

Annex B(vii) – Direct consultation responses.

Consultee	Comment
<p>Cycling UK</p>	<p>Contraflow cycle facilities allow cyclists to legally ride two-way, in streets that are one way for motor vehicles. This increases the permeability of the highway network for cycling. Cyclist journey distances are shortened, creating travel times that are competitive with the car, for many short journeys. More cycling equals better air quality, and more capacity for those who need to use a motor vehicle for e.g. servicing and deliveries. Less experienced urban cyclists will often be able to avoid busy roads. And contraflow significantly reduces illegal cycling on footpaths which we all will surely welcome.</p> <p>In 2011, the DfT relaxed many Traffic Sign regulations. At Cycle contraflow entrances, only an “Except Cyclists” sign is needed under the “No Entry” sign. A marked contraflow lane can be omitted if space constraints exist. Instead, contraflow cyclists may be guided by painted cycle symbols at intervals along the carriageway margin, which will also alert most pedestrians. This simpler approach is the norm in mainland European cities, and works well. Several UK cities have now got similar trial or permanent schemes in place. As a leading cycling city, York should be doing likewise. A local, experimental trial scheme may convince Councillors.</p> <p>Fossgate may be a useful trial site. There is clearly a demand for two way cycling along here, and it may be considered sensible to cater for it, rather than attempting to enforce the current one way regulations. It will enable Piccadilly, so often busy with buses to be avoided for many journeys.</p> <p>The results of a successful trial scheme might then be extended. Castle Gateway scheme will likely feature a Foss cycle Bridge. This would link routes by the River Ouse, via the Eye of York, with Piccadilly. If permanent contraflow can be established in Fossgate, then Merchantgate could also similarly become contraflow. Linked with Fossgate, it would create useful direct cycle routes for many journey origins and destinations.</p> <p>On behalf of Cycling UK, I ask Officers to consider the options for trialling simplified contraflow cycling in Fossgate.</p>
<p>Respondent A</p>	<p>I strongly support proposals to enhance Fossgate as an extension to York's 'foot streets' pedestrian area. Reversing the traffic flow was a very good first step.</p> <p>I therefore looked at your proposed improvement scheme with particular interest. In the 1970s, I was attached to the award-winning W Yorkshire MCC Pedestrianisation Team and subsequently directly involved in similar schemes in Tyneside. I know what can be achieved and its impact on city and town centres.</p> <p>But I was very disappointed by your initial proposals which do not really transform Fossgate to the extent that is realisable. What seems to be proposed is resurfacing and a few build-outs. These will not deter drivers from using Fossgate or allow shopkeepers and cafes to extend their businesses into the street and encourage people to linger or stop there.</p> <p>You will find the type of improvement I hoped to see in the holiday photograph of Prevaža. It is typical of so many simple continental schemes I would therefore encourage you to return to the drawing board. Please consider what type of character and appeal you wish to create in conjunction with the council's urban design and landscape professionals. The budget appears too tight to do much. So I would suggest that you concentrate the improvements to the southern end to deter drivers and on the northern end to attract people into Fossgate.</p>
<p>York Civic Trust</p>	<p>York Civic Trust has reviewed the proposals as indicated in CYC's drawing TP-130048-C-01. The proposals for Fossgate itself seem to us wholly appropriate from the point of view of traffic, parking and pedestrian activity, although we do not wish to comment on the appropriateness of materials chosen.</p> <p>We are, however, concerned with the proposed treatment in Pavement. In its current layout, Pavement has two raised crossings, each around</p>

