

---

MEETING	DECISION SESSION - EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR CITY STRATEGY
DATE	11 MAY 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLOR STEVE GALLOWAY (EXECUTIVE MEMBER)
<i>IN ATTENDANCE</i>	<i>COUNCILLOR MERRETT</i>

#### **96. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

At this point in the meeting Members present were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

#### **97. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last Decision Session – Executive Member for City Strategy, held on 6 April 2010 be approved and signed by the Executive Member as a correct record.

#### **98. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - DECISION SESSION**

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme. Details of the speaker are set out under the individual agenda item.

#### **99. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - WILDLIFE & COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 - PREPARATION OF DEFINITIVE MAP FORMER COUNTY BOROUGH OF YORK (GUILDHALL, FISHERGATE, MICKLEGATE WARDS)**

The Executive Member considered a report, which sought to assist him in determining whether or not to make a number of Definitive Map Modification Orders to record public rights of way on the Definitive Map for the former Borough of York within Guildhall, Fishergate and Micklegate Wards.

Consideration was also given to the Officers tabular response to each of the representations made in writing by Councillors Merrett, D'Agorne and the Ramblers Association for which this item had been deferred at the last Decision Session.

Councillor Merrett referred to additional comments he had forwarded to Officers, prior to the meeting, raising a number of issues in relation to various routes. He stated that since the meeting he had viewed the Sustrans route adjacent to the Law College/Middlethorpe and that the gate previously referred to did not obstruct this route as had been stated so he felt that this path should be included on the Definitive Map. He also referred to ~~a~~ additional paths he had identified in Knavesmire Woods and to the path on

Mill Mount/Scarcroft Hill for which he had received conflicting information about its status. He hoped these routes could also be added to the Map.

Officers confirmed that they welcomed evidence in relation to the existence of the various paths and that Members comments would be taken on board.

The Executive Member referred to the Officer responses made to representations and he confirmed that he was now satisfied that the Orders could be advertised.

He considered the following options:

Option 1: Make the necessary DMMOs to add those paths to the Definitive Map that are recommended in the Schedules. This option is recommended; or

Option 2: Do not make the DMMOs to add the paths to the Definitive Map.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member approves Option 1, and agrees to:

- i) Authorise the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services to make and advertise the required Definitive Map Modification Orders to add all those paths to the Definitive Map, where it is recommended based on the evidence available, to make an Order (see bottom of page of each Schedule (Annexes 1-3) for recommended action).
- ii) If no objections are received, or any objections received are subsequently withdrawn, the Orders referred to in i) above be confirmed; or
- iii) If objections are received, and not withdrawn, the Orders, or relevant parts thereof, be referred to the Secretary of State for determination.<sup>1</sup>

REASON: As surveying authority for the area, the City of York Council has a statutory duty (Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, section 55(3)), to produce a Definitive Map and Statement for the former County Borough of York; and in doing so is obliged to make Definitive Map Modification Orders to register the existence of all public rights of way in that area.

Action Required

1. Instruct Head of Legal Services to make DMMO's.

JC

**100. PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY - WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 - PREPARATION OF DEFINITIVE MAP FORMER COUNTY BOROUGH OF YORK (HOLGATE, CLIFTON, HEWORTH AND HULL ROAD WARDS)**

Consideration was given to a report which sought to assist the Executive Member in determining whether or not to make a number of Definitive Map Modification Orders to record public rights of way on the Definitive Map for the former County Borough of York within the Wards of Holgate, Clifton, Heworth and Hull Road.

