

Background Document

Comments sent in by e-mail in full

Comments
<p>REF 1</p> <p>I've just received the new road layout around the Groves through the post. We live on Brownlow Street and one of us needs to commute to Clifton Moor on a daily basis and the other person to Layerthorpe. Looking at the new proposal I can't work out how to park a car on Brownlow Street and drive towards Clifton moor? Lord Mayor's walk is already static with traffic with 3 traffic light systems for most of the afternoon so surely this is not the route suggested? Also, what is the suggestion for emergency ambulance route to Brownlow street from the hospital? I'm also not sure what the HGV delivery route would be for Brownlow street as access around the corner of Park Grove and Brownlow would be impossible.</p>
<p>REF 2</p> <p>Thank you for discussing the ideas of the traffic alterations at the school last night. I, having a child at the school I am in favor of the reduction of traffic past the playing fields and the aim to reduce the use of the groves as a cut-through from Haxby road to Huntington road. Please appreciate I'm a design director for a major multinational in industrial production for over 20 years so not some disgruntled resident, but I wish this to work for the concept of reduction in pollution and safety but with the aim of the long term solution that works for all.</p> <p>As a resident on Brownlow street who needs to access the direction of Clifton moor and Foss islands on a daily basis obviously have concerns as this proposed scheme will cut the groves in half for the residents. It's a lottery which side of the barrier you live and which way you need to commute.</p> <p>I've studied the proposals in detail, the assessment of the traffic observation report and the possible impacts. In the traffic assessments that were published online, it did state that the closures would allow for a percentage of non-compliance (around 10%). If the physical concrete barriers were replaced by no entry signs then this would reduce the traffic through the groves by 80-90% which is the aim. It would also be considerate for those few individuals who are the unfortunate ones who live at the point of the barriers. This would allow for those few to not be enormously disrupted and punished for the sake of the scheme.</p> <p>Please imagine if someone decided to put a concrete barrier at the end of your drive for 6-18 months if that was your route to work which with children and the pressures of modern life is already a stretch (others with disabilities perhaps). Also, I have to pay £370 to park our cars outside our own house (the nearest parking space is currently 50m away and often 200m s already too few spaces) with children and shopping, etc. the scheme proposes to reduce the spaces by at least 30% in my area and put a physical barrier between the 2 areas where I currently park.</p> <p>I just ask that whatever barrier is put in place (which I agree with the intention) please allows for the immediate residents at the barrier locations.</p> <p>So, please have the barriers in the current locations but as <u>no entry signs not concrete bollards to allow for permit holders</u> to commute to either Clifton moor or Layerthorpe through the imposed restriction. I believe this would achieve the overall goal of cutting through whilst bringing the residents with you!!</p>

Separately, there are 2 other points.

1) All HGV access to Brownlow street delivery would need to now come down Parkgrove and down Brownlow street where the physical dimensional gap is not possible to get an HGV through. Question: what is the proposal for HGV access to Dudley Street?

2) Same as above but for Fire engines and emergency access. (A badly parked van or skip could create non-access)

3) the scheme stated the need to eliminate the groves being cut in half by a stream of traffic but the solution seems to be a physical barrier by concrete bollards.

I know you suggest it's impractical to respond to individual details but (coming from a multinational commercial world where there is no hiding) sorry :) that seems to be a civil service approach to the issue. Unfortunately in commercial business and in matters that affect people's lively hoods and that's not the realistic luxury of language. I'd like to talk further on the matter in person so please let me know when would be best to meet. I presume you're based at the council office and would love to work through a solution that is considerate for the residents who are affected in a positive proactive way.

Many thanks and look forward to speaking soon. Honestly, in a civilized proactive approach. :)

I know the task you've been task is impossible as there are too many people to please!!

REF 3

I have just received the post today detailing the plans for road closure.

I have to say that I am disappointed and unhappy. As a resident on Lowther Street these plans cut off access to the on street parking from Lowther Street and will require a detour through even more built up areas which the plan is supposed to prevent.

Not only that but the plans are supposed to cut down on air pollution and number of vehicles yet the plans suggest that even more traffic will be filtering through streets that never saw it and will increase air pollution by lengthening time in cars by going down narrow streets.

In summary closure on Lowther will increase Traffic going down longer routes via Eldon St to get through Brownlow back to Lowther leading to: Increased air pollution, more traffic, more noise down quiet streets.

A proposed solution to the problems in my eyes and I'm sure others would agree would be to put a zebra crossing near the spar shop at Lowther and another near the school further down the road.

REF 4

I park opposite my home on Penley's Grove Street (outside the side of Helmsley House) and wonder how/if I'll be able to drive down that piece of one-way street to do so during the trial.

Will Lowther St and Penley's Grove Street /Townend St stop being one way?

REF 5

I have seen one off paper regarding closing Lowther street York I think this is a very very bad idea by closing Lowther st

1-it's going to be big traffic from the hospital towards Central which there is already traffic now

2-going to affect peoples life because going to be big traffic from Wigginton Road For all them people live in Clifton more

3-effect on them shop on Lowther st We are from xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx All our customers are coming by cars from other place in your By doing that we absolutely get bankrupt And I spoke to all other shop oner They are absolutely against this as well We all get a solicitor we take this case to the court We are absolutely against this decision And nobody spoke to us about this

REF 6

I have read your information leaflet about the impending road closures in The Groves and have the following comments to make:

Your stated aim is to improve air quality in The Groves by closing roads in this area to through traffic and diverting this traffic on to surrounding routes. This will unarguably increase traffic congestion on Haxby Road, Wigginton Road and Clarence Street; all of which are main arterial routes in and out of the city which already suffer traffic congestion due in no small part to previous schemes such as this: the closure

of Vyner Street, Fountayne Street and minor streets within The Groves are obvious examples. From my front door to the edge of Haxby Road is 15 feet. At times throughout the day Haxby Road often has standing traffic which can sometimes extend from the Haxby Rd/ Wigginton Rd junction back to Rose Street. At these times the air pollution outside my house is such that I can stand at my front door and 'taste' the traffic fumes.

I believe that City of York council have a duty of care to me and my neighbours not to exacerbate this situation. If indeed the effect of these road closures is to increase traffic congestion and air pollution on Haxby Road then surely CofYC will have demonstrated a blatant disregard for residents of these main road properties.

You describe the impending road closures as a trial i.e. an experiment. By definition, a trial or experiment must have criteria for success or failure otherwise it is not a trial. Only by comparing objective (measured) evidence before, during and after the trial period can you determine its success or failure against these criteria: unless you do this you will not know whether you have achieved or failed to meet your objectives. I have to assume you have already agreed all this beforehand and have a plan to measure the impact of this trial on traffic flow and air quality both within the Groves and on the surrounding arterial routes. Could I request, therefore, that you provide me with details of your criteria for success or failure and the precise monitoring methods you will use to measure against these criteria?

