

## Local Transport Strategy Implementation Plan 2024-2026

### Our Strategy to 2040

I suggest that there should be a second row in the “Heritage” line of the table on page 53, as shown below.

|          |  |   |       |       |      |
|----------|--|---|-------|-------|------|
| Heritage | Traffic flows past key sites or in and around the city centre  | Bridge counts and cordon counts                                       | - 20% | - 30% | -40% |
| Heritage | Number of travelling vehicles present (i) near key sites, (ii) around the city centre, and (iii) elsewhere in the City | Counts of number of vehicles (available by cctv and other monitoring) | - 20% | - 30% | -40% |

There are several reasons for taking account of *the number of vehicles* as well as the *flow of vehicles* in the table on page 53. I list some of these here:

1. The view of inspiring architecture is damaged by vehicle intrusion *even if the vehicles are not moving*. (Think of Bootham Bar.) It is I suggest very important to include both moving and stationary or queueing vehicles under the heritage heading in any reasonable list of objectives. Stationary vehicle queues damage heritage appreciation as well as vehicle flow.
2. The number of vehicles on a road link also affects congestion and so should also occur within any assessment of congestion. (Congestion does not occur in the page 53 table; so I also suggest that congestion should be included in further versions of this table and that congestion targets (involving “the number of vehicles” and other variables) should then be included in the table. This involves the development of measures of congestion and will require time and careful consideration.)
3. The number of vehicles on a road link also affects the space available for walking and cycling on that link and so should also occur within any assessment of facilities for walking and cycling and wheeling. (I suggest that “the space available for active travel” targets should be included in

future versions of this table. Again these targets will need very careful consideration.)

4. Consider the list of objectives: Inclusive access, climate, economy, health, safety, local environment, reliability, heritage, future growth, resilience. All would be enhanced by having shorter queues or fewer vehicles. I suggest that the case for including vehicle numbers in any table of “objectives and targets” is a very wide and strong one.

*5. Perhaps this table might be regarded as a “live document” allowing it to develop over time?*