity to meet with members of the Project Team, so that the potential effects of the proposals could be better understood, and to consider how any adverse impacts could be mitigated through amendments to design, or through undertakings being offered relating to how NGT will be constructed.

4.4 As the design has been further developed additional landowners have been written to between February and August 2013, with bespoke letters being issued to over 120 landowners in total. Meetings have taken place with over 60 landowners and the feedback received from meetings and other forms of communication has been used to influence the scheme design.

4.5 The landowner consultation process has led to a number of amendments being made to the scheme design, some of which are referred to within Annex 5. Where appropriate, the Promoters are negotiating detailed heads of terms with affected landowners, in order to regulate the impact of the NGT works on their properties.
5 CONSULTATION WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

5.1 There has been significant engagement with the business community during the development of the project to date. This has included consultation with both business groups and with individual businesses in communities along the proposed route and from the wider area.

5.2 In terms of those businesses along the route the majority of consultation has taken place as a result of the direct landowner consultation process (see section 4 above). In addition to this separate briefings have been held with a number of individual businesses along the route and in the city more widely.

5.3 In addition to individual businesses, the Project Team have also consulted with the wider business community through a range of groups and representative organisations. This has included meetings, presentations and question and answer sessions with organisations such as:

- Head-on (business forum located in Headingley);
- The Chamber of Commerce;
- Leeds Property Forum;
- Leeds LEP;
- Leeds Retail Association;
- Institute of Directors;
- Federation of the Built Environment;
- Yorkshire Business Insider;
- Yorkshire Insider; and
- Leeds & Partners.

5.4 Through the programme of consultation with the business community a number of statements of support have been received from key business leaders and these are provided at Annex 10. This includes statements from:

- Allied London (owners of New Dock);
- Jones Lang LaSalle;
- Bruntwood;
- Hammerson;
- Yorkshire Design Developments;
- Downton in Business;
- SMG (first direct Arena);
- Leeds Chamber of Commerce; and
- The Civic Trust.
6 CONSULTATION WITH SPECIFIC STAKEHOLDERS/ INTEREST GROUPS

6.1 A wide range of engagement and consultation has taken place with key stakeholder groups during all stages of the development of the project.

6.2 In all cases the Project Team have tailored the information presented to these groups to address the particular issues they have wished to discuss. These meetings have proved extremely successful both in terms of collecting feedback on the NGT proposals and in establishing clear routes of communication which will be of use as the project progresses.

6.3 The key areas of stakeholder/interest group consultation are summarised below:

Consultation with the Civic Trust

6.4 A number of meetings were held with the Civic Trust up to the pause in the project in 2010. Following the project re-start two detailed consultation meetings with the Civic Trust held were held in February 2013 to consider the plans for the project in more depth. A number of issues were raised through this process which have subsequently been addressed where appropriate through the design process. A full list of changes as a result of the consultation can be found at Annex 5.

6.5 Following the significant consultation process, the Civic Trust has publically confirmed its support for the NGT scheme and a statement of support can be found at Annex 10.

Consultation with Local Residents' Groups and Community Groups

6.6 A number of meetings have taken place with residents associations representing communities located along the NGT routes. This includes the following organisations:

- North Hyde Park Residents’ Association;
- Weetwood Residents’ Association;
- West Park Residents’ Association;
- Hunslet Carr Community Association;
- Belle Isle Tenants’ Management Organisation (BITMO); and
- Oakfield Residents.

6.7 In addition, the Project Team has also held meetings with, and given presentations to, a number of local groups including organisations such as local Rotary clubs and transport interest groups. These have also included three open
public meetings to discuss NGT, organised by local discussion group Café Scientifique, which were all held in the Headingley area.

Consultation with Equality Groups

6.8 In January 2013 the Promoters wrote to 70 equality/community groups to obtain their initial comments on the NGT proposals. This was followed by a presentation on the NGT project which was given to the city council’s Disability Hub Representatives Network in April 2013. At this presentation a number of key issues were raised by members of the Disability Hub representatives which included:

- The impact of the construction process;
- The scope for combining the traction poles with existing lighting columns;
- The extent of road re-surfacing planned as part of NGT;
- The potential of the scheme to improve journey times; and
- The potential for contractual mechanisms to ensure that the contractors adhered to quality standards.

6.9 On 29th April 2013 an initial Equality Access workshop was held. This involved individuals with a strong interest in access issues and officers of the Council with responsibilities for access issues and working with vulnerable groups. During the workshop attendees were provided with an overview of the NGT scheme and were introduced to the key areas of the design where access groups were likely to have the most interest (for example Millennium Square and City Square where the proposed alignment runs close to areas of high pedestrian activity).

6.10 A key outcome from this workshop was to agree that a core advisory group be established to meet on a quarterly basis to:

- ensure that access issues are fully taken into account in the design, construction, and operation of the scheme; and
- advise on the appropriate individuals or groups across a range of equality characteristics and methods of involvement to consider the practical access issues associated with the scheme.

6.11 It was also agreed that a network of equality access users would be established to meet as required and to act as the ‘voice of the customer’, in order to provide the NGT Team with a practical understanding across a range of equality characteristics, on the access issues involved in providing Leeds with a trolleybus system.

6.12 Further consultation with community equality organisations also took place during Summer 2013 to inform Metro and LCC’s preparation of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) prior to the TWAO submission. This consultation involved the use of a topic guide and included a number of different local groups including:
Leeds Association of Blind Asians (ABA);
Leeds Guide Dogs;
Leeds Deaf and Blind Society;
PATH (Yorkshire);
Belle Isle Elderly Winter Aid;
Leeds Black Elders Association; and
Refugee Council (Yorkshire & Humberside).

6.13 The outcomes of the interviews which were held with the above-mentioned groups have been reflected in the EqIA document.

Consultation with Environmental Bodies

6.14 In accordance with the 2006 Rules, Metro and LCC have carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment of the NGT proposals. This involved the following consultation with environmental bodies.

- LCC;
- Natural England;
- Highways Agency;
- Environment Agency (EA); and
- English Heritage.

6.15 The first formal Scoping Opinion was provided by the Secretary of State in August 2009; the second in November 2012 and the final Scoping Opinion in May 2013.

6.16 During the preparation of the ES, on-going liaison has been undertaken with relevant bodies to address particular aspects during the scheme design and development.

6.17 Following a pre-briefing session with LCC on 26th April 2013 to explain the intended process, an ES Briefing and Mitigation Workshop was held on the 13th June 2013 with the Mott MacDonald and Gillespies Environmental Specialists, LCC Officers, and key members of the NGT Project Team from Metro and Mott MacDonald to discuss the emerging mitigation for each of the EIA specialist topics. The aims of the workshop were:

- To provide a briefing on progress to date, including surveys, assessments completed to date and emerging findings;
- To present and discuss the proposed emerging ES mitigation for each technical discipline;
- To discuss overlaps between related disciplines; and
To review the draft ES Mitigation Register as it stood at this time.

6.18 Following on from the workshop a response to each of the comments was provided by the Mott MacDonald and Gillespies Project Team to demonstrate how the feedback would be considered and addressed.

Consultation with Statutory Undertakers

6.19 There has been consultation with Statutory Undertakers throughout the life of the project which has included consultation as part of the New Roads and Street Works Act procedures.

6.20 A seminar was held for Statutory Undertakers in 2009 to provide a combined briefing about the NGT proposals and this was followed by the issue of ‘C3’ notices in 2010 in order to obtain budget estimates for the NGT scheme cost plan.

6.21 In early 2013 more detailed meetings took place with Yorkshire Water (waste division), Northern Powergrid and Northern Gas.
7 CONSULTATION WITH TRANSPORT INTERESTS

Consultation with Bus Operators

7.1 The scheme Promoters recognise the role of bus operators as a key stakeholder in the NGT project given the future interaction of NGT with existing bus services. The Project Team have sought to provide all operators with equal opportunity to understand more about the NGT proposals and to raise any specific issues they may have.

7.2 This process commenced with a Bus Operator Forum which was held on 12th June 2009 in order to provide a general update on the NGT proposals and enable operators to ask questions. All West Yorkshire based bus operating companies (approximately 150) were invited to the event, including school bus operators. An advertisement for the forum was also posted on the NGT website to advertise the event to other operators from outside the local area. In total seven bus operating companies were represented at the event including companies who do not currently operate in the West Yorkshire area.

7.3 As part of the Bus Operator Forum an open offer was made to all Bus Operators to hold individual follow-up meetings upon request. This offer was taken up by a number of companies with whom subsequent briefing sessions were held between 2009-2010.

7.4 Following the pause in the development of the scheme, a further bus operators seminar was held in November 2012 in order to provide operators with an update following the full remobilisation of the project. All companies currently operating in West Yorkshire were invited, by letter, to this seminar. In total nine people attended this session representing five different bus operating companies and two trade publications.

7.5 Following the second bus operators seminar, a letter was sent to all companies who currently operate bus services in close proximity to the proposed NGT routes. This was to invite those operators who would be directly affected by the proposals with an opportunity to provide their more detailed feedback on the plans. In total three companies accepted this offer and meetings were held with representatives from the following operators:

- First Leeds;
- Arriva Yorkshire; and
- Transdev Blazefield.

7.6 These meetings did not consider any issues relating to the proposed procurement strategy and future commercial opportunities since these would be the subject of a formal market engagement process.
Consultation with Network Rail

7.7 Consultation has taken place with the Network Rail throughout the development of the proposals to date. Prior to the pause in development activity discussions largely centred on the interaction of the NGT alignment with the Pontefract rail line in South Leeds, where the NGT proposal was to run in close proximity to Network Rail land.

7.8 However, following the HS2 route announcement in early 2013, the Promoters adopted an alternative alignment in South Leeds which diverted the route away from the Pontefract rail line. Following this amendment the interface with Network Rail owned land and assets has been greatly reduced.

7.9 An initial agreement is now in place with Network Rail. Detailed discussions are continuing with Network Rail to address their specific queries.

Consultation with the Highways Agency

7.10 Detailed consultation with the Highways Agency took place up to June 2010 before the project was put on hold. This predominantly focussed on the impacts of the proposed Park and Ride site at Stourton on the M621 motorway junction from which the Park and Ride would be accessed.

7.11 Following the Belle Isle route amendment the risks associated with the interfaces between the Park and Ride site and the M621 junction have been significantly reduced. Although general traffic will still access the Park and Ride site via the M621 Roundabout, trolleybus vehicles will now enter from a different alignment which does not directly interface with Highways Agency Land.

7.12 Detailed discussions are continuing with the Highways Agency.

Consultation with Cyclists

7.13 Detailed consultation has taken place with cyclists to help shape the NGT proposals. Following the full project remobilisation. An initial meeting was held with the Leeds Cycling Consultation Forum, which includes representatives from a number of local cycling groups. Following this a smaller cycling sub group was formed to specifically consider the NGT proposals from a cycling perspective.

7.14 The Cycling Sub Group met on 5 occasions between January and April 2013. The group focussed on a number of cycling 'hotspot' locations to identify areas in the design that could be improved. A number of design changes were made as a result of this consultation and these are summarised at Annex 5.
7.15 The revised proposals were presented at the quarterly Leeds Cycling Consultation Forum meeting on 10th July 2013.

Consultation with the Taxi trade

7.16 A site meeting with taxi trade representatives took place on 6th March 2013 to discuss the impact of the NGT proposals on taxi rank provision and operations. At this meeting taxi trade representatives raised a concern about the proposed loss of the existing taxi rank located on Lower Briggate to accommodate NGT. As a result of the consultation process the NGT designs were reconsidered and a proportion of the existing taxi rank spaces at Lower Briggate are now proposed to be retained.

Consultation with the Emergency Services

7.17 The Police have been informally consulted on the designs. Several comments were received at a meeting and are being considered by the design team. A consultation meeting has also been held with West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service.

7.18 No responses have been received from the Ambulance Service.
8 CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY CONSULTEES

8.1 All the parties to be served under Schedule 5 or 6 of the Application Rules have been informed of the intended application and, as detailed elsewhere in this report, many have been subject to more detailed consultation.

8.2 Annex 11 and Annex 12 contain a summary of the various categories of consultee under schedules 5 and 6 to the Rules, who are entitled to receive a copy of the application documents or be served with notice of the making of the application.
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Overview

Purpose
This Communication Management Strategy contains a description of the means and frequency of communication to parties both internal and external to the NGT project.

Contents
1 Introduction
2 Background to the NGT scheme
3 Consultation and Communication Objectives
4 Communications Procedure
5 Tools and Techniques
6 Stakeholder Analysis
7 Records

Introduction

This Communications Management Strategy outlines how the NGT project will ensure that all internal and external stakeholders are informed of all relevant project information.

Metro and Leeds City Council (The Promoters) are developing a new high quality public transport system for Leeds known as NGT (New Generation Transport). The scheme, which will be operated by modern electrically powered trolleybuses, was initiated following the cancellation of the proposed light rail scheme for Leeds, known as Leeds Supertram, in November 2005.

A Major Scheme Business Case for NGT was submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) in October 2009, following which Programme Entry Approval was awarded to the scheme in March 2010. However shortly after this, following election of the Coalition Government, the NGT scheme was put on hold while the Government carried out a review of funding for all major transport schemes in the UK. During this pause, all development work on the scheme was halted other than critical tasks. However, following a revised bidding process, the DfT announced that Programme Entry
Approval for NGT had been reinstated in July 2012 and as such development work resumed from that point.

A significant amount of public and stakeholder consultation has taken place to inform the development of the scheme to date and further engagement and consultation will be vital as the scheme progresses. A Communications Strategy and a Consultation Action Plan were initially developed in 2008/9 to support the on-going development of the NGT project and these documents formed part of the Major Scheme Business Case for the scheme.

The purpose of the Communications Strategy was to ensure that accurate and timely messages about the project were disseminated to a range of identified stakeholder groups. The overall objective of the Consultation Action Plan was to ensure that the NGT consultation process enabled all affected and interested parties to have a two way dialogue about the project throughout its development.

The purpose of this Communication Management Strategy is to provide an updated communications and consultation strategy following the pause in the development of the NGT scheme in one consolidated document.

This document sets out the updated approach in terms of communicating, informing, engaging and managing public and stakeholder involvement at appropriate times, and in accordance with their requirements throughout the life of the NGT project.

The Promoters of the NGT project recognise the importance and necessity of public and stakeholder engagement and participation in problem solving or decisions that directly impact upon living, working, playing, using services or doing business within the City.

The Promoters acknowledge that engaging with stakeholders is more than just consulting. Engaging stakeholders should where appropriate include informing, consulting with, involving, collaborating with and empowering them to understand the issues to enable them to make informed choices.

2 Background to the NGT scheme

Leeds is one of the strongest economies in the Leeds City Region which has led to high volumes of journeys into the city centre by rail and road.

The NGT trolleybus project is seeking to provide a high quality public transport system that will help to support the growth of Leeds’ economy and improve the local environment by helping to address
congestion.

The 14km NGT network would improve vital links between the city’s businesses, its universities, the new Leeds Arena and the city centre. Two major new Park and Ride sites are also proposed at Bodington in North Leeds and Stourton in South Leeds.

Modern trolleybuses powered by electricity from overhead wires would be used to operate the system. Trolleybuses have fast, smooth acceleration and are clean, quiet and don’t pollute the local environment. The NGT trolleybuses would use dedicated lanes wherever possible to help make journeys quicker and more reliable.

The work undertaken to date suggests that NGT will also mean an annual £160 million boost to the economy, with the creation of an estimated 4,000 jobs in the region.

Significant stakeholder engagement and consultation has taken place throughout the development of the NGT project to date. In terms of formal public consultation activities previously undertaken, these can be summarised as follows:

- November 2008 to January 2009: 12 week period of public consultation. Included public exhibitions held in the city centre, distribution of consultation packs and a questionnaire. Resulted in 95% of respondents stating that public transport in Leeds could be improved and the most common request being for more reliable services, cheaper fares, more frequent services, more bus lanes and less crowded services.
June 2009 to September 2009: 12 week period of public consultation. Included public exhibitions held in the city centre and along the proposed NGT routes, distribution of consultation packs and a questionnaire. This resulted in 77% of respondents supporting the NGT proposals and 76% of respondents supporting the use of trolleybuses to operate the system.

May-June 2010: 4 week consultation period on the proposal to extend the north NGT route to serve the community of Holt Park (this extension was requested by the Government as part of the Programme Entry Approval in March 2010). Included a public exhibition in the Holt Park area, distribution of consultation packs and a questionnaire. Resulted in 65% of respondents supporting the proposals.

Detailed reports summarising the results of these public consultation exercises are available on the NGT website at www.ngtmetro.com.

In addition to these public consultation activities an on-going programme of stakeholder engagement has also taken place throughout the life of the project to date including a range of activities including:

- Meetings and briefings with Local Ward Members and attendance at Area Committee and Plans Panel Meetings.
- Reporting to and briefing wider LCC Members, LCC Full Council and Executive Board and the West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (WYITA).
- Briefings and meetings with Leeds MP’s.
- Meetings with a range of local landowners, local business owners, residents and residents groups.
- Engagement with directly affected parties through the commencement of a Land Referencing exercise.
- Engagement with Statutory Consultees.
- Meetings with access groups, cycling groups, environmental groups and other local and national interest groups.
- Briefings with the Chamber of Commerce, developers and the wider business community.
- Briefings to schools and University groups.

3 Consultation and Communication Objectives

The main aim of this strategy is to manage the expectations of the proposed NGT project and to ensure appropriate and effective consultation and engagement takes place throughout the life of the project.
The key objectives of the Communication Management Strategy can be summarised as follows:

- Establish, develop and maintain active support for and understanding of, the proposed NGT project from key stakeholders, partners and ultimately the public, across Leeds and its City Region through planned, targeted, effective and consistent communications;
- Ensure that accurate and timely messages about the project are disseminated by:
  - Identifying key stakeholders and influencers who can support and champion the NGT project;
  - Considering how to communicate with the general public – the population of Leeds and the wider City Region, and how that population breaks down into sub-groups, requiring specific messages;
  - Establishing appropriate, accurate and relevant messages for each of these stakeholder and general public groups and the methods, or combinations of methods, by which they will be conveyed.
- Ensure that any consultation activities provide stakeholders with the opportunity for two-way dialogue;
- Ensure that consultation activities are planned and delivered in a manner that will reach the intended audience and will be accessible to all; and
- Ensure that consultation activities are monitored / evaluated and appropriate is feedback provided to consultees.

4 Communication Procedure

This Communication Management Strategy has been developed in line with Metro’s corporate consultation protocol and Leeds City Council’s corporate community engagement policy, which sets out the Council’s approach to community engagement and links into Leeds Initiative’s overarching city-wide Framework for Effective Community Participation – which draws together all the community involvement policies developed by the partner agencies from across the city. In addition to this the strategy will be mindful of the Council’s ‘Statement of Community Involvement’ (SCI), which is statutory requirement to say how and by what means the ‘community’ will be involved in planning applications and the preparation of planning policies.

5 Tools and Techniques

A range of tools and techniques will be used to communicate and consult with stakeholders and it is
likely that different methods will be appropriate for different groups. The summary below provides an indication of the types of tools that it is envisaged will be used:

- Face to face meetings, briefing sessions and presentations.
- Exhibitions and drop in sessions.
- Website and social media (e.g. Facebook, Blogs and Twitter).
- Newsletters, leaflets and direct correspondence to external parties.
- Direct emails using Metro Messenger (email subscription service).
- Questionnaires and surveys.
- Passenger Consultative Committees.
- Council Area Committees.
- Focus groups.
- Media articles, campaigns and initiatives.
- Periodic bulletins and briefings to Metro and Council staff.
- Advertising.
- Merchandising.

In planning and delivering communication and consultation activities the Promoters will ensure that the following factors are appropriately considered:

### 5.1 Clarity

- Clarity about the purpose, scope and sphere of influence of each consultation exercise;
- Clear statements on any restrictions and limitations on the ability of the consultation to influence decisions;
- Use of plain language and avoidance of jargon; and
- Provision of clear information about the arrangements and timing of consultation events.

### 5.2 Timing

- Engagement will be undertaken as early as possible in the policy making process for the outcomes to have a genuine influence on decisions, policy and service development;
- Sufficient time will be given to allow participants to respond; and
- Consultation will be planned to avoid holiday periods where possible or where this can't be avoided timescales for responses will be extended appropriately.
5.3 **Inclusivity**

- The methods of engagement/consultation will take account of the different communities and their needs and will be appropriate for the intended audience; and
- Consultation exercises will be prepared and delivered in a manner that is inclusive of people from ‘not yet reached’ groups.

5.4 **Accessibility**

- Information will be available in a variety of formats and languages;
- Every effort will be made to bring the consultation to the attention of stakeholders; and
- The location and timing of events will take into account the needs of the differing Stakeholder groups.

5.5 **Transparency**

- The links between the consultation activity and the decision making process will be clearly outlined;
- Feedback on the outcome of consultation will be provided, including why feedback hasn’t been incorporated should this situation arise.

5.6 **Relevance**

- Consultation will only be conducted where there is a clear rationale for undertaking it and where it is clear how feedback will be used.
- Duplication of consultation that has already been undertaken will be avoided. Existing Feedback will be taken into account before any further consultation is initiated.

6 **Stakeholder Analysis**

An initial analysis of project stakeholders has been undertaken to identify the full range of parties who are likely to have an interest in the NGT project. For each of the stakeholders identified, the following analysis has been undertaken:

- Current relationship with the Promoters;
- Desired relationship;
- Key interfaces for communications; and
- Key messages for communication.
7 Records

7.1 Stakeholders

All general interaction with individual stakeholders and community organisations prior to the project being put on hold and since project start up from July 2012 will be brought together into one NGT stakeholder database. This will include details of all correspondence, feedback forms from consultation events, minutes of meetings etc. This database will also provide a record of the dates of interactions with stakeholders and any follow up actions required.

7.2 Book of Reference

As part of the Transport Works Act Order (TWAO) application, the Promoters agents will conduct a Land Referencing study to identify all parties with an interest in land or property (both owners and occupiers) which may be affected (directly and indirectly) by the proposals. The information obtained will be used to compile the ‘Book of Reference’ which is required by statute to accompany the TWAO application.

The Book of Reference is required to contain the details of all parties with an interest in land or property included within the Project Limits of the scheme, including the names of all owners, lessees, tenants or occupiers impacted by the scheme (in accordance with by Rule 12 of the Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) Rules 2006).

Every party listed in the Book of Reference will receive statutory notification when the TWAO application is submitted, in accordance with the abovementioned Rules, and will be provided with the opportunity to make representations to the Secretary of State for or against the scheme.

In parallel with the Land Referencing exercise, the Promoters will undertake further consultation aimed at engaging with affected / interested parties, in order to open up lines of communication and to offer the opportunity to discuss any previous or new concerns each party may have.