The Executive Member pointed out that there had been very few comments and objections submitted in relation to these proposals. He then considered the following options:

Option 1: Make the necessary DMMOs to add those paths to the Definitive Map that are recommended in the Schedules. This option is recommended; or

Option 2: Do not make the DMMOs to add the paths to the Definitive Map.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member agrees to:

- i) Authorise the Head of Civic, Democratic and Legal Services to make and advertise the required Definitive Map Modification Orders to add all those paths to the Definitive Map, where it is recommended, based on the evidence available, to make an Order (see bottom of page of each Schedule (Annexes 1-4) for recommended action).
- ii) If no objections are received, or any objections received are subsequently withdrawn, the Orders referred to in i) above be confirmed; or
- iii) If objections are received, and not withdrawn, the Orders, or relevant parts thereof, be referred to the Secretary of State for determination.<sup>1</sup>

REASON: As surveying authority for the area, the City of York Council has a statutory duty (Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, section 55(3)), to produce a Definitive Map and Statement for the former County Borough of York; and in doing so is obliged to make Definitive Map Modification Orders to register the existence of all public rights of way in that area.

Action Required

1. Instruct Head of Legal Services to make DMMO's.

JC

**101. BLOSSOM STREET MULTI MODAL SCHEME - CONSULTATION RESULTS; ANALYSIS OF NETWORK IMPLICATIONS AND OPTION SELECTION**

The Executive Member considered a report, which informed him of the results of the citywide public consultation undertaken on the proposed improvements to the Blossom Street area. The report also advised of the road network implications of any alterations made to Blossom Street and its junction with Queen Street, Micklegate and Nunnery Lane, following further detailed analysis.

The following options had been considered as part of the proposals:

**Option A** is merely a comparison case to the base model and acts as the 'status quo'. The only change here is the conversion of the bus-gate from signalised to a merge. As discussed, this does show some apparent benefit to car users of this corridor and therefore acts as the 'do minimum' case against which each of the other Options are compared.

**Option B** (which was *Option 1* in the public consultation) includes a new signalised one-stage pedestrian crossing between the Bar Convent and the Windmill PH, much to the benefit of pedestrians. In addition, the inbound Blossom Street stop-line is set further back so that larger vehicles can make an easier left turn into Queen Street. Furthermore, an extended cycle feeder-lane is introduced under Micklegate Bar outbound so that outbound cyclists can travel to the front of stationary traffic to access the ASL, unhindered by vehicles queuing and blocking the archway.

**Option C** is the same, other than that the two other 'staggered' (two-stage) pedestrian crossings, at Holgate Road and outside the cinema, are straightened into one-stage so that pedestrians can cross in one movement.

**Option D** is the same as Option B (with similar benefits), except this time one inbound traffic lane on Blossom Street is removed (three lanes reduced to two) so that room is made to introduce a new inbound cycle lane. This has the benefit that cyclists now have a facility inbound. In addition, inbound traffic lanes would be significantly wider than the narrow ones, which are currently present. With wider traffic lanes and with already being displaced further from the kerb by the new cycle lane, left-turning vehicles would no longer need to straddle both lanes and could easily make the manoeuvre.

**Option E** (which was Option 2 in the public consultation) is the same, other than that the flare from one to two traffic lanes occurs later inbound, after the cinema crossing. This means that the inbound cycle lane can be continuous from Holgate Road to the Micklegate junction.

**Option F** (which was Option 3 in the public consultation) includes a new staggered two-stage pedestrian crossing outside the Bar Convent and also on the Queen Street arm, to improve capacity of this junction. In addition, although similarly inbound to Option E for cyclists, a further cycle lane is introduced, as well as an outbound cycle lane. As a result, outbound traffic lanes are reduced from two to one, and consequently the two outbound Queen Street lanes must be separately phased.

Officers circulated an update at the meeting which detailed their responses to additional comments received from Paul Hepworth of the Cyclists Touring Club, the Cycling City York Major Infrastructure Group and Councillors

D'Agorne and Merrett in relation to the proposed improvements in this area (copy of comments and responses attached as an annex to these minutes).

Officers confirmed that the preferred option was a finely balanced revision and a compromise of the various options put forward to improve safety for all users and maximise benefits for cyclists and pedestrians where possible.