	<p>5m wide, at the locations marked for the new crossings on the plan. Between the two, the road surface is level with the pavement in some places and below in others; this arrangement continues on the stretch to the junction with Picadilly. This irregular provision makes walking conditions difficult for those with impairments, and encourages over-running by vehicles. All crossings of Pavement in this section operate as courtesy crossings, with the only priority afforded to pedestrians provided by the raised crossings, which slow down traffic. The problems of crossing are accentuated by the Council's persistent failure to enforce the access restrictions in Pavement and Picadilly, resulting in flows which are often double legal levels.</p> <p>What is actually proposed is to provide crossings of broadly the same width and in the same locations as at present, but at roadway level. This will remove any of the priority currently afforded to pedestrians, and impose a barrier on pedestrian access to Fossgate, which is the opposite of the intention of the scheme.</p> <p>Instead, we would encourage the Council to implement a table junction throughout the section between these two crossings, and into the entrances to Fossgate and Whip-ma-whop-ma-gate. This would have the combined effect of making the road easier to cross and indicating to drivers that pedestrians should be afforded priority. If this is deemed inappropriate, then both the planned crossings should be implemented as zebra crossings, giving pedestrians clear priority over traffic. At the same time, The Council needs to take action to enforce the access restrictions in Pavement and Picadilly and to reset the kerbs between the junctions of Fossgate and Picadilly so that the demarcation between pedestrian and vehicular areas is clear.</p>
<p>Treemendous York</p>	<p>On behalf of Treemendous York, I attach photos of beautiful, could be all evergreen trees or shrubs in attractive easy movable containers, photos were taken in local Wetherby 2nd week October – Right tree in Right place. Quality only.</p> <p>The plan for Wetherby I believe is (could be through York BID), each property/business pays an annual sum to cover the capital costs for set up, each container is sponsored, the key is daily watering and maintenance most important - Hanging baskets delivered and erected in January and June, they are removed end Sept/Oct and then replaced by Christmas trees with lights.</p> <p><i>Multiple benefits, containers can be used as easy pallet movable green bollards to control traffic, <u>please see Value of Trees in Treemendous York Tree Trail leaflet attached.</u></i></p> <p>There is not enough emphasis on natural environment, green space and trees for recreation and health and peace, for flood prevention, recreation, shade, wildlife, increase property values. <i>Most importantly trees to clean the air, see evidence below.</i></p> <p>Please limit polluting vehicles and increase cycling and walking facilities</p> <p><u>What we would ask the Planning Authority to address .</u></p> <p>The City of York has the opportunity to plan for substantially more mature (canopy) trees to be planted.</p> <p>There's also an opportunity to have connecting green spaces creating a green corridor including central pocket parks.</p> <p>https://www.forestresearch.gov.uk/research/health-benefits-of-street-trees/</p> <p>Important - A new study looks at the role of vegetation in removing air pollutants, and the benefits they provide to human health through reductions in exposure. The Office for National Statistics has published an online interactive map, allowing users to find out how much pollution is removed by vegetation in their area, and how this is valued in avoided health damage costs. An estimated 1.4 billion kg of air pollutants were removed by woodlands, plants, grassland and other UK vegetation in 2015, according to a study produced for the UK Natural Capital accounts by the Center for Ecology and Hydrology.</p> <p>Wow 6,795 kg of air pollutants are removed if you live East of York above average and yet in York only 1,131 kg is removed? York needs Galtres forest re-planting around the ring road!</p>

York Cycle Campaign	See attached letter.
Respondent C	<p>These are my comments on the three issues you mention.</p> <p>1. Pedestrian friendly. Aspiring to be like the Shambles and Stonegate should be the aim. You could ask people what it is that makes these streets attractive, ponder on the responses. An element of this requires vehicles to have access for very few hours per day - night, early morning and late evening. The road surface needs improvement; re-tarmac would be fine, and retain cobble areas already in place. If cafes are allowed furniture outside there should be like for like public seating. The lack of seats is one of the major requests made by older people. More cycle racks are needed throughout the city, including Fossgate.</p> <p>2. Attract more people. Support the development of trader co-operation as traders jointly can identify what will be effective, but they are often hampered by lack of time, and input here would help eg to do a marketing campaign or organise more special vents. Tackle the traffic issue, Shambles and Stonegate are effective because of lack of traffic. Have clear signs which show to everyone what is permitted and when (or not). Have signs on posts plus markings on the road. Make it clear how traffic infringements can be reported and how they will be dealt with. Cosmetic changes are less important than thinking through how people behave and how investing in people will have a greater impact.</p> <p>3. Improve access for pedestrians and cyclists. Ideally cars, lorries etc would have very few hours access per day (see above). This would immediately improve access for pedestrians and cyclists - they would no longer be put off visiting the street. It would feel safer, less worry that if dawdling a vehicle would appear. The disadvantage of the reversal of the direction of traffic is that cycling is now uphill not downhill, a major issue for older cyclists. Ideally there would be two way cycling in the street. The no entry sections of Walmgate need altering for cyclists because at the moment a cyclist can cycle from Walmgate Bar, and along as far as the church but cannot go straight on and enter in to Fossgate, the route is shown to be into Piccadilly and then doubling back to Merchantgate (two right hand turns across a busy road). There could be a cycle lane covering the part where Walmgate and Fossgate meet to avoid this problem. If you do not want to make a major change to vehicle access hours these should be considered: A size restriction for vehicles either by weight or by width or both. Exceptions could be made for emergency vehicles. A resident of flat or room could get a permit if they need a furniture removal van. A city wide scheme for a transport Hub where large lorries transferred their goods into vans and cycle couriers. Thus goods would be delivered in a suitable sized vehicle rather than those causing more pollution and inconveniencing pedestrians and cyclists as happens at the moment in Fossgate.</p> <p>Whatever is eventually carried out for the third point will not be properly successful without considering the city centre as a whole. Access hours are very confusing; they seem to vary from street to street, for vehicles and cycles. Unless someone lives or works in Fossgate they have arrived</p>