7.3 Data Protection Act 1998

The Promoters and its Agents will have due regard to the 8 principles of the Data Protection Act 1998 which are as follows:
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1. Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and, in particular, shall not be processed unless:
   (a) at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and
   (b) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met.

2. Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes.

3. Personal data shall be adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purpose or purposes for which they are processed.

4. Personal data shall be accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date.

5. Personal data processed for any purpose or purposes shall not be kept for longer than is necessary for that purpose or those purposes.

6. Personal data shall be processed in accordance with the rights of data subjects under this Act.

7. Appropriate technical and organisational measures shall be taken against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data and against accidental loss or destruction of, or damage to, personal data.

8. Personal data shall not be transferred to a country or territory outside the European Economic Area unless that country or territory ensures an adequate level of protection for the rights and freedoms of data subjects in relation to the processing of personal data.

7.4 Freedom of Information Act 2000

Metro and Leeds City Council have approved procedures Promoters will respond to requests made in writing, this can be in the form of a letter, email or fax. The Promoters are committed to operating in an open and transparent manner. This means that we will always look for ways of sharing information when we receive this type of request. All requests are monitored to ensure they are handled within the set timescales in accordance with legal requirements.

7.5 Reporting

In order to gain the necessary legal powers to build and operate the NGT Trolleybus system, the Promoters will be required to make an application for an Order under the Transport and Works Act (1992). As part of this application process, it will be necessary to submit a report summarising all consultation activities which have taken place during the development of the scheme. This report will also provide a summary of the results and findings from consultation activities and will demonstrate how these findings have informed the development of the scheme.

This Consultation Report will be made publicly available upon submission of the Transport and Works Act Order.
Issues relating to communication and consultation will also be reported to the NGT project Board as appropriate through monthly highlight reports, at Project Board meetings and on an ad-hoc basis as and when required. Regular reports will also be provided to LCC Members and Members of the WYITA and these will generally be publically available and will, where appropriate, include details of consultation and engagement activities.

Reports summarising the outcome of formal public consultation events will also be published on the NGT website.

In terms of measuring the success of engagement and consultation activities the following measures will be considered:

- Percentage of service-users who say that they are contacted to check that they are satisfied with the services they receive;
- Percentage of service-users who say they are involved in reviewing the services that they receive;
- Percentage of service-users who say they feel services improve as a result;
- Percentage of service-users who say they feel that their opinions and preferences are taken into account when decisions are taken about what services are provided to them.

In addition to the above Leeds City Council has its own key performance indicators (KPIs) concerning consultation / community engagement and having ‘due regard to equality’ when forming policies, strategies and service plans. All Delegated Decision Panel (DDP) and Executive Board reports, prior to submission should be checked by NGT officer with day to day responsibility for consultation and community management to ensure that they meet “due regard to equality” requirements i.e. KPI target of 100% set by the Council.

### 7.6 Timing of Communication Activities

It is envisaged that communication and engagement activities will take place on an on-going basis throughout the life of the project. In terms of large scale consultation and communications exercises these will generally take place at defined points in the programme; however consultation with individuals and groups will continue to take place throughout the programme as required.

A detailed programme of public and stakeholder consultation for the current stage of the project (up to the TWAO submission) can be found at Appendix 2. An overview of general activities proposed
throughout the life of the project is provided below in Table 7.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Stage</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Up to TWAO Application (to Spring/Summer 2013)** | • Distribution of an update leaflet to properties within 600m of the NGT route providing an update on progress and seeking feedback  
• Leaflet made available in libraries/public buildings along route  
• Drop in sessions held at key points along the route  
• Updated information on NGT website including a feedback facility  
• Updates about the scheme via social media networks  
• Individual meetings with residents groups and individuals.  
• Direct correspondence to affected parties/landowners and follow-up meetings as required  
• Direct correspondence to other key stakeholders along the route and follow-up meetings as appropriate.  
• Meetings with local and national interest groups (e.g. access groups, environmental bodies, heritage groups)  
• Meetings with local ward members, wider LCC Members and Members of the WYITA  
• Updates to MP’s  
• Briefings for bus operators and market engagement activities  
• Briefings for Chamber of Commerce and business groups.  
• Direct correspondence and meetings with Statutory Consultees.  
See Appendix 2 for more detail on the proposed activities during this stage. |
| **TWAO Application to Secretary of State Decision** | • Drop in sessions held at key points along the route  
• Updated information on NGT website including a feedback facility  
• Updates about the scheme via social media networks  
• Provision of information on the Public Inquiry and TWAO process  
• Individual meetings with residents groups and individuals.  
• Continuing engagement with affected parties/landowners and formal objectors to the scheme  
• Continuing engagement with other key stakeholders and statutory consultees along the route and follow-up meetings as appropriate.  
Including: Public Inquiry Detailed Design  
**Summer 2013-end of 2014)** |
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**Detailed Design & pre-construction period**
- Distribution of an update leaflet to properties within 600m of the NGT route providing an update on progress and seeking feedback
- Leaflet made available in libraries/public buildings along route
- Drop in sessions/exhibitions held at key points along the route
- Updated information on NGT website including a feedback facility
- Updates about the scheme via social media networks
- Individual meetings with residents groups and individuals.
- Continuing engagement with affected parties/landowners
- Continuing engagement with other key stakeholders and statutory consultees.
- Continuing engagement with local and national interest groups
- Meetings with local ward members, wider LCC Members and Members of the WYITA
- Updates to MP’s
- Briefings for bus operators and market engagement activities
- Briefings for Chamber of Commerce and business groups.

**Construction-Opening**
- Distribution of an update leaflet to properties within 600m of the NGT route providing an update on progress and seeking feedback
- Leaflet made available in libraries/public buildings along route
- Drop in sessions/exhibitions held at key points along the route
- Updated information on NGT website including a feedback facility
- Updates about the scheme via social media networks
- Individual meetings with residents groups and individuals.
- Continuing engagement with affected parties/landowners
- Continuing engagement with other key stakeholders and statutory consultees.
- Continuing engagement with local and national interest groups

---

**Continuing engagement with local and national interest groups**
- Meetings with local ward members, wider LCC Members and Members of the WYITA
- Updates to MP’s
- Briefings for bus operators and market engagement activities
- Briefings for Chamber of Commerce and business groups.

**Meetings with local ward members, wider LCC Members and Members of the WYITA**

**Updates to MP’s**

**Briefings for bus operators and market engagement activities**

**Briefings for Chamber of Commerce and business groups.**

---

**Detailed Design & Tendering process**

**Including:**
- Detailed design

**(early 2015-end of 2016)**

**Construction-Opening**

**Including:**
- Phased construction programme
- Testing and commissioning (early 2017- late 2019)
Meetings with local ward members, wider LCC Members and Members of the WYITA
• Updates to MP’s
• Briefings for bus operators and market engagement activities
• Briefings for Chamber of Commerce and business groups.

Table 7.6 Communication Activities Overview

7.7 Roles and Responsibilities

The NGT Project Board is responsible for approving and reviewing periodically the Communication Management Strategy and any updates to it.

The Project Director is responsible for reviewing the Communication Management Strategy.

The Project Manager has overall responsibility for ensuring that the Communication Management Strategy is appropriately updated, implemented and reported on as required.

The Project Support team will be responsible for producing the Communication Management Strategy and for the day-to-day update of the document. The Project Support team are also responsible for routinely monitoring progress on the development and implementation of communications and consultation activities.
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### Annex 2: Summary of NGT Open Public Consultation Events

#### Phase 1 Public Consultation Events November 2008-January 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Gardens Leeds City Centre</td>
<td>Wed 12(^{th}) November 2008</td>
<td>10:00-17:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thu 13(^{th}) November 2008</td>
<td>10:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 14(^{th}) November 2008</td>
<td>10:00-17:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 15(^{th}) November 2008</td>
<td>10:00-17:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Phase 2 Public Consultation Events June 2009-September 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morrison's, Penny Hill Centre, Hunslet</td>
<td>Thu 18(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 19(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 20(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>11:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Chad's Parish Centre, Headingley</td>
<td>Thu 25(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 26(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 27(^{th}) June 2009</td>
<td>11:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Columba’s Church, Headingley</td>
<td>Mon 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2009</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2009</td>
<td>10:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Gardens, Leeds City Centre</td>
<td>Wed 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>12:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thu 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>10:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>11:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinder Moor, Hyde Park</td>
<td>Thu 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>11:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’ Hospital, East Leeds</td>
<td>Thu 16 July 2009</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2009</td>
<td>11:00-16:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 3 Public Consultation Events (Holt Park Extension) May 2010-June 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park District Centre</td>
<td>Thu 20(^{th}) May 2010</td>
<td>12:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 21(^{st}) May 2010</td>
<td>10:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 22(^{nd}) May 2010</td>
<td>10:00-15:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 4 Public Consultation Events: Nov 2012-March 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Church Hall, West Park</td>
<td>Sat 17(^{th}) November 2012</td>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caedmon Hall, Becketts Park, Headingley</td>
<td>Thu 6(^{th}) December 2012</td>
<td>17:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Church, Holt Park</td>
<td>Wed 12(^{th}) December 2012</td>
<td>17:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley Parish Hall, Headingley</td>
<td>Thu 10(^{th}) January 2013</td>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leeds School, Hyde Park</td>
<td>Tue 22(^{nd}) January 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Thoresby School, Holt Park (open presentation)</td>
<td>Thu 31(^{st}) January 2013</td>
<td>18:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet Library, Hunslet</td>
<td>Thu 7(^{th}) February 2013</td>
<td>15:00-16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s Primary School, Hunslet</td>
<td>Thu 7(^{th}) February 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington House, Leeds City Centre</td>
<td>Mon 11(^{th}) February 2013</td>
<td>13:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 5 Belle Isle Consultation Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Isle Family Centre, Belle Isle</td>
<td>Wed 1(^{st}) May 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Grange Church, Belle Isle</td>
<td>Thu 2(^{nd}) May 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 6 Public Consultation Events June-July 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEART Centre, Headingley (open presentation by Councillor J. Lewis and Councillor R. Lewis)</td>
<td>Thu 5(^{th}) June 2013</td>
<td>19:30-21:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Primary School (Belle Isle Gala)</td>
<td>Sat 22(^{nd}) June 2013</td>
<td>11:00-14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEART Centre, Headingley</td>
<td>Wed 26(^{th}) June 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Chad’s Parish Church Hall, Headingley</td>
<td>Sat 29(^{th}) June 2013</td>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leeds School, Hyde Park</td>
<td>Thu 4(^{th}) July 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Thoresby School, Holt Park</td>
<td>Tue 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s RC Primary School</td>
<td>Thu 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Grange Church, Belle Isle</td>
<td>Sat 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggate, Leeds City Centre (promotional event)</td>
<td>Tue 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>10:00-16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawnswood YMCA, Lawnswood</td>
<td>Tue 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>17:30-19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dortmund Square, Leeds City Centre (promotional event)</td>
<td>Sat 20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>10:00-16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington House, Leeds City Centre</td>
<td>Mon 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>12:00-18:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3:
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1. NGT leaflet: November 2008

2. NGT questionnaire: November 2008

3. NGT leaflet: June 2009

4. NGT questionnaire: June 2009

5. NGT leaflet: Holt Park extension: May 2010

6. NGT questionnaire: Holt Park extension: May 2010

7. NGT leaflet: November 2012

8. NGT leaflet: Belle Isle Route: May 2013

9. NGT Sports Pitches letter to residents: June 2013

10. NGT leaflet: June 2013

11. NGT e-newsletter: June 2013

12. NGT e-newsletter: August 2013
Developing high-quality public transport for Leeds City

What is NGT?

NGT stands for New Generation Transport, a brand new, high quality transport system that would help support the ongoing growth of Leeds’ economy and improve our local environment by combating congestion.

NGT would mean modern, accessible vehicles providing reliable, comfortable and frequent journeys into the city centre from Park & Ride sites located on the outskirts of Leeds.

Where would NGT go?

Three initial routes, as shown on the map, have been identified although they are not finalised. These initial routes would provide links to North Leeds (through Headingley along the A660), South Leeds (through Hunslet and East Leeds) via St James’s Hospital.

Why have these routes been suggested?

The routes identified are those where research shows congestion will cause problems too great to be dealt with by regular buses, where there is no easily accessible rail alternative and where NGT would help to improve links to important facilities such as education, hospitals and places of work.

Carrying large numbers of people, NGT would have its own dedicated lanes wherever possible to get around congestion hotspots and make journeys quicker and more reliable.

What would the NGT system be like?

Although the design of NGT has not been finalised, it would be likely to include:

- exclusive lanes and roads and special equipment to give NGT vehicles priority at traffic lights and junctions;
- new, fully accessible vehicles that are both comfortable and better for the environment;
- high quality stops and shelters with real-time information showing passengers when NGT services are due to arrive;
- large Park & Ride sites for people wanting to avoid the jams by swapping from the car to NGT.

for more information on New Generation Transport and our transport plans for the future, visit www.ngtmetro.com

for more information on New Generation Transport and our transport plans for the future, visit www.ngtmetro.com
What would NGT vehicles be like?

A range of the latest high quality vehicles is being considered for NGT. The main options are:

**Electrically Powered Trolleybus**
- High quality bus powered by overhead electric wires like a tram
- Doesn’t need rails like a tram does, it has tyres like a bus
- No exhaust fumes
- Quieter than a diesel bus

**Diesel-electric Bus**
- High quality bus which can run on both diesel and electricity
- Could switch to electric mode in some areas to reduce noise/fumes (e.g. residential areas and the city centre)
- No overhead wires needed
Diesel Bus

- Uses diesel like normal buses
- Would be new high quality vehicle with the latest diesel engines that are better for the environment
- Cannot run on electricity

Why not a Tram?

Although a tram system would solve some of Leeds’ congestion problems it is not currently affordable and we have been asked to investigate NGT instead.

NGT would allow us to deliver many of the benefits of a tram and would provide the highest quality system that is possible with the funding available. However we aim to ensure that the NGT system would be built so that it could be upgraded to a tram system if necessary in the future.

When would NGT be up and running?

If the funding is agreed for NGT, construction could start in 2012 with the first vehicles running from 2014.

What are the next steps?

In summer 2009, we will be submitting a business case for NGT which the Department for Transport will use to decide whether to fund the system.

We are now developing route and vehicle ideas in more detail in order to see which combination of routes and vehicles gives Leeds the best value for money.

for more information on New Generation Transport and our transport plans for the future, visit www.ngtmetro.com
New Generation Transport

Find out more information from the New Generation Transport web site at www.ngtmetro.com or contact us by email at ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk or at NGT, Wellington House, 40-50 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 2DE or on 0113 251 7401.

The text of this leaflet is available in other formats including large print. Please contact us on 0113 251 7401 for more information.

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please telephone 0113 376 0152 and state the name of your language, we will then put you on hold while we contact an interpreter.

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please telephone 0113 376 0152 and state the name of your language, we will then put you on hold while we contact an interpreter.

Jezeli nie mówia Panstwo po angielsku i potrzebuja pomocy w zrozmieniowaniu tego dokumentu, prosimy zadzwonic pod poniższy numer telefonu. Po podaniu nazwy swojego ojczystego języka prosimy poczatkowo - w tym czasie będziecie kontaktowali sie z tłumaczem.

Printed on Revive 100 uncoated, a recycled grade, containing 100% post consumer waste and manufactured at a mill accredited with ISO 14001 environment management standard. The pulp used in this product is bleached using an Elemental Chlorine Free process (ECF).
12. To which of these groups do you consider yourself to belong?

- White:
  - British
  - Irish
  - Any other White background

- Mixed:
  - White & Black Caribbean
  - White & Black African
  - White & Asian
  - Any other Mixed background

- Black or Black British:
  - Caribbean
  - African
  - Any other Black background

- Asian or Asian British:
  - Indian
  - Pakistani
  - Bangladeshi
  - Kashmiri
  - Any other Asian background

- Chinese and Other ethnic groups:
  - Chinese
  - Gypsy/Traveller
  - Other ethnic group

13. Are you:

- At school/college/university
- Retired
- Employed/self employed
- At home/keeping house
- Other (please specify)

14. How many cars are there in your household?

- 0
- 1
- 2 or more

15. Do you have a concessionary pass that allows you to travel for free on buses and/or for a reduced price on trains in Leeds?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Would you like to be kept informed of progress with New Generation Transport?

If yes please provide us with your name and an email address. If you don’t have an email address please provide us with a postal one.

Name: ________________________________
Email address: ________________________
Postal address: ________________________

Please visit the New Generation Transport website for more information www.ngtmetro.com

Thank you for completing this questionnaire about our proposals for New Generation Transport (NGT). Please return it to the public exhibition staff or, if you take the form away with you, please complete and return it by the end of the day on 9th January 2009 using the FREEPOST envelope provided. Responses will be analysed by our transport consultants Steer Davies Gleave. Any personal information you provide will be processed strictly in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and will only be used to help inform future transport proposals in Leeds.
3. If you currently travel to Leeds by car, what would encourage you to use Park & Ride? Please tick the three suggestions that would most encourage you:

- A frequent bus service into Leeds
- A fast bus service into Leeds
- Low-cost travel
- Facilities at the car park including toilets and a high-quality waiting area
- A secure car park with CCTV and barriers
- A staffed car park
- Nothing would encourage me to use Park & Ride
- Other (please specify)

If 'nothing would encourage you to use Park & Ride', please state why.

4. Do you have any comments about our New Generation Transport proposals?

5. Please could you provide your home postcode
   This will only be used to understand the views of people living in different areas and will not be used for any other purpose.

6. How often do you travel into Leeds City Centre on average?
   - Three or more times a week
   - Once a month or less
   - Once or twice a week
   - Very rarely/never
   - Less than once a week but more than once a month

7. What is your most common reason for travelling into Leeds City Centre? Please tick one box only.

   - I live there
   - I work there
   - For school/college/university
   - Shopping
   - Visiting friends/relatives
   - Recreation/leisure
   - Personal business
   - Employer’s business
   - Other (please specify)

   Facilities at the car park including toilets and a high-quality waiting area
   A secure car park with CCTV and barriers
   A staffed car park
   Nothing would encourage me to use Park & Ride
   Other (please specify)

8. How do you usually travel into Leeds City Centre? Please tick one box to say which method you use most often.

   - Bus
   - Train
   - Bus and train
   - Car (as driver)
   - Car (as passenger)
   - Car and train (e.g. drive to station then train into Leeds)
   - Cycle
   - Walk
   - Taxi
   - Motorbike/scooter
   - Other (please specify)

   If you travel by car do you usually:

   - Pay to park
   - Park for free
   - Get dropped off so do not park

9. Are you:
   - Male
   - Female

10. Are you:
    - Under 16
    - 16-24
    - 25-34
    - 35-44
    - 45-54
    - 55-64
    - 65+

11. Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? (Long-standing means anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time, i.e. more than six months).

   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, does this illness or disability affect the way you travel?

   - Yes
   - No

please turn over ►
New Generation Transport

Find out more information from the New Generation Transport website, at www.ngtmetro.com or contact us by email at ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk or at NGT, Wellington House, 40-50 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 2DE or on 0113 251 7401.

The text of this leaflet is available in other formats including large print. Please contact us on 0113 251 7401 for more information.

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please telephone 0113 376 0152 and give your contact details and the language you require.

More information can be found at www.ngtmetro.com.
What is NGT and why do we need it?

Metro and Leeds City Council are developing a new public transport system called NGT which stands for New Generation Transport. Following the public consultation that we held between November 2008 and January 2009, we have now developed the NGT proposals in more detail and would like your views again.

NGT is a modern public transport system that is being proposed to improve travel, help tackle congestion and reduce pollution in Leeds. NGT would improve vital links between the city’s businesses, its universities, Leeds General Infirmary, St James’s Hospital and the city centre. Our preference is for NGT to be operated by modern trolleybuses.

What are Trolleybuses?

Trolleybuses run on rubber tyres like a regular bus but they are powered by electricity from overhead wires. Trolleybuses have fast, smooth acceleration and are clean, quiet and don’t pollute the local environment.

The NGT trolleybuses would use dedicated lanes wherever possible to help avoid congestion, making journeys quicker and more reliable.

The vehicles would be modern, easily accessible for wheelchairs and buggies and will be fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA).

For more information on New Generation Transport visit www.ngtmetro.com

Where would the NGT routes go?

NGT Trolleybuses would travel along three initial routes, from north, south and east Leeds into and around the city centre.

We are also looking at the potential for other NGT routes in the future, including possible routes to Leeds Aire Valley and to east and west Leeds.

The routes planned for NGT are those where:

- traffic congestion already causes problems or is likely to cause problems in the future;
- there is no easily accessible rail alternative;
- faster and more efficient transport links would provide the greatest benefits to education, health, employment and the city’s overall economy.
The North NGT Route

**THE NORTH ROUTE** would begin at a new Park & Ride site at Bodington, just outside the Leeds Outer Ring Road. It would travel into Leeds along the A660, through Lawnswood, Headingley, Hyde Park and would pass both Universities.

The north NGT route is shown on the right with our **preferred route** in orange and an **alternative option** shown by the dashed line.

- **Our preferred route** includes a new ‘NGT-only’ link road running behind the Arndale Centre. This would allow trolleybuses to avoid traffic congestion in Headingley centre, meaning faster journey times and a more reliable service. This route would also provide new facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. A new NGT stop at Wood Lane on the new link road would provide easy access to Headingley centre.

- **An alternative option** we considered was to re-route general traffic behind the Arndale Centre on a new road, with trolleybuses travelling in front of the Amdale Centre along with other buses.

NGT would serve Headingley centre directly under this option. However, using the route behind the Amdale Centre for general traffic would have a greater environmental impact with increased noise and air pollution. More land would also be needed.

For more information on New Generation Transport visit www.ngtmetro.com

The South NGT Route

**THE SOUTH ROUTE** would start at a new Park & Ride site at Stourton, near the intersection for the M1/M621 at Junction 7 of the M621. It would travel into Leeds through Hunslet and Clarence Dock.

The South NGT route is shown on the right with our **preferred route** in orange and an **alternative option** shown by the dashed line.

- **Our preferred route** starts at the Park & Ride site, then diverts from the A61 along a new ‘NGT-only’ link road next to the railway line, before passing Hunslet District Centre.

This option would provide a new public transport service for the properties surrounding Pepper Road and would directly serve the Hunslet District Centre. This should offer faster journey times as trolleybuses would be separated from general traffic for some of the route.

- **An alternative option** that we considered also started at the Park & Ride site. It did not divert along an ‘NGT-only’ route, but followed the A61. This option would serve businesses along the A61 but would not directly serve the Hunslet District Centre.

Trolleybuses would also be mixed with general traffic along some parts of this route, therefore journey times would be less reliable.