Representations were then received from Mr Hoedeman who referred to previous promises of significant steps forward being made in relation to sustainable transport. This had been promised with the inner ring road; pedestrianisation and more recently speed restrictions and he pointed out that this scheme did not succeed in the promotion of sustainable transport. He stated that Blossom Street was already a nightmare for cyclists and he felt that the proposals would only result in a significant diversion of traffic onto other routes. He requested the Executive Member to defer further consideration of the proposals to allow for changes to be made. He felt that the present proposals would not assist cyclists and referred to the dangers involved in the use of the new route for cyclists through the station car park.

Councillor Merrett made representations on behalf of the three Micklegate Ward Members. He confirmed that they welcomed the works and the consultations undertaken with residents. He went on to *say that Cllr Gunnell, had also been present at the last briefing with officers, when they had seen an earlier version of the current proposal, but they had not been given the detailed traffic figures, only a verbal summary. He said that at the briefing they had raised 9 issues of concern on the then plan, and the majority of these had not been reported in the Officers report. He hoped the smaller ones could be picked up in the promised further local consultation. In terms of the proposals overall, he felt the traffic studies highlighted the shortcomings of the piecemeal approach to tackling problems at single locations in the city centre, where the traffic consequences of doing the right thing at that location, like here at Blossom Street of providing separate cycle lanes, gave unacceptable traffic consequences. A comprehensive approach to reducing traffic in and around the city centre was required to free up space for alternative measures, and was going to be the only way of improving safety for cyclists.* ~~raise a number of concerns including that no separate cycle lanes were proposed on the Blossom Street approach and that a comprehensive traffic solution was the only means of improving safety for cyclists.~~ He raised a number of points relating to the preferred route detailed in Annex E of the report including concerns at the arrangements for cyclists at Micklegate Bar, queuing traffic at the Holgate Road approach affecting air pollution and the knock on effects of the proposals which they felt would encourage rat running in the South Bank area.

Officers responded to these issues in particular that the Blossom Street junction was already at capacity and that any changes would inevitably have a knock on affect elsewhere but they pointed out that this was a multi modal scheme and one that should not disadvantage other highway users.

The Executive Member referred to the wide consultation that had been undertaken in relation to these proposals with the key objective of making the junction safer for all road users. He pointed out that there had been widespread public support for many of the proposed features of the revised

layout, however there were a clear majority of residents who were opposed to reducing the number of traffic lanes and he confirmed that he respected that view in the decision he would make.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- i) Note the results of the public consultation;
- ii) Note the results of micro-simulation computer modelling undertaken to ascertain the road network impact of making various alterations to Blossom Street;
- iii) Approve the implementation of the preferred option detailed in Annex 'E', in order that further consultation can be undertaken locally to develop detailed design, resulting in works being tendered and construction commencing in the autumn of 2010;<sup>1</sup>
- iv) Delegate to the Director of City Strategy authority to approve the detailed design of the scheme, including refinements aimed at addressing any outstanding Police comments about safety issues, as well as any practical opportunities to include cycle priorities on Holgate Road and to reduce the problems caused by the cobbled gutter, and vehicles poorly parked on the double yellow lines, on the narrow strip of cobbles on the south side of Blossom Street;<sup>2</sup>
- v) Request Officers to pursue the introduction of additional loading and waiting restrictions in Blossom Street so that any agreed changes can be implemented at the same time as other work is completed in the area.<sup>3</sup>

REASON: The proposals will provide facilities to enhance the accessibility and safety for all users of this road, with significant improvements for the more vulnerable users: pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, the streetscape and approach along Blossom Street towards the historic Micklegate Bar will be significantly improved, particularly by removing unnecessary street furniture. The proposed measures would also make a significant contribution towards the aims of the Council as a Cycling City.

Action Required

1. Undertake consultation in relation to the proposals in Annex E.

RH

2. Director of City Strategy to approve detailed design including any refinements required. RH
3. Arrange for the introduction of highway restrictions. RH

**102. BUS CORRIDOR WORKS ON A59 BOROUGHBIDGE ROAD AND B1363 WIGGINTON ROAD**

The Executive Member considered a report, which provided background information and timescales in relation to the various elements of proposed works to be constructed on the public highway as part of the Access York Phase 1 project that had not been considered for approval within the planning application process.