	<p>there via another part of the city. Getting there is often a struggle so deterrence and metaphorical barriers need to be removed. Officers should walk or cycle through the city imagining that they have done that before and see what needs to be improved.</p> <p>General comments about the consultation: Alternative ways of gathering public opinion have been used effectively in other areas e.g. Castle gateway. Having a drawn plan immediately sets the parameters for people's thinking. A plan also implies that the things that are important are those that can be drawn on a plan, as opposed to things which are to do with how people interact together, how neighbourhoods develop despite the physical infrastructure.</p> <p>The consultation asks about a plan and gets answers about a plan, missing many other thoughts residents may have. I wonder how the proposal consulted upon fits with One Planet York principles? Finally, by having a budget it implies you will spend this money. You could have a more effective programme of work for less money, but this does not seem to be an option.</p>
Respondent D	<p>In response to your plans for Fossgate I'd like to submit my feedback with regard to the intention to include speed bumps or "tables" in the new road layout. There is a plethora of evidence that suggests that speed bumps cause far more problems than they solve, considering the low traffic levels on the road under these new plans it seems unnecessary to include traffic calming of this nature.</p> <p>Most recent Department for Transport advice was to remove speed bumps in the interests of clean air, considering how poor air quality is in York it would seem prudent to avoid installing more speed bumps. They cause cars to slow down then rev to return to usual speed which increases emissions. In addition they slow the response of emergency vehicles, causing damage to them in some cases, even causing further injury to patients in ambulances. Furthermore existing regulations prevent the installation of speed bumps near bridges, tunnels, subways etc, the reason being that vibration from vehicles traversing the bumps damages those structures. It stands to reason that same vibration will damage buildings on Fossgate as well.</p> <p>Less relevant to this street but still of some relevance is that speed bumps and cushions make it almost impossible for disabled adapted vehicles to traverse streets as they cause ramps and other lowered parts of the vehicle to ground on the road surface and be damaged at great expense to the disabled vehicle owner.</p> <p>I would urge in the strongest sense against installing speed bumps and the such.</p>
Respondent E	<p>£500K on one street. Why not use it to fix all the potholes round the city. The roads are a disgrace.</p>
Respondent F	<p>Following on from my input to the two meetings in Fossgate....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would like to record my concern (expressed verbally) that the on-site consultations were not in accessible venues. We have an accessible room in Briar House that could have been used. Or Spark. 2. I have also mentioned my concern for disabled, less able, people with pushchairs attempting to travel up or down Fossgate. The curbs are a hazard, as are the bollards. I asked the young women who push the children from the Walmgate nursery along the street every day - they really struggle to get the pushchair along the pavement. People are constantly passing each other by walking into the "highway" - this is not safe if cars are allowed to come up there, and if cycles were allowed to go both ways. To fulfil your alleged aim of making the street more pedestrian - friendly, we need a bold plan to make the street level with the pavement, stop the cars parking except for access to businesses and homes (especially the hair dresser and the flats at the Walmgate end, and the Merchant Adventurers Hall - who everyone seems to agree they should have special exemption)