For more information on New Generation Transport visit www.ngtmetro.com
What will happen next?

We are planning to submit a funding bid for NGT to Central Government this Autumn. We hope to find out if we are successful by the end of the year. If successful we will then seek legal powers to build the scheme.

The earliest NGT could be up and running is 2015.

We’d like your input again...

Before we submit our bid for funding to Central Government (through the Department for Transport) we’d like your views on:

- our overall proposals for NGT and whether you would use it;
- our plans to use electrically powered trolleybuses;
- the preferred options for NGT routes and whether you would find the Park & Ride sites useful.

Please fill out the NGT questionnaire and hand it to a member of staff at the exhibition, or return it to us in the free-post envelope provided.

What will happen next?

We are planning to submit a funding bid for NGT to Central Government this Autumn. We hope to find out if we are successful by the end of the year. If successful we will then seek legal powers to build the scheme.

The earliest NGT could be up and running is 2015.

You have already told us...

We ran a public exhibition in Leeds city centre in November 2008 and asked people what they thought of NGT and transport issues in general.

We also gave out information at libraries, one stop shops and on the internet and asked for your feedback.

1,800 people completed a questionnaire which showed that:

- 95% of people thought public transport in Leeds could be improved;
- Over 40% want on-board information;
- Over 30% want cleaner and more environmentally friendly vehicles;
- More frequent and reliable services, cheaper fares, more bus lanes and less-crowded services were the most common requests;
- A large number of positive comments were received about NGT, including support for improved public transport quality and the provision of Park & Ride sites.

For more information on New Generation Transport visit www.ngtmetro.com
NGT stands for New Generation Transport, a proposed new public transport scheme for Leeds. We’d like your views on our proposals to help us develop the scheme.

1. What do you think of our proposals for the NGT scheme? (Please tick ONE box only)
   - Strongly support
   - Support
   - No strong view either way
   - Oppose
   - Strongly oppose
   - Don’t know
   Please tell us your reasons...

2. What do you think of our proposals to use modern trolleybuses on the NGT network? (Please tick ONE box only)
   - Strongly support
   - Support
   - No strong view either way
   - Oppose
   - Strongly oppose
   - Don’t know
   Please tell us your reasons...

3. What do you think of our proposals for Park & Ride sites at the end of the North and South routes? (Please tick ONE box only)
   - Strongly support
   - Support
   - No strong view either way
   - Oppose
   - Strongly oppose
   - Don’t know
   Please tell us your reasons...

About you

15. Are you responding as:
   - An individual – please go to Q16 below
   - An interest group – please go to Q24
   - A business – please go to Q24

16. Please could you provide your home postcode?
   Please note this will only be used to understand the views of people living in different areas and will not be used for any other purpose.

17. Are you:
   - Male
   - Female

18. Are you:
   - Under 16
   - 16 – 24
   - 25 – 34
   - 35 – 44
   - 45 – 54
   - 55 – 64
   - 65+

19. Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? (Long-standing means anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time, i.e. more than six months).
   - Yes
   - No
   If yes, does this illness or disability affect the way you travel?
   - Yes
   - No

20. To which of these groups do you consider yourself to belong?

   White
   - British
   - Irish
   - Any other White background (Please specify)

   Asian or Asian British
   - Indian
   - Pakistani
   - Bangladeshi
   - Kashmiri
   - Any other Asian background (Please specify)

   Black or Black British
   - Caribbean
   - African
   - Any other Black background (Please specify)

   Mixed
   - White & Black Caribbean
   - White & Black African
   - White & Asian
   - Any other Mixed background (Please specify)

   Chinese and Other ethnic groups
   - Chinese
   - Gypsy/Traveler
   - Other ethnic group (Please specify)

   Would you like to be kept informed of progress about NGT?
   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, please provide us with your name and an email address.
   If you don’t have an email address please provide us with a postal one.

   Name: ____________________________
   Email address: _______________________
   Postal address: _______________________

   Please visit the NGT website for more information: www.ngtmetro.com

   Please return your completed questionnaire to the public exhibition staff or, if you take the form away with you, please complete and return it by 23:00 on Friday 4th September using the Freepost envelope provided. Responses will be analysed by our transport consultants Steer Davies Gleave. All responses will be treated in the strictest confidence and will only be used to help inform future transport proposals in Leeds.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
4. Would you consider using one of the NGT Park & Ride sites? □ Yes □ No

If NO why is this?
□ I do not have access to a car
□ I do not travel near either of the proposed Park & Ride sites
□ My employer provides free parking at my place of work
□ Other

If other please specify:

5. What would be most important to you in a new public transport system?

(PLEASE TICK THREE ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More reliable services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner stops and shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less crowding on services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bus only lanes/bus priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Park &amp; Ride sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better-quality stops and shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If other please specify:

6. What would be most important to you for new public transport vehicles?

(PLEASE TICK THREE ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easier access onto vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quieter vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More seats on vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more comfortable ride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If other please specify:

7. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s North route?

If other please specify:

8. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s South route?

If other please specify:

9. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s East route?

If other please specify:

10. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s City Centre route?

If other please specify:

11. Would you consider using NGT to travel around Leeds? □ Yes □ No □ Don’t know

Please tell us your reasons:

11a. If YES, how often might you use it?

□ Three or more times a week
□ Once or twice a week
□ Less than once a week, but more than once a month
□ Once a month or less
□ Very rarely
□ Don’t know

If other please specify:

11b. And at present, how do you usually travel to the destinations that NGT will serve? Please tick ONE box only.

□ Bus
□ Train
□ Car (as driver)
□ Car (as passenger)
□ Cycle
□ Walk
□ Motorbike/scooter
□ Other

If other please specify:

12. Do you live within a ten minute walk of any of the proposed routes? □ Yes □ No

If YES please tick which ONE this is:
□ North route
□ South route
□ East route
□ City Centre section

13. Do you have any suggestions about how we could improve the NGT proposals?

If other please specify:

14. Do you have any other comments about NGT?

If other please specify:

An online version of this questionnaire is also available at www.ngtmetro.com

Thank you.
We’d now like to know a little about you, please turn over >
New Generation Transport

Find out more information from the New Generation Transport website, at www.ngtmetro.com or contact us by email at ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk or at NGT, Wellington House, 40-50 Wellington Street, Leeds LS1 2DE or on 0113 251 7401.

The text of this leaflet is available in other formats including large print. Please contact us on 0113 251 7401 for more information.

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please telephone 0113 376 0152 and give your contact details and the language you require.

Jeśli nie mówi pan/pani po angielsku i potrzebuję pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, proszę podać swój numer telefonu i język, w którym mnie kontaktować – podajemy kontakt w języku polskim.

Jeśli nie mówi po angielsku i potrzebuję pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, proszę podać swój numer telefonu. Po podaniu numeru swojego języka, proszę podać język, w którym chcę być kontaktowany – podajemy kontakt w języku polskim.

Printed on 80% offset, a recycled grade, containing 100% post consumer waste and manufactured at a mill accredited with ISO 14001 environment management standard. The pulp used in the product is bleached using an Elemental Chlorine Free process (ECF).
What is NGT and why do we need it?
NGT stands for ‘New Generation Transport’ under which Metro and Leeds City Council are planning to construct the UK’s first modern electrically powered trolleybus system in Leeds.

The proposals to introduce the Trolleybus system follow public consultations in Winter 2008 and Summer 2009. The NGT Trolleybus network would be a modern public transport system able to improve travel, help tackle congestion and reduce pollution in Leeds.

It would also improve vital links between the city’s businesses, universities and hospitals and the city centre.

What are Trolleybuses?
Trolleybuses run on rubber tyres like a regular bus but are powered by electricity from overhead wires. Trolleybuses have fast, smooth acceleration and are clean, quiet and don’t pollute the local environment.

The NGT trolleybuses would use dedicated lanes wherever possible to help avoid congestion, making journeys quicker and more reliable. The vehicles would be modern, easily accessible for wheelchairs and buggies and fully compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA).

Construction of the multi-million pound scheme would be a massive vote of confidence in the city’s economy, helping to create new jobs as well as protecting existing ones and speeding the region’s recovery from recession.

The Trolleybus proposals are part of a wider vision to improve public transport in Leeds.

Where would the NGT routes go?
NGT Trolleybuses are planned for three initial routes, from north, south and east Leeds into and around the city centre.

The Government has approved funding only for the North and South routes and a city centre link. This means alternative funding will be needed to construct the East Route to St James’s Hospital and to provide the full city centre loop. Alternative means of funding these important sections of the network are being investigated. We are also looking at the potential for other NGT routes in the future, including possible routes to Leeds Aire Valley and to East and West Leeds.

The routes planned for NGT are those where:

- traffic congestion already causes problems or is likely to cause problems in the future;
- there is no easily accessible rail alternative;
- faster and more efficient transport links would provide the greatest benefits to education, health, employment and the city’s overall economy.

For more information on New Generation Transport visit www.ngtmetro.com
The North NGT Route

**THE NORTH ROUTE** would begin at a new Park & Ride site at Bodington, just outside the Leeds Outer Ring Road, with parking for up to 800 vehicles.

It would travel into Leeds along the A660, through Lowwood, Headingley, Hyde Park and would pass both Universities. The Government has also provided funding to extend the North Route beyond the Park & Ride site at Bodington to serve the community of Holt Park, terminating at Holt Park District Centre.

- The North NGT route (shown right), includes a new ‘NGT-only’ link road running behind the Arndale Centre. This would allow trolleybuses to avoid traffic congestion in Headingley centre, meaning faster journey times and a more reliable service.

- This would also provide new facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. An NGT Trolleybus stop at Wood Lane on the new link road would provide easy access to Headingley centre.

The South NGT Route

**THE SOUTH ROUTE** (shown right) would start at a new Park & Ride site at Stourton, near the intersection for the M1/M621 at Junction 7 of the M621, with up to 2,200 spaces. It would travel into Leeds through Hunslet and Clarence Dock.

- After leaving the Park & Ride site, the route diverts from the A61 along a new ‘NGT-only’ link road next to the railway line, before passing Hunslet District Centre.

- This would provide a new public transport service for the properties surrounding Pepper Road and should offer faster journey times as trolleybuses would be separated from general traffic for some of the route.
The Government recently announced funding of £235 million for NGT and confirmed that the scheme has been given ‘Programme Entry Approval’. This is the first stage in the Government’s approval process.

The next stage is to start the process for obtaining the legal powers needed to construct and operate the trolleybus system. These powers will be sought through a ‘Transport and Works Act Order’ and a formal application for these legal powers is due to be made later in 2010. This is likely to be followed by a Public Inquiry into the NGT scheme during 2011.

If all the necessary Government approvals are obtained, construction could begin in 2013 and the UK’s first modern trolleybuses could be operating in 2016.

You have already told us...

During the development of the NGT proposals we have held two periods of public consultation in Winter 2008 and Summer 2009. This involved a series of public exhibitions in the city centre and on the proposed NGT routes. We also gave out information at libraries, one stop shops and on the internet and asked for your feedback.

During the most recent public consultation in Summer 2009, over 2,500 people completed a questionnaire which showed that:

- 77% of people supported or strongly supported the NGT proposals. The main reasons for this support included: the potential for NGT to reduce congestion, environmental reasons and the provision of reliable, quick and high quality modern public transport;
- 76% of people supported or strongly supported the use of electrically powered trolleybuses and;
- 72% of people were in favour of introducing Park & Ride sites on the North and South routes.

What will happen next?

The Government recently announced funding of £235 million for NGT and confirmed that the scheme has been given ‘Programme Entry Approval’. This is the first stage in the Government’s approval process.

The next stage is to start the process for obtaining the legal powers needed to construct and operate the trolleybus system. These powers will be sought through a ‘Transport and Works Act Order’ and a formal application for these legal powers is due to be made later in 2010. This is likely to be followed by a Public Inquiry into the NGT scheme during 2011.

If all the necessary Government approvals are obtained, construction could begin in 2013 and the UK’s first modern trolleybuses could be operating in 2016.
15. Are you responding as:
   - An individual – please go to Q16 below
   - An interest group – please go to Q24
   - A business – please go to Q24

16. Please could you provide your home postcode? 

Please note this will only be used to understand the views of people living in different areas and will not be used for any other purpose.

17. Are you:
   - Male
   - Female

18. Are you:
   - Under 16
   - 16 – 24
   - 25 – 34
   - 35 – 44
   - 45 – 54
   - 55 – 64
   - 65+

19. Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? (Long-standing means anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time, i.e. more than six months).
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, does this illness or disability affect the way you travel?
   - Yes
   - No

20. To which of these groups do you consider yourself to belong?

White
   - British
   - Irish
   - Any other White background (Please specify)

Asian or Asian British
   - Indian
   - Pakistani
   - Bangladeshi
   - Kashmiri
   - Any other Asian background (Please specify)

Black or Black British
   - Caribbean
   - African
   - Any other Black background (Please specify)

Mixed
   - White & Black Caribbean
   - White & Black African
   - White & Asian
   - Any other Mixed background (Please specify)

Chinese and Other ethnic groups
   - Chinese
   - Gypsy/Traveller
   - Other ethnic group (Please specify)

About you

21. Are you:
   - At school/college/university
   - Employed/self employed
   - At home/keeping house
   - Unemployed
   - Other
   - If other - please specify

22. How many cars are there in your household?
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2 or more

23. Do you have a concessionary pass that allows you to travel for free on buses and/or for a reduced price on trains in Leeds?
   - Yes
   - No

For those responding as an interest group or business:

24. What is the name of your business or interest group?

25. Please provide a brief description of it:

26. Business/interest group postcode: 

Would you like to be kept informed of progress about NGT?

If yes please provide us with your name and an email address.
If you don’t have an email address please provide us with a postal one.

Name:

Email address:

Postal address:

Please visit the NGT website for more information: www.ngtmetro.com

Please return your completed questionnaire to the public exhibition staff or, if you take the form away with you, please complete and return it by 23.00 on 18th June using the Freepost envelope provided. Responses will be analysed by the NGT team. All responses will be treated in the strictest confidence and will only be used to help inform future transport proposals in Leeds.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
4. Would you consider using one of the NGT Park & Ride sites?  
- Yes
- No
  
If NO why is this?
- I do not have access to a car
- I do not travel near either of the proposed Park & Ride sites
- My employer provides free parking at my place of work
- Other

If other please specify:

5. What would be most important to you in a new public transport system?  
(PLEASE TICK THREE ONLY)
- More reliable services
- Cleaner stops and shelters
- Less crowding on services
- More bus only lanes/bus priority
- More Park & Ride sites
- Better-quality stops and shelters
- Cheaper fares
- Faster services

If other please specify:

6. What would be most important to you for new public transport vehicles?  
(PLEASE TICK THREE ONLY)
- Easier access onto vehicles
- Quieter vehicles
- Modern vehicles
- More seats on vehicles
- A more comfortable ride
- More space for wheelchairs and buggies
- More environmentally-friendly vehicles
- Cleaner vehicles (inside and out)
- More comfortable seats
- On-board information such as route plans and next stop information

If other please specify:

7. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s North route including the Holt Park extension?

8. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s South route?

9. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s East route?

10. Do you have any comments about our proposals for NGT’s City Centre route?

11. Would you consider using NGT to travel around Leeds?  
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Please tell us your reasons…

11a. If YES, how often might you use it?
- Three or more times a week
- Once or twice a week
- Less than once a week but more than once a month
- Once a month or less
- Very rarely
- Don’t know

12. Do you live within a ten minute walk of any of the proposed routes?  
- Yes
- No

If YES please tick which ONE this is:
- North route
- South route
- East route
- City Centre section

13. Do you have any suggestions about how we could improve the NGT proposals?

14. Do you have any other comments about NGT?

Thank you.  
We’d now like to know a little about you, please turn over >
We'd like to hear your views

How do I get involved?

You can give us your views on the NGT scheme:

Online: www.ngtmetro.com
By email: ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk
By post: NGT, Wellington House, Leeds, LS1 2DE

If you would like to be kept informed about NGT

Follow us @ngttrolleybus
Like us on Facebook

The text is available in other formats including various languages, large text and braille. Please contact us on 0113 251 7421 for more information.

For more information: www.ngtmetro.com
Please tick this box if you would like to be kept informed of developments on the NGT scheme.

www.ngtmetro.com
Winter 2012

Name ......................................................
Email Address .............................................
Postal Address ...........................................

Postcode

NGT, Wellington House, Leeds, LS1 2DE

Follow us @ngttrolleybus
Like us on Facebook

The text is available in other formats including various languages, large text and braille. Please contact us on 0113 251 7421 for more information.

For more information: www.ngtmetro.com
Please tick this box if you would like to be kept informed of developments on the NGT scheme.
• NGT Trolleybuses will emit ZERO emissions en route
• NGT forecast to boost the local economy by £160m per year and create 4,000 new jobs
• Providing reliable, fast and clean consistent journeys
• 800 space Park & Ride at Bodington
• 1500+ spaces Park & Ride at Stourton
• 10 services per hour (peak)

What is New Generation Transport (NGT)?
NGT will be a modern, 14.3km trolleybus system providing a reliable service with improved journey times into and through Leeds city centre. NGT is designed to make public transport more attractive, cleaner and help reduce congestion, especially at peak times.

What will happen next?
After gaining Government approval and £173.5m of Department for Transport funding, the next stage for NGT is to start the process for obtaining legal powers for the project. This is planned for the spring of 2013 and is likely to be followed by a Public Inquiry. Construction could start as early as 2016 with trolleybuses potentially running by 2018/19.

See the back of this leaflet for how you can let us have your feedback on the scheme.

What are trolleybuses?
Trolleybuses run on rubber tyres like regular buses but are electrically powered from overhead wires, like trams.
Carrying up to 200 people, modern trolleybuses are an increasingly common sight in European and North American cities. The NGT scheme will be the first modern trolleybus system in the UK.
Future routes are under consideration.
Get involved

We would like to hear your views on these new proposals. Please let us know what you think by completing the feedback form and returning it using our Freepost address. Alternatively, you can provide your feedback online via our website, www.ngtmetro.com

Two drop-in sessions are also planned for people to find out more about the proposals and speak to members of the NGT team. The details of these are as follows:

• On 1st May, 5.30pm – 7.30pm, Belle Isle Family Centre – St John & St Barnabas Church, Leeds LS10 3PG

• On 2nd May, 5.30pm – 7.30pm, West Grange Church, West Grange Garth, off West Grange Drive, Belle Isle, Leeds, LS10 3AX

You can also find out further information about NGT or contact us as follows:

Online – www.ngtmetro.com
Email – ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk
Post – NGT, Wellington House, Leeds, LS1 2DE

@ngttrolleybus Like us on Facebook

The text is available in other formats including various languages, large text and braille. Please contact us on 0113 2517421 for more information.
What are trolleybuses?
Trolleybuses run on rubber tyres like a regular bus but they are powered by electricity from overhead wires, like trams. Carrying up to 160 people, modern trolleybuses are an increasingly common sight in European and Northern American cities. The NGT scheme will be the first modern trolleybus system in the UK. Future routes are under consideration.

Facts and Figures
- NGT network forecast to carry approximately 11 million passengers in the first year of operation
- NGT trolleybuses will emit ZERO emissions along the route
- NGT forecast to boost the local economy and help create new jobs
- Providing reliable, fast and clean consistent journeys
- 800 space Park & Ride at Bodington
- 1500+ spaces Park and Ride and depot creating around 250 jobs at Stourton
- 10 services per hour at peak times.

What will happen next?
After gaining Government approval and £173.5m of Department for Transport Funding, the next stage for NGT is to start the process for obtaining legal powers for the project. This is planned for 2013 and is likely to be followed by a Public Inquiry in early 2014. Construction could start as early as 2017 with trolleybuses potentially running by 2020.

Route change
Originally the proposed route for NGT was along sidings alongside the Pontefract railway line, between Balm Road Bridge and the Park and Ride site at Stourton. However when HS2 Ltd announced, in January, that the high-speed rail link to Leeds city centre would be running along the same route it became necessary to consider an alternative route for NGT.

The new proposed route for NGT would see trolleybuses running through Belle Isle, along Belle Isle Road, via Belle Isle Circus roundabout and along Winrose Grove into the Park and Ride site.

The plan below shows this new route in more detail.

What will happen next?
After gaining Government approval and £173.5m of Department for Transport Funding, the next stage for NGT is to start the process for obtaining legal powers for the project. This is planned for 2013 and is likely to be followed by a Public Inquiry in early 2014. Construction could start as early as 2017 with trolleybuses potentially running by 2020.

Route change
Originally the proposed route for NGT was along sidings alongside the Pontefract railway line, between Balm Road Bridge and the Park and Ride site at Stourton. However when HS2 Ltd announced, in January, that the high-speed rail link to Leeds city centre would be running along the same route it became necessary to consider an alternative route for NGT.

The new proposed route for NGT would see trolleybuses running through Belle Isle, along Belle Isle Road, via Belle Isle Circus roundabout and along Winrose Grove into the Park and Ride site.

The plan below shows this new route in more detail.

We’d like to hear your views about the route change
You can send your written feedback via our Freepost address by stating:

In order to ensure that we can identify feedback from communities close to the Belle Isle route, please could you provide your postcode.

Name: ____________________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________
Postal Address: _______________________________________
Post Code: __________________________________________

Please tick this if you would like to be kept informed of developments on the NGT scheme

Please tear and return using the address provided overleaf.
Dear Sir / Madam

NGT and Sports Pitches in the Bodington Area

As you may be aware, Metro and Leeds City Council (The Promoters) are developing proposals for a £250m 14.6km Trolleybus system from Holt Park, via a 850 space Park & Ride at Bodington, through Leeds to a 1500 space Park and Ride at Stourton.

I am writing to inform you about the NGT scheme’s proposals to alter the configuration of existing sports pitches in the Bodington/Lawnswood/Weetwood area and to construct new sports pitches including some floodlit all weather pitches. This work is required to replace the pitches that will be lost at the site of the Bodington Park and Ride. We would like to invite you to view the plans and provide comments on the proposals, either on our website (www.ngtmetro.com) or at the upcoming engagement events in your local area.

Holt Park on Tuesday 9th July 2013
Ralph Thoresby School, Holtdale Approach, LS16 7RX
5:30pm – 7:30pm

Weetwood on Tuesday 16 July 2013
Lawnswood YMCA Sports & Leisure Centre, Otley Road, LS16 6HQ
5:30pm – 7:30pm

The website includes the plans as well as a factsheet about sports pitch proposals in the Bodington area.

What happens next?

The Promoters propose to submit a Transport and Works Act Order application submission in September 2013, there will be a 42 day period when any individual or group can make a formal representation in writing, to the Secretary of State for Transport, either in support of, or in opposition to the scheme. During this 42 day period, all the documentation, including the final plans and the Environmental Statement, will be published online and will be available for public viewing at a range of locations along the NGT route.