The report also examined the consultation process requirements and outlined the draft proposals for the bus corridor and resurfacing works and the integration of the proposed cycling improvements.

Officers updated that, since the agenda had been published, the Planning Committee had, at their meeting on 29 April, granted planning permission for the Wigginton Road Park and Ride site.

Councillor Merrett welcomed the proposals and related bus priority measures. He asked that consultation should also be undertaken with Micklegate Ward residents and cycling groups. He confirmed that his only concern related to the *Wigginton Road Park and Ride* bus service not penetrating the city centre and made suggestions as to possible routes to overcome this.

Officers confirmed that Micklegate Ward members would be consulted on the proposals and that they were in the process of examining eight different route options for the service.

The Executive Member confirmed that there had been no comments received in relation to the timescales and that it was important to coordinate other capital works with these improvements. He stated that he anticipated that there would be a lot of public interest in these proposals and that he hoped a consensus on the way forward could be agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Executive Member for City Strategy agrees to:

- (i) The consultation proposals as set out in paragraphs 12 to 14 of the report;
- (ii) The timescale for producing detailed reports to this Decision Session in September 2010 for further consideration; detailed in paragraph 9 of the report. <sup>1</sup>

**REASON:** To ensure that the Access York Phase 1 project continues to progress satisfactorily and to make sure that any approval of works within the public highway receives appropriate consultation.

Action Required

1. Undertake consultation as detailed in report.

PT

*[As amended at the Executive Member for City Strategy Decision Session held on 1 June 2010]*

**103. OPERATION OF CITY OF YORK COUNCIL'S DIAL AND RIDE SERVICE**

Consideration was given to a report, which set out the arrangements for the day-to-day operation of the Council's Dial and Ride service, which was currently delivered by the charity York Wheels. The Dial and Ride was a Council service for York residents who could not use other local bus services either because they could not get to a bus stop or who needed extra assistance at either end of their journey.

The Executive Member confirmed that, at this stage, only tenders were being invited for running the service and that there would be another opportunity to discuss options when interest in the contract was known. He stated that in view of representations received he was to amend the proposals to ensure that the voluntary sector were given equal opportunity to put forward their proposals should they so wish.

He then considered the following options:

Option 1 - Instruct officers to renegotiate a service level agreement with York Wheels for the day-to-day operation of Dial & Ride. This option will include setting and reviewing strategic targets on an annual basis to ensure the continuing improvement of assisted travel services for York residents.

Option 2 - Instruct officers to tender the day-to-day operation of Dial & Ride externally, including vehicle maintenance.

Option 3 - Instruct officers to bring all aspects of the operation of Dial & Ride in-house.

**RESOLVED:** That the Executive Member for City Strategy authorises Officers to tender the day-to-day operation of Dial & Ride externally, including vehicle maintenance (as set out as Option 2 in this report) and requests Officers to ensure, as far as possible, that the voluntary sector are enabled to submit tenders on an equal footing with the commercial sector.<sup>1</sup>

**REASON:** To ensure that the Council continues to operate a high quality Dial & Ride service whilst ensuring that it is getting the best value for money across all aspects of the operation and to ensure that the service operates efficiently.

Action Required

1. Invite tenders for the running of the service.

PB



**104. AN UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS MADE TOWARD THE INTRODUCTION OF INTEGRATED BUS TICKETING AND THE 'YORCARD' SCHEME**

The Executive Member considered a report, which updated him on the current position concerning the introduction of an integrated ticket for York together with regional progress on the delivery of 'Yorcard'. Officers updated that agreement had now been reached with the operators serving Elvington to introduce cross ticketing and that this was now in operation.

