A19 (PHASE 2), CROCKEY HILL: PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS

Number of respondents: **127**

Addresses of respondents: 61 Not stated; 17 Wheldrake; 12 Crockey Hill; 11 Selby; 8 Escrick; 4 Riccall; 3 Fulford; 2 Deighton; 2 Goole; 2 Howden; 1 York; 1 Acomb; 1 Askham Bryan; 1 Bubwith; 1 North Duffield

Comments concerning:	No. of comments	Addresses (if known)			Response
Concerns over merge / merge won't work	28	Not stated 15 Wheldrake 6	Selby 3 Riccall 2	Howden 1 Askham Bryan 1	Merge arrangements are widely used throughout the UK and specifically in York have been successfully used on the A1237 Outer Ring Road. The additional lane southbound through the junction is required for the desired capacity improvement and due to available highway width and utility positions can not continue further south than the current proposed design.
Existing traffic signals at Crockey Hill are at fault (Whldr Ln triggered unnecessarily etc)	27	Not stated 13 Riccall 3 Wheldrake 2	Escrick 2 Selby 2 Deighton 2	Crockey Hill 1 Bubwith 1 Howden 1	The existing traffic signals operate under a MOVA system whereby the A19 is prioritised over Wheldrake Ln. However once a certain queue length develops at WL, that phase is triggered. It is recognised that the induction loops on WL can on occasion be overrun from vehicles turning from A19. The new signals are proposed to have above-ground detection to correct this.
Replace signals with a roundabout	27	Not stated 12 York 2 Escrick 2 Selby 2	Deighton 2 Goole 2 Crockey Hill 1 Wheldrake 1	Acomb 1 Fulford 1 North Duffield 1	The size and geometry (i.e. entry and exit flares) of a potential roundabout means that it would be far too large than the available adopted highway would allow. Significant land purchase would also be required to facilitate this option. Furthermore a roundabout would not be appropriate for such a major/minor road junction.
Welcomes the proposals	20	Not stated 6 Crockey Hill 4 Wheldrake 4	Escrick 1 Deighton 1 Selby 1	Howden 1 Fulford 1	Noted.
Agrees that congestion needs addressing	20	Not stated 10 Selby 3 Wheldrake 2	Crockey Hill 1 Riccall 1 Goole 1	Howden 1 Acomb 1	Noted. This scheme is designed to address some of the congestion currently experienced southbound on the A19 and at the A64/A19 Fulford Interchange.

Problem is at Fulford Interchange, not here	18	Not stated 6 Wheldrake 4 Escrick 2	Selby 2 Crockey Hill 1 Deighton 1	Fulford 1 Riccall 1	Observations and modelling of the existing network here have shown that although Fulford Interchange congestion is a symptom of the problem, it is not the root cause. The seeding point for the queues has been identified as at Crockey Hill. We are working with Highways England to address other issues experienced at the Interchange.
Concerns over removal of trees	16	Not stated 9 Wheldrake 4	Crockey Hill 1 Acomb 1	Fulford 1	The proposed alignment of the design has been adjusted to save the 6 mature oak trees which were identified by the ecological consultant as being of high value. Other self-established sycamore trees are deemed to have little value and would be replaced by a compensatory planting scheme of an appropriate nature. Also it is likely that trees and shrubs at the very back of the highway boundary would not need to be felled, retaining some degree of screening.
Too expensive – money should be used elsewhere	14	Not stated 6 Wheldrake 4	Selby 3	Bubwith 1	Funding for this scheme originates from the DfT's Local Pinch Point grant which can only be spent on transport congestion related schemes on the A19 to the south of the city.
Will make no difference / waste of money	13	Not stated 8 Wheldrake 2	Selby 2	Crockey Hill 1	Modelling shows that there will be a marked improvement in capacity at Crockey Hill, leading to less exit-blocking at Fulford Interchange.
Speeding & overtaking concerns	12	Not stated 5 Crockey Hill 2	Wheldrake 2 Deighton 1	Selby 1 Howden 1	Two southbound lanes gives the opportunity for drivers to choose which lane to use if travelling straight ahead and potentially overtake slow moving vehicles (i.e. tractors) more safely. The speed limit would remain at 40mph.
Lack of cycle & pedestrian facilities	10	Not stated 6	Crockey Hill 3	Wheldrake 1	An option has been drafted which includes a new shared-use footpath between the highway junction and the Minster Vetinary Practice to the north of Crockey Hill. This would be to the back of the western verge and be for pedestrians and cyclists. However this option is inevitably more expensive than a scheme without an additional path.
Should have a Left-Turn lane and an Ahead-Only lane (i.e. no merge)	10	Not stated 6 Wheldrake 2	Riccall 1	Askham Bryan 1	Such a scheme would not result in the required increase in capacity. This option was initially modelled and showed that there was no capacity benefit.
No issue / existing junction works fine	10	Not stated 6	Wheldrake 3	Selby 1	Evidence shows otherwise.