I am obviously particularly interested in how you will assess any increase in traffic congestion in Haxby Road, Wigginton Road and Clarence Street. Furthermore I would like you to quantify what level of increase in traffic congestion and air pollution on these roads you are prepared to accept before you declare the trial to be a failure.

REF 7

I refer to your leaflet regarding the work in the Groves Area.

Could you confirm that a computer model using current vehicle movements has been used to come to these conclusions?

As a resident of St John Street for over 30 years, I know that the vast majority of non-residential traffic through this street is east to west; ie from Penley Grove St to Lord Mayors Walk, in order to beat the Monkgate traffic lights.

Unless there is something else planned, Blocking Penley Grove Street, will only exacerbate this situation especially when all the other routes have been blocked (resulting in huge traffic jams in Monkgate), unless:

- a) the "Access Only" route is properly policed again (as it used to be) or,
- b). some form of residents-only access from St Johns Crescent to St John Street is also introduced (raising bollards).

There have been serious accidents in St John Street in the past from vehicles trying to beat the lights, resulting in one death. I am concerned that the plans if not thoroughly thought through may result in more danger to residents.

REF 8

I recently received a leaflet that outlined the Groves' Regeneration project which would start with some trial road closures.

I'd just like to say that I think this is a brilliant start to a much needed change in the area. We live on Emerald Street and frequently walk out with our young children in the area and would welcome the closures.

Whilst the closures are interesting, im more interested in the images on the front of the leaflet which shows an artist's impression of how the street could look. The back is also great with the example of Francis Road in Leyton. My question is after the 18 month trial how do you plan to evaluate the scheme and then if successful what would the permanent plan be? How the area would then welcome new shops, green spaces, outdoor seating and a community feel is the next thing that would be important. A Bisby Road equivalent would be brilliant.

Keep up the good work and make it happen!

REF 9

Sorry but not able to attend meeting on the 17th Feb.

We live down George Court Penley Grove and sometimes my husband has to bring his van home. Would he still be able to get around these roads. Is Penley still one way?

REF 10

Just received the information sheet.

I fully support these proposals. This is the sort of action that has to be taken! It's common sense for all the reasons you point out. Motor vehicles have degraded our community. The front cover of your leaflet depicting Lowther St with village character is inspiring and at present hard to imagine. I should add we have a car but try to cycle as much as possible. Curtailing traffic will further incentivise us and I'm sure others.

REF 11

I live on the Groves. I am a retail consultant.

This will kill the shops. Your illustration could not be further from reality. Very sad badly thought through. All the cars will sit for longer round the Groves adding to the poor air quality. Who has thought this up. I presume they have no evidence or experience in this field.

REF 12

I received the information leaflet through my door on the Groves Trial and I may not be able to make the meeting on Monday so I am emailing over thoughts as a resident on Fern Street. Whilst I am all for reducing traffic in the city centre, this email highlights my concerns as a resident of the Groves for 7 years now and buying a property in this location to access and egress easily to places of work, family, social life etc.

- I feel that we are being blocked in by losing the access along March Street between Penleys Grove and Lowther Street and Townend Street - a route we use frequently to get access on to Huntington Road/Wigginton Road to get out towards the ring road and not having to drive through the city centre.
- Having to egress right on to Lord Mayors Walk from St John Street is difficult already due to the sheer volume of traffic and the queues back from Gillygate blocking this road. I frequently see drivers not willing to wait in the left queue and overtaking to be able to get in the right hand lane at this junction, it is already dangerous with them driving towards oncoming cars but now I would be pulling out into this as well.
- Closing the junction at Penley Grove Street will send more traffic down St John Street
- We have many delivery drivers who aren't willing/able to get up and down St Johns Street to access our streets due to the narrow road. We always advise deliveries to enter/exit via Penleys Grove Street.
- I believe it would add at least a further 20 minutes during busier periods (which isn't always rush hour) to exit left from St John Street via Lord Mayors walk to the traffic lights to turn left back towards Lowther Street which is an easy exit point for us to reach Huntington Road direction.
- The junction at the top of St Johns Street and High Newbiggan Street it is difficult to exit with cars queuing blocking the road into the car park/in front of St John Street/Lord Mayors Walk.
- At the access point on to St John Street from Lord Mayors Walk it already states this a resident access only which I am sure is ignored and it the reason behind this project to stop people cutting through. Would it be possible to look at ways to police this with some form of reg plate system in place/fines like what happened on Lendal Bridge? That way only residents would be utilising these cut throughs to exit the Groves.

Thank you for taking the time to read these comments, I would be interested to know when the trial will be going ahead an any updates/discussions around this.

REF 13

I have heard about this for the past few months and numerous things still puzzle, which I will go into in more detail. Firstly I am unable to attend the meeting at Park Gove on 17th February 2020.

My name is xxxxxxxxxx and I live at xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, and looking at the proposals I will be affected, but I am unsure if it will be positive or negative. I do drive a car and also use my cycle. I do feel I am reasonable

responsible motorist, with this I mean using my car only for, which I believe are essential trips.

So my concerns are:-

- Parking, even though I have a garage I do park on the street/road and display my permit, however the trial would see my parking space options vastly reduced. For example, if I come home from Park Grove I get the option to park in my street or in Neville Terrace, but with this Neville Terrace would not be an option under the trial. Other points regarding parking if the trial goes ahead it is more and more difficult to get parked in the R25 area and I do feel too many permits are issued, cars are parked in back lanes and on areas that no restrictions exist, this does need addressing. The number of permits issued for multi-residents (students houses and the number of issued permits needs to be reviewed.

- Road closures :-

Any traffic coming from Markham Street/Eldon Street into Neville will have to turn around to get out

- Earl Street closure, this would see a vast reduction in “rat run” traffic and this I believe needs to be in place as soon as possible, but again people living in these streets would see their parking options reduced.
- The closure on Penlys Grove Street with St John Street does make sense, however to make a small section two way makes no sense what so ever, unless you plan on parking your car there or reside here, but Penlys Grove Street could become two way, because there would be no access from Monkgate to Clarence Street, and vice versa.
- The closure across Neville Terrace, just before Brownlow Street, which would mean ALL traffic coming up Park Grove would need to go along Brownlow Street, and then down to the bottom of Lowther Street, it would mean motorists going around in circles the same applies to motorists coming down Markham Street, down Eldon Street and then along Abbot St and up Penlys Groves Street
- The closure of Lowther Street/ Brownlow Street (and I know this sounds selfish would be great for me) but again motorists coming down Lowther Street would need to go down Abbot Street and Back onto Penlys Grove Street, again going around in circles. Unless (like me) you reside, and you need to go down Lowther Street, great for residents especially at peak times as traffic queues would no longer exist, well not in Lowther Streets junction with Huntington Road.

One way streets, proposal, which would make Brownlow Street one way, and this only makes sense if Park Grove Becomes one way, or at least from the Emerald Street. Making St John Street one way makes no sense whatsoever, as this would be used mainly by residents and to restrict access from Lord Mayors Walk would add to residents journeys.

