

Support for *Option 1* –

- The change in layout would keep the flow of traffic moving.
- This option should be sufficient to reduce the traffic using Westminster Road and The Avenue as a short cut.
- This option is the most appropriate option from the point of view of safety to drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.
- The loss of the last few yards from the pinch-point up to the traffic signals would not be a big disadvantage, given that the inconvenience to a very small number of cyclists would be minute compared with the benefit to a much greater number of motorists – cyclists coming off the cycle ramp will simply merge and take their turn with vehicles as they used to do before.
- Cyclists would not be discouraged as this is the exact scenario in many areas of the city - it would be ideal to have separate cycle paths, however it is not possible in some areas. A good example is Lendal Bridge. Also, along Bootham where the cycle lane is intermittent for car parking, cyclists are not deterred. Also, a cycle lane with moving traffic on either side (as in **Option 2**) is much less safe than allowing the cyclist to be in control of making the decision whether to stop and wait for traffic to move, or get off their cycle and walk along the road edge.
- Removal of the cobbles and a hedge trim would provide enhancements to this option.
- No cobbles should be removed anywhere in the city.
- Could further adjustments also be made to the phasing of the lights to let a few more cars through the junction from this direction? I appreciate that this would be at the expense of flow from the other directions (but the other roads into this junction never seem as bad).

Support for *Option 2* –

- Experience has shown that cyclists are in particular danger just before traffic lights, when many car drivers are impatient to get through the lights and encroach on cyclists' space. Therefore, the introduction of a dedicated cycle lane right up to the traffic lights is required, even though it is the more expensive option.
- This option allows better access for cyclists to the junction, whilst improving traffic flow.

Support for no change –

- Neither proposal retains the current safe cycle access on approach to and through this busy junction. Both options show a disregard for the safety of cyclists and would wreck the whole of the Water End cycling scheme, and in Option 2 the amenity and safety of pedestrians. It made a huge difference when the layout was altered to the benefit of cyclists and I felt much safer using the junction. The proposal to design sub-standard width traffic lanes is a recipe for serious injury or worse for cyclists when coupled with the largely aggressive and impatient driving shown by a great number of motorists at

this junction. So, I'm surprised that sub-standard solutions are being considered, given York's claim to be a 'Cycling City'.

- The Council's own traffic calculations show only a minimal improvement in vehicular flow through any amended junction and I would suggest that this is not a persuasive enough argument when balanced against the increasing hazard faced by cyclists across the city. The present layout safely allows everyone to use this junction, whether on foot, cycling or in a car. Both proposals now under consideration are biased in favour of the overly considered car lobby and neither should be implemented.
- Both options would increase deterrence to cycling and add to the congestion, which leaves me wondering what exactly the policy is in York, given that the proposed options are inconsistent with the aims of LTP3 and York's current user hierarchy. The current arrangements are beneficial to those who cycle and provide an example to those who don't. As part of the Council's sustainability agenda and its drive to reduce congestion and air pollution it makes sense to penalise those who drive and visibly reward those who choose to travel by alternative means.
- Traffic used to be backed up before the cycle lane was introduced and will continue to be so if the cycle lane is removed. Squeezing in another lane of traffic merely to make the motoring lobby shout a bit less will not solve the traffic issues at this junction. This would only add 5 or 6 cars into a left-turn lane before access to the lane is blocked off by all the vehicles wishing to go straight ahead or turn right.
- Motorists will respond to an increase in capacity by filling that capacity and the perceived gain will be eliminated in a fairly short period of time. Thus, any gain will be very short lived and the only way of actually improving journey times is by reducing the amount of motor traffic. The motivation behind making the proposed changes is purely political, and merely seeks to placate a vociferous lobby of motorists who refuse to accept the reality that they themselves cause the congestion through their own choice to take a vehicle onto the finite amount of space available on the roads.
- The council proposes to remove provision for cyclists at the very point where it is most needed to ensure their safety. Cyclists are to be dumped into the traffic flow at the point where it splits into two lanes, which is exactly where they will be in the most danger.
- I am concerned about narrow traffic lanes causing larger vehicles to take wider turns or squashing cyclists on the inside who have not been able to get across, or get to the front easily. Larger vehicles can also mount the curb when turning left, thus making pedestrians vulnerable. 26 cyclists have been killed in London this year alone through large vehicles turning left across cyclists moving straight ahead. Surely the prevention of accidents for pedestrians and cyclists is more important than people being late for things - maybe they should leave earlier, or use a different route!
- Whatever is decided I would like to propose the additional feature of a "Keep Clear" box to allow traffic from Clifton Dale/Green to turn right safely into Water End. This would be particularly important if two lanes were reinstalled.
- As a cyclist I would not be prepared to negotiate the junction as proposed in either scheme, nor would I allow my children to. We find it quite remarkable that the Council is even considering reinstating the left hand lane at this