	<p>3. We need more cycle racks than just 10. If the car parking was removed, there would be more space for cycle racks, And more room for planters (which can also double as cycle racks - there are plenty of imaginative designs out there)</p> <p>4. The crossing at the Pavement into Whip-Ma-Whop-Ma-Gate needs to be where most people do actually want to cross: at the corner by the pub opposite Stonebow House. Not further along the street. A monitoring exercise would be good before the final plan is developed and implemented.</p> <p>5. I agree with Sheridan that the consultation started from the wrong place - developing a plan and then presenting it to people for comments is not the most democratic way of proceeding. Please, in future, use My Future York - style consultations. Where people are given the chance to explain how they already use an area and what would improve it for them. If people are given a plan, they feel that is set in stone almost and cannot imagine another way. (Except for a few notable exceptions!)</p> <p>6. The "directive" from central government is not a law, nor would there be some kind of punishment if we did go for a levelling of the street surface area. It's merely a suggestion.</p> <p>7. Please show some evidence in statistics of your reports about peoples' responses. We have not yet heard where the information was gathered from blind and partially sighted people about it being more dangerous for them than it is now if the street was levelled. Surely the steep drop from the curb and the bollards are more dangerous,</p> <p>Thank you for the extra meeting with us last week. And for extending the deadline. It has really helped me gather my thoughts. I appreciate your efforts to listen and record our responses, and for trying to please everyone. And to get it done in the projected time-scale It is a very huge task. But I urge you to re-think the plan and implement the suggestions that have been made. It is very disheartening to be asked your opinion on something and be told repeatedly that you cannot have what you want! Why can't we have what we want? Give us the figures of how many people want pedestrianisation and how many feel the need to drive through the street. I was talking to a local resident the other day who told me he drives up there often. But he said he doesn't NEED to. And would find another way to travel if he couldn't go up Fossgate. I fear you are being held to ransom by a few stropky car drivers who need to give way to the majority.</p>
<p>Respondent G</p>	<p>It is great to see that Fossgate is getting some work done to improve it, however I have some major concerns regarding the planned changes. Firstly I would like to comment on the change to the direction on the one way system. As a motorist I have found the change to be very negative, I have a close relative (my father) who owns a business and property on Fossgate so I regularly drive down the street. The one way systems throughout York are very confusing and off putting, especially since there are heavy fines for going the wrong way or the wrong time, they are poorly signposted and visitors to York would have no idea of the one way system. I find that to get to Fossgate via the current route takes much longer as I seem to circle around the street. The biggest problem is trying to get out at the top of the street, particularly if turning right away from the centre. The corner is very difficult to see past, especially with pedestrians crossing at the top without looking, or stopping. Delivery vans (particularly the large M+S vehicles) parking up for unloading cause an obstruction for other road users, and make it dangerous for vehicles to try to move out beyond them - visibility is seriously impaired. Add to this, buses and cyclists as well as vehicles trying to leave Colliergate and the whole Fossgate junction becomes a risky challenge. Cyclists are an added danger as they are regularly seen going against the traffic down Fossgate.</p> <p>I honestly feel that since the change businesses have suffered. Now when I visit Fossgate, the majority of the street is filled with cafes, restaurants and pubs. Many of the unique shops have now gone, to be replaced with yet more cafes. I feel there is very little point visiting Fossgate now throughout the day, and at night I am quite nervous as there are a lot of people who have consumed alcohol shouting and making a lot of noise which can be intimidating. I know people live on Fossgate so I can only imagine what it must be like for them.</p> <p>In regards to pedestrianising the street, I am concerned the street will lose more of the few business left that are not cafes or pubs. We have property on Fossgate with a private car park, yet when the street party's are on we cannot get access. The few times I personally have tried,</p>

	<p>those claiming to be in charge have been rude and made it an unpleasant experience to go to our own personal property. This is not ok. I also know that these street parties regularly use my father's property, without permission, meaning frequently residents of the properties with the right to access cannot gain entrance to their homes, or our private car park. Furthermore, the mess left following these events is left strewn across our property, which we then have to clear up. There have been reportings of rats, presumably feasting on the left over food and garbage for which we now have to pay pest control to monitor. This should not be our responsibility or expense. I also worry that a lot of people with limited mobility will suffer greatly as many use taxis to get as close as possible to where they need to be.</p> <p>Another major concern regarding the proposals is the use of the removable bollards. For those, such as my father, who have businesses or residential properties on the street, how will they be able to get to/from their homes or businesses, how will customers of the business (many of whom are disabled and arrive by car), be able to get back out of Fossgate when the bollards are installed. Will all residents and those needing access be given access rights?</p> <p>I have concerns about making more room for outdoor seating, people who use wheelchairs, walking aids, guide dogs, push chairs etc currently struggle as tables are taking up so much room, I think it is unfair to allow more space for certain traders. I also know my father is unable to attend the street meetings as they are set for the middle of the day, which again is unfair for those who cannot walk out of their shops or businesses.</p> <p>Ultimately, I hope this does not happen as it is already hard enough to own a small business, because of the increasing cost of business rates and additional charges now being levied on the small independent trader. I fear it will become impossible to keep trading. My father has run his business on Fossgate for over forty years and I know it would be devastating for him to have to close. I have heard a lot of people voicing complaints but were either unaware, or, as in our case, found we could not gain access to the website advertised on the street itself due to it being a closed site and public access is not allowed. Obviously I cannot speak for all, but for the tenants of my father's property, they have not been informed on the changes and have not had an opportunity to voice their opinions.</p> <p>I hope this will raise some concerns that may not have been thought of and also I hope you will be able to reassure me, and answer the questions regarding use of the proposed bollards.</p>
<p>York Environment Forum</p>	<p>I have been tasked with giving the feedback from York Environment Forum about the proposed developments on Fossgate.</p> <p>Not necessarily in order of importance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivery lorries. Officers seem reluctant to have a size limit that is below 7.5 tonnes. If there was a lower limit it would be more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, easier for other vehicles to get past if needed, as well as would be less pollution. This fits in with the idea for having drop off points or transfer stations from large to smaller lorries. It may be the right time to revive this idea, which would fit in with the extra security measures for the city centre. 2. Cycle racks and signage - more cycle racks and preferably instead of car parking spaces. Our Chair pointed out that "cars are GUESTS" in the city centre and should not be given the assumption of access anywhere. We wish to see a steady progression to giving the streets back to cyclists and pedestrians. Signage needs to be multilingual and could be visual instead of verbal. Both on the street and at eye - level. 3. We would like to see an analysis of the consultation itself, how the plans have come about, how the consultation is presented and worded. And some more statistics from consultations with the blind, partially sighted and disabled members of our community. The current arrangement