To summarize

- In my view if this is to happen, ALL the proposals must happen, NOT just part of them
- Parking and parking permits needs to be more robust
- A review of the NO-ENTRY at the junction of Neville Terrace and Brownlow Street
- One way proposal of St John Street

REF 14

I just wonder if you could supply some information from the meeting that took place at Park Grove School on Monday 17th Feb 2020 regarding the traffic proposals street closures and one way systems that are going to be trialled in the Groves for the next 18 months.

REF 15

I live on Clarence Street and therefore I am going to be affected by the Groves trial, which based on your actions appears to be a fait de complit. The first I heard about this trial was on 14th February 2020 when a leaflet arrived. I would have liked to attend the meeting on Monday, but due to the short notice, I have been unable to arrange childcare. The lack of communication is truly appalling, especially as it is wholly deliberate. I 100% oppose this trial - all the benefits that the Groves may benefit from will be at my detriment. On Clarence Street, the number of vehicles will increase, the air quality will deteriorate, the speed of traffic will reduce and road safety will worsen. This will have a major impact on my life and I would like to register my opposition to it. Unfortunately, I have to do this anonymously due to my mental health problems.

I know this email will have zero impact as you have no interest in hearing opposing views.

REF 16

I hope you are not going to close Penley's Grove Street. It is a very popular road and many cars are using it. It is the best way to reach my home like for many people as well. I am 65 years old and I live in Del Pyke. Now I'm worrying how I am going to reach my home by car. I need a car to visit my daughter or to do shopping in a bigger shopping centre, etc. Next year I will need to go to her to look after my grandchild full day. I cannot afford to waste my time on buses since she is leaving her home at 7 am. Drivers are not enemies.

I am walking a lot; however, I still need to keep my car. I try to walk as much as I can; however, a car is necessary in the 21st century.

Speed is low in the Groves.

I think the Groves is too small for cycling. It is easy to reach everything on foot. Who needs to cycle? I saw a group of young boys cycling many times. I am scared of cyclists in our area. Their behaviour looks not good; once they prevented me to come into my house. My daughter sent email to a relevant person. Usually people are walking. To whom are you going to create a space for cycling? Walking conditions are very good; nobody needs to walk on the road. Cars are not rivals for pedestrians. It would be nice to see more police officers watching young cyclists in the evening.

Roads are not preventing from planting, seating and playing.

REF 17

I have two observations re the distributed pamphlet.

Since this is an 18 month trial, I assume no dedicated cycle lanes are to be painted.

The "Cafe culture" envisaged on the front is farcical, the vast majority of cyclists do not reduce speed when approaching pedestrians or possess audible devices, apart from the odd shouted profanity.

Therefore, without a physical separation much antagonism and possible accidents will ensue.

If the object of the scheme is to reduce congestion and improve air condition how is this to be achieved?

The one place you need better air quality is Park Groves school as more than 50% of parents drop off and pick up their children by car.

Blocking off the roads at Earl St. and Park Grove is only going to mean more U turns resulting in more congestion and more pollution!

REF 18

I live in Guildhall Ward but don't live in the Groves. I live off Gillygate, in Portland Street - but I know the Groves well. My three children attended Park Grove School from the age of 4-11. I was

a XXXXX at Park Grove for three years and subsequently XXXXXXX of the XXXXXX there for another eight. I quite understand the problems concerning vehicular traffic through the narrow and confined streets of the area, and especially the problems and conflicts it generates outside the school itself.

Over the years many traffic restriction measures have taken place in York to cut out 'through traffic'. Closing Muncastergate, Fountayne Street etc. have all added to the weight of traffic through the Groves. The plans to extend these restrictions to Penley's Grove Street and Lowther Street are the latest example.

I also think they are clueless.

Of course we all want to live in safe, calm, unpolluted neighbourhoods but the plans don't solve the problem: all that happens is that they move it somewhere else - and, in York, that somewhere else is where other people already live. A great Green vote winner for the Groves, but what about the rest of us here? Do any Guildhall Ward councillors actually live in Guildhall Ward?

Gillygate is already recorded as being one of, if not **the**, most polluted streets in the whole of Yorkshire - not something a council should be proud of. The new plans divert all eastbound traffic at The PunchBowl at the top of Clarence Street, down past York St. John's to the Gillygate junction and subsequently left along Lord Mayor's Walk. Gillygate already tails back with traffic turning into Lord Mayor's Walk.

North-westbound, one assumes Groves traffic will - what? - head up Huntington Road from the Brigadier Gerard, do a left at Yearsley Pool and head back in to the PunchBowl along Haxby Road? Or clog up New Earswick on the way to the A1237?

It's all very well closing streets, but what alternatives will you offer? There aren't buses or trains and as so many expensive cycle routes continue to be bereft of users, it's obvious people aren't going to suddenly get the bicycle clips out this time.

For over two years I have been writing to the City Council requesting 'no idling' signs to be put up in our small street - which daily hosts people eating, drinking, making phone calls, reading, woking online, sleeping etc - in their cars (on yellow lines or in residents' spaces) WITH THEIR ENGINES RUNNING. Why has **nothing** been done? At £20 a fine, there'd be at least £750 a week to be earned from a street 100m long.

So why do you find the inevitable increase the incidence of pollution the Groves Plan will bring to this area to be acceptable?

Please, do me a favour. There's a weather station in Gillygate. Please record pollution levels before the Groves Plan goes into operation, and measure it again in the months afterwards. **And publish the results.** If there's no change, I shall be the first to shout it from the rooftops. But if there is, drop the Groves Plan and come up with something else. And don't make things difficult by adopting the usual CoYC mantra of making council tax-paying residents apply for a FOI request.

The pollution in Gillygate is enough to make one retch some days. The Groves plan is very likely to increase it. Don't pollute where I live any further.

I would very much appreciate an acknowledgement of the points I raise in this reply. And some indication of what is to be done about the horrendous pollution in Gillygate.

You are proposing to move the problem in the Groves to a neighbouring area, in the same ward, which is already suffering from worse conditions. How on earth can this be acceptable?

REF 19

I apologise for not coming to the drop in event on Monday but I was in Glasgow. I hope an email still enables me to cover the nuances and detail of my issues/queries with the proposals.

1. Emergency service access. I assume they won't be allowed to breach the road closures and it strikes me that this could add precious time and delay their journeys to certain locations in the Groves.
2. From a more selfish point of view the idea of adding time to journeys will certainly apply to residents. To head towards Foss Island from Markham Street where I live will now take 5-10mins longer depending on the traffic and luck with the lights.
3. Linked to this, I think you're overestimating the ability of surrounding roads to deal with the increased traffic. Roads like Wiggington are going to get backed up even further as there is no release valve of going through the Groves so everyone will be going right from Wiggington past the Co-op.
4. I also think March Street is going to see a great deal more cars on it as people extricate themselves from places like Markham and Eldon street to get out towards Clarence street. March Street is very narrow and pot holed already. I can't see extra traffic being beneficial for it.
5. An 'up to 18 month' trial seems excessive. I sincerely hope they'll be flexibility to make changes earlier than that if things go badly
6. I am all for ideas to get cars off the road. Addressing climate change and pollution levels is our greatest challenge as a society going forward. However, this scheme is not actually about that. It's just redirecting cars, making other roads busier and creating issues elsewhere for others . I suspect a lot of this has been driven by a minority of residents in the area who involve themselves in meetings and associations, and who generally approach life by trying to push problems away from their doorstep, not caring who they impact elsewhere. In my opinion the traffic that cuts through th Groves is not excessive, and people do not drive fast. It's part and parcel of living near the centre. If you want a quiet, pedestrian existence move to a village.