cost for such little added benefit whilst openly admitting that the proposed changes adversely affect safety.

- As a frequent user of the Clifton Green Junction in rush hour, I firmly believe that the council is in danger of wasting more money in trying to solve an insoluble problem. A high proportion of the traffic that is blocking back in mornings originates from the A59, trying to enter the city via Bootham by cutting down Boroughbridge Road and along Water End and this traffic would enter the city much more smoothly if it were possible for traffic to join the A19 via the A1237 and the Rawcliffe Bar intersection. Until York Council bites the bullet and funds the dualling of the A1237 and puts in proper grade separated junctions at Rawcliffe and at Poppleton anything else will be fruitless tinkering.
- Traffic planning needs to be about more than simply tackling congested spots in a sequential unplanned manner as if it were a game of '*whack-a-mole*'. The Council's efforts to reduce car use and promote alternative transport with soft measures such as bus and cycling promotion, travel plans and speed limits, need to be backed up with reallocation of road space to other users. Without this, induced traffic will take the place of any trips removed from the road. There is abundant evidence for this. One paper, "Smarter Choices: Assessing the Potential to Achieve Traffic Reduction Using 'Soft Measures'" (Cairns et al 2008) surveys over 250 instances of the use of soft measures, concluding that such measures could play a very significant role in reducing traffic, but it is critical to 'lock-in' the benefits of such measures with policies to control induced traffic" such as "including prices, service improvements, traffic control and management and infrastructure changes". Reallocation of road space away from car users is the most cost-effective method of doing this. So if you will not take any difficult decisions to "lock-in" the benefits of the soft measures, you may as well not bother doing them. Added to this is the fact that compared to the proposed options, the current layout is safer for cyclists.
- The introduction of the cycle lane taking cycles all the way up to the traffic lights at Clifton Green has brought a significant benefit. This junction was certainly the most difficult one for me to negotiate on my journey to Heworth from Clifton. I admired the progressive policy of the City of York in making the radical change of introducing the lane. It was a nightmare trying to get through the traffic before the cycle lane was introduced. The cycle lane has been greatly appreciated by those of us trying to pursue a greener form of travel through cycling to work. I find it disappointing that at these times of austerity, and given the policies on encouraging cycling by both local and central government, the City of York Council is prepared to consider investing officer time and other resources to making changes of this kind for the benefit of 2 or possibly up to 5 cars each change of lights. This is not the time to make any change.
- The council should only change the layout of lanes if such change is calculated to result in fewer casualties and fatalities than the present arrangements. To reinstate a left hand turn lane is not worth doing if it costs lives.
- I do not want the council to spend tax payers' money making changes that could conceivably make the junction even less safe and more intimidating for cyclists or impact negatively on pedestrians. Any alterations to road infrastructure have got to demonstrably improve the journey for, and the

safety of, cyclists and pedestrians. Neither of the two options proposed meet those criteria, and therefore neither should be introduced.