A Public Inquiry is then likely to be held into the scheme and this is expected to take place in spring 2014. This Inquiry will be chaired by an independent Inspector who will hear the arguments for and against the scheme. The Inspector will then submit a report to the Secretary of State for Transport who will decide whether to grant the legal powers needed to construct and operate the trolleybus network.

If you have any questions in relation to the scheme please feel free to contact the NGT team (contact details above). We also hope that you can attend one of the local engagement events.

Regards

Dave Haskins – NGT Project Director
NEW GENERATION TRANSPORT (NGT) WILL SEE THE CREATION OF A MODERN RAPID TRANSPORT SYSTEM, WITH TROLLEYBUSES OPERATING ALONG ROUTES RUNNING NORTH AND SOUTH OF LEEDS CITY CENTRE.

It will provide faster and reliable services, with improved journey times into and through the city centre. The system is designed to make public transport more attractive, cleaner and help reduce congestion along key routes, especially at peak times.

For more information about NGT, visit our website: www.ngtmetro.com

This leaflet can be made available in other languages and formats including large text and braille. Please contact us on 0113 2517421 for more information.

Designed & Produced by www.tpd-design.co.uk
WHAT ARE TROLLEYBUSES?

Trolleybuses are electrically powered vehicles that are run from overhead cables. They run on rubber tyres like a regular bus and will have dedicated lanes at key points along the route and junction priority to help avoid congestion and ensure quicker, more reliable journeys.

Modern trolleybus vehicles are an increasingly common sight in European and Northern American cities and such vehicles can carry up to 160 people. The Leeds NGT system will be the first modern trolleybus system in the UK and is forecast to carry approximately 11 million passengers in its first year of operation.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

The Government has given the go ahead and allocated £173.5m funding for NGT. Following extensive consultation, revised plans and designs will be published in June 2013. The next stage is to start the process of obtaining legal powers for the project, planned for September 2013. A Public Inquiry is likely to take place early in 2014, with final approval from the Secretary of State expected in 2015. Construction could then start in 2017 with the new transport system up and running by 2020.

FACTS AND FIGURES

- 26% of the route between Park and Rides and City Square segregated from general traffic.
- Considerable journey time savings in comparison to bus services, 14 minutes quicker between Bodington and City Square alone.
- NGT network forecast to carry approximately 11 million passengers in the first year of operation.
- 26 new modern stops with real time information, shelter, seating, lighting and ticketing machinery.
- NGT trolleybuses will emit ZERO emissions along the route.
- NGT forecast to boost the local economy and help create new jobs.
- Providing reliable, clean and consistent journey.
- 800 space Park and Ride at Bodington
- 1500 space Park and Ride and depot creating around 250 jobs at Stourton
- 10 services per hour at peak times
- 18 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 12 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 5 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 4 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 6 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 3 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 5 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 10 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 22 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 33 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 19 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 22 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 33 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 12 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 22 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 18 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 14 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 14 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 14 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 13 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 10 mins to City Centre (NGT)
- 13 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 14 mins to City Centre (bus)
- 13 mins to City Centre (bus)

In order to ensure that we can identify feedback from communities close to the proposed routes, please tell us your postcode.

Name: 
Postal Address: 
Postcode: 

Please tear and return using the freepost address provided overleaf.

If you’d like to tell us what you think about the proposals, you can contact us by email at: ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk or you can write to us at our freepost address:

New Generation Transport
West Yorkshire PTE
Freepost, RSHK-LSTX-HGXB
Wellington House
Wellington Street
Leeds
LS1 2DE.

Alternatively, you can use this tear-off slip to tell us what you think and return it to the freepost address printed on the reverse.

Please tick this box if you would like to be kept informed about developments on the NGT scheme:

TERRORUS YOUR VIEWS ABOUT THE NGT.

If you’d like to tell us what you think about the proposals, you can contact us by email at: ngtinfo@wypte.gov.uk or you can write to us at our freepost address:

New Generation Transport, West Yorkshire PTE, Freepost, RSHK-LSTX-HGXB, Wellington House, Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1 2DE.

Alternatively, you can use this tear-off slip to tell us what you think and return it to the freepost address printed on the reverse.
Welcome to the first NGT E-Newsletter

Everyone receiving this email has asked to be kept updated on the scheme. If you have since changed your mind and would like to opt out of any future updates please see the unsubscribe option at the top of this email. However, please have a read first, we think you will find it interesting.

The latest engineering drawings (Design Freeze 7) are now available to see/download from the NGT website (click here). The drawings (or ‘plans’) are still working drafts. It is therefore still possible that some changes will be made prior to the submission of the Transport and Works Act Order (TWAQ) application, which is anticipated to be in September of this year.
Next round of public engagement events

Want to find out more about the latest developments with NGT? Then why not come to one of a number of public engagement events planned during June and July? The events will provide people with the opportunity to discuss the scheme directly with members of the NGT project team.

read more

NGT - Saves time, good for the economy and jobs

Recent work on the NGT scheme indicates that the Leeds trolleybus could save commuters over two hours of travel time per week, which has been positively welcomed by members of the business community who say it will help to boost the local economy and create new jobs.

read more

Fact or Fiction?

Geneva ripping up its trolleybus network? Budapest scrapping trolleybuses? Read the real facts about the NGT scheme, don’t be misled or misinformed.

read more

FAQs

Everything from ‘Why Trolleybus?’ to ‘What impact will the NGT scheme have on cycling provision along the route’ is answered in detail.

read more
Keep up to date with the latest news on NGT

We have lots of exciting news on the NGT scheme which has passed some major milestones since the last E-Newsletter was issued back in June. If you are reading this and you’re not on the E-Newsletter mailing list yet you would like to be, then please let us know (click here).
Leeds Councillors vote in favour of NGT

In July 2013 Leeds City Councillors voted in favour of moving to the next major milestone in the development of the NGT trolleybus project. At their meeting on 1st July, the Council passed what is known as a 'Section 239 Resolution' with a majority vote.

read more

Leeds Civic Trust back NGT

The Leeds Civic Trust has recently confirmed its support for NGT after a detailed review of the proposals. Read what Dr Kevin Grady, the Director of the Trust, has to say about NGT.

read more

What could NGT look like?

In the absence of a modern trolleybus network in operation in the UK, we take a look at some similar systems across Europe. Although we don’t yet know what make/model vehicle will be used as part of the scheme, these examples give you an idea of what NGT could look like.

read more
What is a Transport and Works Act Order?

When will submission documents be available for public viewing? How does someone support/object to the scheme? Will there be a Public Inquiry? What is a Public Inquiry? Your questions answered.

read more

NGT Team complete round of engagement events

The NGT team have been busy traveling up and down the proposed route of the NGT project engaging with members of the public and talking them through the recently released Design Freeze 7 plans.

read more
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SUMMARY

1. Consultation on the New Generation Transport (NGT) project ran from November 2008 to January 2009, and started with a four day public exhibition at Victoria Gardens in Leeds City Centre. Consultation packs (containing a leaflet, questionnaire and freepost envelope) were given out to those who did not have time to or wish to enter the trailer on the exhibition day. A further 1,400 consultation packs were distributed to members of the public on 18th and 19th December 2008 in Leeds City Centre. The packs were also available at libraries along the three proposals NGT routes and information on the proposals, with an online questionnaire, was made available on the internet.

2. There was a good response to the NGT consultation and over 1,800 questionnaires were completed. All age and ethnic groups were represented and respondents came from all over Leeds and the outlying areas.

3. Over 95% of the sample thought public transport could be improved in Leeds. The most popular requests were for more reliable services, cheaper fares, more frequent services, more bus lanes and less crowded services.

4. 85% though bus vehicles could be improved and on-board information was the most commonly suggested measure. Over one third of the sample also asked for cleaner vehicles (inside and out) and more environmentally friendly vehicles.

5. There was a positive response to the NGT proposals and respondents welcomed the fact that they involve high quality public transport improvements and Park & Ride. The issue of quality was important and the results show a desire for a scheme which is more than a ‘typical bus’.

6. There were also requests for greater route coverage across Leeds, including in West Leeds. A significant number of respondents also asked for a tram scheme rather than NGT.
1 Introduction

Background

1.1 In September 2008 Steer Davies Gleave was commissioned by Metro to assist with the public consultation for the New Generation Transport (NGT) proposals and the Transport for Leeds project. This included a four day public exhibition at Victoria Gardens in Leeds City Centre in November 2008 and the design and analysis of feedback questionnaires.

1.2 The exhibition was well attended by over 1,000 people as shown in Table 1-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>No of people at the exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12th Nov</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 13th Nov</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 14th Nov</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 15th Nov</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 The purpose of the exhibitions was to show the NGT and Transport for Leeds proposals to members of the public and seek feedback on them to help inform ideas.

1.4 Questionnaires to capture people’s views on the proposals were made available for people to complete at the exhibition, and consultation packs (containing a leaflet, questionnaire and freepost envelope) were given out to those who did not have time to or wish to enter the trailer on the exhibition day. A further 1,400 consultation packs were distributed to members of the public on 18th and 19th December 2008 in Leeds City Centre. Information on the proposals, with an online questionnaire, was also made available on the internet.

1.5 This report summarises the responses to the NGT questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Appendix A.

Number of responses

1.6 Table 1.2 illustrates the number and type of questionnaire responses received during the consultation period. This started on 12th November 2008 and finished on 9th January 2009.
TABLE 1-2 NGT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of questionnaire</th>
<th>No of completed forms</th>
<th>% of all completed forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freepost - received soon after exhibition</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freepost - received soon after extra promotion</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 There was an excellent questionnaire response from the exhibition and 84% of all those attending completed an NGT questionnaire. The response rate for the forms handed out during the extra promotion was 5%, which is reasonable given that there was no supporting activity at the time (such as an exhibition) and there was no incentive provided for questionnaire completion.

1.8 Respondent postcodes have been mapped to illustrate the spread of responses. This is presented in Figure 1.1 and shows that respondents came from all over Leeds, with a large concentration around Headingley.

FIGURE 1.1 GEOGRAPHICAL SPREAD OF RESPONDENT POSTCODES
2 Results of the consultation

2.1 The results presented in this report are from those who chose to take part in the consultation. They may not be representative of the wider Leeds population.

Respondent demographics

2.2 58% of all respondents were males and 42% were females. Responses came from a mixed age group, including 3% that were under 16 years old. The age of respondents was compared against the means of questionnaire completion to identify whether there were any patterns. The results are presented in Figure 2.1.

FIGURE 2.1 AGE OF RESPONDENTS

2.3 Figure 2.1 shows that, as with the Transport for Leeds consultation response, over two thirds of the internet forms were completed by those aged 25 - 54 years old. In comparison, fewer than 50% of paper forms were completed by this age group. This suggests that a greater proportion of people aged 25 to 54 are more likely to complete an online questionnaire than a paper form.

2.4 The same pattern was not evident amongst those under 24 years, but it is not possible to identify whether this, and the pattern identified above, is influenced by choice of how to participate or awareness of all options. The latter issue relates to how the different consultation options were advertised and whether this reached all age groups.

2.5 The respondents’ age profile does not fully align with the Leeds population (identified in the 2001 Census), although all groups are represented and there is a good spread of age ranges. Those under 16 and over 65 years old are under-represented, whilst those aged 16 to 64 years old are over represented.
TABLE 2-1 AGE OF RESPONDENTS COMPARED TO THE LEEDS POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>NGT respondents</th>
<th>Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Respondents were asked whether they suffer from a long term illness, and if they do, whether it affects the way they travel. 16% of respondents stated that they suffer from such an illness and 7% stated that they suffer from a long standing illness that affects the way they travel.

2.7 The respondents were from a wide range of ethnic groups. The full breakdown is provided in Table 2-2 and compared well with that of the Leeds population. All ethnic groups were represented by those providing feedback.

TABLE 2-2 RESPONDENT ETHNIC PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White: British</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Irish</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black African</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Asian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Indian</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Pakistani</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Other Asian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: African</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Other Black</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Chinese</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Other ethnic group</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 The ethnicity of respondents was also compared to the type of questionnaire response to identify whether there were any patterns. The results are presented in
Table 2-3 and show that ethnic groups other than White and Chinese & Other were less likely to complete an internet form than a paper one. The sample size of groups other than White are small however, therefore this suggestion must be treated with a degree of caution.

**TABLE 2-3 ETHNIC GROUP AND QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>No of respondents within group</th>
<th>% of group completing paper forms</th>
<th>% of group completing internet forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese &amp; Other ethnic groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 The occupation of the respondents was also recorded and is presented in Table 2-4. This shows that the majority of respondents were employed/self employed.

**TABLE 2-4 RESPONDENT OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed/self employed</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/university</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home/keeping house</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Respondents gave details of their existing transport opportunities. The respondents’ car ownership profile compares well to that of Leeds and almost one third of the sample lives in a non-car owning household.

**TABLE 2-5 CAR OWNERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cars in household</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11 A question was also asked about whether respondents hold a concessionary pass that allows free bus travel and/or reduced train fares. Approximately 30% of respondents stated that they had a concessionary pass, while the remaining 70% do not.

2.12 The age range of pass holders were examined and 57% of the under 16s said they held a pass, as did 47% of the 55 to 64 year olds and 98% of those aged over 65.
Travel to Leeds City Centre

2.13 Respondents were asked about the frequency of their travel into Leeds City Centre. Approximately two thirds travel in three or more times a week.

TABLE 2-6 FREQUENCY OF TRAVEL INTO LEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three or more times a week</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week but more than once a month</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14 The questionnaire also asked why people travel into Leeds most often. The most common response was for work, followed by shopping. The results are compared between the whole sample and those who travel into Leeds three or more times a week.

FIGURE 2.2 REASONS TO TRAVEL INTO LEEDS CITY CENTRE

2.15 Almost two thirds of those travelling into Leeds three or more times a week do so because they work there. As expected, those who travel into Leeds to shop are less likely to do so three or more times a week. Approximately 10% of both types of respondent (all respondents and those who frequently travel into Leeds) do so for school, college or university.

2.16 Respondents were asked how they usually travel into Leeds. Bus was, by far, the most frequent response and over half the sample usually travels into Leeds this way. After that the most frequent responses were car driver and train, both which are used by over 10% of the total sample.
2.17 The responses were compared between the total sample and those who travel into Leeds three or more times a week. The results, presented in Figure 2.3, show little difference. The total proportion of those travelling to Leeds by car (drivers and passengers) was 18% amongst all respondents compared to 16% for those who frequently travel into Leeds.

FIGURE 2.3 MODE CHOICE INTO LEEDS CITY CENTRE

2.18 Those who usually drive to Leeds were asked whether they pay to park. Almost 50% stated that they pay to park and approximately 30% park for free (the remaining proportion are dropped off in the city centre so do not require parking). Results were also examined for those that drive to Leeds three or more times a week. They show that a lower proportion (42%) pay to park and 33% park for free, with fewer being dropped off.

---

1 Please note that the travel patterns shown in this report are based on those participating in the consultation and may not be representative of the wider population.
Opinions of public transport in Leeds

2.19 Respondents were asked whether they feel public transport in Leeds could be improved and over 95% felt that it could. (1% felt that services could not be improved and 2% did not know).

2.20 The questionnaire gave a list of suggestions that could help improve services and respondents were asked to select those they felt were most effective. Results show that more reliable services was the most commonly selected response, followed by cheaper fares and more frequent services. This is presented in Figure 2.4.

FIGURE 2.4 SUGGESTED PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS

2.21 The request for cheaper fares was also examined amongst the non-concessionary pass holders (71% of the total sample). This showed that 50% of respondents requested cheaper fares.

2.22 Respondents had the opportunity to note ‘other’ improvements in addition to those on the form. Over 200 people suggested ideas about this and common themes were:

- Requests for a tram (29 people): “A tram like Sheffield or Manchester.”
- More/better routes (22 people): “Additional routes connecting East and West Leeds without going into city centre” and “urgently need ‘shuttle’ bus from rail station to St James’s Hospital.”

---

2 The question asked respondents to select the three suggestions they felt were most important but a large proportion ticked more than three so all views have been reported. This was the same for the question relating to bus vehicle improvements, the results of which are summarised in Figure 2.5.
Better customer services on public transport (20 people): “Less surly drivers - customer focus please”.

More evening/weekend services (16 people): “More frequent bus services early evening and return services up to midnight so I can realistically choose not to drive when going out in the evening.”

Faster bus services (12 people): “Much faster services.”

Smartcard ticketing - generally requested as a way of speeding up bus journeys (11 people): “Speed up buses by a) paying by simple fare structure or payment in advance, b) more doors for quicker entrance and exit.”

Bus priority (8 people): “Traffic lights should change to green when a bus comes along so it doesn’t have to stop.”

Restrict car use/parking (7 people): “Less cars whose journeys should be metered. There should be a questionnaire to ask why they are congesting Leeds roads in a selfish way - the car drivers should be made accountable and responsible for wasting resources.”

Respondents were also asked whether they felt bus vehicles in Leeds could be improved. A large majority (85%) felt that bus vehicles could be improved, 9% did not know and 6% felt the services could not be improved.

The questionnaire then provided a list of suggested improvements and again, respondents were asked to select the ones they felt would be most effective. Results are presented in Figure 2.5 and show that onboard information was the most popular response, followed by cleaner vehicles, more environmentally friendly vehicles and more modern vehicles.

**FIGURE 2.5 SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO BUS VEHICLES**

Respondents also had the option to suggest ‘other’ improvements that could be made to bus vehicles. The most common suggestions were:
Comments about bendy buses or double deck vehicles (17 people): A small number of people were in favour of bendy buses (“more bendy buses which have more seating and are more comfortable”) but most expressed dislike for them. It was felt that the vehicles have fewer seats than double deck buses and help create congestion: “Ban bendy buses - they are rubbish - not enough seats, poor ventilation, poor suspension, take up too much road space.”

Security/anti-social behaviour measures (14 people): “Scratched windows on upper decks of buses send a bad message to users. Signs needed to ask passengers not to play music on buses.”

Comments about bus layouts (14 people): It was generally felt that there should be more leg room, “more room for taller people” and more space for luggage.

Better ventilation/air conditioning/heating (9 people): “Warmer in winter, colder in summer.”

More reliable vehicles (8 people): “Running vehicles - regularly we pick up passengers from other buses which have died.”

There were also requests for cleaner windows/no adverts covering windows, cycle racks, better wheelchair accessibility/easier access when stepping onto/off the bus and more space for luggage.
Opinions of Park & Ride

2.27 Those who usually travel to Leeds by car were asked what would encourage them to use Park & Ride. A frequent service into Leeds was the most popular response, followed by a fast service into Leeds and low cost travel. Only 4% stated that ‘nothing would encourage me’.

FIGURE 2.6 MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE PARK AND RIDE USE

2.28 The ‘other’ suggestions for how to encourage the use of Park & Ride primarily related to the need for a service that is cheaper than the cost of driving and one that it is in a convenient location.

2.29 These issues were also picked up amongst those who explained their answer that ‘nothing would encourage me to use a Park & Ride.’ The most common responses about this were:

- No need for a Park & Ride as other sustainable modes are already used (45 people): “I do not need to - I live near a bus stop.”

- Preference for driving (18 people): “How else would I get directly to my destination without changing here there and everywhere? If I have to change buses and walk part of the way to get to my place of work it adds more time to my journey so I may spend extra time sat in the comfort of my car.”

- Lack of confidence in a Park & Ride system (11 people): “I have no confidence in the council’s ability to deliver on its promises to provide adequate park and ride facilities” and “it would take too long. It wouldn't be secure.”

- Person needs to drive into Leeds (7 people): “I have a business I need to travel between clients.”
Concern about the time a Park & Ride journey would take - primarily due to long bus journey times (5 people): “Unreliable bus service - travel time on buses too long”.

Comments about the New Generation Transport Proposals

2.30 Further comments (in an open question format) were invited from the respondents about the NGT proposals. A summary of the responses, and number of people making the comments, is provided in Table 2-7 below.

2.31 The comments were broadly supportive of the proposals and the respondents welcomed the fact that the public transport improvements would be high quality and environmentally friendly. There was more support for trolleybuses than the alternative vehicle options, although there were more requests for a tram.