All in all, I don't think it's a great plan.

REF 20

Following on from the consultation evening for the groves trial road closures, one area that I didn't put on my feedback form related to the success criteria for this trial.

I understand one of the main reasons for doing this trial is to reduce the pollution levels at Park Grove School. Could you please confirm what readings you have taken at the school and what will be deemed to be a successful reduction in levels there please. Could you also confirm that you have taken readings at St Wilfrid's and will be monitoring that site for any potential increases.

I'm not sure what traffic flow analysis has been completed, please could this information be shared, and furthermore could the success criteria be shared for what the change in traffic flows is looking to achieve.

Could you confirm what would have to happen to change or abort the trial at any stage once it's implemented. I appreciate it would be embarrassing to go back to what is already in place which would make that move difficult, so it would be excellent to understand from the outset what your expectations are and what will be done if these are not met.

REF 21

I have read your leaflet about the road closure and am broadly in favour. Here are my comments and suggestions:

1) **Remove the existing bollard between Neville Street and Neville Terrace.** The four new closure points will effectively prevent any motor vehicle from traversing the Groves area. The Neville Street/Terrace bollard is not necessary. It's removal (at no cost) will mean (the small amount of) local traffic in Neville Terrace, Markham Street and Eldon Street wishing to head north can exit to Haxby Road rather than being forced to exit south into Clarence Street and adding to congestion in that area. (Vehicles in Markham Street can currently exit to Haxby Road by performing a three point turn, but only if there is space and

their vehicle is small enough.)

2) **Sort out the horrible mess of signage and kerb at the bottom of Markham Street.** Please can you take this opportunity to fix the bent, distorted no entry signs - personally, it would make more sense to replace them with "*No motor vehicles except for access*" signs as are installed at the bottom of St John Street (See attached photos). I would also remove the pointless bicycle contraflow. I have lived in Markham Street over 25 years and cycle everyday, but can honestly say I have never used this contraflow or seen any other cyclist use it. It is invariably full of detritus including broken glass, as in the photo.

I have also never noticed any problem with vehicles entering from the bottom of the street. There is, however, a problem with large delivery vans and trucks driving down from the Haxby Road end, finding they don't have space to turn at the bottom and having to painstakingly reverse back up the street. A redesigned Markham Street/Eldon Street exit would help eliminate this.

3) **Allow two way cycling throughout the Groves area.** Bicycles are not cars. I can see no reason why bicycles should be forced to follow convoluted, inconvenient routes around the Groves (or York generally for that matter!) I recently spent several years living in Brussels, a city with a worse traffic problem than York. However, the no entry signs to ALL the one way streets included the words "*Except bicycles*" below them - even narrow streets - and it works! People riding bicycles need to respect pedestrians, but there is no reason why they can't safely share the space as they do around the Minster... and in the artists impression on the front of your leaflet! I hope it will encourage more deliveries/trades people to use bicycles too.

4) **Paving.** Assuming the trial is a success, and I hope it is, I would really like to see more paving rather than tarmac (e.g. as shown on your leaflet.) The Groves back alleys still have some wonderful double hexagon tiles, which give the area a distinct look (<http://yorkstories.co.uk/paving-part-2-down-the-alleys/>). Perhaps these could be used as inspiration for new paving to replace some of the tarmacked roads? I would also favour "build outs" and/or chicanes to calm traffic rather than speed bumps, which are an unsatisfactory solution for everyone.

I could go on, but this seems a good place to conclude. My final comment is not to forget that people also live on Clarence Street, Lord Mayor's Walk and Monkgate. A friend who lives on Wigginton Road near the hospital once told me that eliminating "rat runs" does nothing to help his quality of life (he was thinking of Vyner Street and Fountayne Street).

Please feel free to contact me should any of my points not be clear.

REF 22

I just wanted to register my unhappiness with the planned trial going ahead. I live in Diamond Street. There's a planned road closure on Earle Street. This cuts off direct access to Haxby Road. A drive that I make multiple times a day as I work on Clifton Moor and drive there and back twice a day.

I don't understand the point of this closure as the roads around here are very quiet. They aren't really used as a cut through by drivers. Have you done traffic monitoring and have some actual data to back up the necessity of this project? Have you polled all the residents or is this just the wish of a small handful of people?

I can't imagine many residents are going to be happy on either side of the divide now that their access is going to be cut in half, necessitating a five to ten minute detour for every single trip. If you're trying to reduce emissions, you are in fact increasing it.

I was unable to come to the meeting at the school on Monday, as I was working but I'm interested to know what say as residents we have in this and what opportunity we have to oppose it. Please let me know.

REF 23

I was unable to make it Monday night, but wanted to share my thoughts. I support trying to make the groves car free but am worried about it.

Lowther St and Penleys Grove St are used as a cut through between haxby Road and Huntington Rd as you are aware. The letter said that you think the roads around can support the added traffic but I'm not so sure. As it is during rush hour it takes ages to get down clarence st to go around Lord mayor's walk.

I live on Neville St and if I want to go right at the end of my street to go towards yearsley it is very hard to see with the cars parked there and is a dangerous turn. So I tend to go the back way using Eldon St and Amber St but you are also planning to shut that. I'm worried about the effect on haxby and Huntington Rd which are already busy.

I don't have solutions but I really don't think the alternate routes suggested can take the extra traffic.

REF 24

I no longer live in the groves having moved to Howden in September. However I remain a carer for a friend who lives on Dudley Mews.

Please could you advise which roads you are closing as your BUZZ article does not mention the names, as I need to know which way round to go to get to my friends address.

REF 25

We are very much in favour of the traffic calming proposals, however the current proposed location for the Penleys Grove Street blockage needs re-thinking.

X and X Penleys Grove Street are grade 2 listed properties and I think everyone would agree that it would be a complete tragedy to tarnish the look of these attractive houses with a concrete bollard outside. I think it would be much more sensible to move the bollard further down Penleys Grove Street (outside the higher numbered properties). This is not just because I don't want it outside my house, but purely because I don't want the listed buildings tarnished in any way.

I realise this may not have been considered originally but now that it has been flagged up I trust that you will agree.

REF 26

As a resident of St John Street i am writing to once more express my concerns and objections to this plan.