	<p>of pavement and curbs cannot be considered to be acceptable nor safe. A level surface with tactile delineation to show where the centre of the street starts would be preferable.</p> <p>4. The crossing at the Pavement into Whip-Ma-Whop-Ma-Gate / Colliergate needs to be reconsidered. Removing the raised area which slows traffic would not be necessary if people are to be considered most likely to want to cross at that point. Or at the other corner of the junction of Fossgate and Pavement. The extra spending on this part may be diverted back into Fossgate itself and be used for further improvements there instead.</p> <p>In Summary - we would prefer to see full pedestrianisation of the portion of Fossgate from Pavement to Franklin's Yard, with a two-way portion at the Walmgate bridge end, to allow access to Merchant Adventurers, the entrance and exit from Franklin's Yard (thus avoiding the need for cars / vans to travel all the way up Fossgate to get out) and the flats at that end of the street.</p> <p>We would like to see more tree and flower bed planting along the street. As well as seating being provided during the daytime all along the street and not just in selected bays while cars are parked (often with engines running) nearby.</p> <p>We hope to see a revised plan soon that has taken into account the comments given in during this very brief consultation.</p>
<p>Respondent H</p>	<p>Thanks for the questionnaire regarding improvement planned for Fossgate. I am sorry to say I find the questions farcical. Who would <u>not</u> want to improve the area where they live? However, it is not clear exactly what you have in mind. For whom is the improvement intended. The restaurants or the residents? There are some residents who need to sleep during the daytime, due to their working hours.</p> <p>Since the reversal of the traffic flow, the coffee shops have all blocked parts of pavement outside their businesses with chairs and tables, making it difficult for wheelchair bound and blind people to navigate their way.</p> <p>For permanent residents, the Sunday festivals have turned out to be a total nightmare. It would be tolerable but for the musical "entertainment" with amplifiers. Not to mention the alcohol induced sing-along later in the afternoon. I have no doubt it is fun for visitors, who can leave the street after an hour or so, but for residents it is anything but.</p> <p>The August festival was so much worse this year, partly due to the weather, and the fact that there were other things going on throughout York. The 10K for instance. The bus and some train cancellations made it almost impossible to escape. I am far from the only resident who dread the 2019 festival Sundays, especially the way they have escalated.</p> <p>Can something be done about the music? That would be a welcome relief, and make it possible - once again - to enjoy living in Fossgate.</p>
<p>Respondent J</p>	<p>Further to our conversation from earlier today (Wednesday 3 October 2018) in Ambiente Tapas, here is the link to the strategy that refers to cycles as mobility aids. Inclusive Transport Strategy.</p> <p>4.26 Local authorities are responsible for the design of their streets. It is for them to ensure any pedestrian environment scheme, including a</p>