The Executive Member confirmed that this was a useful report which showed that some progress was being made on the difficult issue of cross ticketing and that the 'Yorcard' trial was to be further developed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Executive Member for City Strategy notes the contents of this report and:

- i) Support the continuation of work to support the introduction of both integrated and smart ticketing for bus passengers in York and specifically through work being undertaken as part of the Yorcard scheme.<sup>1</sup>
- ii) Agree to surveys being conducted to identify the demand for a multi-operator bus ticket alongside a citizens' panel survey.<sup>2</sup>

**REASON:** Both integrated and smart ticketing will encourage greater bus use and will make bus travel more affordable.

Action Required

- 1. Progress 'Yorcard' scheme. AB
- 2. Undertake surveys to identify demand. AB

**105. CITY OF YORK'S LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - AMENDED CONSULTATION/PREPARATION STRATEGY FOR LTP3**

The Executive Member considered a report, which presented details of a revised approach for processing the preparation of LTP3, due to the calling-in of the Executive Member's provisional decision on 2 March 2010 for undertaking the LTP3 Stage 2 Consultation.

Officers updated that with regard to the proposal to engage with stakeholders and the public through a 'dialogue' that they were currently pursuing externally the arrangement of an interactive web-based forum.

The Executive Member confirmed that it was unfortunate that the Stage 2 consultation on the LTP3 had been delayed, as this would restrict the amount of time for further discussion. However the proposed 'dialogue' would allow those with specific interests and concerns to explore them and

the door to door survey on all residents in the autumn to give everyone the opportunity to influence the final content of the LTP3 document.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for City Strategy is recommended to:

- i) Notes the contents of the report, particularly Annex A which sets out the revised approach for preparing and adopting LTP3, by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011.
- ii) Approves the revised approach at Annex A. <sup>1</sup>.

REASON: To enable the effective preparation and adoption of the City's Local Transport Plan 3, before the current LTP expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

Action Required

1. Pursue agreed consultation etc on LTP3.

IS

Cllr Steve Galloway, Executive Member for City Strategy  
[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 5.00 pm].

Decision Session - Executive Member for City Strategy  
 Tuesday, 11th May, 2010

**Agenda Item 6 – Blossom Street Multi Modal Scheme:  
 Officers’ Response to Further Comments Received**

Comment	Officers’ response
<b>North Yorkshire Police</b>	
<p>1. Consideration should be given to the issues raised in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.</p>	<p>Following receipt of the Stage 1 RSA, a meeting was held with one of the authors of the audit and Officers from Transport Planning, Engineering Consultancy (Transport &amp; Safety), Network Management, and the Assistant Director (City Development &amp; Transport).</p> <p>The meeting was held to discuss the outcome of the audit, the safety concerns and to decide on any necessary amendments to the Preferred Option. Subsequently, each of the issues raised from the RSA was considered and addressed. Some recommendations were incorporated into the scheme. Others were rejected, with the reasoning explained below.</p>
<p>2. All proposals put forward result in significant safety issues that are not present with the current road layout. They will also result in an increase in the perception of danger to all road users.</p>	<p>There are inevitably some safety issues associated with designing this scheme - much is being proposed for a small area of road-space and at a junction that is already at capacity, so very little flexibility exists.</p> <p>There is already a high accident rate On Blossom Street, so improving safety is key, but with a compromise for maintaining the efficient operation of the road network in the area – and the layout in the proposed scheme reflects this.</p> <p>It is the view of Officers that the scheme perhaps does make users more cautious (due to the removal of the islands and the proximity of the traffic flows etc), but this is not a negative effect and is the type of proposal that the DfT favours for such space with a mix of users. Officers’ are of the view that the scheme makes the best use of available space and is an improvements on current layout to all users. The benefits of this scheme far outweigh the minimal risk to safety.</p> <p>As discussed in Paragraphs 60-69 of the report, the new route to the station (via Lowther Terrace), in addition to the alternative parallel route to the east of Blossom Street (using Scarcroft Hill), will provide a safer and more attractive route to using Blossom Street for those with limited confidence on a bicycle.</p>
<p>3. The current three (narrow) lane inbound layout causes a number of problems and consideration should be made to reducing to two lanes.</p>	<p>Was considered but rejected. Paragraph 70 of the report.</p> <p>Micro-simulation modelling indicates a significant loss of capacity with reducing the number of lanes here, also causing displacement of traffic onto alternative routes.</p> <p>Public opinion (resulting from the citywide consultation) is also not favourable at all.</p>

