

1 Background

1 These notes are made for completeness to rebut some minor points of detail in the Council’s response to my DV26.

2 Modelling Public transport interventions

2 The Council’s paper claims that my paper is flawed as it ignores significant interventions to support walking, cycling and public transport in the North East Growth Triangle (NEGT) are being planned alongside growth.

3 This is incorrect. In both my first paper (to which the Council were responding) and my second paper that extended my spreadsheet model to make a more comprehensive comparison on the carbon footprint of the JCS housing distribution vs. the NNTAG proposed housing distribution, a range of modal splits are modelled for the NEGТ area.

4 This issue is answered, in the Table under point 12 of this second paper, where I indicate that both the JCS and NNTAG housing distributions are modelled with a *Background household transport emissions (modal split) in the NEGТ* of 20%,50%,70%,or 90%. The relevant line in the table is:

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| a | Both papers: <i>Background household transport emissions (modal split) - NEGТ</i> | 20%,50%,70%,90% | 20%,50%,70%,90% |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|

5 Both papers note that the only JCS carbon footprints that are lower than any of the NNTAG distribution ones are ones where the NEGТ area modal split is unrealistically small even with the planned interventions.