The communication strategy of the council in my view has been very poor with the initial meeting held to discuss this project with the community on a working day at 2pm. The meeting had low attendance and was not a fair representation of the community, it occurs to me the council planned the meeting at this time to drive their agenda and not that of ALL the residents you serve - why is this?

In addition my wife and i attended the drop in meeting held on the 17th Feb 20 to learn the plans for the trail. At this meeting we learnt the council intends to divert traffic up St Johns Crescent and St Johns Street. When your representative was asked a simple project planning question he was unable to confirm the following:

- The number of cars that use St Johns at present and the volume by which the numbers would increase, we were informed the council does not have this information!
- The number of households that would be forced to use St Johns Street as their exit route and therefore the impact on traffic volumes - we were informed the council do not have this information!
- Nor do the council know how this change will impact air pollution in the

street!

- Nor do the council know how this change may impact parking in the street!

Clearly you will not from my tone i am extremely disappointed and concerned by these plans and the total lack of an impact assessment conducted for St Johns Street and the impacted areas.

This is simple project planning!

In the GREEN LIGHT newspaper dated Feb 2020 an article from Councillor Denise Craghill makes it clear this trail is a done deal - Why is this when on the 17th we were informed the plan was still at the consultation stage ?

In addition Councillor Craghill states she wants no unintended consequences - what does this mean?

Clearly we have outlined the consequences of this plan for St Johns street - am i to assume the consequences are therefore intended?

The residents of St Johns Street have outlined they concerns at (1) The initial meeting (2) At the drop in meeting (3) By Email, still there is no response to our concerns from the council.

I would welcome you proposal to address our concerns and questions as this is causing my wife and i serve anxiety.

REF 27

I would like to thank the councillors and council officers for giving up their time to run the drop-in session on the proposed road closures in the Groves on Monday evening. I was very impressed with the professional way that the session was conducted.

Although I didn't get a chance to speak to any of the officers on the evening, I am strongly in favour of the proposal for the trial road closure. As a resident of Penley's Grove Street for the last four years I have directly experienced the adverse effects of the current road layout which has inadvertently encouraged large numbers of private and commercial vehicles to use the neighbourhood as a rat run. Although the narrow road has a 20 mph speed limit, the majority of vehicles travel at over 30 mph and rarely give way to pedestrians seeking to cross the road. We are regularly subjected to aggressive driving, with vehicles mounting the pavement rather than wait whilst I cross the road with my children or park the car outside my house. Last summer our parked car was written off by a motorist who drove straight through a bollard before fleeing the scene.

As a resident of the Groves, I have seen how streets such as Fountayne Street and St Johns Street have improved dramatically with the installation of access restrictions. It was therefore disappointing to see that a number of St Johns Street residents, who have lobbied for and benefitted from access restrictions on their own street, came to the meeting to oppose in principle a measure that would allow others to experience the same benefits. I hope that the Council continues to promote progressive transport policies for the whole city of York.

REF 28

After voicing my concerns over traffic using St John street as a cut through from monkgate to lord mayor's walk, I was very pleased to read in the press that you were planning to close penleys grove Street to traffic, so attended the meeting at park grove school to see the plans, but they showed the closure to be after the st John's crescent turning, still allowing traffic to enter st John's crescent/street! Last night's press said you are going to stop traffic entering st John street from penleys grove Street! I would like to know how? We do not want St John street return to the rat run it used to be before it was made access only!! Many thanks.

REF 29

i attended the event at Park Grove School last Monday.

I am writing to support the plans for the Experiment.

I use the cycle route through the Groves many times each week, and occasional shop at the Spar shop.

My suggestion that would be helpful for cyclists is to increase the number of signposts which show the best ways of travelling through the Groves. And you could have a specific map for cyclists in the area.

I spoke to some people at the event who thought the plans would be worse for cyclists, so it would be good to take positive steps to make it clearer how to make the best of roads by bike,

REF 30

I am a Groves resident, and am confused and concerned about the proposed road closures.

I am confused that a plan to further isolate us is being marketed as a 'regeneration'. 'Gentrification' would seem a far more appropriate term. I fail to see how cutting off the area is going to breath life in the community. The artist's impression of a pedestrianised Lowther Street is very optimistic in showing all the shops there still doing business. I also noticed that it's claimed in the marketing that the area is cut in half by traffic, which isn't something I had noticed, and this is considered a bad thing, however the proposed road closures divides the area between the more up market houses in the St. John's st/Penley Grove st area and. those of us in the council housing.

I am also very concerned about access to my flat (x Burneston House). As I don't own a car, I rely on delivery for items such as an oven, mattress or washing machine and for online groceries or clothing. From the maps of the proposed closures I have to conclude that deliveries by truck or large van will not be easy or even possible. How are the Londis and the shops on Lowther street to get stock? Presumably the recycling and trash collections will get round this by driving on the pavement or wheeling the bins to edge of the estate. Again, the upmarket houses will not be negatively impacted.

A plan to cut traffic going through thee area has been made with apparently very little consideration for the need for vehicles to get to us.

REF 31

In the spirit of a transparent process which should be able to be accountable and subject to scrutiny, I request that I receive a response to all of the questions/statements below please:

Consultation and implementation

1. How has this consultation been conducted?
 - a. How many residents are there in the Groves?
 - b. How many residents were consulted?
 - c. How were they consulted?
 - d. Why weren't all residents invited to the consultation events – these were clearly not widely publicised. Putting notices up on local noticeboards is not acceptable if not all residents pass them/look at them.
 - e. Some residents only became aware when this was published in the Press in October 2019 and more only found out when the leaflet was distributed recently.
 - f. All residents should be given a vote on the proposals
2. At the council meeting in October Andy D'Agorne suggested that the additional road closures, i.e. Earle Street would not necessarily be implemented immediately and that the impact of the primary road closures would be monitored before doing this – has this now changed?

3. At the meeting in October it was reported that this would only be implemented once further consultation had taken place, why is this only happening now, weeks before the work is due to start?
4. Implementation was planned for April due to other road works taking place and the potential impact this would have on roads that are expected to absorb the traffic – road works frequently take place, how will these routes cope then?
5. The leaflet refers to creating turning points at the closed off roads – how will this be achieved? –removing car park spaces and reducing already limited parking?
6. How will delivery trucks, bin trucks and emergency vehicles be able to turn in the limited space available?
7. The leaflet states that the traffic will be directed to other bigger roads – these roads are already congested, the report (appendix B – scenario 3) stated that there would be an increase:

AM:

- a. 148% increase in traffic turning left from Clarence Street to Lord Mayors Walk
- b. 97% increase on the straight-ahead movement from Wigginton Road to Haxby Road
- c. Right turn from Monkgate to Foss Bank increase of 148%
- d. 59% increase in traffic turning left from Lord Mayor's Walk to Monkgate

PM:

- a. 134% increase in traffic turning left from Clarence Street to Lord Mayors Walk
- b. 140% increase on the straight-ahead movement from Wigginton Road to Haxby Road
- c. Right turn from Monkgate to Foss Bank increase of 171%
- d. Figures not provided for increase in traffic turning left from Lord Mayor's Walk to Monkgate

Report stated: Subject to discussions with CoYC officers, it may be necessary to undertake some junction assessments to assess in detail the operational impact of one of more of the scenarios on the existing junctions.