<p>4. Nothing done to aid left turning larger vehicles from Blossom Street into Queen Street.</p>	<p>These are aided by the left lane being displaced 1 metre further away from the footway due to the cycle feeder lane; the Blossom Street stop-line being set further back; and the islands on Queen Street being removed. Analysis shows that an FTR can make the manoeuvre solely from the left lane, no longer requiring to straddle two lanes.</p>
<p>5. Difficulty for cyclists inbound to get into straight ahead &amp; right turn ASL from the proposed advanced cycle feeder lane. Consider another cycle lane on the nearside of the straight ahead lane.</p>	<p>Insufficient highway width to accommodate a secondary feeder lane and maintain adequate highway capacity. As it is only feasible to accommodate one cycle feeder lane on the Blossom Street city bound approach arm, it is preferable to accommodate cyclists in the nearside. This is based on the observed turning manoeuvres at the junction and the public consultation which showed certain cycle users (and potential cyclists) would not feel comfortable using a central feeder lane. Cyclists wishing to travel straight ahead or right will benefit from an increase in lane width on the approach arm leading to the stop-line.</p> <p>As discussed in 4. above, left turning vehicles also benefit from the current proposed position of the cycle feeder lane.</p> <p>To help cyclists get into the correct position, Officers now propose that where the two inbound traffic lanes flare to three, within the cycle feeder lane we provide arrows indicating that to continue within the feeder lane is for left-turners only.</p>
<p>6. The cycle lane should be a minimum of 1.5 metres in width to provide better separation between cyclists and other vehicles.</p>	<p>These are not 'cycle lanes' in the normal sense (for vehicles to pass cyclists leaving sufficient width, when travelling at 30mph). They are 'feeder lanes' into ASLs, their purpose to get cyclists down the inside of stationary vehicles and bypass the queuing traffic to reach the front of the queue. These arrangements have been adopted by CYC, within the Cycling Infrastructure Design Standards approved in 2009.</p> <p>To accommodate wider cycle lanes would require the removal of a traffic lane. As previously stated, this is not a workable transport solution in network capacity terms.</p>
<p>7. Long crossing distance for pedestrians at the new crossing between the Bar Convent and the Windmill PH. Consider retaining a refuge and stagger the crossing.</p>	<p>Discussed in Paragraph 74-76. Staggering the crossing and retaining the three lanes means that the refuge would have to be sub-standard in size and width, with a high likelihood of being struck, plus narrowing traffic lanes to sub-standard.</p> <p>Not providing a crossing in this location is not an option as pedestrian safety is one of the key aspects of this scheme.</p> <p>Therefore accepting a longer single-stage crossing is acceptable to Officers, with mitigating measures included to improve safety (e.g. on-crossing detection will be 'doubled up').</p>
<p>8. The pedestrian crossing near to the cinema has a refuge but is straight across with no stagger. Pedestrians who cross late in the cycle could find themselves stranded on the island.</p>	<p>The island will have push buttons in accordance with PUFFIN crossing guidelines, however, it is envisaged that pedestrians will cross the carriageway in one movement. When commissioning the signals, the engineer will allow sufficient clearance time for pedestrians to negotiate the full length of the crossing should they cross late in the cycle.</p>