	<p>shared space, is inclusive and that they meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>4.28 This Strategy should help ensure that disabled people are able to move around freely through the pedestrian environment, and use it to access other modes of transport. If using a cycle, whether as a mobility aid or not, they will be able to use inclusive cycle infrastructure to support their journey</p> <p>Cycling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Local Transport Note 2/08, which sets out the Department’s guidance to local authorities on designing safe and inclusive infrastructure for cyclists, to take account of developments in cycling infrastructure since its publication in 2008 and the responses to the draft AAP consultation and publish a revised version by early 2019; • By 2020, explore the feasibility of amending legislation to recognise the use of cycles as a mobility aid* in order to increase the number of disabled people cycling. <p>* A mobility aid is usually a device or piece of equipment that enables disabled people to get about such as a wheelchair or mobility scooter. Cycles are not legally identified as a mobility aid, or ‘invalid carriage’. As they are not permitted on footways or in pedestrianised areas, unlike wheelchairs and mobility scooters, disabled cyclists can be asked by the police to dismount and walk their cycle on the footway, in a pedestrianised area or in a ‘cyclists dismount’ zone.</p>
<p>Walkcyclelife Forum</p>	<p>Reflecting on the meeting yesterday and a few comments if I may. Grab a cuppa – it’s a longish email ☐</p> <p>1. Fossgate needs to be seen as a place, as a public space, and pedestrianised</p> <p>The comment was made yesterday- “<i>Fossgate is a Public Highway</i>”. Fossgate is in fact a street. The guidance in the government’s Manual for Streets is relevant here and gives LAs a clear steer to treat streets as places, as public spaces and put a people-friendly environment and pedestrians first.</p> <p>Some key Manual for Streets principles that are relevant and underlined some of my comments yesterday are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>applying a user hierarchy to the design process with pedestrians at the top;</i> ○ <i>emphasising a collaborative approach to the delivery of streets;</i> ○ <i>recognising the importance of the community function of streets as spaces for social interaction;</i> ○ <i>promoting an inclusive environment that recognises the needs of people of all ages and abilities;</i> ○ <i>reflecting and supporting pedestrian desire lines in networks and detailed designs</i> <p>In Fossgate’s case, the best and, in my and many others’ view, the only way to improve Fossgate for people is to limit vehicle access to the</p>

street by pedestrianisation and make it as attractive and as people-friendly a public space as possible. The current proposal retains vehicle access and so does not do this. This is why it is meeting so many objections from the community, who want Fossgate to be a place - not a highway - where people visit, enjoy moving through, meet others, linger and enjoy its attractions, without the public health, safety risks and intrusion of motorised traffic.

As well as in the Manual for Streets, policy backing for pedestrianisation, pedestrianisation and better placemaking can be found [York LTP3](#) where “*enhancing public streets and spaces to improve the quality of life, minimise the impact of motorised traffic and encourage economic, social and cultural activity*” is a key aim and the 2011 JMP city centre report on accessibility and movement referred to yesterday. There is also the excellent [Healthy Streets policy and principles](#), adopted by TfL. A Healthy Streets advisor from London will be at the next Walk Cycle Forum on 19 November, and hopefully comment on Fossgate and other York streets, which I hope some of you can attend.

I still wasn't totally clear why you were unable to include pedestrianisation on a Footsteets basis for Fossgate in the current proposal. Could you set out your reasons in full in writing? It would also be helpful to have a description of a potential process for pedestrianisation and likely timescale as discussed, for now and the future.

2. The community needs to be better engaged and consulted in street development proposals

The comment was made yesterday “It is only your view that this is not an adequate consultation”. This is not the case.

There is plenty of information online about good practice in community consultation in street design, such as community-led street design from Sustrans, and the internationally renowned placemaking movement and people first initiatives by Project for Public Spaces and Gehl architects – links below:

<https://www.sustrans.org.uk/our-services/our-expertise/community-led-design>

<https://www.pps.org/category/placemaking>

<https://gehlpeople.com/services/public-space-street-design/>

In this case, it would have made such a difference here if the community had been given an opportunity to have input into the design process and proposals at an early stage and a simple observation of public life survey had been carried out. Both would have cried out (as many have said to me) – “pedestrianisation – of course!”