8. Why is there no concern for residents surrounding the Groves and the impact the increased traffic will have on them and their quality of life and the increase in air pollution?
9. Safety in the Groves – at night it feels unsafe to walk through the Groves, however the gradual flow of cars coming through on an evening is currently reassuring, safety is likely to decrease with the implementation of a closed area – how will this be managed?
10. Have ambulance/emergency vehicle drivers/dispatchers been made aware – what are their thoughts on this?
11. How will the implementation be managed?
 - a. Initially this will cause chaos as drivers will be unaware when entering the Groves that they can't get through!
 - b. It is already difficult to navigate the Groves and signage through the Groves is already poor – how will this be managed?
12. How will the situation be monitored throughout the next 18 months? And what feedback will residents get?
13. Who proposed these changes? How can we be confident that there is not a conflict of interest, i.e. local green councillor Denise Craghill proposing changes and approval provided by Andy D'Agorne? Surely someone independent should be approving/declining?
14. The conservative councillors have voiced concerns – why are these not being listened to?
15. Why have the one-way systems not been highlighted in the leaflet?
16. All access to Huntington Road is blocked to those living in the west of the Groves – this is not acceptable given the proximity to that side and access required by local residents – why was the decision made to block the road at Earle Street?
17. Traffic will be moved to Haxby Road and will be forced past the Haxby Road primary school – why is this not a concern?
18. Increased traffic will be forced from the west of the Groves on to Haxby Road forcing a

right turn towards Yearsley Crescent – what will be done to make this safer? It is already a busy road with limited visibility to each direction due to parked cars?

19. The junction from Haley's Crescent to Huntington road is busy and dangerous, especially when turning right on to Huntington Road, the filter is not always on and limited cars can turn right in the time given – will these lights be changed to allow a better flow of traffic?
20. The consultation documents suggest that traffic permit zones will change – what will this look like and how will this be monitored?

Arguments proposed for the closures

1. Through traffic and congestion has been raised as an argument, I walk through the Groves 4x a day, in the morning, lunch and between 4-6pm, this is only a minor issue at rush hour times, so limited to 1-2 hours max a day – how can this be classed as a major problem?
 - a. How has this been assessed?
2. Queuing traffic is worse when the School is open and there is barely any during holidays, this suggests that it is mainly parents taking their children to School that are the main cause of traffic on Lowther Street –
 - a. do you really expect this traffic to stop?
 - b. Have you asked the School to question parents and ask how many drive their children to School?
 - c. Why have you not spoken to the School to see if they can discuss how parents transport their children to school
3. Air pollution – what are the levels? Is this above what is to be expected?
4. The leaflet refers to road incidents/safety/accidents – how many road accidents has there been in the Groves?
 - a. Why haven't other measures been tried first? E.g. speed bumps, pedestrian crossings?
5. Leaflet refers to a divide in the community – as a resident of over 4 years there is no cohesive community, the Groves is predominantly made up students (transient residents, here for a limited time), those in social housing, a considerable amount of people with drug and alcohol issues and finally homeowners.
 - a. The proposed road closures completely cut off the west of the Groves from the rest of the community
 - b. What is going to be done about antisocial behaviour in the Groves which is more of a problem than traffic?
6. The leaflet proposes that people will want to be outside more – the area most effected is outside a probation office – is that likely to be appealing?
7. **Notable quotes from the official report** - None of the below points have any substance or evidence to back up the claims – what evidence is there to support these statements?

Residents feel that there is a barrier dividing the community which threatens safety both in terms of risk of accidents and poor air quality. It also puts people off getting out and about and meeting up with neighbours - particularly families with children and older people with limited mobility.

- How many said this?
- Not all residents have been consulted, how can these views be truly representative of the Groves?
- FEEL does not equal FACT
- Do families with children want to socialise outside a probation office?
- What is going to be done about antisocial behaviour in the Groves which is more of a problem than traffic?

We don't want to stop people from accessing their homes or local shops by car. It's important that we all support local businesses and having access for all is key.

- The proposals will make the entry and exit of the Groves for most residents convoluted

and will increase journey times

“Equally we also need to consider safety, particularly as this route is located next to Park Grove Primary School. However, the Groves Regeneration Project has been talking to residents in the area for some time now and a key message that has come out of consultations is that the level of traffic on narrow residential roads through the area has a significant adverse impact on the local community.”

- Provide evidence of the amount of road accidents in the Groves, particularly near the school
- Question parents of the School and ask how many drive their children to School
- Why are you not closing Park Grove Road to incoming traffic – as this is the one that predominantly suffers at School drop off and pick up time and is a narrow residential street?

Post ‘consultation’ event on the 17th Feb.

- How are you going to feedback the results of the consultation to residents? A list of the questions asked at the meeting and answers from the Council should be provided to all residents.
- Will you have a further meeting to discuss the outcome of this meeting with residents?
- How are you going to capture the opinions of this from those that could not attend the meeting?
- Why was The York Press provided with an interview on the consultation without residents being communicated to first?
- Why were council workers at the consultation told that all residents had been consulted on the plans so far? For information, I think that one of the main sources of anger surrounding this whole debacle is that the Council are continuously and incorrectly claiming that there has been extensive consultation. This is an outrageous lie. Consultation seems to have been limited to those members of the Groves Association, which I only found existed after attending the council meeting in October, and those living in the vicinity of Lowther Street and Penley’s Grove Street.
- Have you read the comments on every article that the York Press has published on this so far, (on the Facebook posts and comments underneath their article on their website) they certainly paint a different picture of public opinion to the one that the council leaders are stating – are you going to take this in to account as part of the consultation feedback?

During the trial – if it goes ahead

- How will you ensure that residents have adequate knowledge on how to express their feedback during the trial period?
- How will you keep residents updated on throughout the trial?
- What measures will be in place to monitor the trail?
- All residents should be provided with regular updated via the post and should be constantly provided with information on how they can provide feedback. This should also be extended to residents of the surrounding roads that are expected to absorb the traffic – what is your response to this?

REF 32

We are writing this letter to express our concerns over the proposed new traffic measures being implemented in the groves area of York which we feel will adversely affect life in our part of the city. Whilst we commend the ultimate aims

of the scheme to improve air quality and life in general by reducing extraneous traffic from the area, we feel the proposals are being poorly implemented as they do not take into account the wider impacts of these changes and there has been a lack of proper consultation with all affected local residents on the impacts of the scheme. Apart from the single meeting we attended at Park Grove school we have found no evidence of local consultation with residents that has been publicised locally.