Cycling City York Major Infrastructure Group	
<p>9. Disappointing that the preferred scheme appears to confirm that car drivers are still top priority, despite the Hierarchy of Users - where pedestrians and cyclists etc should be considered first. The scheme does not make a serious step towards promoting modal shift for a low-carbon transport arrangement.</p>	<p>Significant improvements have been made for pedestrians within the Preferred Option. Significant improvements (on the current layout) have also been made for cyclists. However, this can not (and should not) be done at the complete expense of the efficient operation of the road network, especially at such an important junction, as has been demonstrated in the micro-simulation modelling. There is an element of benefit and compromise for all users in this proposed scheme.</p> <p>With frequent buses using this street from the proposed relocated and enlarged Askham Bar and new Poppleton P&amp;R sites, we should not make any alterations which could potentially cause increased bus journey times than at present - which would potentially discourage people from using the service as an alternative to their own private vehicles.</p> <p>Although of course the Hierarchy needs consideration, so also does the Traffic Management Act 2004, which gives the council a duty to “effectively manage the highway network in order to avoid, reduce or minimise congestion or disruption on the highway network for all road users”.</p>
<p>10. The decision (to keep 5 traffic lanes) should not be based solely on the result of a public consultation. Drivers will always vote in their own interests.</p>	<p>Although public opinion was considered, the main decision to retain 5 traffic lanes in the Preferred Option was due to the results of the micro-simulation modelling which showed that any reduction in lanes significantly increased queue lengths elsewhere in the network (due to the key position of this particular junction) and which also caused vehicles to re-route through South Bank.</p> <p>The layout of the Preferred Option does not prejudice any further alteration in the future (i.e. removal of a traffic lane / wider cycle lanes) if further developments occur which restrain private car-use in the future. This could easily be achieved with the ‘blank canvass’ that Blossom Street presents with the proposed removal of the refuge islands.</p>
<p>11. Wholly inadequate improvements for cycle-users considering that this is a Cycling City scheme.</p>	<p>This scheme is a <u>multi-modal</u> safety improvement scheme for all users and is not solely for cyclists. Only a fraction of the cost of implementing this scheme would be potentially coming from the Cycling City grant, with the majority from the Local Transport Plan.</p>
<p>12. Fails to address the intimidating environment faced by outbound cyclists on Blossom Street. A central outbound cycle lane would be preferable.</p>	<p>With the new cycle pre-signal from Queen Street, cyclists should be clear of the Queen Street junction and in the correct lane positioning by the time the rest of the traffic follows.</p> <p>The decision not to put the outbound cycle feeder lane between the two traffic lanes was made after considering the many comments received from the public consultation where the public said that they would feel intimidated cycling between two lanes of traffic.</p> <p>A central cycle feeder lane is achievable (from South Parade to Holgate Road). However, cycle flows in this area during AM and PM peaks indicate nearly double the amount of cyclists travelling straight ahead at this junction than those turning right. Space is only available for one cycle feeder lane here, for straight ahead movements or right-turns. Officers have considered this and believe that for consistency (i.e. similar layout to other approaches in this area – Queen Street outbound for example), for safety, and to avoid confusion for cyclists and motorists, a nearside cycle feeder lane would still be preferable to one positioned between the two traffic lanes. This would also benefit a greater number of cyclists.</p>

