

**Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission 25<sup>th</sup> October 2018  
Putney Road Link Road scheme: Submission from Putney Road Say No**

**Abstract of Submission from Putney Road Say No**

The submission is very detailed and it may help the Commission to have a brief abstract which summarises the main points. The submission is made following a request to councillors which identified four reasons which justified a call-in of the scheme. The submission starts with the specific reason for the call-in, but also covers the other three because they are all closely connected.

**1. The public record of the consultation has been altered to remove claims about reduced rat-running in Clarendon Park (pp1-3)**

There is an important discrepancy in the public record of the consultation. Specific predictions made in the consultation about reducing rat-running in Clarendon Park do not appear in the formal record in the report on the consultation. The specific pages are appended to the submission, and also identified and discussed in the accompanying text.

It appears that this discrepancy has arisen because of the second reason given for call-in.

**2. The consultation was seriously misleading about reducing rat-running (pp3-6)**

The first report of the traffic modelling in the funding bid document identified a risk of increased rat-running in Clarendon Park. All subsequent public statements about the scheme claimed that rat-running in Clarendon Park, and elsewhere, would be reduced by the operation of link road, or by the scheme. Many of these statements linked the claims directly to the traffic modelling. Specific predictions of reduction were made for Clarendon Park Road. Similar claims about reducing rat-running were made in the presentation to the Scrutiny Commission.

The final statement in the Executive Decision report effectively withdrew all these claims by stating that the traffic modelling showed the impact on rat-running would be neutral. This means the modelling showed no reduction in rat-running in Clarendon Park. The Executive Decision report contradicts every public statement about the link road or the scheme. It also leaves a clear inconsistency with the specific predictions made in the consultation.

We believe this was seriously misleading to the public taking part in the consultation. The claims about rat-running are known to have influenced views of the scheme. The inconsistency with the specific predictions in the consultation also appears to be the reason for the discrepancy in the public record.

The explanation for the occurrence of both 1 and 2 above can be found in the remaining two reasons for requesting a call-in.

### **3. The traffic modelling evidence shows the link road is not needed** **The traffic modelling evidence shows the link road does not work (pp7-10)**

These are brought together because they are intrinsically related.

The scheme is made up of two parts. A new junction between Putney Road and Aylestone Road which improves local access to the business area. This new junction also enables the second part which is making Putney Road into a link road between Aylestone Road/Saffron Lane and Welford Road.

In four periods of traffic modelling the scheme is used for local access in all four, but as a link road in only one. There is no real demand for the link road. This is why we say it is not needed.

The traffic modelling also shows that all the benefits of the scheme are created in the two evening periods. The link road was not used in the evening periods. In the evening Putney Road was used only for local access to the business area. This means all the benefits are created by the improvement to local access.

When Putney Road does function as a link road journey times increase. This means it reduces benefits. It lowers the benefits which the improvement in local access creates. If Putney Road was used as a link road in all four periods it would remove all benefits of the scheme.

These are the reasons why we say the link road does not work. These are the most important conclusions of this submission.

If the scheme is to reduce rat-running it can only be by use of the link road, the local access can make no contribution to reducing rat-running. The link road only functions in one period so its possible impact on rat-running is limited.

The link road is claimed to reduce rat-running by creating faster and shorter journeys. If it is to reduce rat-running it must do this. The traffic modelling shows that journey times increase when the link road is used. Journeys are not faster. Measuring distances on maps it has not been possible to find any shorter journeys which would reduce rat-running in the areas where it is claimed. Journeys are neither faster nor shorter. This is why we say neither the full scheme, nor the link road part of it, can reduce rat-running.

Without a reduction in rat-running there is no benefit to local people affected by the scheme - only more traffic, and therefore more congestion and everything that goes with it. This is why the consultation was seriously misleading about rat-running.

Putney Road Say No  
16 October 2018