Also, you may not be aware that ITY have a commitment under the Access Fund to develop a project around community consultation and trials of community street design across the city. DMCC and I developed a brief for this and it is currently with AB in the form of a RfQ which I very

	<p>much hope will go out to tender this year. This will help with the resources to assist CYC to better explore community collaboration, consultation and street design in the future.</p> <p>In conclusion, I feel Fossgate pedestrianisation could be the start of a real opportunity, a movement for us to start to work better as a city, CYC and community together, in improving our streets, public spaces, our shared physical environment and the quality of life of every one who lives, works, and visits here.</p> <p>Frankly, people in our city are brutalised by the noise, pollution and visual intrusion from the amount of traffic that has been allowed to invade the public spaces of the city. It is the main barrier to increased walking and cycling. It would be an act of deep compassion to start to develop a bold and humane strategy in city wide place-making that reduces traffic, puts people first and creates more, attractive, traffic-free public streets and spaces. This strategy would be supported by many CYC policies - clean air, OPY, LTP3, anti-terrorism, public health etc. And there is of course a wider, increasing urgent, imperative to reduce transport emissions from motorised vehicles that are contributing to destructive climate change.</p>
<p>Councillor D'Agorne</p>	<p>One point to note is that the consultation statement rather seems to imply that the recent DfT guidance on “shared space” is specifically about pedestrians sharing with cyclists, when it is actually about townscape projects where kerbs are absent between vehicle and pedestrian space:</p> <p>“A shared space between pedestrians and cyclists has been considered for Fossgate. However, there are mixed views on this type of environment, in particular by groups representing visually impaired people. This concern is related to excluding anyone who finds it difficult to navigate areas with level surfaces, where the distinction between pavement and road is removed. The Department for Transport has asked councils to pause the introduction of any new ‘shared space’ schemes”.</p> <p>I also wonder why this consultation has ignored entirely my suggestion that the Foss Bridge end of the street could be made two way, thus avoiding residents from the flats and delivery vehicles to exit the street without having to drive all the way up to Stonebow? This would at least reduce to a minimum the inconvenience for cyclists who wish to use it in a contraflow direction, from Franklins Yard.</p> <p>I've no doubt there will also be comments about the token build outs that are not where they are needed most (e.g. outside the blue bell) and all on the same side of the road, encouraging higher traffic speeds, and contraflow cycling down hill.</p>
<p>Councillor Flinders</p>	<p>Please could you confirm why local councillors have not been consulted on the revised plans before the start of the public consultation?</p> <p>Please could you also confirm what consultation you did with the Walmgate Community Association?</p> <p>I did respond to your original email, on 11 July 2018, expressing support in principle for these proposals, although as the site meeting was held during working hours I was unable to attend.</p> <p>My concern is that no face-to-face consultation has been held with councillors, except for a site visit held during working hours and that no</p>

	attempt has been made to arrange any other meeting.
Councillor Craghill,	<p>This scheme as it stands is a small improvement on what we have now but is a hugely missed opportunity on a number of counts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street is crying out to be a fully pedestrianised part of the footstreets. This proposal fails to do this. • Traffic, including deliveries, will still be allowed in the street during the main shopping hours and the layout of the street with raised pavements and a central carriageway still prioritises motor vehicles over pedestrians in the street. • The scheme fails to do anything about the extremely narrow pavements at the Pavement end of the street (outside the Nepalese restaurant, Connolly's and Alterations Express. And outside part of Sutlers and the Bluebell on the other side). The widening of the pavements near the junction itself is very limited in terms of improving accessibility. The bollards on the Connolly's side of the street need to remain in place to protect the overhanging buildings from large vehicles but access around them for pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties can't be improved unless there is a level surface across this part of the street. • The lack of a level surface across the top part of the street (from Pavement down to Franklin's Yard) means that improvements for the cafes in the street in terms of the capacity to put out tables and promote a street café environment are limited. It seems that the narrowing between the Hairy Fig and the Fossagate Social is intended to allow some street tables whilst maintaining a reasonable pavement width for accessibility – and this is an improvement on the current situation. However, as far as I can see this will still be a very limited space and will still see customers sitting right next to passing vehicles and inhaling their exhaust fumes. <p>I have asked but I am still not clear about the reasons for not having a level surface from the junction with Pavement down to Franklin's Yard.</p> <p>I would like clear separate answers regarding i) funding availability, ii) issues with a recent Government moratorium on 'shared space' and related to that iii) difficulties presented by level surfaces for people who are blind or partially sighted.</p> <p>In relation to funding issues, I have had no clear answer as to whether or not there is sufficient funding to make the street a level surface between Pavement and Franklin's Yard? I can't help getting the impression that the funding could be sufficient to make this stretch level as some of the work providing build outs wouldn't be necessary?</p> <p>In relation to the moratorium requested by the Government on new shared spaces I am still unclear as to whether officers have asked the Department of Transport for clarification on how long this will last before new guidelines are published and if they can provide further clarification as to what they regard as 'shared space' in the meantime.</p> <p>In respect to the concerns of blind and partially sighted people I naturally believe this is a very important consideration. But I would like to see what options have been considered in terms of delineating level surfacing and 'safe spaces' in ways that do not have to involve kerbs and varying levels, which must in themselves be challenging for some blind and partially sighted people.</p> <p>I have also asked and had no clear answer as to why the option of pedestrianisation (i.e. bringing Fossagate into the footstreets as proposed many times in the past) wasn't considered as part of this consultation?</p> <p>My preferred option would be pedestrianisation of the street during footstreets hours between Pavement and just before Franklin's Yard and a</p>