TABLE 2-7 SUMMARY OF FURTHER COMMENTS ABOUT NGT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive comment</td>
<td>Respondents noted that they welcomed the plans, especially the fact that they were for high quality services and environmentally friendly transport. Comments included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(143 people)</td>
<td>• A welcome and much needed service otherwise Leeds is in danger of grinding to a gridlock halt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Excellent idea. More flexible than trams and easier to extend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Love the environmentally friendly transport - great ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in Leeds other than central</td>
<td>35 people requested an NGT route in West Leeds. Other comments were that public transport improvements are needed within the city centre and outlying areas. Comments included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need attention (87 people)</td>
<td>• NGT does not tackle the city-wide problems that bus operators face of congestion on all major radials and in local centres. Rather it is a set of proposals where the benefits will accrue to a limited number of corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council tax payers from the better parts of Leeds will be ignored - they will just pay the bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yet again West Leeds misses out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for a tram</td>
<td>The responses showed real concern that Leeds is lagging behind other European cities by not having a tram. Comments in support of one included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61 people)</td>
<td>• Trams will always be preferable to buses, many cities in Europe have extensive tram systems and they can’t all be wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Although the proposals are a step in the right direction I feel that Leeds should have its own tram system, Leeds is the largest city in Europe not to have one, it would encourage people to leave their cars at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If trams are the best solution why can’t we find the money (Manchester did).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolleybus welcomed</td>
<td>There was more support for a trolleybus than diesel-electric/electric vehicles. There was evidence that some people prefer this option to a tram, although they were in a minority. People welcomed the fact that it was a more radical improvement to high quality buses. Comments included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 people)</td>
<td>• I think that they should be environment friendly and modern - not just a bus though, make it almost exciting!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MUST be differentiated from normal buses if people are to switch, therefore trolley bus is my favoured option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                            | • Only the trolleybus option would demonstrate a genuine, permanent investment in Leeds’ transport infrastructure. New diesel or diesel-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General PT improvements (54 people)</td>
<td>Requests for general public transport improvements related to numerous issues including fares, comfort, accessibility, additional services, faster and more direct routes, cleanliness and bus priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scepticism about solution (43 people)| A number of comments expressed scepticism about whether the solution was large-scale enough to make a difference. People were also concerned about how NGT could provide faster transport if it was not fully segregated. Comments included:  
  • Seems to combine the worst aspects of trams and buses, lack of flexibility and lack of segregated running. The main requirement is to get segregated routes and then it is not necessary to have a tram or trolleybus  |
| P&R welcomed (23 people)             | Comments included:  
  • It is a great idea, the city desperately needs a park and ride system to compete with other major cities, please make sure it happens!  |
| Diesel-electric welcomed (22 people) | There was support for this option as it was seen as more flexible and would not involve as much construction/disruption as the alternatives:  
  • Diesel-electric seems a good option - environmentally friendly but no infrastructure costs and flexible.  |
| Reliability improvements needed (21 people) | Comments included:  
  • My main gripe with bus service is that it can’t be relied upon as buses are often late, early (which is especially irritating) or don’t show, the buses make me constantly late.  |
| Bus based system not good enough (17 people) | Comments included:  
  • A fancy bus stuck in traffic (say the Headingley corridor) will still be an eyesore and not attractive to drivers.  
  • Diesel bus services are not a next generation transport plan in my opinion.  |
| NGT will take too long to introduce (12 people) | Comments included:  
  • I really want it to happen quickly, as 2014 is just too late.  
  • Your publicity (new generation of transport) proposal makes it very exciting times for public transport in Leeds, but as usual in this country everything takes too long.  |
| Funding concerns (11 people)         | There were concerns about whether the government would fund the NGT scheme and also whether council tax would be used. Comments included:  
  • How can we expect to get funding for the NGT when Supertram was refused?  
  • The trolley-bus option looks very expensive - more money for council tax payers to find.  |
| Concern about fares increase (10 people) | Comments included:  
  • Anything to improve the bus service would be good but no doubt that would increase the fares.  
  • Concerned that the bus fare would increase to pay for new transport system.  |
| Better access to hospitals needed (7 people) | A number of comments were received about the need for better access to St James Hospital from South Leeds, Headingley, Meanwood and Cookridge.  |
| The scheme is a waste of money (4 people) | Comments included:  
  • Utter waste of money, it’s trams or nothing.  
  • What’s the point? Use the money to do something good for a change - we need better roads with no holes or lumps. It ruins cars suspension and costs drivers a lot each year. Get your act together for a change.  |
Annex 5:

Consultation and the Design Process
## Annex 5: Consultation and the Design Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Issue Raised By</th>
<th>Feedback Received</th>
<th>Design Response in revised plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park Terminus</td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Concern among cyclists around interaction with buses in front of Asda and general facilities for cyclists in this location</td>
<td>Inclusion of a contra-flow cycle lane in the one-way bus stop location and provision of cycle parking at the terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park Terminus</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>General feedback about reducing street clutter throughout the whole of the route</td>
<td>Re-design of the route into the terminus so that it no longer requires a full loop around the Asda car park and minimises visual impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park Terminus</td>
<td>Asda</td>
<td>The proposed access to the main Holt Park car-park, at the north-east corner of the car-park was considered to be undesirable due to the number of car-parking spaces it would affect.</td>
<td>Through consultation with Asda and other parties the design was amended such that the car-park entrance has moved further west, directly from Holt Crescent in to the middle of the northern perimeter of the car-parking, resulting in fewer spaces being lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park Nursery</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Proximity of retaining wall may interfere with fire escape route</td>
<td>Retaining wall to be constructed further away from nursery building, so as not to interfere with fire escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Park Fire Station</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Initial stop location was opposed because fire station is expected to remain operational beyond commencement of NGT works, and even in the event that the fire station is decommissioned in advance the landowner's preference was against a stop being located at front of potential development site</td>
<td>Stop location moved on account of landowner response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Feedback Received</td>
<td>Design Response in revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodington Park and Ride</td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Improvements to cycling facilities required</td>
<td>Cycle lanes provided on the approach to the Park and Ride site and a Toucan crossing provided at the entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University sports pitches,</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>The layout and provision of sports pitches, as initially presented, did not meet the University’s requirements</td>
<td>Through consultation with the University of Leeds and Sport England the design and provision of replacement sports facilities and pitches have been amended to provide a scheme which is acceptable to all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodington</td>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>The layout and provision of sports pitches, as initially presented, did not meet the University’s requirements</td>
<td>Through consultation with the University of Leeds and Sport England the design and provision of replacement sports facilities and pitches have been amended to provide a scheme which is acceptable to all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Park</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern about the proposal to make Kepstorn Road one-way</td>
<td>Design re-worked which enables Kepstorn Road to remain two-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Junction layout at West Park felt to be too complicated, especially in terms of pedestrian movements</td>
<td>Simplification of the junction layout to revert back to a roundabout-style junction which is more in line with the current arrangement, which enables pedestrian crossings to be simpler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions and meetings with property and business owners</td>
<td>Concern about the impact on the shop forecourts, access and trees as a result of the proposed NGT stop location</td>
<td>Minor changes to existing kerb layout to minimise impact on forecourt and re-positioning of proposed NGT stop to avoid tree loss. Provision of new access points to the shop forecourt area has resulted in fewer car-parking spaces being lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otley Old Road</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern about the provision of bus lay-bys which would encroach into the grass verge at the side of the highway.</td>
<td>Design in this area reconsidered and number of bus lay-bys has been reduced in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Feedback Received</td>
<td>Design Response in revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern about the re-siting of existing bus stops.</td>
<td>Bus stop positions reconsidered and bus stops now largely remain in the same location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Suggestion that more NGT stops needed on this section</td>
<td>Provision made in the design for an additional stop at Tinshill Lane (dependent on fire station relocation which is currently under consideration).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Need for safe cycle crossing facilities at Raynell Approach to allow for access to nearby school</td>
<td>Toucan crossing now included in this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern about the positioning of a bus stop layby outside properties east of Spen Lane</td>
<td>Relocation of this layby to a location which does not affect access to properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawnswood Roundabout</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Tree loss felt to be particularly severe in this location</td>
<td>Detailed review of the design rationale in this area which included the appraisal of a number of different options. Preferred option in DF7 has lower tree loss compared to alternatives and has reduced since earlier design iterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Lack of facilities for cyclists approaching/ navigating the busy roundabout (also access to Oxley Hall)</td>
<td>Cycle lanes now included on the approaches to the roundabout (and N/B approach to Oxley Hall) and Toucan crossings incorporated into the layout of roundabout for safer negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchwood Avenue sub-station location</td>
<td>Public consultation and consultation with landowners</td>
<td>The original sub-station location was proposed to be on land owned by Miller Homes, but feedback raised concerns about the location from a visual perspective and also due to the loss of open space.</td>
<td>The location has been amended to be within an existing Yorkshire Water compound site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Feedback Received</td>
<td>Design Response in revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetwood Road/Cottage Road</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Lack of parking/loading facilities for shops in this location</td>
<td>Loading bays and parking facilities now incorporated into the design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Lane</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern that pedestrian facilities would be moved away from their existing location</td>
<td>Design re-worked to retain pedestrian crossings very close to their current positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s Court, Headingley</td>
<td>Consultation with property owner</td>
<td>The original design included the replacement of car-parking spaces serving St Michael’s Court to the rear of the property, but this conflicted with the property owner’s proposals to extend the building.</td>
<td>The design has been revised to locate three parking spaces to the side of the property, thereby overcoming the conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley Hill</td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Concerns amongst cyclists on the proposals to remove the inbound cycling lane and concern over the width of the proposed outbound NGT lane</td>
<td>Design reconsidered and now proposed to widen Headingley Lane in order to reinstate this cycle lane and widen the NGT (bus) lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart Road</td>
<td>Public drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concern about the loss of a right turn at Rampart Road and the reduction in access that this could result in.</td>
<td>Right turn reinstated to improve local accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark’s Street</td>
<td>Cycling Group</td>
<td>Cyclists concerned that removal of the inbound cycling lane would have a significant impact on safety.</td>
<td>Kerb lines and lane widths amended to retain existing cycle lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Area</td>
<td>University Meetings</td>
<td>University had concerns on the proposed road layouts, pedestrian movements, access to their sites and location of substation</td>
<td>Radical change to proposed traffic flows in this area to create a more welcoming environment for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Amended substation location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Feedback Received</td>
<td>Design Response in revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan</td>
<td>Leeds Metropolitan</td>
<td>Feel that the stop locations are too remote from the University for NGT to be used</td>
<td>Provision for an additional stop has been included within the order in the limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>by staff/students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>Access Group meeting</td>
<td>Concerns amongst access groups about the notion of shared space in this location</td>
<td>Proposals to provide some form of low kerb delineation in this location to satisfy differing access needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner Consultation</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Concern from Cathedral on the loss of servicing facilities.</td>
<td>Footway service bay reinstated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi trade</td>
<td>proposed removal of</td>
<td>Concern over proposed removal of taxi rank at Lower Briggate</td>
<td>Some taxi spaces retained on Lower Briggate rather than removal of entire rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taxi rank at Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briggate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet</td>
<td>Landowner Consultation</td>
<td>Concerns from local primary school regarding access, parking and pupil safety.</td>
<td>Improvements to arrangements to include right turn access into Joseph Street, controlled crossings for pupils, waiting restrictions to restrict parking outside school from nearby commercial uses, re-provision of parent parking and drop-off area, new secure staff car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes Resulting from Consultation Feedback (by theme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue Raised By</th>
<th>Feedback Received</th>
<th>Design Response in revised plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on conventional bus services</td>
<td>Drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Concerns about conventional buses not being able to use some sections of NGT lane.</td>
<td>Significant proportion of NGT–only lanes changed to public transport lanes to allow use by conventional buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus operator consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to existing land and properties</td>
<td>Landowners and occupiers</td>
<td>Issues regarding private and commercial access points and servicing arrangements as a result of direct landowner / occupier consultations</td>
<td>Numerous minor adjustments and changes to proposed layout and restrictions to improve arrangements for these users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative modes</td>
<td>Drop-in sessions</td>
<td>Alternative electric bus mode</td>
<td>Further discussions with DfT resulted in written confirmation that the funding approval is only valid for a trolleybus vehicle. Promoters have continually monitored development in electrically powered buses but current research suggests that there are no pure electric buses currently in commercial operation that would be suitable for the operation of a system with the capacity and frequency requirements of NGT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY

1. A twelve week consultation period on the Leeds New Generation Transport scheme (NGT) ran from 15th June until 4th September 2009. NGT is a proposed trolleybus scheme for Leeds which would provide high quality public transport on three routes leading into the city centre.

2. The consultation consisted of six public exhibitions each lasting two to four days across Leeds including evenings and Saturdays. Information was also available on the internet, in libraries, to local groups and distributed to members of the public on-street.

3. Feedback was sought via a questionnaire which over 2,500 people completed. The questionnaire responses showed a positive reaction to the proposals and 77% of all respondents supported/strongly supported them. The main reasons for such support related to:
   - Reduced car use/congestion;
   - Environmental reasons;
   - Provision of reliable/ quick/ good quality, modern public transport; and
   - Positive impact of the scheme on Leeds.

4. A similar level of support was shown for the use of trolleybuses, which were primarily supported due to environmental reasons. Over 70% of all respondents supported/strongly supported the introduction of Park & Ride sites at the end of the North and South routes; such support was even higher amongst car owners.

5. The feedback questionnaire asked about potential use of NGT and 88% of those living within a ten minute walk of one of the routes said they would consider using it. 42% of car owners responding said they would consider using one of the Park & Rides.

6. A number of comments and suggestions were received in relation to the NGT proposals. Common themes included the following:
   - A desire for more NGT routes and wider coverage across Leeds;
   - The need for low fares to encourage use;
   - The need for competitive Park & Ride pricing to encourage car drivers;
   - Concern about how NGT would integrate with existing bus services - some feel it is not necessary if existing services are improved; and
   - The impact of the scheme on traffic, with some concerns that NGT would create additional congestion.
1 Introduction

Background

1.1 Public consultation on the New Generation Transport (NGT) proposals took place over a twelve week period from 15th June to 4th September 2009. The main activity was a series of public exhibitions which ran along the proposed routes and in the city centre. The exhibition opening times covered evenings and Saturdays and the programme of dates is shown in Table 1-1. A trailer was used as the exhibition venue as shown in Figure 1-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Exhibition dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Leeds</td>
<td>Morrison’s car park at the Penny Hill Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Thurs 18th - Sat 20th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (1)</td>
<td>St Chad’s Parish Centre, Otley Road</td>
<td>Thurs 25th - Sat 27th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (2)</td>
<td>St Columba Church, Headingley</td>
<td>Mon 29th - Tues 30th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Victoria Gardens, The Headrow</td>
<td>Wed 1st - Sat 4th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (3)</td>
<td>Hyde Park, Woodhouse Lane</td>
<td>Thurs 9th - Sat 11th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leeds</td>
<td>Beckett Street Car Park opposite St James Hospital</td>
<td>Thurs 16th - Sat 18th July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1-1 EXHIBITION TRAILER
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1.2 The exhibitions were attended by over 1,300 people. A further 18,000 people who were passing by, but did not visit the exhibition, were given an information pack. These contained an NGT leaflet, feedback questionnaire and freepost envelope. Table 1-2 shows the number of people attending each event as well as the number of information packs distributed.

**TABLE 1-2 EXHIBITION ATTENDANCE AND DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION PACKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition</th>
<th>No of people attending exhibition</th>
<th>No of information packs given to passers-by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Leeds</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (1)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (2)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Leeds (3)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leeds</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Members of the public were also provided with information and the opportunity to comment in the following ways:

- The NGT website: this provided information about the scheme and an online version of the feedback questionnaire;
- Local libraries: information packs were available at libraries across Leeds; and
- 900 additional information packs were given out in the city centre after the exhibitions ended.

This report

1.4 This report provides a summary of the responses to the NGT questionnaire. It should be noted that the results came from those who chose to complete a questionnaire. They may not represent the wider Leeds population.

1.5 The report is structured as follows:

- Section Two details the numbers of respondents and respondent demographics;
- Section Three sets out the support for the scheme, new public transport and potential NGT use; and
- Section Four summarises the comments received about the scheme.

1.6 A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Appendix A.
2 Consultation results

Number of responses

2.1 Table 2-1 details the number of questionnaire responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of questionnaire</th>
<th>No of completed forms</th>
<th>% of all completed forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition - City centre</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition - North Leeds</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition - South Leeds</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition - East Leeds</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition total</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freepost</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The questionnaire response rates were as follows:

- Exhibitions: 28% of those attending completed a feedback questionnaire; and
- Information packs: approximately 10% of those given a pack completed a questionnaire.

2.3 The response rate for the exhibitions is not out of line with usual response rates - people often come to events for information and leave without completing a questionnaire.

2.4 Respondent postcodes have been mapped to illustrate the spread of responses. This is presented in Figure 2-1 and shows that respondents came from all over Leeds, with large concentrations around Headingley, North Leeds and South Leeds.
The vast majority (98%) of responses came from general members of the public. 1% of responses came from businesses and a further 1% came from local interest groups.

**Respondent demographics**

Information about respondent demographics is presented below and was cross-tabulated by the type of response: exhibition, freepost and internet. This found that:

- Males were more likely to provide feedback than females, and much more so when responding at the exhibitions and online;
- Those under 16 year olds were more likely to give feedback at the exhibition than by freepost or online;
- Those over 65 years old were less likely to respond online; and
- All ethnic groups were represented at the consultation and the respondent ethnic profile generally compares well to the wider Leeds population.

**Respondent gender**

56% of all respondents were males and 44% were females. Figure 2-2 illustrates the gender split by type of response, showing that females were more likely to reply by freepost than at the exhibitions or online.
FIGURE 2-2  TYPE OF RESPONSE AND RESPONDENT GENDER

Respondent age

2.8 Responses came from a mixed age group, including 2% that were under 16 years old. Figure 2-3 illustrates the age of respondents and the means by which they provided feedback. It shows that those under 16 responded at the exhibition but were less likely to by freepost or online, and that those over 65 were also less likely to reply online. The largest group of online respondents were aged 25-34.

FIGURE 2-3  AGE OF RESPONDENTS

2.9 The respondents’ age profile does not fully align with the Leeds population (identified in the 2001 Census), although all groups are represented and there is a
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good spread of age ranges. There were fewer responses from those under 16 years old, whilst those aged 45-64 years old were over-represented.

TABLE 2-2  AGE OF RESPONDENTS COMPARED TO THE LEEDS POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long term illnesses

2.10 Respondents were asked whether they suffer from a long term illness, and if they do, whether it affects the way they travel. 18% of respondents suffer from such an illness and half of them (9% of the total sample) suffer from a long standing illness that affects the way they travel.

Respondent ethnicity

2.11 The respondents were from a wide range of ethnic groups. The full breakdown is provided in Table 2-3 and is compared to 2001 Census ethnicity data for Leeds. This shows that the NGT respondent ethnicity generally aligns well to the wider Leeds population.

TABLE 2-3  RESPONDENT ETHNIC PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White: British</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Irish</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black African</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Asian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Indian</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Pakistani</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Other Asian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: African</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Other Black</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Chinese</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Other</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent occupation

2.12 The occupation of the respondents was also recorded and is presented in Table 2-4. This shows that the majority of respondents were employed/self employed.

TABLE 2-4  RESPONDENT OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed/self employed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/university</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home/keeping house</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transport characteristics

2.13 The respondents’ car ownership profile compares well to that of Leeds. Almost one third of the sample live in a non-car owning household and just over two thirds own one or more cars.

TABLE 2-5  CAR OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cars in household</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14 Respondents were asked whether they hold a concessionary pass that allows free bus travel and/or reduced train fares. Approximately one third of respondents stated that they had a concessionary pass, while the remaining two thirds do not.

2.15 The age range of pass holders were examined and 41% of the under 16s said they held a pass, as did 52% of the 55 to 64 year olds and 97% of those aged over 65.
3 Support for the NGT scheme

Summary

3.1 The consultation results were very positive and showed that:

- There is strong support for the proposed NGT scheme - almost 80% of respondents support/strongly support the proposals;
- The greatest support was apparent amongst those attending the exhibitions;
- Those living within a 10 minute walk of the proposed routes were more likely to support the proposals than those living further away;
- Respondents with two or more cars were less positive than others; and
- Local interest groups were less positive than others.

Opinions about the NGT proposals

3.2 The results showed strong support for the NGT proposals as illustrated in Table 3-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The level of support was mapped by respondent postcode and is presented in Figure 3-1. This shows that there is some strong opposition along the North and South routes, as well as elsewhere in Leeds, but not along the East route.
FIGURE 3-1 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS ACROSS LEEDS
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Support for the NGT proposals across the Leeds area
3.4 Respondents were asked why they supported or did not support the NGT scheme. The most common reasons for support related to the following issues:

**Reduced car use/congestion:**
- “Massive traffic problems, this could be the catalyst to reduce traffic flows.”
- “Need more effective public transport to avoid jams!”

**Environmental reasons:**
- “Any new initiative for greener transport on popular routes is an excellent idea.”
- “I am a school child and I really think we should have cleaner buses.”

**Provision of reliable/quick public transport:**
- “The A660 corridor desperately needs fast, efficient public transport - it’s been waiting too long.”
- “It’s really important to have something that will attract people and get them into town fast.”

**Provision of good quality, modern public transport:**
- “Leeds needs a modern public transport system suited to the 21st century.”
- “Looks efficient and fun!”

**Positive impact of the scheme on Leeds:**
- “Innovative idea to take Leeds into the forefront of modern city transportation.”
- “If done correctly it will help promote the city and improve the transport experience all round.”
- “Leeds is getting bigger and spreading outwards. The NGT should help the city move forward at a steady pace.”

3.5 The most common reasons for opposing the scheme related to the following reasons:

**Considered a waste of money:**
- “More cost to the people of Leeds & we can’t afford this.”
- “Very expensive project at the moment, better at the moment to help people with the housing problems.”

**Proposals would only benefit some areas:**
- “It only helps a small portion of the population of Leeds.”
- “Once again, the people of Belle Isle and Middleton have been forgotten.”

**Scheme is not needed:**
- “Why can’t you just sort out the roads and existing provision”
- “Travelling into Leeds city centre on a regular basis I do not experience any problems using public transport/car.”

**Would not reduce congestion:**
- “Vehicles still have to use the public highway so will still be held up in traffic.”
- “The scheme still uses buses and doesn’t do anything to reduce congestion”
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3.6 The level of support for the NGT proposals was examined amongst different groups as shown in Table 3-2 to Table 3-4. Table 3-2 shows that the exhibition respondents were more likely to strongly support the scheme, whereas internet respondents were more likely to strongly oppose it compared to the other groups. This implies that face to face consultation (and providing an opportunity to discuss the proposals) is a valuable way of helping to remove concerns about a scheme and generate support. It should also be noted that there was no specific mechanism to prevent multiple internet responses, for example from an ardent objector.

### TABLE 3-2 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – TYPE OF RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Exhibition</th>
<th>Freepost</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Table 3-3 shows that those living close to the routes showed more support than others.

### TABLE 3-3 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – PROXIMITY TO ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Live within 10 min walk</th>
<th>Do not live within 10 min walk</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 There was also a slight difference in the level of support by car ownership, as shown in Table 3-4 and those with two or more cars were slightly less positive than others.

### TABLE 3-4 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – CAR OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>No cars</th>
<th>One car</th>
<th>Two + cars</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-5 shows the level of support according to the type of respondent. It highlights that the small number of interest groups showed less strong support than individuals, as did the business respondents. The interest groups also showed a higher level of opposition than the individuals and businesses.

**TABLE 3-5 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – TYPE OF RESPONDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Interest group</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions about the use of Trolleybuses

Over three quarters of all respondents support/strongly support the use of trolleybuses on the NGT routes as illustrated in Figure 3-2.

**FIGURE 3-2 OPINIONS ABOUT THE USE OF TROLLEYBUSES ON THE NGT ROUTES**

The most common reasons for supporting the use of trolleybuses related to:

Environmental reasons:
- “Less pollution and carbon dioxide.”
- “Trolley buses are mostly ecologically sound.”

Quieter transport:
- “I particularly like the idea of quiet vehicles.”
- “The normal buses are very loud and regular so you can’t really get away from them.”
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General support:
• “This NGT looks marvellous. I hope it works.”
• “Next best alternative to super trams and cheaper to construct”

3.12 The most common reasons for opposing the use of trolleybuses related to:

Preference for a tram:
• “Supertram would have been better as it ran on its own reserved track, not the roads as the trolley bus does.”
• “Metro and Leeds City Council should not accept second best for Leeds. Leeds deserves better.”

The need for overhead wires:
• “Uses network of ugly poles and wires for power.”
• “Overhead cables will be a permanent eyesore in suburban Leeds.”

General opposition:
• “Less mobile than electric buses yet take more infrastructure.”
• “Trolley buses, even in their current form, are still largely heritage in design and show no signs of development.”

Opinions about the Park & Ride proposals

3.13 Almost three quarters of respondents support/strongly support the idea for Park & Rides sites at the end of the North and South routes. Car owners were more supportive than non car owners, as shown in Table 3-6.