The scheme is set up to stop traffic "rat running" through the groves area, rerouting traffic either up or down Haxby Rd and around Huntington Rd, Monkgate and the already extremely congested Lord Mayors Walk thereby increasing traffic flows and, exacerbating road safety problems and pollution on these already very busy roads. Our concerns are as follows:

1. The pollution and air quality on other local street including Lord Mayors Walk, Haxby Road, Monkgate and Huntington Road will be significantly worsened as vehicles will be idling for longer producing more co2 and NOx impacting local people across a wider area, and will have a detrimental effect on the historic city walls.
2. A number of the roads in the area already have accident problems and these will become worse. Huntington Road in particular has a long standing

problem with speeding traffic on a busy narrow main road with children, cyclists and parked vehicles.

3. There is no evidence of any detailed traffic studies to assess the impact of different options and the capacity of different roads to accommodate additional vehicles, and what alternatives might have been considered to reduce overall traffic flows in the area.
4. Staff and visitors to York District Hospital have a major impact on traffic flows in the area and this needs a detailed travel plan to reduce the adverse impacts that accessing the hospital create. This also impacts on access for emergency vehicles which we believe will worsen as a result of the proposals.
5. There will a significantly adverse impact on bus service reliability and journey times on Haxby Road and Huntington Road due to increased congestion on these roads.
6. The council should have explored the possibility of reopening the railway lines between the city and the surrounding suburbs of Haxby and Wigginton where the majority of the car traffic through the Groves originates. The railway lines are still there and it would offer a viable alternative for public transport as would extending the operational hours of the line that runs through Poppleton to Harrogate which doesn't run late

enough or very frequently. The park and ride buses finish too early and should be extended until midnight.

7. The city centre, which is already seeing many shops closing due to a combination of high rents, business rates set at unrealistic levels and high car parking charges, will decline further due to implementation of this scheme making it difficult for people to come to the city.
8. The existing shops on Lowther st will suffer a serious drop in trade and eventually close due to lack of custom due to access issues.
9. People who rely on carers to visit will be impacted as already time pressured carers will have less time to spend with them as they will be sat in traffic for longer.

All these points have really not been addressed with the local community and the council is not taking into account the wider concerns of the residents of the area.

Please can you provide us with evidence of the analyses that you have undertaken and the different options you have considered. We would be interested to understand the impacts on road safety for different users, air quality and congestion, as there was none available at the consultation event at Park Grove

school.

For your information we intend to start a petition to oppose these changes with the local residents, and we would ask you to not beginning implementing any changes until you have provided us with more information on the impacts.

REF 33

How do residents enter and exit the Groves? I live in Markham St, from the map I assume I can no longer exit via Huntington Rd? Markham St is currently one way, will that be changed so we can turn around or will Lowther St one way be changed so we can turn right at Eldon St?

The proposed re direct roads for traffic, Clarence St, Lord Mayors Walk and Monkgate are already congested and the map does not highlight Wigginton Rd and Haxby Rd which also are congested. Those who currently use Penley Grove St (and are needing access to Wigginton Rd) could chose to use Huntington Rd and do a U turn around onto Haxby Rd causing increasing congestion. Additional road pressure is also going to come from the housing development on the Nestle site.

My concern is that I have professional visitors such as nurses and carers who have very busy client lists and getting around York is already an issue. Late calls because of traffic has an adverse impact on the client. They are already being impacted by the increasing congestion in the areas I have mentioned above. How will re directing onto your proposed route help?

REF 34

As a regular church attendee at At Thomas's Church I must Irotest at the proposal to close Lowther st to through traffic.For156 years At Ts has served the parish its where we worship our God, its where we send of our dead, and where so many other facilies serving the aged,the disposed

,etc, I think those proposing this closure will probably bring about the closure of St The, we have struggled over many years to keep this churchalive and now have 150 dedicated Christians working out of the church to serve the parish and the grove's, this propssa I has the potential to kill us off. I plead with those tasked with agreeing this proposal look at the broader picture and understand the importance of a vibrant welcoming Church in the Grove's.

REF 35

I am writing to you with regard to the proposed new traffic system for the Groves area. I have serious concerns for this proposal.

I am concerned that considerably more traffic will be flowing along Lord Mayor's Walk, a road that is already very congested. This will cause a backlog onto St John St, creating pollution in this residential area of York. I live on St John St and am concerned that the only exit will be on to Lord Mayor's Walk.

I very much appreciate that there is a lot of through traffic using Penley's Grove St., and this will be forced to use Lord Mayor's Walk.

By turning St John St one way, this will stop the cycle route, from Lord Mayor's Walk out of the city, which is well used at the moment.

Can I suggest that Penley's Grove Street is blocked at the Londis Shop so that traffic can exit from the Groves area via Abbot Street and Lowther Street onto Huntington Road.

This will end any through traffic and enable two way traffic still on St John St.

An alternative could be that Penley's Grove street is again blocked as suggested and made two way. This could maintain the cycle route and give two way access to St John St and Penley's Grove Street.

I think there needs to be a further meeting with residents of the area, especially as no mention was made in your leaflet about a one way system.

I am happy to speak to you about this issue and can be contacted on 07703575750.

REF 36

Good morning

I am writing to you as a resident of St John Street and as a result of attending the drop in session at Park Grove School.

I made several comments at the meeting both on speaking to the officers and in writing on the comments sheet.

I have also had several exchanges of emails with our three ward councillors, and in the light of their letter to The Press yesterday, and since emailing Councillor Craghill, Denise assures me that a follow on meeting will be organised to discuss specific concerns.

Whilst I am in favour of reducing traffic in the Groves area, I feel that the plans, as proposed will merely shift the problem to our end of the Groves. The plans as outlined in the session indicate that Penley's Grove Street will be blocked off at the former Groves House, sending traffic down St John Crescent/St John Street.

I have the following questions/concerns: -

1. Is it proposed that there is signage at Monkgate/Penley's Grove Street to clearly indicate that the street is blocked off and there should be no through traffic.
2. Has any consideration been given to making Penley's Grove Street two way, so that traffic from Garden Street/Lockwood Street/Waverley Street and St John Crescent and St John Street can go out at Monkgate? I feel this would work, and then whilst I am not in favour of it, St John Street could be made one way, from where it meets Garden Street towards Lord Mayor's Walk.
3. If the street is made one way, could speed bumps be installed to slow down traffic? During my time in the street, a little lad was killed by a speeding car.
4. St John Street is access only, and has been so, for at least 30 years. The proposals would negate this.
5. The pinch point at the Lord Mayor's Walk end of the street was widened, only last year, to minimise large lorries/van from coming down the street.
6. What will happen when large vehicles come down the street and get stuck? An escape route could be provided through the bollards at Garden Street, but at present, they are not removable.
7. St John Street is a cycle route ? is it proposed there will be contra flow for cycles, if the street is made one way?
8. There are other consequences of making the street one way ? if you come down the street hoping to park, but miss a space, you will then have to go round the block again.
9. St Wilfrid's School entrance is in the car park. Cars queue from the car park into Lord Mayor's Walk twice a day. The length of the queue will most likely increase if the street is made one way.
10. Will pollution test levels be done in the street before and during the trial?