level surface along this same stretch.

With a level surface and pedestrianisation there would no question of shared space during the footstreets hours as vehicles would not be admitted. There would be shared space outside the footstreets hours but at much less busy times of day. In this option, there would be a need for clarification from the Department of Transport regarding its current advice to local authorities and close working with blind and partially sighted groups on how to delineate the space.

If **only** this stretch of the street were pedestrianised it would provide the pleasant pedestrian priority environment that is being sought and prevent any through traffic during the day, but also allow for two-way traffic between Franklin's Yard and Walmgate. The latter would maintain access to the parking bays at that end of the street, allow vehicle movements in and out of Franklin's Yard, in and out of Fossgate House and in and out of the close vicinity of the Merchant Adventurer's Hall entrance. The Green Group has suggested this option a number of times, but it appears not to have been considered so far.

A further option that doesn't seem to have been considered would be pedestrianisation but without the level surface. In this case there would no shared space so this would not be an issue. This would, in my view be a less satisfactory solution but would be an improvement on the current proposals.

If the area to be pedestrianised were as suggested (between Pavement and Franklin's Yard) it would be a question of adding a TRO or TROs to a version of the current proposals. It may need one TRO to implement the pedestrianisation and one TRO to reinstate two way traffic between Franklin's Yard and Walmgate. It would also need further consideration of the proposed build outs at the southern end of Fossgate.

There seems to be a conviction amongst officers that vehicle access is needed by a small number of residents and traders during footstreets hours. I would like to see far more evidence of how many residents and how many traders hold this view, what exactly these access needs are, whether they could be met in other ways and to what extent limiting the pedestrianisation to the stretch between Pavement and Franklin's Yard would allay concerns.

Limiting the length of the pedestrianisation could potentially tackle some specific problems whilst the prevention of through traffic would bring benefits to the whole street, not only the pedestrianised section.

I would also like to see clear numbers in the report indicating the views of street residents, street traders and the wider community in the surrounding area and York as a whole, who value Fossgate as part of our shared city centre.

It seems that many reasons are being found as to why we cannot properly pedestrianise this street, rather than focussing on the transport hierarchy which puts pedestrians and people with disabilities at the top and grasping the opportunity to give this vibrant little street the environment it is crying out for – fully pedestrianised with street cafes, planters, seats and maybe some trees.

Other concerns

As mentioned above I also have some concerns about the proposals for Pavement at the junction with Fossgate. Speed tables that currently slow down buses and any other traffic on Pavement are being removed, which means traffic could be faster – not prioritising pedestrians. At the

same time, pedestrians are visually directed towards informal 'crossings' at the same locations as the previous speed tables – far away from the natural place for pedestrians to cross into Fossgate. A large proportion of pedestrians going (or likely to go) down Fossgate are surely coming from Colliergate and the natural line for them to take is straight across – and yet there is no facility provided for this – simply a resurfaced highway. This doesn't seem like a good use of this money. A layout which actively encourages pedestrians to cross from Colliergate into Fossgate would be more appropriate. The proposed layout is presumably a consequence of the lack of pedestrianisation and the prioritisation of vehicle traffic still turning out of Fossgate into the flow of pedestrians.

The junction with Walmgate. If the street is to be pedestrianised, say as far as Franklin's Yard, there may well be a need for two way traffic (as above) between the junction with Walmgate and Franklins's Yard giving access to Franklin's Yard itself, to the back of the Merchant Adventurer's Hall and to the flats by Foss Bridge. The entrance treatment proposed would then need to be altered again to provide for two-way vehicle flow. Whilst I appreciate that the proposed build outs do offer a gateway treatment, with the option to provide better signage, this is again something of a 'halfway house' solution. I do also wonder if the buildout near the bus stop will allow buses that currently turn right into Walmgate to tackle that corner? Have the bus companies been consulted?