**TABLE 3-6 SUPPORT FOR THE PARK & RIDE PROPOSALS BY CAR OWNERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>Car owner</th>
<th>Non car owner</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14 The most common reasons for support related to the following issues:

Would reduce car use/congestion:
• “Will reduce congestion on the main routes into Leeds benefiting both NGT and normal buses.”
• “Give car drivers an opportunity to try out these new transport alternatives.”

Support route/Park & Ride location choice:
• “The Southern P&R is particularly useful as it will provide access to the city from the national motorway network.”
• “Useful for those that live just beyond the proposed route -
Other general support:

- “Fantastic idea for both commuters and shoppers.”
- “Park and Ride is already successful in many cities.”

3.15 The most common reasons for opposing the Park & Ride sites related to the following issues:

Oppose route/Park & Ride location choice:

- “More park & ride sites required on existing rail network - Horsforth Ring Road, East Leeds, South Leeds.”
- “Bodington too close - lots of traffic along Otley Road from Bramhope and North.”

Would not reduce congestion/would create congestion:

- “Huge amounts of traffic come to Lawnswood roundabout now and Park and Ride would increase it.”
- “Am a little concerned it will cause congestion in the area as I live nearby.”

3.16 A number of ‘other’ comments were made about operational issues. These related to the following:

- Price: suggestions that the service is free, cheaper than public transport or cheaper than parking fees in the city centre;
- Security: very secure car parks would be needed;
- Public transport links: a high quality, frequent service is needed;
- Size of the site: adequate parking provision;
- The need for cycle storage at the sites;
- Additional Park & Ride sites within Leeds; and
- Consideration of the local residential areas - to ensure on-street parking is not abused.

Potential use of the NGT Park & Ride Services

3.17 There was a positive response to the idea of Park & Ride sites and 42% of car owners said they would consider using one. The response was even more positive for car owners living within a potential catchment of the proposed sites as shown in Figure 3-3 and Figure 3-4 with:

- 45% of car owners living within the Bodington catchment saying they would consider using the NGT Park & Ride; and
- 53% of car owners living within the Stourton catchment saying they would consider using the NGT Park & Ride.
FIGURE 3-3 WOULD CAR OWNERS IN THE BODINGTON CATCHMENT USE THE PARK & RIDE SITE?
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Note: Larger dot size indicates duplicate respondents at same postcode.
FIGURE 3-4 WOULD CAR OWNERS IN THE STOURTON CATCHMENT USE THE PARK & RIDE SITE?
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3.18 Those that would not consider using the Park & Ride sites were asked why this was. Amongst the car owners that would not consider using the sites (58% of all car owners):

- 59% do not travel near the proposed Park & Ride sites;
- 16% do not have access to their household’s car; and
- 4% have parking at work which is provided by their employer.

3.19 Other reasons were also given and included the fact that car owners live closer to the city centre than the proposed Park & Ride sites, travel into the city centre in other ways than the car (bus, train or cycle) and that such travel would not be practical: “although I think the P+R is a good idea, I can’t carry all my equipment on a public transport, so it’s the car or nothing, I’m afraid.”

Opinions about a new public transport system

The overall service

3.20 Respondents were asked what would be most important to them in a new public transport system. The results are presented in Figure 3-5 and show that more reliable services, cheaper fares and faster services were the most important features.

**FIGURE 3-5 IMPORTANT FEATURES OF A NEW PUBLIC TRANSPORT SYSTEM**

![Bar chart of important features of a new public transport system]

New public transport vehicles

3.21 Figure 3-6 shows what respondents would like in new public transport vehicles. By far the most popular feature was more environmentally friendly vehicles, followed by on-board information and cleaner vehicles inside and out.
Potential use of NGT

3.22 Over 80% of all respondents said they would consider using NGT to travel around Leeds. As expected, those living close to the routes were more likely to say this than others, as shown in Table 3-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you consider using NGT?</th>
<th>Respondents 10 minute walk of NGT route</th>
<th>Respondents NOT within 10 minute walk of NGT</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.23 Respondents that would consider using NGT were asked how often this might be. More frequent use was anticipated amongst those living closest to the routes and over 50% of such potential users said they might use NGT three or more times a week.
Potential users of NGT were also asked how they currently travel to the destinations that the scheme will serve. Responses were examined amongst those that live within a 10 minute walk of the proposed routes and would consider using NGT. This found that a significant proportion (almost 20%) currently travel by car, as shown in Table 3-8.

### TABLE 3-8 CURRENT TRAVEL TO NGT DESTINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of potential use</th>
<th>Car - driver</th>
<th>Car - passenger</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three + times a week</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than monthly but less than weekly</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Comments about the proposals

4.1 Respondents provided a large number of comments about the proposals which have been coded during the data analysis into different categories.

The North Route

4.2 The ten most frequently made comments about the North Route are shown in Table 4-1. A number of these relate to the different route options around the Arndale Centre and the majority agreed that the preferred option (with NGT on the new link road) was the best one.

TABLE 4-1 COMMENTS ABOUT THE NORTH ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Welcome idea (203 comments) | • Good route which will be well utilised by students and commuters.  
• It would be a good thing for this area. |
| Alternative/additional routes needed (156 comments) | Requests for:  
• An extended service to Holt Park, Otley, the Airport, Yeadon, Golden Acre Park, Horsforth, Bramhope and Cookridge.  
• A service to Kirkstall, Headingley Stadium, Meanwood, Moortown, Roundhay Park, Chapel Allerton and Chapeltown, Oakwood and Alwoodley. |
| Route currently congested (112 comments) | • Crucial to relieve totally unacceptable daily congestion.  
• Should definitely go through Headingly as it’s the worst for traffic. |
| ‘Other’ concern (106 comments) | Include concerns about:  
• Who will benefit from scheme - students (non-rate payers?)  
• Impact on existing bus services.  
• Creation of new link road.  
• Environmental impact of scheme.  
• Extra traffic works - new crossing, junction changes etc.  
• Number of NGT stops.  
• Safety for the visually impaired who might not hear the trolleybuses approaching. |
| Favour preferred option (93 comments) | • The preferred route is the best option and would cause less overall disruption.  
• The preferred option through Headingly seems more sensible and less disruptive / destructive. |
| Suggestion about scheme (73 comments) | Suggestions included:  
• Incentives for use (e.g. lower fares).  
• A no stopping service option.  
• Late night services.  
• Extra services when there are cricket and rugby matches in Headingly. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interchange at Bodington/Lawnswood to reduce the number of buses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free Park &amp; Ride.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures to reduce traffic introduced at the same time as NGT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment about new link road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56 comments)</td>
<td>• This is the THIRD plan to bring traffic behind the house and shops up Headingley Hill and behind the Arndale Centre. The first was for a road bypass, then the ill fated tram route, now trolley buses!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned about the environmental impact of the off road section e.g. lighting, the inevitable blitz of traffic signs, green field development and urbanisation, tree loss, lack of tree replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favour alternative option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54 comments)</td>
<td>• Public transport can never be 100% effective until it takes centre stage with the car becoming secondary. It should be cars that compromise, not NGT. NGT through the centre would also allow for semi-pedestrianisation, encouraging business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not reduce congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48 comments)</td>
<td>• May create increased problems on an already busy route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will not significantly improve the experience of commuting on this route, given limitations of space through Headingley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to segregate from traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45 comments)</td>
<td>• Unless dedicated lanes can be made properly effective, it’s not likely to improve significantly on current bus performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• You need dedicated lanes/routes to avoid bottlenecks, if it isn’t quicker or comfortable or reliable then the well off car drivers won’t use it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Cycling issues were also raised by 27 people commenting on the North route. Comments included questions about cycle lane provision and the fact that provision should be made with “a positive attitude not as an after thought”. There was concern about the loss of the northbound cycle lane at Headingley Hill: “I object to the proposal to lose the inbound cycle lane at Headingley Hill - Hyde Park corner. This point needs to be resolved or else I would withdraw my support from the whole scheme.”

The South Route

4.4 The ten most frequently made comments about the South Route are shown in Table 4-2.

TABLE 4-2 COMMENTS ABOUT THE SOUTH ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/additional routes needed</td>
<td>Requests for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150 comments)</td>
<td>• An extended service to Belle Isle, Middleton, Dewsbury Road, Rothwell, Morley, Beeston, White Rose Centre, Elland Road, Oulton, Woodsford and Wakefield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112 comments)</td>
<td>• I think it is brilliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Great for people in the South. This part of the city has a lot of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment category</td>
<td>Example quotes/ notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under privileged areas and is not too well served by any public transport after rush hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Favour preferred option (56 comments) | • Don’t bother serving the businesses on the A61; businesses never use public transport, even if it’s perfect.
• A61 route very poor option as no one lives on this road and service will rely mostly exclusively on Park and Ride business. Poor journey time will make unattractive to motorists. |
| ‘Other’ concerns (40 comments) | ‘Other’ concerns related to:
• Impact on existing bus services.
• The need for seatbelts on services: *A lot of people in these areas have bitter disputes over children, so I’d hope that seat belts would be available to use.*
• Whether integrated bus and trolleybus tickets would be available.
• Who would benefit from the scheme - *those from outside of Leeds?*
• Anti-social behaviour on public transport.
• Environmental impact of the scheme. |
| Park & Ride comment (36 comments) | • Some concern about extra traffic due to the Park & Ride: *will force a large quantity of traffic every day onto roads that are already close to capacity*
• Need for secure parking: *many cars would be broken into (I used to live in the adjoining streets and it is rough)*
• Desire for more information for local residents: *the houses near where the park and ride is intended to be should have a visit from a representative explaining what is intended more indepth, and how it is going to affect us.* |
| Suggestion about scheme (36 comments) | Include suggestions about:
• Areas to extend NGT into.
• The need for high frequencies.
• The need for a tram.
• The need to integrate NGT with existing public transport services. |
| Route is currently congested (22 comments) | • *Would ease congestion into Leeds from the motorway.*
• *The Stourton Junction is already very, very overcrowded at busy times.*
• *Very good considering the amount of congestion along that route during rush hour* |
| Need to segregate from traffic (17 comments) | • *More of it should be separated from general traffic to improve reliability and journey times.*
• *Speed is key - if you do not segregate the trolleybuses the whole thing would turn into a glorified bus.* |
| Not needed (17 comments) | • *It would be possible to speed existing bus services using more priority measures without introducing an expensive trolleybus system.*
• *Poor route, not the busiest of bus routes, a bit political.* |
| A waste of money (12 comments) | • *Waste of council money. Money could be used to make streets and roads cleaner.*
• *Why waste money on something like this when the buses are OK* |
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The table shows that 56 people made a comment in favour of the ‘Preferred’ South route option which travels past the Penny Hill Shopping Centre and through the Pepper Road area. Only seven people disagreed and favoured the alternative option. Reasons included:

- “Alternative route serving businesses seems better. Other route already has good bus services.”
- “Preferred route cuts through an existing housing estate which I do not think would be reasonable.”

The East Route

The ten most frequently made comments about the East Route are shown in Table 4-3.

TABLE 4-3 COMMENTS ABOUT THE EAST ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Route is too short (202 comments) | • It’s absurd - only city centre to St James’ Hospital.  
• Too short. Should run past Seacroft Centre and have a Park and Ride to help ease traffic coming into Leeds from York and Wetherby.  
• It’s too short. East Leeds very badly served. If concern is short term congestion relief, then ok, but if it’s social need then East needs much longer route. And where’s the West route? |
| Alternative/additional routes needed (178 comments) | Requests for:  
• An extended service to Seacroft, Roundhay Road, Harehills Road, Whinmoor, Cross Gates, Halton, Temple Newsam and Coulton. |
| Welcome idea (94 comments) | • It would help people who have disabilities and families that have children as well.  
• Fantastic idea, much needed to ease congestion and develop Leeds as an economic centre. |
| Would welcome improved link to St James’ Hospital (83 comments) | • Very useful for visits to St James’  
• Anything that links up St James’ to both the North and South is a great idea. |
| ‘Other’ concern (40 comments) | The concerns raised related to:  
• Impact on existing services  
• A preference for the tram  
• Impact on traffic  
• Interaction with existing bus services  
• Demolition of the pub opposite St James’ - Why does Fountain Head have to be pulled down? This is only decent pub with no trouble in
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area.</td>
<td>• Land-take between the Shakespeare tower blocks (opposite St James) and Beckett Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Not needed       | • Adequate service already exists on this route.  
| (39 comments)    | • The route is already very well served by the regular buses. There would be no benefit to the new service. |
| Suggestion about | Include suggestions about:  
| the scheme       | • Areas to extend NGT into  
| (26 comments)    | • Ticket options/methods of payment |
| A waste of       | • Rubbish. Showcase route.  
| money            | • Wow! So we can pay millions on wires overhead to save us 1 second or so on the short journey? |
| (19 comments)    | |
| Park & Ride      | • Have you considered a park and ride for the East, to accommodate those coming from York and East Yorkshire? This could either be sited at the Hospital or nearby? |
| (14 comments)    | |
| Route is currently congested | • Quite congested this area. Hard to imagine how new transport system will fit in. |
| (7 comments)     | |

City Centre Route

4.7

The ten most frequently made comments about the City Centre Route are shown in Table 4-4. They show that there is some confusion about the function of this route and some think it is a stand-alone service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4-4  COMMENTS ABOUT THE CITY CENTRE ROUTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Welcome idea     | • There would be direct route to the two main hospitals.  
| (226 comments)   | • Good idea to circumvent the city. Allows more people access to get around easier. |
| 'Other' concern  | Concerns related to:  
| (130 comments)   | • Interaction with general traffic - whether this would slow NGT or NGT slow traffic.  
|                  | • Whether there would be an NGT loop in the centre.  
|                  | • Aesthetics of the scheme, including overhead wires.  
|                  | • Interaction with existing bus services.  
|                  | • Impact on pedestrian traffic.  
|                  | • Trolleybuses travelling through Millennium Square. |
| Wider coverage   | • Excellent. How about covering more of the centre of Leeds?  
| needed in the    | • Ideally, take all routes right round city centre loop to provide good access e.g. to Playhouse. |
| centre           | (76 comments)         |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes/ notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concern about NGT and Free CityBus (74 comments) | • Will it rival the “free bus” which is so excellent at the moment?  
• Won’t be popular if you take away the existing free city centre service.  
• Needs to be frequent as current free buses do not have enough capacity especially during peak morning period. |
| Not needed (43 comments) | • I think the centre is small enough to not require a route.  
• Hardly seems worth it. Quicker to walk for most people. |
| Alternative/additional routes needed (37 comments) | • It should go nearer the Merrion Centre  
• Route in front of museum, intolerable. Must go up Calverley Street and Portland Way  
• What about another stop at the library and art gallery. I think that would be good. It could serve Millennium Square and The Light also. And maybe another stop near the Corn Exchange/The Calls? |
| Whether a one way or two way loop (35 comments) | • Great as long it goes in both directions (unlike the loop and the free bus service)  
• If at all possible, trolleybuses should go in both directions around the city centre route. |
| Current congestion on route (34 comments) | • Hope it reduces traffic in city centre.  
• I hope this will reduce city centre traffic and make Leeds more pedestrian friendly |
| Would increase congestion (19 comments) | • Your proposal for this area is to clog up more. It’s a joke! I cannot see how a trolley bus will ease an already congested Leeds city centre. |
| Waste of money (16 comments) | • More bus priority and restrictions on private cars would deliver a better service for a fraction of the cost. |

### Other comments about NGT

4.8 Other comments made about NGT related to the following:

- A desire for NGT to extend to other areas including West Leeds;
- Requests for alternative transport solutions - including a tram, improvements to existing bus services and greater attention to walking and cycling;
- The need for more NGT priority/segregation;
- The need for low fares; and
- Provision of integrated ticketing and smartcard technology.
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Summary

1. A four week consultation period, on the proposal to extend the Leeds New Generation Transport scheme (NGT) to Holt Park, ran from 20th May until 18th June 2010. NGT is a proposed trolleybus scheme for Leeds which would provide high quality public transport on three routes leading into the city centre.

2. The consultation consisted of an exhibition lasting three days, which included an evening and a Saturday. Information was also available on the internet, in the local library and was distributed to members of the public on-street.

3. Feedback was sought via a questionnaire which over 140 people completed. The questionnaire responses showed a positive reaction to the proposals and 65% of all respondents supported / strongly supported them. The main reasons for such support related to:
   - Reduced car use / congestion;
   - Environmental reasons; and
   - Provision of reliable / quick / good quality, modern public transport.

4. A similar level of support was shown for the use of trolleybuses, which were primarily supported due to environmental reasons. Over 70% of all respondents supported / strongly supported the introduction of Park & Ride sites, such support was even higher amongst car owners.

5. The feedback questionnaire asked about potential use of NGT and 71% of those living within a ten minute walk of one of the routes said they would consider using it. 39% of car owners responding said they would consider using the Park & Ride services.

6. A number of comments and suggestions were received in relation to the NGT proposals. Common themes included the following:
   - A desire for more NGT routes and wider coverage across Leeds;
   - Concern about how NGT would integrate with existing bus services – some feel it is not necessary if existing services are improved; and
   - The impact of the scheme on traffic, with some concerns that NGT would create additional congestion.
1 Introduction

Background

1.1 In Summer 2009, a twelve week consultation period on the New Generation Transport (NGT) proposals took place, with public exhibitions on each of the proposed routes. The proposals were for three initial routes:

- North Route to a Park & Ride site at Bodington;
- East Route to St James’s Hospital; and
- South Route to a Park & Ride site at Stourton.

1.2 The Promoters (Metro and Leeds City Council) were also looking at the potential for other future NGT routes and highlighted, within the consultation materials, an aspiration to extend the North Route to serve Holt Park.

1.3 In March 2010, the Government granted Programme Entry Approval to the NGT network and allocated funding for the North Route to Bodington, the South Route to Stourton and a city centre link between these two routes. In addition the Government gave approval to a proposed extension of the North Route to serve the Holt Park area. The Government did not approve funding for the East Route to St James’s Hospital or the full city centre loop. Work is currently underway to investigate alternative means of funding these important sections of the route.

1.4 Following the inclusion of the proposed Holt Park extension within the Programme Entry Approval, public consultation on this proposal to extend the North Route to serve the Holt Park area took place over a one month period from 20\textsuperscript{th} May to 18\textsuperscript{th} June 2010. The main activity was a public exhibition which was held at the Holt Park District Centre. The exhibition opening times covered an evening and a Saturday and the programme of dates is shown in Table 1-1. An exhibition display was used, on the concourse outside the entrance to ASDA supermarket, as shown in Figure 1-1.

1.5 The exhibition was attended by over 400 people as shown in Table 1-1. A further 400 people who were passing by, but did not visit the exhibition, were given an information pack. This contained an NGT leaflet, feedback questionnaire and freepost envelope.
TABLE 1-1  NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT ATTENDED THE EXHIBITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>No of people at the exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 20th May (12 noon – 8pm)</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 21st May (10am – 6pm)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 22nd May (10am – 3pm)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1-1  EXHIBITION DISPLAY

1.6 The purpose of the exhibition was to show the proposed Holt Park extension of the NGT Trolleybus network to members of the public and seek feedback to help inform design.

This report

1.7 This report provides a summary of the responses to the NGT questionnaire and is structured as follows:

- Section Two details the numbers of respondents and respondent demographics;
- Section Three sets out the support for the scheme, new public transport and potential NGT use; and
- Section Four summarises the comments received about the scheme.

1.8 A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Appendix A.
2 Consultation results

2.1 The results presented in this report are from those who chose to complete a questionnaire. They may not represent the wider Leeds population. The questionnaire response was approximately 18%.

2.2 Details of the proposed Holt Park extension were available on the NGT website and people were given the opportunity to provide comments on the proposals, using a specific link. It should be noted that demographic information was not sought from respondents using the website (of which there were only 2. A further 6 respondents sent comments on the proposals using the NGT e-mail address). Therefore the results shown in this section are based on those respondents who completed the NGT questionnaire.

2.3 Respondent postcodes have been mapped to illustrate the spread of responses. This is presented in Figure 2-1 and shows that the majority of respondents came from the Holt Park area, which was expected for this local consultation.

FIGURE 2-1 GEOGRAPHICAL SPREAD OF RESPONDENT POSTCODES
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Respondent demographics

**Respondent gender and age**

2.4 58% of all respondents were males and 42% were females. Responses came from a mixed age group, including 1% that were under 16 years old.

2.5 The respondents’ age profile does not fully align with the Leeds population (identified in the 2001 Census) Table 2-1, although all groups are represented. There were fewer responses from those under 16, 16-24 and 25-34 years old, whilst those aged 55-64 and 65+ years old were over-represented.

**TABLE 2-1 AGE OF RESPONDENTS COMPARED TO THE LEEDS POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent illness**

2.6 Respondents were asked whether they suffer from a long term illness, and if they do, whether it affects the way they travel. 24% of respondents suffer from such an illness and almost a third of them (10% of the total sample) suffer from a long standing illness that affects the way they travel.

**Respondent ethnicity**

2.7 The respondents were from a range of ethnic groups. The full breakdown is provided in Table 2-2 and is compared to the 2001 Census ethnicity data for Leeds. This shows that the NGT respondent ethnicity generally aligns well to the wider Leeds population.
TABLE 2-2 RESPONDENT ETHNIC PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White: British</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Indian</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Caribbean</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Chinese</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group: Other</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent occupation**

2.8 The occupation of the respondents was also recorded and is presented in Table 2-3. This shows that the majority of respondents were employed / self employed.

TABLE 2-3 RESPONDENT OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed/self employed</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/university</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home/keeping house</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport characteristics**

2.9 The respondents’ car ownership profile compares well to that of Leeds, as presented in Table 2-4. Almost one fifth of the sample live in a non-car owning household and just over four fifths own one or more cars.
### TABLE 2-4  CAR OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cars in household</th>
<th>% of Leeds residents (2001 Census)</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Respondents were asked whether they hold a concessionary pass that allows free bus travel and / or reduced train fares. Over two fifths of respondents stated that they had a concessionary pass.