Disruption / roadworks during construction	10	Selby 4 Crockey Hill 2	Wheldrake 2	Not stated 2	Inevitably with any major highway scheme there will be some degree of disruption, although these will be scheduled to keep disruption to a minimum (i.e. off-peak working where possible).
Concerns re: Access to properties / safety while waiting to turn off the A19	9	Crockey Hill 5	Wheldrake 2	Not stated 2	For Deighton Grove Lane (3 properties), a 2 metre wide hatched area will be present within the centre of the carriageway for vehicles waiting to turn right into the lane. This area is afforded some protection being in the shadow of a new wider pedestrian island. The layout by the entrance to Deighton Grove (6 properties) is unchanged from the existing layout and unlike Deighton Grove Lane, it is not wide enough to incorporate a designated area / hatching for turning vehicles.
Safety & collision concerns during merge	9	Not stated 5 Wheldrake 2	Selby 1	Howden 1	See previous response re: merges.
Remove existing signals & return to uncontrolled T-junction	7	Not stated 3	Selby 3	Crockey Hill 1	The 10 years pre-signalisation of this junction recorded 31 road traffic accidents, 2 of them serious. The 10 years post-signalisation has only recorded 4 slight RTAs. It is clear that the signalised junction offers greatly improved safety at this location.
Pedestrian refuge concerns	6	Not stated 4	Crockey Hill 1	Howden 1	The pedestrian refuge is to be widened to 2.0 metres, but due to configuration of the junction can not be relocated. Although crossing 2 lanes of traffic now instead of 1, there will continue to be suitable gaps in the traffic from the nearby signals at Wheldrake Ln.
Germany Beck comments	6	Not stated 4	Wheldrake 1	Fulford 1	Noted, although unrelated directly to this scheme.
Tractors causing slow moving queues	5	Not stated 3	Wheldrake 1	Selby 1	See previous response re: speeding / overtaking.
Harder to egress as more free-flow	5	Escrick 2 Crockey Hill 1	Wheldrake 1	Not stated 1	Although southbound capacity of the junction will increase, it is not anticipated that there will be any more significant *free-flow*. Traffic conditions south of the junction are likely to normalise quickly following the merge.
Change signal timings - Fulford Interchange	4	Not stated 2	Riccall 1	Howden 1	See para 27 of report.
Slow drivers cause queues to bunch up	3	Wheldrake 1	Howden 1	Not stated 1	See previous response re: speeding / overtaking.
Extend the dualling further south	3	Wheldrake 2	Not stated 1		Due to available highway width and utility positions, we can not continue the dualling any further south than the current proposed design.

General suggestions re: improving flow / reducing traffic (P&R; businesses; etc)	3	Acomb 1 Goole 1 Not stated 1	Noted.
Prevent double-parking in Fulford	3	Not stated 2 Wheldrake 1	Noted and referred to the appropriate team.
Phase 1 works (northbound) were a success	2	Riccall 1 Howden 1	Noted.
Good idea using roadside boards to consult	2	Wheldrake 1 Selby 1	Noted.
Why no improvement for inbound traffic?	2	Wheldrake 1 Not stated 1	Little can be proposed at this junction to improve inbound capacity. With the resultant exit blocking at Fulford Interchange, it was agreed that improving outbound capacity would be prioritised.
Existing speeding concerns in Crockey Hill	1	Crockey Hill 1	See previous response re: speeding / overtaking.
Reduce intergreen by moving signals closer	1	Howden 1	The proposed stop lines and signal positions are as close to the junction as swept-path analysis allows.
Concerns over proposed new signal timings	1	Howden 1	The signals will be upgraded, utilising above ground detection. Thus they will be more reactive and adaptive to peak-time traffic conditions.