11. Has there been a car count of vehicles using the street, and will this be done during the trial?

12. The proposal states the trial will be closely monitored ? by whom and what criteria will deem it a success or otherwise?

The proposals are a result of Grove residents working with councillors over the last two years. To my knowledge, no-one in St John Street was included in discussions regarding this, and whilst I have attended some Groves Residents Association meetings in the past, I did not take part in in any discussion. I have checked the plans issued at that time and they do not include our street, nor that part of Penley's Grove Street from the almhouses to Monkgate, and nor any of the other streets at this end of the Groves.

I look forward to your reply.

Thank you and regards,

REF 37

I am writing to raise concern about the proposed closure of streets in the Groves. Whilst I am all in favour of reducing the number of cars through residential areas, I am concerned that the knock on effect of these proposals is a significant increase in traffic through the junction at the end of my street, Claremont Terrace.

I refer you to this Press Article:-

<https://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/18253520.road-closure-plans-groves-cause-traffic-routes/>

It seems to me that the Groves proposal should be matched by a campaign to reduce the number of car journeys in the area so that the existing routes are protected from increased pollution from engine fumes. There doesn't appear to be any such proposal in the plans. Surely there should be some statement of intention to reduce car journeys by an amount similar to the projected increase through the Gillygate/LMW junction, at the very least. Otherwise the only thing that is being done is to dump the traffic problem onto another community. I know some people in Claremont Terrace are very concerned about this issue, as well as me. I have encouraged them to write to you too.

Also, it is well known that the Gillygate/Clarence Street/LMW junction is often at saturation point so I can only see that the extra traffic will simply spend more time stationary, idling and waiting for the queues to clear. This will lead to a build up in air pollution as well as frustration for drivers.

Thank you for reading this so far. I trust it finds a sympathetic response.

REF 38

We were extremely disappointed to read about the plans to close the Groves to traffic as detailed in the Press yesterday.

As parents with three children at Park Grove Primary School we know well the issues with traffic in the Groves and would support any reasonable measure to reduce this. While the traffic is clearly not ideal, it is typically slow moving and contained to a one way system so is of minimal danger when talking our children to and from school.

However, as a resident of Claremont Terrace, in one of the most polluted areas of the city due to excessive traffic congestion, I cannot see how a forecasted 148% increase is either reasonable or in the best interests of the citizens of York, not least as it is already an extremely busy and therefore far more dangerous than

our route through the Groves.

While we try to avoid driving where possible, we are regularly stuck in traffic trying to get home, often taking longer to complete the last half mile of our journey than it does the substantive element of it.

We would also note the high volume of tourists in the area due to the Union Terrace and St John St car park adding an extra challenge in safely returning to our home.

We have had no direct consultation about these plans, despite the considerable impact on the day to day lives of our family, and it is disappointing to say the least that we have only become aware of it due to the diligence of the chair of our residents association.

I would therefore respectfully request a formal consultation with those most impacted by these decisions as a minimum requirement before any closure is enacted.

REF 39

I'm a Green Party member and someone who openly supported the party campaign literature, now I'm turning to you and your colleague for help having read this article:

<https://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/18253520.road-closure-plans-groves-cause-traffic-routes/>

I live on Claremont Terrace with two young children and I have to contend with already high levels of emissions everytime I take them to school or nursery - using Gillygate and Lord Mayors Walk. I feel like residents are being sold out by moving a problem, not a resolving it. Myself and other residents are very disappointed, upset and angry about this so I'd welcome an invitation to talk it through.

I would also like to take this opportunity to try and ascertain current air quality on Gillygate - noting that the air monitor is placed high up and not representative of street level - particularly child height. If these levels are as high as I believe them to be then I think there's more action that I need to take with urgency.

REF 40

DEAR SIR,
MAKING LOWTHER ST AND PENNYGROVE ST
NO THOUGH STREETS IS A BIG MISTAKE. FOR THE
FOLLOWING REASONS FIRSTLY YOU HAVE NOT
CONSULTED ALL THE RESIDENTS I ALSO AM A MEMBER
OF ST THOMAS CHURCH AND YOU HAVE NOT HAD
OUR VIEWS, WHILE I CAN SEE THE REASON FOR
CLOSING IS TO MAKE IT CLEANER AND STOP POLLUTION
BUT YOU ARE JUST PUSHING IT OUT TO OTHER STREETS
HAVE YOU CONSULTED THE PEOPLE IN MONKGATE,
LORD MAYORS WALK CLARENSE ST WIGGINGTON RD
HAXBY RD HALEYS TERR AND HUNTINGTON RD
THERE IS A LOT OF CONGESTION ALREADY IN THESE
STREETS WITHOUT ADDING MORE CARS WAITING
IN TRAFFIC. YOU IMPROVED THE HAXBY RD
WIGGINGTON ROAD JUNCTION. HAVE YOU INFORMED
THE FIRST YORK BUS COMPANY OF THE DELAYS
THIS WILL MEAN TO THEM. THE BIG PROBLEM IS
TRAFFIC WAITING TO ACCESS THE HOSPITAL.
I THINK YOU SHOULD HOLD BACK AND ENSURE YOU
GET ALL PEOPLES VIEWS. I WILL ALSO TAKE SOME
PICTURE OF THE CONGESTION SO YOU CAN SEE WHAT
I MEAN.

MANY THANKS

REF 41

Dear Ms Maskell,

I am sure at the present, your mail box is overflowing with Corona virus questions and concerns.

I am 84 years of age, and obviously, confined to my flat, so I thought I would contact you on another topic.

The closing of the so called RATRUN in Penleys Grove Street, where I have lived for over thirty years.

A friend and I attended the so called consultation at Park grove school by the City council, but as usual, it was only to tell us what the council are going to do.

In all your dealings with the City Council, I wonder if you have met a councilor who has any respect for the taxpayers money they spend, because what they are planning is a complete waste of that taxpayer money.

1. We will lose 2-3 resident parking spaces,

This, when York respark is over doubly subscribed.

2. To excavate the dimensions of the "island", to alter the drains(surface water), then to construct the so called island and place the bollards to effectively block the road.

3. With the cost of anything these days,the labour costs,machines, transport costs, this is going to be a very expensive opperation,running to many thousands of pounds.

Not Two Hundred Meteres away, at the junction with, March Street, Townend Street , there already exists what the council are prepared to spend a great deal of money building. All that is needed are the bollards to close the road. A task that I think even York Council could complete in a day.

I am sure the savings would be very considerable, and maybe the money saved could be used for a much more worthy cause.

There is one more thing that need to be sorted out,that is the eyesore,and general Rubbish that is at number X Penleys Grove Street.

I,and other residents have seen vermin in all the junk that is stored there.

I rang the council about the vermin,and was told that the council no longer do pest control.

If you have time, I would love for you to have a visit,and see this eyesore for yourself.