2.11 The age range of pass holders were examined and 32% of the 55 to 64 years old said they held a pass, as did 63% of those aged over 65.
3 Support for the NGT scheme

Summary

3.1 The consultation results were positive and showed that:

- There is clear support for the NGT proposals, 65% of respondents support / strongly support the proposals;
- Those living further away from the proposed route were more likely to use NGT than those living within a 10 minute walk of the route; and
- Respondents with two or more cars were less positive than others;

Opinions about the NGT proposals

3.2 The results showed good support for the NGT proposals as illustrated in Table 3-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>% of NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The level of support was mapped by respondent postcode and is presented in Figure 3-1. This shows that there is some strong opposition from residents living on or close to Otley Old Road which is part of the proposed NGT route.
FIGURE 3-1  SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO HOLT PARK
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Note: in some instances there were duplicate respondents at same postcode
Respondents were asked why they supported or did not support the NGT scheme. The most common reasons for support related to the following issues:

| Reduced car use / congestion: | • “There needs to be a public transport system which encourages motorists out of cars”
|                              | • “Need a faster, cheaper service from Leeds to Holt Park, reducing the congestion and delays through Headingley” |
| Environmental reasons:       | • “Need a cleaner, environmentally friendly form of transport to cut pollution and congestion”
|                              | • “A less polluting form of public transport” |
| Provision of reliable / quick public transport: | • “Leeds has a need for faster and more efficient transport”
|                                              | • “It will provide a much more direct and quicker route into the city” |

The most common reasons for opposing the scheme related to the following reasons:

| Considered a waste of money: | • “Complete waste of money at a time when the country is experiencing severe economic problems.”
|                             | • “Waste of money. Not as versatile as bus.” |
| Scheme is not needed:        | • “Extension to Holt Park is unnecessary on an already little used bus route.”
|                             | • “The additional transport not required as buses are not full now.” |
| Environmental impact:        | • “Mainly oppose because of how it will destroy the look of the local environment. Wires trailing and concrete instead of grass verges will look rubbish.”
|                             | • “Trolleybuses need overhead power – an eyesore.” |

Table 3-2 shows that those living further from the route showed more support than those living within a 10 minute walk of the route.
### TABLE 3-2 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – PROXIMITY TO ROUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>% that live within 10 minute walk of NGT route</th>
<th>% that do not live within 10 minute walk of NGT route</th>
<th>% of all NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 There was also a significant difference in the level of support by car ownership, as shown in Table 3-3 and those with one or more cars were significantly less positive than those with no cars.

### TABLE 3-3 SUPPORT FOR THE NGT PROPOSALS – CAR OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>% with no cars</th>
<th>% with one car</th>
<th>% with two + cars</th>
<th>% of all NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opinions about the use of Trolleybuses

3.8 Almost two-thirds of all respondents support / strongly support the use of trolleybuses on the NGT routes as illustrated in Figure 3-2.
3.9 The most common reasons for supporting the use of trolleybuses related to:

**Environmental reasons:**
- “A more environmentally friendly form of transport.”
- “The buses will provide a fast, environmentally friendly solution to current transport needs.”

**General support:**
- “Trolleybuses are more flexible than tram.”
- “Avoids digging up roads for tram tracks.”

3.10 The most common reasons for opposing the use of trolleybuses related to:

**The need for overhead wires:**
- “Particularly up Otley Old Road where the overhead cables and support will spoil the whole outlook.”
- “Overhead wires are unsightly – is the price worth paying?”

**General opposition:**
- “Trolleybuses are an unnecessary expense. Trolleybuses don’t allow an express service.”
- “We need a supertram system. Leeds is the largest city in Europe without one. Trolleybuses are generally considered a poor substitute.”
Opinions about the Park & Ride proposals

3.11 Almost three quarters of respondents support / strongly support the idea for Park & Rides sites at the end of the North and South routes. Car owners were more supportive than non car owners, as shown in Table 3-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of support</th>
<th>% of car owner</th>
<th>% of non car owner</th>
<th>% of all NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong view either way</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 The most common reasons for support related to the following issues:

Would reduce car use / congestion:
- “A great way of getting commuter transport, i.e. cars, out of the city.”
- “There is a need for the Park & Ride site to the North of the city thereby easing congestion through Headingley.”

Other general support:
- “Leeds lags well behind other cities, large and small, in the provision of park and ride sites.”
- “Need P&R sites to encourage people to use new services.”

3.13 The most common reasons for opposing the Park & Ride sites related to the following issues:

Environmental impact:
- “Completely destroys the local environment.”
- “Prefer to keep Greenfield site.”

Would not reduce congestion / would create congestion:
- “Additional concentrated traffic will block Otley Road.”
- “I think this will create more traffic chaos. I also think if you’re driving, what’s the point of P&R – you may as well go the full hog.”
Potential use of the NGT Park & Ride Services

3.14 Over a third of respondents said they would consider using the Park & Ride services. Of those car owners who would consider using the sites (39% of all car owners), 64% lived within 10 minutes of the proposed Park & Ride site at Bodington.

3.15 Those that would not consider using the Park & Ride services were asked why this was. Amongst the car owners that would not consider using the sites (61% of all car owners):

- 31% do not travel near the proposed Park & Ride sites;
- 6% have parking at work which is provided by their employer; and
- 5% do not have access to their household’s car.

3.16 Other reasons were also given and included the fact that car owners live on the proposed route and would therefore not need to use their car, travel into the city centre in other ways than the car (bus or train) and that such travel would not be practical: “I would not park my car in a large car park then proceed to catch a bus into Leeds. It seems so impractical”.

Opinions about a new public transport system

The overall service

3.17 Respondents were asked what would be most important to them in a new public transport system. The results are presented in Figure 3-3 and show that more reliable services, cheaper fares and faster services were the most important features.
3.18 Figure 3-4 shows what respondents would like in new public transport vehicles. The results show that more environmentally friendly vehicles, cleaner vehicles inside and out and a more comfortable ride were the most important features.
Potential use of NGT

3.19 Over 70% of all respondents said they would consider using NGT to travel around Leeds. The proportion of respondents who do not live within a 10 minute walk of the NGT route was greater than those respondents who do live within a 10 minute walk of the NGT route, as shown in Table 3-5.

TABLE 3-5  POTENTIAL USE OF NGT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you consider using NGT?</th>
<th>% that live within 10 minute walk of NGT route</th>
<th>% that do not live 10 minute walk of NGT route</th>
<th>% of all NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.20 Respondents that would consider using NGT were asked how often this might be, as shown in Figure 3-5. More frequent use was anticipated amongst those living closest to the routes and over 35% of such potential users said they might use NGT three or more times a week.

FIGURE 3-5  POTENTIAL USE OF NGT

Respondents that would consider using NGT:

- All respondents: 35% three or more times a week, 24% once or twice a week, 20% less than once a week but more than once a month, 9% once a month or less, 5% very rarely, 7% don't know
- Live within 10 min walk of route: 36% three or more times a week, 25% once or twice a week, 21% less than once a week but more than once a month, 7% once a month or less, 4% very rarely, 7% don't know
- Do not live within 10 min walk of route: 26% three or more times a week, 22% once or twice a week, 17% less than once a week but more than once a month, 17% once a month or less, 9% very rarely, 9% don't know
3.21 Potential users of NGT were also asked how they currently travel to the destinations that the scheme will serve. Responses were examined amongst those that live within a 10 minute walk of the proposed routes and would consider using NGT. This found that a significant proportion (almost 40%) currently travel by car, as shown in Table 3-6.

**TABLE 3-6 CURRENT TRAVEL TO NGT DESTINATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of potential use</th>
<th>% Car - driver</th>
<th>% Car - passenger</th>
<th>% Bus</th>
<th>% Walk</th>
<th>% Cycle</th>
<th>% Train</th>
<th>% of all NGT respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three + times a week</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than monthly but less than weekly</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Comments about the proposals

4.1 Respondents provided a number of comments about the proposals which have been coded during the data analysis into different categories, as shown in Table 4-1.

The Holt Park extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment category</th>
<th>Example quotes / notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome idea (38 comments)</td>
<td>• I feel that it is essential to extend route to Holt Park, thereby serving the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I think the extension to Holt Park is a brilliant idea as it will enable people to have a quicker and more comfortable ride into the city centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Holt Park extension would be particularly good – reaching a lot of potential passengers that don’t use the bus as it slow and unreliable and infrequent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Other’ concern (14 comments)</td>
<td>• “Don’t want trolleybuses along Otley Old Road.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Will encourage more traffic in Cookridge / Holt Park.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient number of stops – Spennithorne Drive would help.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion about scheme (12 comments)</td>
<td>• “Would hope that the part of the route using Otley Old Road would be widened – this road is really an old winding country road – unnecessary delays occur even now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Should run to airport.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Very doubtful about taking it up Otley Old Road, surely continuing along Otley Road would be more practical.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed (11 comments)</td>
<td>• “Seems completely unnecessary, the public transport in this area is already more than adequate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I do not think that the extension to Holt Park is necessary. The current car park at Holt Park is already full and would become an unofficial park and ride with even less space for shoppers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I do not believe there is demand for it. There is already sufficient access.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waste of money (7 comments)

- “The Holt Park extension is unnecessary based on current level of traffic and bus usage. Waste of money.”
- “The whole idea is a total waste of money and was presumably intended to be funded by the outgoing Labour Party’s giveaway.”
- “Please, please, please do not make the mistake of doing this. It is a complete waste of money.”

Other comments about NGT

4.2 Other comments made about NGT related to the following:

- A desire for NGT to extend to other areas including East and West Leeds;
- Requests for alternative transport solutions – including a tram, improvements to existing bus services and greater attention to walking and cycling;
- The need for more NGT priority / segregation; and
- The timescale for delivering the project seems too long.
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LCC City Plans Panel Invitation Letter
Dear Sir / Madam

NEW GENERATION TRANSPORT (NGT) PLANS PANEL MEETING  25th JUNE 2013

The Council is writing to you following the previous comments you have made in relation to the proposed New Generation Transport (NGT) project and various related consultation events. I am writing to let you know that on the 25th June 2013, as part of the consultation process on NGT, the Council, through its City Plans Panel, will be considering the planning issues related to the project at this stage in order to inform a Full City Council meeting on the 1st July 2013, which will decide whether the City Council (together with Metro) should make an application to the Secretary of State for a Transport and Works Act Order (TWA Order), giving them the powers to construct and operate NGT. If the Full City Council decides to proceed, the application is likely to be made in September this year.

If a TWA Order is applied for, it will be considered by the Secretary of State for Transport, who will decide whether permission should be granted. After the application, there will be a period for the public to make representations, and the Secretary of State is likely to hold a public inquiry into the TWA Order. This is anticipated in Spring 2014.

As the TWA Order application is made to the Secretary of State, it will not be the role of Plans Panel to decide whether permission should be granted for NGT. However, if the TWA Order is made, any permission granted will be similar to an outline planning permission, and will be subject to planning conditions, where the City Council will be responsible for their discharge. The proposed draft conditions at this stage will be among the matters being considered by Council Members of City Plans Panel on the 25th June, alongside a draft design guide.

The scheme to be discussed at the City Plans Panel meeting will provide an opportunity for Panel Members to help understand the NGT proposals and impacts and provide an opportunity for them to respond to any further issues / concerns which may arise from the public or interest groups as part of the process. The views of the public will help form the City Plans Panels response to the NGT proposals.
To aid members of the public further, draft engineering drawings will also be available for inspection covering key characteristic areas of the route. These drawings will be available from the 12th June 2013 by accessing the following web link www.ngtmetro.com. However, the full suite of application documents will not be available until the TWA Order is made.

The Panel will meet at the Civic Hall, Leeds and this meeting will be held in the Council Chamber and will start at 9.30AM.

Due to the complexity of the scheme and its geographical coverage, it is considered that the best way to deal with this is to discuss updates section by section in the following order:

1. Bodington and Otley Old Road - Otley Road/Otley Old Road junction to Holt Park
2. Lawnswood and West Park - Ancaster Road to Otley Road/Otley Old Road junction, including Lawnswood Roundabout
3. Otley Road - Shaw Lane to Ancaster Road
4. Headingley - Hyde Park Corner junction to Shaw Lane including Headingley Hill and section behind the Arndale Centre
5. Woodhouse Moor – Clarendon Road to Hyde Park Corner junction
6. Universities area – Beyond top of Cookridge St to Clarendon Road
7. City Centre – Clarence Dock inclusive to top of Cookridge Street
8. Southern Section – Stourton to Clarence Dock

A week before the meeting an itinerary for the day will be issued to provide indicative times for each section of the route and a programme for the day. Again, this can be viewed by accessing the following web link www.ngtmetro.com.

The meeting will be held in public and there will be an opportunity for public speaking. The issues under consideration will solely relate to matters concerning planning issues, for example, the impact the route may have upon the character of a particular area, tree loss, the impact on buildings and walls and the siting of proposed sub-stations or the details of the proposed draft conditions (e.g. fixtures to listed buildings). Other matters, for example, the choice of route / technology, trolley bus & over headline electrification / value for money / funding, will not be discussed at this meeting but could be considered at the potential public inquiry into the TWA Order application. As noted above, members of the public will have opportunities to make representations about the scheme and participate in the Inquiry.

The Panel is open to members of the public to attend. At Panel there will be an opportunity for objectors or supporters to speak providing this is on planning grounds only. The NGT project team, as applicants, will be responsible for presenting their proposals.
Speaking is for up to 6 minutes for each section of the route. If more than one person wishes to speak for either side, a spokesperson should be nominated where possible. Given there is a limited amount of speaking time available for each section of the route, once we have received an idea of the numbers of people wishing to speak we intend to put these individuals in contact with each other with a view to nominating a spokesperson.

If you wish to speak you should tell us as soon as possible and not later than 5pm on the Wednesday (19th June) before the Panel. You can write, email Stephen.McArthur@leeds.gov.uk or telephone us with your details together with the section of the route which is of interest and a summary of the issue you would wish to speak about. A member of staff will be inside the room for you to register with before the panel meeting begins.
If you are attending and have any specific access requirements, please contact us as soon as possible.

If you do not wish to attend, any representations you have made will be carefully considered at the Panel and you do not need to reply to this letter or make any further representations.

Please note that the handing out of written representations or other material, such as photographs, will not normally be allowed at the Panel meeting. This is even in the circumstances where the hand out relates to an address that you wish to make to the Panel meeting. The reason for this is simply because the Members of the Panel will not have time to read and digest such material at the meeting itself.

Yours faithfully

Phil Crabtree
Chief Planning Officer
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LCC City Plans Panel Minutes
25th June 2013
CITY PLANS PANEL

TUESDAY, 25TH JUNE, 2013

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn, M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty, T Leadley, E Nash, N Walshaw, M Ingham, J Cummins, B Anderson and J McKenna

12 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable interests

13 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Lewis and Councillor R Procter who were substituted for by Councillor J McKenna and Councillor B Anderson respectively

14 Chair’s remarks

The Chair outlined the procedure for the meeting which would commence with a brief overview of the NGT scheme, followed by details of the 7 sections of the route being outlined, on a north to south basis, with the opportunity for registered speakers to have up to 6 minutes, per section of the route to address the Panel. There would the opportunity for the NGT team to pick up on issues raised, together with further information from Planning Officers where relevant, which would be followed by questions and comments from the Panel, before moving to the next part of the route

The Chair stressed that the purpose of the meeting was not to discuss the merits or demerits of any transport system. The meeting was proceeding on the presumption that NGT had in principle approval from the Council’s Executive Board and therefore the meeting would be focussing on the planning aspects of the scheme and seeing if improvements to it could be made to deliver the best possible scheme for the City. It was noted that the comments of the Panel were without prejudice to individual Members’ views on the broader merits of the scheme

The Chief Planning Officer stated that that this was the final stage before the scheme was put before the Secretary of State for the Transport and Works Order Act, which would be followed by a Public Inquiry and the purpose of this meeting was to assist the Local Planning Authority in forming its views on its submission to that Order. There would be a further opportunity for City Plans
Panel to consider the proposals when these had been finalised, following further consultation

As discussions remained on-going about the impact on Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings etc, draft conditions had been drawn up but that these would be considered further and revised where necessary

15 Submission of the Transport and Works Act Order - Application for the New Generation Transport (NGT) Scheme

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on the submissions of the Transport and Works Act Order application for the New Generation Transport (NGT) Scheme. Appended to the report was a schedule of draft conditions proposed and a copy of the Design Statement

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. To assist Members when considering the route of NGT, two screens had been provided, one showing the proposal in diagrammatic form and the other showing the site as it currently was, as depicted on Google Earth

Officers and representatives of the NGT team presented an overview of the proposals and provided information relating to:

- the policy basis for NGT
- possible extensions to the route in the future
- the improvements and on-going interventions already made to public transport
- funding issues and the rolling investment programme which would provide greater investment and opportunities
- the benefits of NGT
- greater efficiency and reduced journey times, with the trolley buses having transponders to allow them priority through the traffic
- consultation and engagement
- future timescales, with 2016-2020 being the timescale for construction and commencement of the scheme
- planning issues relating to the impact of proposals on Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings
- the provision for cyclists and pedestrians in the scheme, including the use of shared surfaces in some locations
- the number and location of substations along the route and the amount of overhead line equipment which would be necessary
- the impact of the proposals on taxi rank provision in the City Centre, with a temporary site being identified at Meadow Lane

In respect of the Design Statement, Members were informed that this was a key document which set out the design intent and standards and also

Minutes approved at the meeting
Held on 1st August 2013
included issues relating to sustainability, environmental management and maintenance and would supplement the Environmental Statement.

The main drivers of the design of the scheme were outlined as were the design objectives and overarching principles, which would include a co-ordinated and consistent design approach; the need to minimise the impact of infrastructure and to minimise clutter, with the project providing an opportunity to review and consolidate existing highway clutter.

In terms of landscaping, NGT would create green corridors wherever practical. Whilst there would be some tree loss, there would be a 3 for 1 replacement policy, with 1500 – 1600 new trees to replace the 400 trees which would be felled to accommodate the proposals. Where particularly good trees were to be removed, this would be replaced by a ‘super replacement specimen’ mature tree, where appropriate.

Regarding woodland and scrub, some 3000sqm of this would be lost but this would be replaced by 30,000sqm of woodland and scrub land.

In summary, the approach to design was to raise design quality and promote a fresh, new transport offer for Leeds which would have a co-ordinated approach to design and branding.

Members commented on the following matters:

- the process of the scheme going to the Secretary of State and whether there would be flexibility built in so that changes in circumstances or new issues which arose could be dealt with
- the need for the text of the Design Statement to properly respect pedestrians and cyclists by not abbreviating these words
- that the images in the Design Statement should depict the trolley bus scheme being proposed and not trams
- tree planting; whether a greater number of trees would be provided in the south which currently did not benefit from as much greenery as in the north of the city; that as many species would be deciduous whether there would be safety issues as a result of leaf drop; the impact on Environmental Services with likely increased need for leaf clearing and how colour could be introduced along the route in the winter months
- the method to be used to ensure that what Members are shown on the schematics, will be what is provided and the need for information about the construction phase and measures to be taken to minimise the impact of this
- the overhead line equipment, whether building owners could refuse to agree to fixings being attached to their buildings and the need to appreciate that some modern buildings whilst appearing solid, were
The following responses were provided:

- that there would be some flexibility in the TWOA documents and if made by the Secretary of State, would contain powers tied to the drawings and plans which would include limits of demarcation, i.e. margins of tolerance
- that the comments made about the text and images would be addressed
- that the approach to tree planting had been to maximise the provision of new trees along the route, although there were some restrictions in terms of available space and location of utilities, however there would be a large amount of tree planting in the south of the city, especially in Belle Isle
- that the possibility of achieving better winter interest or colour into the planting would be considered. In terms of leaf drop and safety, whilst noting the concerns, it was important to achieve green corridors and that in the long term, there could be a greater maintenance requirement
- that phasing of works, construction compounds and the construction strategy would form part of the TWOA and the Public Inquiry would consider the planning conditions and controls; that the draft conditions appended to the report addressed issues regarding construction and trees, and in respect of the cross sections displayed, these were theoretical but that the detailed plans would show planting, stops and surfacing etc
- concerning overhead line equipment, discussions would take place with building owners to ensure the building was adequate to take the equipment and that the Order would contain a mix of rights and process for owners to ask for the fittings to be sited elsewhere

The Panel then considered the route of the NGT, north to south, on a section by section basis

**Holt Park to Bodington via Otley Old Road**

Members were provided with the following information:

- this section was where the NGT would be mainly running on streets
- that the scheme was complimentary to the Holt Park District Centre where the aim was to separate NGT from general traffic to reduce congestion and delay
- that bus movements outside the Asda supermarket would remain
there would 6 car parking spaces lost, with some spaces also being lost at the nearby health centre, although there would be reprovision in the main car park

- a plaza would be provided, which would house the NGT stop and would create a sense of place around the stop

- the location of substations in this section were highlighted

- that new planting would break down the impact of the overhead line equipment

- that a Park and Ride with 830 spaces would be provided in this section, which would be well screened

- that replacement sports pitches at Weetwood, Lawnswood and Bodington would be provided to mitigate against the loss of pitches with the possibility that the increase in provision could enable the public to have use of these facilities

- that the proposals would result in a net gain of 150 trees

The Panel then heard representations on the proposals for this section from three objectors. Concerns were raised in respect of the proposed park and ride scheme in Holt Park, its layout and the impact that this would have on accessibility to and from an adjacent children’s nursery and related safety issues. Objectors also noted that this section of the route affected several conservation areas. These areas are of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which needs to be preserved or enhanced. Further issues were raised in terms of tree loss and the lack of information in terms of tree surveys. Concerns were raised with regard to the fact that the proposals would cause unnecessary environmental harm and create clutter in the streetscape, at odds with the character and appearance of the conservation areas.

The Planning Projects Manager updated the Panel and advised that the second substation along this section was sited on greenspace and that measures would be needed to compensate for this loss.

Receipt of a further representation was reported.