- The queues are sometimes caused by the signal timings, when only a few vehicles are allowed through, causing driver frustration and unnecessary delay. Alter the signal timings and save a lot of unnecessary expenditure.
- It is unacceptable for the Council to spend tax payers' money to knowingly make a junction more dangerous. What would the position of the Council and Councillors be regarding civil and/or criminal liability should a cyclist subsequently be killed or injured? It is astonishing that just a short time after the cycle lane was introduced, money is going to be spent to remove it. This is a pathetic indictment of the short-termism and waste inherent in our political system.
- This change can only encourage car use and discourage cycling and thus runs counter to the council's stated objectives in: Reduce air pollution by reducing traffic emissions; Sustainable Travel to Schools Strategy; CO2 emission reduction; City of York Local Transport Plan; York's "Just 30" physical activity campaign.
- The proposed alterations would lead to a second rate cycling facility. Many cycle routes in York are simply tokenism, because they are either there for a very short distance, or are so narrow as to be meaningless. This junction is currently excellent for cyclists. To spend money to keep irate car drivers happy, when we are faced with increased congestion levels if we continue with our current car use, seems pointless.
- The Council needs to honour and implement its own policies. These policies seek to promote sustainable transport, specifically pedestrian movement, cycling and travel by public transport, reduce air pollution and promote enhancements to the quality of the environment. Increasing capacity for motor vehicles at this location will facilitate greater car use, particularly in the peak periods when the dominant purpose is commuting. Furthermore, where there are conflicts of interest due to limited road space, as at this location, we believe the Council should then prioritise on the basis of its own hierarchy of users, which seek to safeguard facilities for the disabled, pedestrians and cyclists above all others. It seems to us that both options fail to meet the Council's own policies and criteria.
- It was unfortunate that the introduction of the single traffic lane with a dedicated cycle path at Water End was followed by significant re-working of the roundabout on the northern ring-road and the intersection of the A19; I suspect this displaced much of the traffic stuck on the outer ring-road onto Water End during most of 2011.
- You can't fit a quart into a pint pot. The road is too narrow to have the extra left-turning lane. When this did exist, there was still always congestion at this point because one large vehicle would block both lanes. Neither of the proposed options will solve the problem of congestion on this route, and therefore motorists will still use Westminster Road and The Avenue as a means of avoiding congestion.
- Neither of the options proposed are really safe for cyclists and seem potentially hazardous for car drivers too. I do remember the junction how it used to be, and felt that it didn't work well at all with two car sized lanes scraping past each other. I do however, think that the current configuration works very well, and I think people must accept that at peak times in an old

city that congestion at junctions is a natural occurrence. It makes very little difference to my car journeys but an enormous one to my cycling journeys.

- As a motorist and cyclist with Special Needs and in this respect a member of the York Access Group, I cannot speak highly enough of the improvements in safe passage that I am enjoying as I make my way to and from the City Centre from Acomb where my wife and I live.
- Surely we don't want the council being investigated by the police for making a junction more dangerous, should any incidents occur following any changes. Tackling congestion should not be prioritised over the safety of cyclists.
- If either proposal were introduced, then the council's cycling campaign will become an utter farce - I may as well buy myself a car. The facts are that many cyclists are knocked down in York each year and any plans which increase this risk to cyclists is frankly disgusting.
- Cyclists have a lovely run up to the lane along Water End coming over Clifton Bridge, so why propose to remove it when they get to the most dangerous part of the road?
- The amount of vehicle traffic likely to use the 'extra' lane is going to be very small as 'clearly' only cars at the head of any queue can gain access to it. The council needs to give a clear signal that they are serious about supporting modal shift or it will not occur, as the current situation sends a message to every driver that they only have to moan and it appears that the council will just take a 'political' decision to back-track.
- I cannot see that restoring the original layout will provide sufficient improvement to warrant the decreased safety of the junction or the damage to York's reputation as a cycle friendly city, and could impact future investment in similar schemes.
- Radical measures are required to encourage more people to walk and cycle. A large amount of work and investment has already been made in efforts to encourage cycling and walking, but both proposals to reinstate a left turn traffic lane go against this, by spending more money on destroying what is considered to be an essential part of the cycle network at a location where it is most needed.
- I previously commended the council for the new cycling infrastructure on Water End. When driving, there are rarely significant congestion problems. By bike, the journey is safer and quicker, and the route connects with other safe off-road routes. I am appalled to learn that there are now proposals to remove the final section of the cycle route – both proposals will cause real danger to cyclists. I would be surprised if they have been drawn up by people with experience of using cycle routes. I strongly urge the council to avoid expensive alterations, which will result in greater danger, especially at this time of financial austerity.

Those with alternative suggestions –

- Put the layout back to its original state, i.e. before the cycling measures were introduced;
- Use part of the Village Green to create the sufficient space required;
- Point closure for Westminster Road and The Avenue is the only way to prevent 'rat-running' traffic cutting through;
- Get rid of the Village Green altogether and turn the whole of the Clifton Green area into a huge one way gyratory.