

Reply to TRO50006-001043- Response to Applicant Doc 8.11 Other Parties Deadline 3 submissions

From John P Davis PhD DIC PINS ID 20011413

Ref SRNG Response to Applicants Document 8.7 Parts B para 3 VISSIM

I am pleased to see the response from Roxhill with reference to the validity of the VISSIM software used to evaluate the new road layout around the proposed development near to Junction 15 of the M1.

It has now been accepted that the collisions I reported to have observed in the VISSIM graphical display do exist and are no longer being described as 'graphical errors' and are now described as 'Quirks'

Quirks do not exist in software, they are errors or often accepted as 'BUGS'. The glib use of the word 'Quirk' suggests it is a random event with no reason or cause and can hence be neglected. BUGS are accepted as errors and have to be fixed in any safety critical computer programme.

I disagree strongly to this layman's talk.

The explanation of an overtaking car sometimes not 'seeing the rear axle' and hence driving into the back of the car in front is also not acceptable. The 'Quirk' I observed in the VISSIM promotional video clearly shows a fast car driving through the car in front. Both axles.

I also challenge the presumption that such poor unvalidated software can be relied upon to predict random traffic flows and hence be used for reliable and confident planning for such a project where lives are at risk.

I also would like to see some information to support the statement: -

"This does not represent a collision or invalidate the VISSIM assessment"

The true errors in the reliance of this software for future planning, as in this case, will result in over confidence of the planners and poor decision making with the potential outcome being very severe.

John P Davis PhD DIC