Members discussed this section of the route and commented on the following matters:

- the relocation of the recycling facilities and that an alternative location for these should be sought

- concern about the Asda car park becoming an unofficial Park and Ride; the possibility of increased on-street parking and some reassurances about how this could be addressed, with a residents parking scheme being suggested
• the impact of the proposals on the nearby nursery and whether some car parking spaces could be reserved in the supermarket car park for a drop off/pick point for parents
• road safety issues and that some consideration should be given to traffic speeds in this area and that where possible, 20mph routes should be included
• the possibility of the Holt Park link being used as a drop off for Leeds Bradford Airport
• proposals to expand Lawnswood Cemetery and how these related to the NGT route
• the number of spaces at the Park and Ride and whether this was sufficient
• that the proposals conflicted with people’s ability to access the Wellbeing Centre
• the entrance point to the Park and Ride needed to be reviewed to ensure that there was no conflict between pedestrian safety, cars and buses. Members also raised issues in relation to suggestions that the number of buses would be reduced there; that there would be more cars on the road and additional car parking spaces would be required. Members also sought confirmation that sufficient park and ride spaces would be provided
• the rationale for the spur leading up to Holt Park
• the proposals for the junction with Otley Road and Otley Old Road
• the need for more consultation with local people

The following responses were provided:

• that further consideration could be given to the location of the recycling facilities
• that there was no intention for the Asda car park to become an unofficial Park and Ride; that to address local concerns about this it would be possible to introduce limited waiting times for people parking and/or residents parking. On this approach, Members were not persuaded that this was appropriate and considered that measures should be planned for at this stage. In response to the possibility of introducing a residents parking scheme and how the cost of this could be met, Members were informed that it was not possible at this stage to provide such detail
• that during construction access to the nursery and health centre would be maintained at all times; that the existing footpath from the nursery would not be altered and that a boundary treatment could be provided, if required. Regarding a drop off/pick up point for parents, the existing arrangements could continue, despite slight
changes to the plaza design and that further discussions should take place with the operators on this matter

- that Highways were aware of the issues regarding traffic calming and that the traffic speeds had yet to be finalised
- that in respect of a link to the airport, it was felt that this would not be attractive to users
- that any expansion of Lawnswood Cemetery was a planning matter
- that a range of factors had been used to determine the level of parking at Bodington Park and Ride, with Officers being satisfied on this
- the spur, and that the Department of Transport had in the past considered an analysis of the route and passenger numbers and that it would generate revenue and attract passengers and was therefore critical to the viability of the scheme
- that the junction with Otley Road and Otley Old Road would be traffic lighted and fully signal controlled, with the trolley buses having precedence
- that further consultation would be carried out

The Chair advised that the proposals would come back to City Plans Panel in later in the year and that it was hoped that progress on issues raised could be made

The Panel then considered the next section of the route

**Lawnswood and West Park – Ancaster Road to Otley Road/Otley Old Road junction, including Lawnwood Roundabout**

Members were provided with the following information:

- this section contained a mix of NGT and public transport lanes
- that the key issue in this area was significant tree loss, due to the need for lane widening, although there would be a net gain on 150 trees
- that there had been design changes at West Park and that dialogue was continuing with local businesses on this
- that traffic modelling at Lawnwood Roundabout had shown that the proposals for the junction would provide the reliability NGT required
- that centre running for the vehicles had been considered over nearside running
- that it would not be possible to retain the trees to the north of the approach to the roundabout but that mitigation tree planting would aim to create a new tree structure, with an image shown of the likely appearance of the trees after 15 years of growth
- that soft green verges were being provided and that a grassed track was being proposed
that the existing roundabout would be modified and the wall and trees by the police station would be retained
that there would be an impact on some residential properties, with a 1.8 metre strip being required
that the floral display and grassed area on the existing roundabout would be recreated in the new design of the roundabout

The Panel then heard representations on the proposals from an objector

The Planning Projects Manager updated the Panel and advised that the Conservation areas were West Park and Weetwood. The receipt of 5 additional representations was reported

Members discussed this section of the route and commented on the following matters:

• provision for cyclists, with clarity being sought on the current cycling provision and what was proposed
• how cycle lanes would be identified
• concerns about safety around Lawnswood School
• tree loss, the need for details of the number to be removed and the level of replanting and that winter flowering cherry would be a suitable species to brighten up this area
• the need for graphics to be provided showing the extent of the newly planted tree cover after 4-5 years growth
• that the roundabout regularly experienced congestion and traffic queuing; that there were proposals for future development in the area and how the NGT proposals would work in view of this
• whether when planning applications came forward for developments in this area, Metro would object to these on the grounds of congestion which would affect NGT journey times

The following responses were provided

• that cycling provision would comprise two different routes, to cater both for experienced and less confident cyclists. There would be the use of existing cycle paths and some new ones would be provided. For those cycle routes on the carriageway there would be sufficient lane width for buses to easily pass cyclists and the proposals represented a significant gain to cycling facilities
• that through discussions, it was made clear that cycling groups did not want the cycle lane demarcating on certain sections of the highway and this request had been met
• that if Lawnswood School had safety concerns about the use of shared surfaces close to the school, this could be looked at further
that the level of tree loss and replacement planting was, to the north of the roundabout 38 trees removed and 63 replanted; to the south, around Lawnswood School, 23 trees removed and 19 replanted and at West Park 1 or 2 trees would be removed but that there was no room for replanting. That the trees would be 4 – 5m high when they were planted

• in terms of traffic congestion, that improvements on the A6120 traffic signals controls would deal with bottlenecks and that the trolley bus would have transponders which would enable them to get through, ahead of other vehicles. Regarding traffic growth, this had been taken into account. Whilst it was not possible to give guarantees about increased capacity as a result of other developments, what was being put in for the NGT would be for the betterment of the area and that as other developments came on board, it would be for those individual applications to address any highways and traffic issues arising from them. The Head of Planning Services stated that traffic modelling on future schemes would need to be taken into account by developers

The Head of Planning Services summarised the main concerns raised by the objectors as safety around Lawnswood School; the sharing of stops and the moving of the wall at Spenfield. It was stated that the full impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area would be better understood once the Environmental Statement had been published. Members’ request for graphics showing tree growth in this section of the route after 4-5 years was reiterated

The Chief Planning Officer stressed the need for clarity about the segregation of cyclist facilities and pedestrian movements around Lawnswood School and beyond as Members did not appear to be fully satisfied on the information which had been provided

The Panel then considered the next section of the route

**Otley Road _ Shaw Lane to Ancaster Road**

Members were provided with the following information:

• this section was a mix of dedicated NGT and shared bus lanes
• that concerns had been raised about the loss of trees and verges, particularly at the Three Horseshoes Pub, where a new plaza was being proposed
• that there would be a net gain of 15 semi-mature trees in this section
• a substation would be located in this section, with this being set back from Churchwood Avenue and being screened by trees
• that the most significant change was the closure of Weetwood Lane, outside the Three Horseshoes Pub, to create a new public square
• to address the pinch point in this area, the corridor would be widened, although it would not be possible to retain the kerb lines and mature trees would be removed
• some resurfacing would be provided, with the tarmac being refreshed and an amount of York stone being laid

The Panel then heard representations on the proposals for this section from two objectors

Members discussed this section of the route and commented on the following matters:

• the closure of part of Weetwood Lane had not been discussed in the workshops which Members had attended and it was unclear as to what purpose this proposal served
• previous highway proposals to close part of Weetwood Lane had been rejected by Highways and Transportation Officers earlier this year
• the need for clarity about the 5 traffic lanes being proposed in this location
• whether commercial vehicles would be able to access the pub and the shops, for servicing and what the likely manoeuvre would be for a large vehicle delivering to the pub
• the need for a site visit to fully understand what was being proposed
• whether closing St Chad’s Lane and keeping Weetwood Lane open had been considered
• what the provision for cyclists would be in this section of the NGT route
• the proposals to refresh the tarmac and that the opportunity should be taken to provide a better quality surface

The following responses were provided:
• that the proposals to close part of Weetwood Lane were not new and that the closure of this road, rather than St Chad’s Road was to provide a better pedestrian environment and an opportunity to support the local shops in this area, although the proposal had not proceeded
• that highways had been considering a scheme to close part of Weetwood Lane, but as part of the proposed route was earmarked for NGT, it was felt, in the interests of transparency, that the previous proposals should no longer be pursued
that the 5 traffic lanes would be required for inbound and
outbound NGT; inbound and outbound general traffic and a right
turn lane into St Chad’s Road
• regarding servicing arrangements to the shops and pub, that
small vehicles would be able to turn around and that larger
vehicles would have the option of reversing into this area. It
was accepted that these arrangements should be reviewed
• it was confirmed that new cycling facilities, between St Chad’s
and Weetwood Lane would be shared with NGT

In view of a site visit to this section having been requested, the Chair agreed
to this and advised that this would take place at the next available opportunity

The Panel then considered the next section of the route

Headingley to Shaw Lane to Hyde Park Corner

Members were provided with the following information:

• This section had areas where the NGT would be incorporated with
  normal traffic, have dedicated areas and run on dedicated public
  transport areas.
• Parts of this section had the most significant areas of tree loss – where
  possible replacement trees would be provided.
• Details of walls that would have to be demolished and rebuilt.
• Bypassing Headingley Centre with a purpose built grass NGT track
  with pedestrian and cycle routes.
• The inclusion of an NGT turn round facility.
• Siting of substation.
• Need to carry out road widening – this would be easier to do on the
  southern side where there would be less disruption – this would include
  some demolition, rebuilding of walls and resurfacing of pavements.

An objector to the scheme raised concerns including the following:

• the loss of heritage in a conservation area
• the loss of mature trees, walls and buildings
• new planting to replace 100 year old trees was not acceptable
• Listed structures would be demolished
• all local resident and community groups were against the scheme
• the scheme would be detrimental to the wellbeing of residents
  particularly the old and vulnerable
• that the scheme did not represent the best use of public monies

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were
discussed:
additional objections that had been received in relation to the Headingley and Hyde Park Conservation areas lighting of the Headingley bypass. This would be unobtrusive low level lighting

- the inclusion of a turn round facility would allow for more frequent shorter journeys in to the city centre during peak hours
- the possibility of re-using stone from demolished walls and buildings over head line provision – where possible this would be tethered to existing pillars and buildings but there had been no detailed design yet
- material to be used for surfacing pavements

In summary to discussion on this section, key issues noted included the impact on heritage, particularly trees and structures

The Panel then considered the next section of the route

**Woodhouse Moor – Clarendon Road to Hyde Park Corner Junction**

Members were provided with the following information:

- significant changes included improvements to the public realm
- there would be widening of footpaths and demolition of a row of shops to create new open public spaces
- junction improvements to keep free flowing traffic
- grassed NGT section on Monument Moor – this would prevent widening of the current highway and removal of existing trees. There would also be improvements to steps and re-siting of the statue
- new pavements made with natural York stone

An objector to the scheme raised concerns including the following:

- the history of Woodhouse Moor and impacts on the heritage
- loss of greenspace and play areas
- reference to deputations that had been submitted to Council
- suggestion that the NGT should be kept to run along Woodhouse Street
- the scheme did not make the best use of public monies

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- provision for cyclists – this would be mixed across this section with some advisory lanes and some mixed with NGT/bus lanes
- the play area was on private land and currently disused. There were no children’s play facilities. Members discussed the possibility of
including a children’s play area and using felled trees to create an adventure playground
• there would be a net increase of 100 trees in this section
• potential environmental improvements to the area

The Panel then considered the next section of the route

Universities Area – Clarendon Road to the top of Cookridge Street

Members were provided with the following information:

• the most significant change to this section would be the creation of a public transport access only corridor along Woodhouse Lane
• measures to change current traffic including making Blenheim Way a two way system and the inclusion of a new roundabout to re-route traffic
• discussions had been held with the Universities regarding access to their sites
• pedestrian access including pedestrian routes to the Arena and pavement improvements siting of a substation

An objector to the scheme raised concerns including the following:

• the scheme would be detrimental to what was felt to be to most attractive route into the city centre
• new traffic schemes would seem to encourage more car users
• the NGT scheme was only 50% segregated from current traffic and would not improve access
• if the scheme went ahead this stretch of the A660 would be damaged irrevocably
• the scheme did not make the best use of public monies

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

• impact of car use and congestion – as part of the business case it had to be ensured that congestion was maintained at similar or reduced levels and it was aimed to improve congestion. The proposed traffic scheme would allow more through movement of traffic and reduce congestion at junctions
• running speeds of the NGT and whether these would be an improvement on current journey times into the city.

The Panel then considered the next section of the route
City Centre – Cookridge Street to New Dock

Members were provided with the following information:

- locations of stops including Cookridge Street, The Arena, City Square and Trinity
- route through the City
- proposals to widen footpaths and create pedestrianized streets
- the use of building fixings rather than poles for overhead lines

An objector to the scheme raised concerns including the following:

- the scheme would run on previously pedestrian areas
- detrimental effect on the amenity of Millennium Square
- the proposal to remove the only large tree in the City Centre

A member of the public spoke in support of the scheme and raised the following issues:

- there was currently a distinct lack of connectivity between the north and the south of the city
- the NGT would provide opportunity for a transport link to assets such as the Royal Armouries and new developments in the south of the city

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- the road at the side of Millennium Square where the NGT was proposed to go had previously been left available for the Supertram scheme
- measures to denote the route of the NGT through pedestrian areas
- opportunities to tie in with developments at City Park and Brewery Wharf
- use of materials on surfacing in the city centre
- the location of the sub-station was acceptable

The Panel then considered the next section of the route:

Southern Section – New Dock to Stourton Park & Ride

Members were provided with the following information:

- this section would see the highest proportion of NGT only routes
- proposed route changes from Belle Isle Road to Belle Isle Circus
- creation of new routes for pedestrians and cyclists
- impact on way to Hunslet Town Centre through a pedestrianized residential area – screening would be offered
• changes in the scheme due to the HS2 proposals
• the NGT park and ride depot

Two objectors to the scheme raised concerns including the following:
• disruption the scheme would cause to residents and traffic
• impact on underground facilities
• damage to historical landmarks
• there would only be 3 stops between the start of the line and the city centre – this would not generate enough passengers as people would continue to use buses
• the scheme would damage business and property values
• alternative routes were suggested

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:
• concerns regarding the pedestrian area at Whitfield Square
• grass track through Belle Isle
• siting of substations
• design standards for the park and ride area
• concern regarding the route of the NGT which would pass Pym Street, blocking the end of this street and having an impact on local businesses and associated safety issues

Members were then asked to consider the recommendations as outlined in the report:

RESOLVED –
(1) That Members’ views on the draft planning conditions as set out in (appendix 1), the draft design statement as set out in (appendix 2) and the siting of sub-stations together with views on the planning issues identified in order to inform the progression of the Transport and Works Act Order application be noted
(2) That the Panel support in principle the completion of a S106 agreement, or other suitable mechanism, to provide local training and employment initiatives which arise from the construction, management and operation of these NGT proposals
(3) That the Panel support proposals for taxi parking at Meadow Lane on a temporary basis only, as this land is required as part of proposals for the city park, as proposed in the South Bank Planning Framework, and a replacement permanent facility will need to be identified and provided

16 Date and Time of Next Meeting
Minutes approved at the meeting
Held on 1st August 2013
Thursday 4th July 2013 at 1.30pm
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### Annex 10: Statements of Support from the Business Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leeds Arena                | Ben Williams     | General Manager            | "The First Direct Arena is set to become a major attraction for Leeds, drawing in audiences from across the wider region and the UK, as well as from the city itself. Modern transport connections are going to be essential to its successful operation. NGT offers the ideal solution, providing improved access to the city centre and its leisure attractions, but integrating this with the wider transport network and through extensive park and ride facilities. It will add significantly to the attractiveness of Leeds as a place to visit, enabling people to travel in comfort and avoid congestion as they arrive and leave the city centre."

| Leeds Chamber of Commerce | Mark Goldstone   | Head of business representation | "Businesses are of the view that transport is one of the key factors that determine levels of local growth. As well as driving economic regeneration, good transport networks are vital if employers are to have access to the workforce they need to grow and expand."

"There are many areas where local firms have the skills and experience to play key roles in the delivery of the scheme and it's vital that we make the most of these opportunities to maximise the benefits of NGT to the local economy."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leeds Civic Trust  | Dr Kevin Grady  | Director| “The Trust has spent many hours examining the proposals and has discussed them in great detail with Metro and Leeds City Council officers. We believe that it is in the best interests of the city as a whole that the scheme is implemented.  
We are fully satisfied that the system will deliver the significant reductions in journey times that the transport engineers predict, notably at peak periods.  
The Trust is pleased to see that the NGT team has made strenuous efforts to limit the environmental impact of the scheme on the Conservation Areas through which it passes.” |
| Allied London      | Michael Ingall  | CEO     | “We are hopefully slowly emerging from a period of very little growth and a real lack of investment. Whilst Leeds has progressed better than most cities in this period, with the development of the Arena and Trinity, its medium to long term development can only be achieved by significantly improving the current infrastructure, which in turn will drive the next wave of development.  
“NGT is a crucial infrastructure if Leeds is to evolve as a holistic city and it is absolutely vital the private sector get behind this project and give it their full support as the benefits to all communities and stakeholders are huge.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammerson</td>
<td>Joe Swindells</td>
<td>Project director of Victoria Gate</td>
<td>“We believe that the delivery of NGT is critical to the success and development of Leeds. The high-end retail brands that we will bring to the city need to see that Leeds has a clear vision for the future, encompassing the short, medium and long-term, as well as the city’s commitment to a high-quality, pedestrian friendly shopping environment. “This is what the NGT scheme demonstrates - showing that the future transport needs of the city are being addressed and that Leeds can be invested in with confidence. We fully support the first and subsequent routes, which will help to improve connectivity across the city centre along with surrounding areas and would welcome the time when an extension of the NGT comes to our scheme.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Lang LaSalle</td>
<td>Jeff Pearey</td>
<td>Lead director</td>
<td>“The lack of an integrated transport system has held back Leeds from maximising its economic potential. NGT is the key to helping it unlock that potential for the future. It will deliver a range of financial benefits to the local economy, creating jobs and providing more people with easier access to the city centre. “In addition, it will improve the arrival and departure of residents and commuters to the city centre, easing traffic flow and congestion and encouraging people out of their cars. It is also a flexible system which will create a more desirable place to work, live and visit.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organisation | Contact | Title | Quote
--- | --- | --- | ---
Yorkshire Design Developments | Peter Connolly | founder | “NGT is a scheme that will connect the city, providing areas outside the centre with fast and reliable journeys as well as a useful park and ride system. It will deliver significant financial benefits, which means developers and investors can pursue future projects with confidence.

“The technology behind the scheme is simple, effective and well tested. Other cities have already adopted this approach and it has proved good for their development. For Leeds to continue to develop improved connectivity is vital and the proposed network promises this.”

Downtown in Business | Frank McKenna | Founder and CEO | “New Generation Transport is one of the largest government investments in transport infrastructure in the UK, outside London. It is perhaps the most significant scheme of its type as it has the potential to create thousands of jobs and drive growth and regeneration.

“It can deliver the same economic, social and environmental benefits for Leeds that the tram has to Manchester, at a fraction of the overall cost.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bruntwood    | Craig Burrow | Director of Leeds   | “It’s an exciting time to be in Leeds, and with so many new developments happening or in the pipeline it is crucial we have a public transport infrastructure that supports growth.  
“Good transport access for the people who work in our buildings is an important consideration for where Bruntwood chooses to invest. We want people to be attracted to work in the city centre, so having a public transport system that’s both reliable and future-proof is essential.  
“That is why I support the introduction of the trolleybus as a financially viable alternative to the Supertram. It will be of great benefit to the city and help to boost our economy." |
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## Annex 11: Leeds NGT – Parties to be served with a copy of the application and documents under Schedule 5 of the TWA Rules 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Authority sought for</th>
<th>Party to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Works affecting the bed or banks of, or the subsoil beneath, a river</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3        | Works affecting the banks of, or the subsoil beneath, an inland waterway comprised in the undertaking of the [Canal and River Trust] or any of the reservoirs, feeders, sluices, locks, lifts, drains and other works comprised in or serving the undertaking | Canal and River Trust  
Inland Waterways Association  
National Association of Boat Owners  
Environment Agency |
| 5        | Works causing or likely to cause an obstruction to the passage of fish in a river | The Environment Agency  
The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
| 9        | Works affecting, or involving the stopping-up or diversion of, a street, or affecting a proposed highway | Leeds City Council  
University of Leeds  
British Telecommunications plc  
Headingley Land Developments Limited  
Headingley Land Developments (2002) Limited  
Colebridge Limited  
Diocese of Leeds Trustee  
BRB (Residuary) Limited  
Z & J Bauman  
V Mohammed |
| 10       | The stopping–up or diversion of a footpath, bridleway, a byway or a cycle track | Auto-Cycle Union  
British Horse Society  
Byways and Bridleways Trust  
Open Spaces Society  
Ramblers’ Association  
British Driving Society  
Cyclists’ Touring Club  
Peak and Northern Footpaths Society |
| 11       | The construction of a transport system involving the placing of equipment in or over a street | Leeds City Council  
Secretary of State, for the attention of the Highways Agency  
Private Street Managers (as 9 above) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Authority sought for</th>
<th>Party to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12       | Works affecting land in, on or over which is installed the apparatus, equipment or street furniture of a statutory undertaker | Yorkshire Water Services Limited  
Northern Powergrid Holdings Company  
Northern Gas Networks Limited  
EE Limited  
Virgin Media Limited  
Cable & Wireless Limited  
Thus Limited  
British Telecommunications plc  
Telefonica UK Ltd  
Verizon Global Solutions UK Ltd  
Vtesse Networks  
Vodafone Limited  
Hutchison 3G UK Limited  
BskyB Telecommunications Services Limited  
Geo Networks  
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited  
British Gas  
National Grid plc  
National Grid Gas plc |
| 14       | Works affecting:  
(i) a building listed under Part 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;  
(ii) an ancient monument scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979; or  
(iii) any archaeological site | English Heritage (Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) |
| 15       | Works affecting:  
(i) a conservation area designated under Part 2 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990  
(ii) an area of archaeological importance designated under section 33 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 | English Heritage (Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England) |
<p>| 24       | Works to construct, alter or demolish a transport system or to carry out works ancillary to its operation or works consequential upon its abandonment or demolition | Her Majesty’s Railway Inspectorate |
| 27       | Works affecting land in which | Secretary of State, Department for |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Authority sought for</th>
<th>Party to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>there is a Crown interest</td>
<td>Transport The Secretary of State, Department for Transport, for the attention of the Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Annex 12: Leeds NGT – Parties to be served with a copy of the application and documents under Schedule 6 of the TWA Rules 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Authority sought for</th>
<th>Party to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Works affecting the banks or the bed of, or the subsoil beneath a river</td>
<td>The Crown Estate Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Works affecting the banks or the bed of, or subsoil beneath, an inland waterway, a</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>canal or inland navigation, or any of the reservoirs, feeders, sluices, locks, lifts,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drains and other works comprised in or serving that inland waterway, canal or inland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>navigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Works which would, or would apart from the making of an order, require a consent to</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the discharge of matter into waters or onto land under Chapter 2 of Part 3 of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Resources Act 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Works likely to affect the volume or character of traffic entering or leaving –</td>
<td>The Secretary of State for Transport (for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) a special road or trunk road;</td>
<td>attention of The Highways Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) any other classified road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The construction of a transport system involving the placing of equipment in or over</td>
<td>Multiple owners and occupiers of buildings which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a street (except a level crossing)</td>
<td>have a frontage on, or a private means of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which first meets the highway at, the part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>street in or over which equipments is to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>places, other than those on whom a notice has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been served pursuant to rule 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The compulsory purchase of ecclesiastical property (as defined in section 12(3) of</td>
<td>The Church Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Acquisition of Land Act 1981)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Works in Greater London or a metropolitan county</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Authority sought for</td>
<td>Party to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police and Crime Commissioner, West Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Works or traffic management measures that would affect services provided by a universal services provider in connection with the provision of a universal postal service and relating to the delivery or collection of letters</td>
<td>Royal Mail Group Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Works for which an environmental impact assessment is required</td>
<td>The Design Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>