13. The positioning of the inbound cycle (feeder) lane encourages cyclists to take up a dangerous position.	See 5. above.
14. 1.0 metre cycle (feeder) lanes are sub-standard and a token gesture to cyclists. These should be 1.5 metres as a minimum.	See 6. above.
15. Space for widened cycle lanes should be taken from the traffic lanes or from the footways / cobbled areas.	<p>Proposed traffic lane widths throughout the scheme area are already narrow, especially for a main arterial route and gateway into the city, used by large vehicles and many buses. Any further reduction in these widths may compromise safety.</p> <p>There are large numbers of pedestrians who use the footways and also there are significant costs associated with moving kerbs and drainage etc. Therefore Officers worked within the 'footprint' of the current carriageway dimensions.</p> <p>Conservation groups and local residents have strongly objected to any proposal to widen the carriageway at the expense of the cobbled areas. Furthermore on investigation, there are a large number of utilities positioned beneath the cobbles which would potentially need expensive diversionary work if we included this suggestion.</p>
16. Positive reaction to the 'head start' signal for cyclists emerging from Queen Street.	-
17. Support the extension of the feeder lane by-passing The Mount bus-gate, which is often blocked by buses.	-
18. A Keep Clear under Micklegate Bar will not be obeyed. Traffic signals north of the Bar would be the best solution (similar arrangement to Monk Bar).	<p>As set out in the report under paragraph 80, a Keep Clear at this location is not appropriate.</p> <p>The situation at Micklegate Bar is not the same as at Monk Bar (where the configuration of the traffic through the arches is different). Also, with traffic emerging from Bar Lane/Toft Green onto Micklegate just a few metres north of the Bar, traffic signals here would be very problematic. Furthermore they would require 'scheduled monument consent' which is a lengthy process. However, if required, traffic signals could be retrofitted to this area at any time in the future if deemed an appropriate measure.</p>
19. Any cycle lane should be bounded by kerbs on the traffic side, to prevent blocking by vehicles.	This would not be advisable as it would prevent cyclists from moving out of a cycle lane, across traffic lanes, to correctly position themselves at junctions.
20. The Lowther Terrace alternative route will only benefit a limited number of cyclists from Holgate Road, but is of no	With 87% of the public in favour of the Lowther Terrace/York Station route, it is obviously a popular proposal and will be well used.

<p>use to cyclists travelling onto Micklegate and Nunnery Lane.</p>	<p>As set out in paragraphs 67 to 70 within the report, an alternative route already exists for those cyclists wishing to access Nunnery Lane and Ouse Bridge without needing to use Blossom Street. This route will be well signposted and promoted.</p>
<p>21. Why was the following reported within the report, when it has no foundation (as neither are a legal requirement)?  “11% of comments received were regarding cyclists not respecting the laws of the road, including not using cycle lanes and not wearing high visibility clothing.”</p>	<p>It is correct that there is no legal requirement for cyclists to use a cycle lane when one is provided, nor to wear mandatory high visibility clothing.</p> <p>However, this sentence (taken from paragraph 19 of the report) was merely reporting the outcome of the public consultation and the views expressed. It would not be appropriate for Officers to selectively omit comments which many local residents had expressed.</p>
<p>22. Cars parked on double yellow lines on narrow strip of cobbles outside KFC are a problem and usually stick out into road. Cobbled gutter in same area exacerbates the problem for cyclists.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that this is an issue. As well as increased enforcement of the parking restrictions, other means of preventing illegal parking in this location is currently being considered. This includes the use of bollards or the planting of small street trees within the cobbles.</p>
<p><b>Cllr Merrett – Facility requested</b></p>	
<p>23. Cllr Merrett has highlighted that a secondary stop line and signals at the junction of Holgate Road and Lowther Terrace would assist cyclists going to / from the new station access, as well as preventing cyclists being blocked or becoming trapped against the kerb by larger vehicles at the narrow corner of Holgate Road. It would also assist in the air quality in this area.</p>	<p>Officers considered this proposal in detail and concluded that this is not a workable option. It would be incredibly challenging to get a Holgate Road pre-signal to work anything like sensibly, given the large travel time between the new stop line and the main stop line. Also, this feature has not been modelled and so it would be essential that some modelling was produced to show the effects (which Officers think would be significant).</p> <p>As the main green does not clear all approaching traffic, vehicles would still get stuck between the two stop-lines, unless the new signal 'gated' traffic quite severely, and queuing much further back up Holgate Road would be seen. Because of the additional delay which would be imposed on drivers, it is very likely that we would see more 'racing' through to the main green which would cause problems for cyclists.</p> <p>Network Management would be very concerned about this proposal and the affect it would have on traffic on Holgate Road. Their judgement is that it would cause additional delays, (also to the new A59 P+R service). They can not see how it could be implemented in a way that would achieve the goals Cllr Merrett desires and does not think it would particularly increase safety or air quality (it would just move the problem to a new location and increase it's severity).</p> <p>A yellow box junction at Lowther Terrace has been included within the Preferred Option instead.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank