

## City of York Streetscape Strategy & Guidance – Consultation Responses

### 1. Summary of Consultation:

The consultation ran for eight weeks from 05/06/13 to 31/07/13 in conjunction with the Local Heritage List Supplementary Planning Document and the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultations.

Documents available online, at West Offices and at York Explore Library. Copies were also placed in the members group rooms.

Preferred Options letter includes reference to this consultation. Email letter and links to relevant CYC officers, all Members, Parish Councils, Planning Panels and specific consultees (including interested bodies and previous respondents to CHCAA).

Leaflet summarising the content, how to get involved, and the key questions were made available online, in York Explore library and West Offices, and distributed at key meetings. An easy-read leaflet was produced in response to a request from York People First and added to the online information.

CAAP presentation 02/07/13.

York Access Forum presentation **date?**

Promoted at YOPF event and staff exhibition.

Press release – Yorkshire Post Article 10/06/13. York Press Article 11/06/13 and feature 12/07/13:

[http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/features/features/10544307.Design manual aims to improve look of York s city streets/](http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/features/features/10544307.Design_manual_aims_to_improve_look_of_York_s_city_streets/)

| Method          | Number of responses                 |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Leaflets        | 12                                  |
| Surveymonkey    | 20                                  |
| Other responses | 27 TO add ASinclair & KDaggett text |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>59</b>                           |

## 2. Analysis of structured questions (leaflets & surveymonkey):

| Question/ number who agreed                     | Summary of written comments   | Officer Response/ changes to be made  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>1) Do you agree with the key principles?</b> |   |   |
| A city for people                               | Yes 25 No 4 Partly 1  |   |
| Access & mobility                               | Yes 28 No 1   |   |
| Design  | Yes 25 No 3   |   |
| Distinctiveness                                 | Yes 26 No 3   |   |
| Way-finding & legibility                        | Yes 26 No 2   |   |
| Light & dark                                    | Yes 25 No 3   |   |
| Management                                      | Yes 27 No 2   |   |
| Please explain:                                 | <p>L2 - A healthy city: adequate loos - no using alleys and corners as toilets. A safe city: no cars in the pedestrian areas, no avoidance of 'left turn only' signs.</p> <p>L3 - Good idea.</p> <p>L4 - York pavements are very uneven, therefore the Council needs to address this issue before someone has a very nasty accident.</p> <p>L5 - My husband and I and others think we have no meeting places because the city has sold them. Others also against the sale of Guildhall.</p> <p>L6 - 'City for People', I would if it were true. 1) Pedestrians come second in pedestrianised area behind cyclists. Cyclists should not cycle in any pedestrianised areas. 2) 'Cyclists dismount' signs should be enforced.</p> <p>L8 - Have a problem with distinctiveness using existing evidence bases only. Surely new evidence bases are being created, or existing bases are being updated and revised in an on-going process?</p> | <p>L2-will add something about street cleaning. Other issues are not really for the strategy.</p> <p>L4 – This comes under general management. Will see if this needs to be strengthened in the strategy.</p> <p>L5 – not an issue for this strategy.</p> <p>L6 – not an issue for the strategy.</p> <p>L8 – Yes, indeed they are so will ensure that this is made clear in the document.</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>L10 - Yes I think you have most things right but un-necessary street furniture needs to be removed. Dark spots should be lighted up so as to help stop muggings etc.</p> <p>L11 - "A City for People" should not bar cyclists from the city centre - they are people too. We need to encourage more PEOPLE out of cars and onto buses, walking and cycling. "Distinctiveness" - why is the council tarmac over the paviour sets in your pictures? "Wayfinding" - that Sheffield example is awful. "Management" - seems to be worse now than ever before.</p> <p>SM3 - However there are some streets which may not get much foot traffic but are seen by a lot of people in cars, buses and on bikes and there may be some aspects which should enable it to be considered for visual enhancement in a higher priority than it would otherwise be. In effect there should always be room for exceptions where the argument is right.</p> <p>SM4 - Whilst these seem OK as general principles, should there not be something on dealing with existing issues e.g. motorists and cyclists flouting the current rules governing access to the footstreets or reviewing the existing arrangements e.g. hours of operation?</p> <p>SM5 - Design: partly agree, but not about "uncluttered" and "consistent pallet[te]" because this is often used as an excuse for cheap, expansive bland public areas.</p> <p>SM7 - I agree with all the principles but I should like to stress that provision for "A city for people" and "Access and Mobility" should look after the interests of ALL the city's residents and not just those of the special-interest groups. York is very bad at catering for the interests of the "non-disabled but not as active as they once were" residents of the central area and very bad indeed at policing both the conduct of cyclists in pedestrian areas and the blatant abuse of the Blue Badge parking scheme that can be seen any day. I should also like to comment particularly on Light and Darkness. We are all much more conscious of the light pollution of the night sky now than we were even just a few years ago. Yet York uses street lighting that seems</p> | <p>L10 – de-cluttering is dealt with. <b>Lighting section will be beefed up to include a statement about safety.</b></p> <p>L11 – <b>Cycling section will be re-written to be more cycling friendly. Tarmac of pavours</b> has been explained in the text but will strengthen. Also, point made in text that this should not continue. The wayfinding example from Sheffield is actually well liked in Sheffield but we will be bringing this forward as a separate piece of work. Management is dependant on funding and CYC is facing budget shortfalls but point is made in document that we need to work to higher quality threshold.</p> <p>SM3 – Yes, there will always be exceptions and this is noted however, the purpose of the suggested priority areas is to focus capital funding over and above regular maintenance programmes and pedestrian heavy areas seems the most appropriate way of doing this.</p> |
|--|---|---|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>deliberately designed to pollute the night sky as well as to shine unpleasantly into people's home (and bedrooms). It is to be hoped that in the big programme of lighting renewal now going on some attempt will be made to get rid of the worst of the old fittings.</p> <p>SM8 - A living, vibrant city is one where people can move about easily. Increasingly, the quality of the public realm is being recognised as contributing to people's well being and therefore good design and a planned approach will help to achieve this. At the end of the day, if you can move through the city without thinking about it too much it would suggest a well-thought out environment.</p> <p>SM13 - In principle the disabled should have extra consideration, but in practice I feel that doing so, in a medieval city, undermines the objectives and application of the Streetscape strategy. As long as the city provides disabled parking on the streets, it cannot become a proper city of footstreets and fulfil it's real potential. Could the disabled have additional free parking provided in e.g. the Coppergate/Clifford's Tower car parks, or Bootham Row car park or St Maurice's Rd near Monkbar, for a longer period to compensate for the slightly longer distance they might have to travel were streets such as Blake St no longer available.</p> <p>SM14 - Pedestrians and motorists should share priority. I would like to see a true shared space - see Exhibition Road in Kensington (but without the ghastly criss-cross pattern, choose something more appropriate to York's distinct character); the idea being that as there is no delineation between pavement and road traffic has to move slowly to avoid pedestrians. For example, at present Lendal Bridge is very safe for pedestrians because the traffic has to move so slowly. I know Lendal Bridge is clearly not a shared space but it's the slowness of traffic that counts. Look at current desire lines to see how pedestrians dislike being herded. Foss Islands is a very depressing place to be a pedestrian. There are many trades people who have to cross York several times daily with their equipment and I would not</p> | <p>SM4 – This is an enforcement issue and a subject outside the purpose of this document. <b>However, a statement, perhaps under next steps or a recommendations section could include a statement on enforcement.</b></p> <p>SM5 – the document is very specific in many places about high quality responses to public realm improvements. No change required.</p> <p>SM7 – The access &amp; mobility audit engaged with a variety of individuals covered by the 2010 equalities act including older people. The point is that a city fit for less able people will also be a city fit for all. <b>Dark skies are referenced in the document but agree that this could be strengthened. The lighting section will be amended appropriately.</b></p> <p>SM8 – agreed.</p> <p>SM13 – The issue of blue and green badge parking in the city centre has not been dealt with in this document as it requires</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>like to see them have to increase their journeys in case the increased costs put their businesses at risk.</p> <p>SM15 - One only has to look at the news or wander the streets to see that businesses have a massive impact on the York Streetscape. It is perhaps fair to say that perceptions of the city are far more influenced by businesses than, for example, issues of light, clutter and navigation. And I do mean in a positive way as well as a negative way. It seems to me that there should be an eighth key principle that covers this factor. <b>As the city centre adapts to a changing retail world - and I believe York has a real opportunity to embrace this - it's surely important that there's no disconnect between businesses and York's Streetscape.</b></p> <p>SM17 - The city of York was designed by people centuries ago, and it has access and mobility as its trade-mark for centuries. Trying to close bridges defeats all aspirations for its residents, as the on-line petition shows.</p> <p>SM20 - It's all very well being a "city for people" But restricted access for vehicles and deliveries is destroying the city and bringing roads to a standstill. Pedestrian / Cycling areas are fine when considered carefully, but equally vehicular access to the city is REQUIRED for the continued operation of businesses and the well being of residents.</p> | <p>significant further analysis that will consider shopmobility provision, parking for mobility scooters and on street parking. Many disabled people cannot walk very far and wheelchairs are not always needed or appropriate.</p> <p>SM14 – Agreed. <b>The issue of shared space solutions to parliament/pavement/Piccadilly is being considered but blind and partially sighted people are fearful of these solutions in York. It may be that we install some shared spaces but retain signalised crossings. This is not covered by the document but consideration will be giving for including a new section.</b></p> <p>SM15 – Interesting perspective and one not considered. A good point is being made and I will look at how this could be integrated into the document.</p> <p>SM17 – not an issue for this strategy.</p> <p>SM20 – The principle does not undermine this. Access for deliveries is allowed and will</p> |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | continue to be allowed but at certain times. This is a tried and tested solution which is the norm in the majority of similar towns and cities in continental Europe and elsewhere.  |
| <b>2) Do you agree that the streets and spaces with the highest pedestrian activity should be priorities for investment?</b> | Yes 20 No 11   |  |
| Please explain:  | <p>L1 - There are plenty of other areas in need of upgrade. Why ALWAYS concentrate on city centre and pedestrian areas and only deal with other areas if there are funds available?</p> <p>L2 - But it depends what investment is planned. Plants in tubs are all very well but the pavements are a mess of the broken paving, variety of materials, poor visual appearance generally.</p> <p>L5 - Essential surface water is drained off for safety in winter. I think Stonebow pavement would not sink so much if you put grills in-between the flagstones to stop it sinking down and upsetting the soil. The water needs to drain straight into the gully, not flood all over the pavements. The water outside Ware &amp; Kay solicitors floods 6 feet (over both road and pavement). I have complained before. Suggest clamshell design in the concrete (sketch) - water always drains, rough surface helps traction, fewer flagstone edges to tip up or trip people.</p> <p>L6 - If so, why spend so much on signage for streets and expanding the</p> | <p>L1 – Secondary shopping streets are included but it is a mistake to believe that improvements to the centre only benefit visitors – all citizens benefit. Other streets are covered by the CYC maintenance budget.</p> <p>L2 – <b>Agreed and the document will be strengthened to ensure that general maintenance is improved.</b></p> <p>L5 – The stonebow surfacing is inappropriate for exiting traffic and the sub-base is not suitable. This is wholly</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>20MPH limit?</p> <p>L7 - Pavements need to be maintained to be as safe as possible, especially the elderly and disabled who may have problems with their sight and balance, see 4, or mother with buggies.</p> <p>L8 - Pedestrian activity is already way too high in the centre - have you seen Spurriergate and Coney Street on a Saturday for instance? Investment, without especially careful considerations, could exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>L9 - Roads and paths that are well maintained and quickly repaired and made smart gives each person self esteem and confidence. None of York should be allowed to get run down. It is cheaper to keep it good.</p> <p>L10 - Yes again, street pavements should be a priority for the disabled and wheelchairs.</p> <p>L11 - <b>No, not necessarily. It might be better to do some work on other areas to... In order to ENCOURAGE greater pedestrian activity.</b></p> <p>L12 - The matrix proposed on p29 is logical but does not consider the present state of streets and spaces: high footfall places, in general, are of an adequate standard; low footfall places have been neglected. A balancing Act is required to even things out. Suburban infrastructure needs more investment.</p> <p>SM1 - The particular points causing hazards (e.g. strangely angled dropped kerbs) should be priorities for investment, and the new benches provided on the busiest streets seem to be well-used and are I know appreciated by older residents, so that should continue. In terms of essentially cosmetic changes I have no strong feeling either way. Only care about money not being wasted.</p> <p>SM3 - but see above</p> <p>SM4 - Investment recommendations need to take account of the current restrictions on local authority budgets. All proposals need to demonstrate they are cost-effective.</p> <p>SM5 - Priority should be set by a balancing all relevant details - current usage by all modes, potential future usage, current utility and condition of features.</p> | <p>responsible for pavement quality. <b>This is raised in the document but will be strengthened.</b></p> <p>L6 – good point and will be noted.</p> <p>L7 – agreed. See L2 above.</p> <p>L8 – not an issue for this strategy.</p> <p>L9 – See L2 above.</p> <p>L10 – See L2 above.</p> <p>L11 – A good point and will consider how the document may make the point.</p> <p>L12 – IN part this is covered by including secondary shopping streets in the document. See L2 above for a possible response.</p> <p>SM1 – noted</p> <p>SM4 – noted.</p> <p>SM5 – Disagree. The priorities are not based on ‘pretty areas’ but significance and high pedestrian movement. The pedestrian priority follows priorities in the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>SM6 – noted.</p> <p>SM7 – Useful comment but outside the remit of the</p> |
|--|--|---|



|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>The objective should be to maximise the value for money for all users, not give artificial priority to the "pretty" areas.</p> <p>SM6 - Pedestrian activity follows leisure cultural and economic activity. Priority has to be given to historic spaces and key networks within the city - present of future areas with the highest pedestrian activity. The focus must be on enhancing the heritage assets and pedestrian networks that connect them.</p> <p>SM7 - These spaces need to be kept attractive and alive, both for the sake of the city's own residents and for the tourists, for whom they offer a significant element of the city's attraction. The investment needs to include policing, particularly at weekends, to ensure that the very disturbing hen and stag parties do not make the central areas effectively no-go areas for residents and normal visitors.</p> <p>SM13 - Yes, but with the caveat that I think that the junctions of pedestrian and motor traffic areas are equally important.</p> <p>SM14 - If a resident pays Council Tax he doesn't deserve to fall down a pot hole in his street just because it's a cul de sac. Having said that Parliament Street is a mess and should be a priority.</p> <p>SM15 - I believe there is a balance to be found. You must of course appeal to the masses. However, some of the real joy in York can come from visiting those areas away from the main shopping streets and attractions.</p> <p>SM17 - All streets in our city belong to the citizens of York.</p> <p>SM18 - Although I think all streets should be brought up to a standard that residents would be proud of.</p> <p>SM19 - The main problem with the streets in York is that they are filthy - they need to be pressure cleaned and this needs to have continuously - as well as all the other aspects - streets furniture, bus stops etc - everything is so dirty it is embarrassing and depressing to see, compared to other European cities.....picking up litter is not enough.....</p> <p>SM20 - ALL streets should be funded equally - there is currently a</p> | <p>document. However, a statement, perhaps under next steps or a recommendations section could include a statement on enforcement.</p> <p>SM13 – not sure what is meant here but there are moves to examine the use of shared space in some locations and will include something on this in the document.</p> <p>SM14 – See L2 above.</p> <p>SM15 – agreed and noted.</p> <p>SM17 – agreed and the document is not contradicting this.</p> <p>SM18 – agreed and see L2 above.</p> <p>SM19 – useful comment and will ensure that the issue of street cleaning is covered in the document.</p> <p>SM20 – The city centre is not just the preserve of visitors and is well used by citizens. There is limited funding available.</p> |
|--|---|---|

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | disproportionate amount of spending on the city centre compared to the rest of the city. This is public money and must be used to the benefit of ALL York residents and tax payers.   |   |
| <b>3) Does the guidance cover all the right issues?</b> | Yes 16 No 9 Mostly 1  |   |
| Please explain:   | <p>L1 - What about safety? Removing 'street furniture' has potential to cause concerns for safety, since new pedestrian crossings fail to bleep (Acomb, opposite St Leonards shop) and recently on corner of Fawcett Street, those with hearing impairments are at risk. Well done for causing such a risk.</p> <p>L2 - See Q1. For way-finding, the signs are often turned in wrong directions, so more secure sign posting is needed.</p> <p>L4 - Telephone boxes that are not in use, must be removed on Haxby Road near the Park and near the traffic lights on Clarence Street.</p> <p>L5 - York needs taxis to be allowed in the foot-streets 24 hours per day. Even the police and street angels need them for the drunks. Poor mobility means the flagstones are a hazard.</p> <p>L6 – De-cluttering should be a priority whether it be council signage or advertising.</p> <p>L7 - The elderly and disabled need street lights, particularly where the pavement/ roads are uneven or rubbish bins are left in the street. Street lights should be designed to make this possible, while not annoy residents by being too bright.</p> <p>L8 - <b>Accept for the increasing problem of feral pigeon infestation and dog fouling. Issues that are very real to everyone (except, presumably, feral pigeons, dogs and irresponsible dog owners).</b> Prosecutions against the latter should be enforced.</p> <p>L9 - Green corridors are not mentioned. I worry that roads and roundabouts</p> | <p>L1 – useful point and is more to do with management . Will review management text and add new text to pick this issue up.</p> <p>L2 – Will be dealt with through the wayfinding strategy.</p> <p>L4 – <b>Will examine this issue and yes, if not in use and not a listed structure they should be removed.</b></p> <p>L5 – Taxi access is not an issue for this document Paving quality is however, and the text will be strengthened to enhance this issue.</p> <p>L6- it is, but will ensure that the text underlines this point for the whole city.</p> <p>L7 – The lighting section will be redrafted to take these points on board – several other people</p> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>are too wide for bees and butterflies to fly across. I just want it to be a consideration.</p> <p>L10 - I think so, but on street cafes, buskers etc. should not obstruct footpaths or right of way again for the benefit of the disabled.</p> <p>L11 - York is a historic city and a visitor destination - these have to be primary considerations. York also has to learn from the great cities of modern Europe how to overcome the awful transport and congestion problems we have.</p> <p>L12 - The guidance is a useful first step. When one aggregates the topics in the exemplar strategies listed on p76 it becomes apparent that much is missing in the York Draft Strategy.</p> <p>SM2 - A very comprehensive study which includes many aspects of urban space and streetscape which one does not obviously consider.</p> <p>SM3 - but little mention of cycling. York cycle tracks are a bit of a mish-mash and markings poorly maintained.</p> <p>SM4 - I am not persuaded that the guidance fully addresses the issue of conflict between users.</p> <p>SM8 - Possibly consideration could/should also be given to more types of street furniture. For example, well designed and placed planters can enhance an area, provide more 'natural' barriers to differentiate areas. Also, I frequently notice that street furniture (benches, bus shelters etc.) are designed at heights more appropriate for men than, say, women, shorter people or children. Whilst the guidance recommends a specific bus shelter this is not actually particularly comfortable to sit on, let alone if you have children with you!</p> <p>SM11 - Not clear as to what the guidance is</p> <p>SM13 - Yes, with the caveat that with the changes to traffic flow which will be the inevitable result of closing Lendal Bridge should be properly integrated with any Streetscape strategy. I realise that the proposals to close the bridge and the Streetscape strategy are not formally linked, but I feel i) that extra consideration must be given to the junction areas at each</p> | <p>have raised the issues of dark skies, safety and clutter in relation to street lighting.</p> <p>L8 – This is a management issues and the appropriate section will be amended to take account of cleanliness and enforcement. There will be a specific section on cleanliness.</p> <p>L9 – Interesting point and will discuss with landscape colleagues about appropriate text that might be used.</p> <p>L10 – This point is made clearly in the document but again, as with other issues raised, there is an enforcement problem which needs to be highlighted.</p> <p>L11 – Noted.</p> <p>L12 – Noted, yes the document could include a greater range of topics and this will be discussed with colleagues with a view to adding further sections.</p> <p>SM2 – noted.</p> <p>SM3 – Good point – <b>the guidance could usefully include a section on cycle tracks</b>, see also L12 above.</p> <p>SM4 – will reconsider whether</p> |
|--|---|--|

|                    |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|
|                    | <p>end of the bridge ii) that extra consideration should be given to new lanes/traffic lights/traffic islands and whatever else is considered to be necessary to keep traffic flowing. I do not feel that any major expenditure should be made until best traffic flow of the new system has been properly assessed. For instance, it seems foolish to go ahead and spend money on Exhibition Square and St Leonard's too soon, when a hotel is about to be developed and before the changes to lanes etc have been finally decided.</p> <p>SM15 - No, see my answer to question 1 (i.e. the influence of bars, shops, food establishments, etc) Additionally, the document does seem to have been developed in quite an insular business-like manner. I can't help feeling the average member of the public would have helped to give this a more personal touch. After all, this surely isn't all about boring old practicalities! Isn't it as much about the emotional impact the city has on its residents, visitors and investors? That's what York can really do to a person when it gets it right (and it does).</p> <p>SM17 - Mainly yes.</p> <p>SM19 - Deep cleaning must be at the heart of any project to re-invigorate York as well as a campaign to engender pride in the city by the locals and encourage people to care for the city - ie zero tolerance on litter etc....</p> <p>SM20 - It should cover the issues that are best for York residents, not for the council and tourists.</p> | <p>relevant text needs to be strengthened.</p> <p>SM8 – A section on planters will be added. Street furniture height is covered by equalities guidance and British Standards but an interesting point which needs further thought. Bus shelter design and seating will be discussed further with public transport colleagues.</p> <p>SM11 – noted.</p> <p>SM13 – noted.</p> <p>SM15 – <b>Agreed in principle but the document does have to deal with the practicalities first. The vision has attempted to consider the more esoteric and emotional impact. Will give more thought to the vision.</b></p> <p>SM17 – noted.</p> <p>SM19 – <b>will add section about management, cleanliness and enforcement.</b></p> <p>SM20 – <b>The city centre is about residents/citizens as well as visitors but perhaps this point is not made strongly enough.</b></p> |
| <b>4) Does the</b> | Yes 21 No 5 Partly 1   |  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>guidance adequately consider the needs of disabled and older people?</b></p> |  |   |
| <p>Please explain:</p>   | <p>L1 - Why ALWAYS focus on disabled and older people? Yes, their needs are catered, and of concern, but consider able bodied 'users'.</p> <p>L2 - I'm not disabled. What consultations did you carry out with user groups?</p> <p>L4 - Automatic doors to every shop where possible, also lifts.</p> <p>L5 - Access to the shops denied during foot-street hours for taxi shoppers etc children, tourists all need taxis.</p> <p>L6 - 1) older and/ or disabled people often need vehicular access to the city centre. This has recently been re??????. 2) need for more seats in city centre. When Parliament Street events take place, existing seats are inaccessible!</p> <p>L7 - Pavements and roads are uneven or slabs are cracked. Pavements and many roads still have potholes, which is dangerous to people with bad sight problems with balance or need to use trolleys.</p> <p>L8 - Consideration only seems apparent in the areas of surfacing and seating (if more seating will actually be provided). A further problem for older people are the lack of public conveniences in the area: Parliament Street, Goodramgate, Coney Street.</p> <p>L9 - Snow and ice is not mentioned. New policy and guidance and new ways of coping needs York geniuses to advise us.</p> <p>L10 - The CYC does a good job, but uneven and broken pavement slabs need to be replaced on a more urgent basis, especially for wheelchair users.</p> <p>L11 - Access by bus and taxi is the key consideration, and the ability to bring motorised electric scooters into the centre and park these like bicycles anywhere, for easy access.</p> | <p>L1 – by getting things right for communities of interest as defined by the Equalities Act 2010 we will create a city that is ‘fit for all’. No change to text.</p> <p>L2 – See answer to L1 above. The public consultation exercise was designed to capture other views and comments.</p> <p>L4 – Unfortunately this is not part of the remit of a streetscape manual.</p> <p>L5 – Not a valid comment for this document to consider. Restricted access is enabled for blue and green badge holders. Other users are deemed able to walk from car parks or other access points.</p> <p>L6 – Agreed that you cannot have enough seats – there is clearly more to be done. The document explains this.</p> <p>L7 - Agreed and the document</p> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>SM3 - Don't really know, though York has some very uneven surfacing and kerbing. Don't know how you resolve this and not lose a lot of character to the streets. You could have publicised wheelchair friendly routes for example but it would be difficult in the more popular locations. I pushed a wheelchair down the Shambles. On the cobbles it's very uncomfortable for the passenger. It's better on the pavement though these are rather narrow and it's hard to get on and off as there aren't many sloping kerbs.</p> <p>SM4 - It is unclear how these needs are being addressed.</p> <p>SM7 - If it is followed it will make for a much more attractive city.</p> <p>SM8 - There seems to be a good focus on those with mobility and visual impairments. Whilst not explicitly to do with design some of the pedestrian crossings recently installed (the past year or so) do not 'beep' and remain green for a very short period of time, creating difficulties for those with visual and mobility issues? Whilst central York's street plan is generally medieval in character, could future planning include consideration of the width of pavements for wheelchair/scooter users and pushchairs where appropriate. In some places it is difficult to move along the pavement due to trees, inappropriately sloped drives/kerbs and cars parked half on the pavement (Bishopthorpe Road around Butcher Terrace for example).</p> <p>SM17 - Disabled residents feel that they are being ignored by the current council, members and officials.</p> | <p>will be strengthened to ensure that general maintenance is improved.</p> <p>L8 – More seating has been provided in the centre and more will follow as funds become available. Public conveniences are available in the centre but not adequately signed and this issue will be picked up by the wayfinding strategy. The number and frequency of PC's is not really an issue for this document.</p> <p>L9 – Interesting point and can be picked up through a general maintenance section.</p> <p>L10 - Agreed and the document will be strengthened to ensure that general maintenance is improved.</p> <p>L11 – Good point about mobility scooter parking – will examine this with colleagues and add text to cover the point.</p> <p>SM3 – Wheelchair friendly routes is a good point and will be picked up by the wayfinding strategy.</p> <p>SM4 – noted.</p> |
|--|---|--|

|   |                                 |  |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
|   |                                 | <p>SM7 – Noted.</p> <p>SM8 – The width of pavements was an issue raised by the access &amp; mobility audit and its recommendations are included in the text of the strategy but will review the wording and strengthen if necessary. The new pedestrian crossings conform to regulations as far as I am aware – the non-beep has been raised by others and will take advice on whether this is an appropriate issue for the document to take on board.</p> <p>SM17 – noted, but in the context of this consultation I believe they have been fully consulted and their views integrated into the strategy as much as we can – this question is deigned to see how well we have done.</p> |
| <p><b>5) Does the document fully reflect the findings of the access &amp; mobility audit?</b></p> | <p>Yes 15 No 5 Don't know 2</p> |  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Please explain:</p>                             | <p>L1 - In the main.<br/> L4 - Access to all areas should be top priority for safety reasons.<br/> L7 - See 4, need a trolley, have bad eyesight and balance, have osteoporosis.<br/> SM1 - I don't know, unfortunately I rather tired of the A &amp; M audit as it was so full of errors in street names. It doesn't encourage me to read through a document when it appears no one else has bothered to. I'm no pedant but a bit more effort should have gone into this as it's otherwise an important document.<br/> L8 - I cannot comment as I have not seen the A&amp;M audit as yet. This is, it states, available for information, but where from, are hard copies available?<br/> L10 - I don't know, I have not read the document.<br/> SM3 - see above<br/> SM4 - Impossible to tell from the summary.<br/> SM7 - The document probably does reflect the findings of the access and mobility audit, but as a resident of the central area I was not happy with those findings. Access from this area to the railway station, the hospital, even the new Council Offices is not easy if one has even the slightest mobility problem. The bus services are poor, slow, and unreliable, and any thought of using taxis is soon abandoned when one contemplates the cost of the devious routes that have to be followed and the amount of time spent sitting in traffic-jams or at traffic-lights. Just consider trying to get a cab away from the railway station ...<br/> SM11 - Where is the document<br/> SM17 - As above</p> | <p>L1 – noted<br/> L4 – noted and agree, but CYC cannot afford to undertake this mammoth task which is why the priorities have been proposed for pedestrian heavy environments.<br/> L7 – noted and see above answer to L7 question 4.<br/> SM1 – noted.<br/> L8 – noted.<br/> L10 – noted.<br/> SM3 – see answer to SM£ question 4.<br/> SM4 – noted<br/> SM7 – noted.<br/> SM11 – noted<br/> SM17 – see answer to SM17 question 4.</p> |
| <p><b>6) Do you have mobility impairments:</b></p> | <p>Yes 6 No 21 Prefer not to say 4<br/> L5 - Frightened of ice on pavements.</p>  | <p>L5 – see answer to L9 question 4.</p>   |
| <p><b>7) Are the next steps</b></p>                | <p>Yes 15 No 6 Probably 1</p>   |  |



| for 2013-2014 the right ones? |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Please explain:               | <p>L1 - In the main.</p> <p>L4 - Bring our city up to date and welcome visitors, not turn them away.</p> <p>L6 - Yes, as long as all are considered together, not some left aside.</p> <p>L8 - Anything that would improve the centre is welcome. Sadly, beyond the centre seems past helping.</p> <p>L10 - Mostly, but more restrictions on vehicle movement. I though vehicles were restricted from 10.00am until 16.00, this is not being enforced except blue badge holders and emergency vehicles, all other vehicles should be banned in-between these times.</p> <p>L11 - The Edinburgh bins are better as you don't have to touch them. The solar bin is awful as you have to touch it. <b>Bicycles and mobility scooters should not be classed as clutter.</b> Do not cleanse York of cyclists and elderly/disabled people like they were unwelcome.</p> <p>SM1 - See below</p> <p>SM2 - Yes, the 11 steps derive from the report and are relatively cost-neutral. However there is no reference /proposal to tackle some of the horrors / damage perpetrated by the utility companies during repairs or installation. <b>I suggest that there should be measures to monitor / enforce compliance and to repair damage already done.</b> The next steps are a good start on the way to restoring the City's uniqueness and elevating it above the creeping metro blandness.</p> <p>SM3 - If based on the leaflet it's hard to say. You need to read the original 79 pp document for this. I'm unsure whether the issue of street lighting is adequately covered for instance.</p> <p>SM4 - See comments above re issues not apparently being tackled.</p> <p>SM7 - The ideas are fine, but they are all concerned with planning things rather than with getting on and doing things. To make sure York remains an</p> | <p>L1 – noted</p> <p>L4 – noted</p> <p>L6 – noted</p> <p>L8 – noted</p> <p>L10 – noted.</p> <p>L11 – Interesting point about the bins and will raise it with colleagues but the solar bin is now part of CYC default standards.</p> <p>SM1 - ??</p> <p>SM2 – It is covered in next steps but <b>will strengthen the text and consider a separate section on maintenance.</b></p> <p>SM3 – Noted</p> <p>SM4 – noted.</p> <p>SM7 – Noted and agreed that action is required but this document is designed to ensure that when the action happens it is carried out in the right way.</p> <p>SM11 – in the document.</p> <p>SM13 – noted.</p> <p>SM15 – agreed and cleanliness will be added.</p> <p>SM17 – the bridge closure is not</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>attractive place to live and an attractive place for the tourists who are now such a major part of the city's economy things need to start happening fast (such as the closure of Lendal Bridge, for example ...).</p> <p>SM8 - I welcome the intention to reduce street clutter, particularly in the city centre and arterial routes.</p> <p>SM11 - What are the next steps</p> <p>SM13 - Yes, with the caveat expressed in 3. Let the traffic flows resulting from Lendal Bridge closure be properly understood before undertaking any large scale 'landscaping' which will be needed as a result.</p> <p>SM15 - They are mostly correct. However, I think general cleanliness should feature and I suspect it would feature higher in most people's priorities than some other plans for the year. Some streets (the paving mainly) just feel dirty and that surely stands against everything this policy sets out to address. Yet it doesn't feature in the plans. By the way, I assume this features in the "Management" principle?</p> <p>SM17 - Closing any bridge is most silly and ignores the needs of commerce.</p> <p>SM18 - Not fast enough</p> <p>SM20 - A generic policy of management will not work - each area needs to be considered individually. There is no need for an "action plan and pallet of materials". Each area should be assessed and material purchased in bulk to proved cost savings, whilst fixing ALL areas, not just priority ones.</p> | <p>one of the next steps in this document.</p> <p>SM18 – noted.</p> <p>SM20 – agreed on the management and text will be amended. Agreement on a pallet of materials is essential to avoid confusion and inconsistency in the city. Purchasing in bulk is a good suggestion but storage areas will need to be identified.</p> |
| <p><b>8) General feedback/comments:</b></p> | <p>L1 - Securing traffic lights on Fawcett Street, rather than a pelican crossing would have been safer. Despite a pelican crossing, many motorists fail to stop, even when pedestrians are on the crossing! Feeding in to join traffic from Barbican remains as precarious as previously.</p> <p>L3 - Good idea.</p> <p>L5 - Shops should only be allowed saturated or heritage paintwork. Bootham and Gillygate (cafe now bright green) make the place look slovenly.</p> <p><b>Amplified performances must be kept low volume. The shop workers do</b></p>   | <p>L1 – Noted.</p> <p>L3 – noted.</p> <p>L5 – Shopfronts has not been included but could be dealt with in a supplementary planning document. Will discuss further with conservation colleagues.</p>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><b>complain about this.</b></p> <p>L6 - Cyclists and skateboarders riding in pedestrianised area is a major problem and safety hazard.</p> <p>L9 - To relax people's eyes and minds, green strips of grass should line all footpaths. Even damaged it is better than if it is covered. It is better for bees and butterflies as well. Your photo is interesting. <b>This material is unavailable now if it is dug up it should be sent to a store to be reused for repairs such as when street lights are installed.</b> LED and fluorescent paint should be considered.</p> <p>L10 - Apart from question 7, yes a great improvement, there is always something that's missed, but who gets everything right.</p> <p>L11 - There should be <b>more cycle parking</b>, not less. Cycle parking should be rationed in Parliament Street and increased in certain areas. To call York a "Cycling City" and seek to reduce cycle parking is farcical.</p> <p>L12 – See 5 page response below.</p> <p>SM1 - The Streetscape report is interesting and thought-provoking. I'm pleased it's available online and hope it will continue to be after this consultation as I'm sure it will be of interest to residents now and in the future. Having read it I'm more baffled than ever as to why King's Square is to be repaved. It's fine as it is and there are clearly many other areas where the money would be better spent. <b>Parliament Street, for example, which is strangely uneven.</b> If trees are to be planted could fruit trees be considered? Small ornamental trees are uninspiring. Clearly we'll never plant the stately 'street trees' like limes again, but perhaps instead we could have something useful/edible instead. Apparently the mulberry tree bears an edible fruit. A shame the one in King's Square is to be removed for 'aesthetic reasons'. Though providing new benches is good, in areas where there are none, I object to the council removing existing benches in order to replace them with the 'standard design'. This is a waste of money and can't be justified. Particularly where the existing seats have memorial plaques, as in King's</p> | <p>Amplified sound is mentioned in the document and will review the text to see if it could be strengthened.</p> <p>L6 – agreed. Will consider adding to section on enforcement.</p> <p>L9 – agreed that greenery is beneficial but there are limited possibilities in the centre of York. Will discuss with landscape colleagues about a green infrastructure section.</p> <p>L10 – noted.</p> <p>L11 – Agreed. The intention behind removal of cycle parking in Parliament Streets was not to decrease parking but to move it to Piccadilly which is not far. However, the text will be amended to keep the parking.</p> <p>L12 – noted.</p> <p>SM1 – On trees, an interesting and useful point. There is a draft tree strategy being prepared currently which will contain guidance on street trees. On seats, the document suggests replacing seats that are worn out or otherwise not</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>Square. I'm not sure why street performers are included in this document, see no problem with them, think there are enough rules regarding their performance already, and strongly disagree with any further 'action' being needed. I hope this report will lead to a greater appreciation of historic features of the streetscape, the details it highlights so well, and aid in their preservation. My main concern about this general 'reinvigoration' movement is that it looks likely to over-sanitise the place and remove the quirky aspects that make the place special and give the true distinctive sense of place.</p> <p>SM2 - I congratulate the authors of the study for its depth and the breadth of research; reference both to existing York measures and suitable comparators such as Sheffield and Doncaster is effective. The early background sections are concise and informative. 1. Please ensure that the whole document remains readily accessible after consultation for wider reference. 2. I note with alarm the use on 2 occasions of the term "quarter" to describe certain parts of the city. This is pretentious, rebranding tosh and has no place in a northern English city. We already have "...gate" and the main bridges and roads as landmarks to delineate the city areas; please stick with them.</p> <p>SM3 - York is to be commended for such a comprehensive review of its streetscape assets as shown in the master document. It gives priority to city centre areas which I do not disagree with but I would be very interested in knowing what survey work has been carried out in outlying areas such as Fulford. Further work involving people with local knowledge would be desirable. There should be publicity given to how particular eyesores/improvements should be communicated.</p> <p>SM4 - Summary paper vague and contains too much jargon.</p> <p>SM5 - The report seems to have an undue emphasis on actively replacing materials and fittings with the object of "uniformity" in a given area. I would promote a lighter touch of leaving well alone unless something is of</p> | <p>suitable as in equalities compliant. On street performers, this is not about street performance per-se but about excessive amplified performance especially in Parliament Street. This is an issue to do with how people use and appreciate space. Many public realm strategies consider ambiance as part of their analysis.</p> <p>SM2 – 1. Noted, 2. The term quarter is used in reference to the Doncaster Cultural Quarter (an official label) and the Micklegate Quarter which is a locally derived label. They are both formally in existence. Therefore there is no pretentious use of the term.</p> <p>SM3 – Interesting point about outlying areas. These are being examined as part of the York Historic Environment Characterisation Project, an English Heritage funded project to complete November 2013.</p> <p>SM4 – noted.</p> <p>SM5 – replacement of materials</p> |
|--|---|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>particularly poor quality or condition. You use Walmgate Bar as an example of poor material choice - I would contend that even with the best materials the whole area looks over-engineered and artificial. We should not be "recreating" York as if building a film set, we should be making minor improvements and carrying out repairs. One repeated theme I can agree with is the poor quality of repairs by utilities - the Council should be advising and enforcing the highest standards for these works. Cycle parking should remain in Parliament Street and St Sampson's Square unless the same (or greater) quantity of new parking is provided close by.</p> <p>SM7 - Please let us begin to see things happening -- and on a scale rather better than the rather disappointing city contribution to the recent changes in Deangate.</p> <p>SM8 - I welcome the guide as a planned management of York's public realm. As someone who regularly cycles and walks into the city centre I welcome the focus on pedestrians and designing appropriately located cycle infrastructure. In Stockholm, for example, cycle racks are used in places to demarcate the beginning of green spaces or pedestrian areas (for example at Smedsuddsvagen). There is an opportunity to develop more logical flows for cyclists in places (an ability to turn right onto Skeldergate bridge from Tower Street without having to get off??) and for some bold developments around cycle furniture. I agree about the clutter of bike racks on Parliament Street and the decision to move to less central areas. Perhaps York could consider storage options, such as the 'Apple' outside the railway station at Alphen aan den Rijn in the Netherlands (but appropriate to York)? Finally, a plea to attempt to manage utility companies' interventions into the road! There are various examples where a road or pavement has been resurfaced only to be dug up by first one, then another utility company in a row!!</p> <p>SM9 - Hello, It all looks excellent. It would be good to see some innovative cycle stands throughout the City, including in Parliament Street. Kind regards, Iris Wells</p> | <p>is not to achieve uniformity but to achieve a quality public realm that uses a consistent default pallet of materials which will in turn result in a less complicated and simple environment that is relatively easy to maintain and manage. Agreed on the cycle parking and the text will be amended. Utilities is dealt with under next steps but it is clear that further text is needed.</p> <p>SM7 – not sure I understand the comment on Deangate. Not sure that anything has been done here.</p> <p>SM8 – Finding space for cycle racks that are accessible and safe is proving a challenge but remains a priority for CYC. Following many adverse comments, the text will be amended to retain the racks on Parliament Street but perhaps consideration could be given to better siting? There is a next step regarding utilities but further text will be developed.</p> |
|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>SM10 - Any impingement on current arrangements for access to Fire Service Vehicles or access to Fire Hydrants, Dry or Wet Risers should be notified to North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>SM13 - An excellent and comprehensive report. But this is just the initial stage, and the devil will lie in the detail - which the public does not yet have. I would like to see wide publicity for this and all subsequent reports, both to give the public the opportunity to respond, and in the interest of retaining general goodwill. The Streetscape strategy should avoid the PR disaster which accompanies the Lendal Bridge plan! As a member of the public I would like to see consultation with those who, like me, will be immediately affected by any plans. I live in Duncombe Place, and despite having approached the Council several times to find out what is happening, if indeed there are any plans at the moment, and having had vague promises of consultations being made and meetings held, I have never been contacted. Let everybody who wants to be included and updated, not just business and commerce.</p> <p>SM14 - I would like to see more trees (but not in tubs - see Long Street Thirsk for dead trees in tubs), but not limes as they only need pollarding and then they look awful - see Lord Mayor's Walk. There should be more vegetation in general, but not growing out of the buildings, especially not in the gutters at King's Manor - they should know better. I like the free food bed on Whip-Ma-Whop-Ma-Gate. There should be more public seating in Parliament Street so that it is a place to meet. What do you mean by 'designed benches' under Principle 3? All benches are designed, can't you just design ones that are comfortable and vandal-proof? But yes, get rid of all of the unnecessary signs, railings and any bollards that are not rising ones. While I am glad to see the work that has been carried out around the minster (the ramp particularly) I think the crunchy-nut cornflake road surface looks weird, and would not like to see more of it in the city. Avoid anything olde worlde but invest in quality modern design that will be a credit to the city ie less like that</p> | <p>SM9 – Interesting point about innovative cycle rack designs – the document favours the Sheffield Hoop only because it is an industry standard. Will investigate further.</p> <p>SM10 – noted.</p> <p>SM13 – noted.</p> <p>SM14 – noted. There will be a draft tree strategy out to public consultation which will address street trees. Note the comment on designed benches – text will be clarified.</p> <p>Comment on quality modern design noted and agreed with. This is covered by Principle 3. Design. Comments on cafes noted.</p> <p>SM15 – Noted.</p> <p>SM19 – Noted and useful comment. Will firm up on next steps.</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>god-awful fountain in Parliament Street - and more like the Millennium Bridge. Don't allow every cafe to have outside tables, there isn't room for it and it's elitist.</p> <p>SM15 - I've covered all my comments in the answers above. I've hopefully been constructive as I'm not a doomsayer when it comes to this beautiful city and the council. I appreciate this opportunity to have a say.</p> <p>SM19 - please take into account comments about deep cleaning and please ensure that the person who makes decisions on signage, design for anything permanent or temporary in the city is skilled in that area of work and treat any decisions on design etc as someone would if they were working for the national trust....come up with a set of guidelines fitting for the city and ensure everyone across the city uses them..... Work up a new 'logo/brand' for the city council so that when using this logo for events it looks welcoming to all.....Edinburgh has a good example.....</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

### 3. Analysis of other responses:

| Name              | Response  | Noted   |
|-------------------|---|---|
| 3.1 York resident | <p>In response to your request for comments, I confirm that I generally agree with your document and guiding principles, but have a number of detailed comments:</p> <p>(Page 4) Is the title of this page intended to be “Foreword” or is some clever meaning intended here? (Collins Dictionary definitions of “Foreword” are (noun, obsolete): “a vanguard” or (transitive verb, obsolete): “to guard in front”</p> <p>(Page 28) Principle 6 (agreeing a new obligation on utility companies to look after the city streetscape) should take a higher priority – not wait until the improvements are undertaken.</p> | <p>It is a Foreword in the traditional and common usage of the term.</p> <p>This is not a hierarchy of priorities but will review text.</p> |

(Page 57) In the centre of the city I would prefer to see the use of bus shelters without side panels. At a number of locations (e.g. Museum Street/ St Leonards Place, Station Road by Grand cedar Court Hotel (labelled in your report as “positioned correctly”, Stonebow), bus shelters are placed quite well back from the kerb edge, so that the glass panels and the waiting crowd (often beside, rather than in the bus shelter) then entirely block the pavement – not only for mobility impaired footpath users. This point is also raised in Access and Mobility Audit.

(Page 63) **In sensitive streetscapes, you could consider encouraging or obliging the utility companies to site their street cabinets underground in manhole chambers. In addition, you should also consider much greater regulation and management of outside wiring** – particularly by BT – who from my own experience seem to think they can nail wires to just about any building they like – without obtaining the wayleave required by the Electronic Communications Act/ Electronics Communications Code. York could benefit greatly from reducing cable clutter and “taking BT in hand”.

(Page 66) **There should be a limit on sound amplification.** I was recently amazed by the volume of an electric guitar being played on Coney Street in the late evening, outside.

(Page 67) The city council should take a much greater role in waste management rather than collection and landfill. With this number of visitors the City should be in the vanguard of serving up take-away and other foods which do not result in huge quantities of 1-use products (e.g. polystyrene) ending up in landfill – less than 10 minutes later. Germany has proved that even on 1-use aluminium drinks cans it is possible to charge a deposit. Returnable bottles (with deposits) would also greatly improve the image of our streets and river – often cluttered with plastic bottles, aluminium cans, pizza boxes, and half-eaten baked potatoes and doner kebabs in

Noted and will raise this point with local transport colleagues.

CYC is, where possible, investigating this but the Utility companies are not always sympathetic. **Will include text to emphasise the point.**

Agreed but apparently there is little the council can do to limit this. Will investigate further. Agreed but this is a national challenge. Not sure what the council on its own can achieve. However, I will discuss further with colleagues.



polystyrene boxes. Restriction of use of materials to cardboard and paper and imposition of deposits would yield significant benefits – and reduce the size of the waste removal problem. Teenagers and others would be motivated to collect bottles if there was a deposit on them – and the outlets dispensing them would have to manage their returns.

#### Response to ACCESS & MOBILITY AUDIT Consultation

(Page 17) I am encouraged that you will provide some areas of guardrailing to allow people intimidated by the open walls to enjoy them, but equally encouraged by your implication that a large proportion of the wall will remain open – in their untainted historical state.

(Page 29) I am not a fan of PUFFIN crossings. I preferred the previous PELICAN crossings. I find that the PELICAN crossings provide a “green man” or “red man” signal in amore obvious place (on the opposite side of the street) – enabling me to remain focussed on the road and the traffic while waiting. I don’t tend to stare at a red man at waist height right next to me.

#### Further Items for Consideration

“Cycling Rowdies”: it is unfortunate that the creation of some cycle routes (e.g. the shared footpaths/ cycle paths beside the river) are treated by some cyclists as it they are “cycling motorways” – with little respect for foot users – many of whom move rather “randomly” and without considering others too much. Greater separation needs to be achieved.

Toilets: judging by the number of smelly puddles and striped walls (sometimes on shop doors, but often on walls and by Lendal Bridge) – particularly at night, greater availability and signage for toilets is necessary.

Not the preserve of the Streetscape Strategy but a usefull point nevertheless.

Interesting point that has been raised by others. However, from a safety viewpoint the Puffin is better. They sense the presence of a pedestrian on a crossing and will not change to green (for motorists) until clear – much better for slow people. Perhaps the benefits should be explained.

**Noted. Evidence supports the separation of cycle tracks from pedestrian paths. An additional section will be added dealing with cycle tracks and cycle lanes.**

This issue will be considered by a wayfinding strategy and implementation programme over the next twelve months.

**Agreed. Add text to new section on cleanliness.**

Agreed and as above.

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>Pigeons: a significant amount of mess around certain public places is caused by pigeons – who frankly are nowadays in such number that their “swarming” and “close fly-bys” are rather intimidating. More needs to be done.</p> <p>Cigarette butts and chewing gum – another significant blight on the streetscape: it seems there needs to be more education that we don’t “simply pay the council to have them cleaned up for us”.</p> <p>There is an implication that Lendal Bridge may be prioritised for foot traffic and bus traffic. I am concerned that the loss of access via Lendal Bridge will cause me significant access problems to my own home. But if the bridge traffic is to be restricted – then bus traffic too should be eliminated.</p> <p>I am strongly against the use of roads for busses only. My town of birth, Reading, had a phase in the 1970s/1980s in which only busses were allowed into the city centre roads – but the busses themselves then became a menace: think “juggernaut driver” without the speed restrictions caused by traffic congestion. There is already an indication of the likely “typical traffic speed” on York’s “pedestrian-only” streets – take a walk down Coney Street during the evening time and try to avoid the taxis.</p> | <p>Noted but not covered by this document.</p> <p>Noted but not covered by this document.</p> |
| <p>3.2<br/>CTC North<br/>Yorkshire</p> | <p>I respond to the public consultation on behalf of CTC North Yorkshire, the local group of the national Cycling Charity CTC.</p> <p>Please find attached for your information and guidance, a publication by the former Cycling England organisation, which details the recommendations for cycle parking. There are some photographs of "heritage" style Sheffield racks which may be appropriate for some sites in the City.</p>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Also attached a copy of the current DfT Local Transport Note 2/08 "Cycle Infrastructure Design". Section 11 has extensive advice on cycle parking.</p> <p>CTC is concerned by the desire to remove on-street cycle parking from Parliament St. Placing racks at the periphery of the Vehicle Restricted Area (locally called "footstreets") may be beneficial for those who arrive and subsequently depart from the same side of the VRA. The Report seems to presume that this will always be the case. But cyclists who have a number of calls in the City centre will often wheel their bikes through the VRA, parking short term at various sites as they go. They will then leave the VRA on the side opposite to which they entered, to return to their workplace or home.</p> <p>Many residents who work within the VRA will cycle there. If they are fortunate to have dedicated workplace parking, then they can penetrate right to their destination by bike. But not all businesses can offer off-street cycle parking to their staff. The next best alternative is to park on street for the working day. To retain the competitive time saving advantage of cycling, this must preferably be as close as possible to the workplace. Any enforced walking for significant distances will erode the time saving benefits of cycling, and so discourage use of this travel mode.</p> <p>I have not learned of any survey findings, which might reveal the relative proportions of all day and short term cycle parking within the VRA. It may be considered helpful to determine these numbers, and tailor cycle parking within the VRA to known demand, rather than bow to a knee jerk decision to simply remove existing racks.</p> <p>Removal of on-street cycle parking from within the VRA will inevitably lead to more bikes being locked to street furniture, trees, railings and so forth, within the VRA. It will be impossible to discourage this, and we urge Officers and Members to accept the inevitable realism that small clusters of on street cycle parking will always be</p> | <p>Noted and text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
|---|--|

|                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
|                          | <p>needed within the VRA.</p> <p>The writer represents CTC on the North Yorkshire Police York Cycle Theft Task Group. Cycle theft in the City centre has been on a downward trend for some while, following various initiatives. Cyclists who park their bikes in the City centre are being repeatedly urged to lock them with two different designs of lock, to something that is immoveable. It would be unfortunate if this theft trend was reversed by removal of formal parking provision.</p> <p>(Cycle Parking Guidance &amp; DfT Cycle Infrastructure Design documents attached to email)</p>   |  |
| <p>3.3 York resident</p> | <p>I have just read your leaflet entitled "City of York - Streetscape Strategy and and Guidance". In this you are looking for views in respect of "design, distinctiveness, way-finding, light &amp; dark and management". Indeed you commissioned an "Access and Mobility audit".</p> <p>Meanwhile the major road nearest to my house (Rawcliffe Drive - heavy vehicles and buses route) is falling apart with abundant cracks and potholes (made worse by the useless "speed bumps" which a previous Labour administration insisted were installed).</p> <p>I don't care if you colour the road black, red, blue, yellow or pink. I just want the roads outside the City Centre (and the location of the bulk of Council Tax payers) to be kept up to a standard.</p> <p>In 2012, James Alexander indicated that cost cutting meant that road repairs would take longer and there would be a growth in potholes: yet the Council has funds to produce totally useless audits.</p> <p>Just do the minimum which the law requires and start diverting funds away from tourists and to York residents!</p> | <p>The streetscape strategy and guidance is aimed at setting standards for improvements to the city centre and secondary shopping streets such as Front Street, Acomb for all citizens as well as visitors. The access &amp; mobility audit has allowed CYC to take full account of our most vulnerable citizens in planning work in the public realm. The proposed priorities are rightly based on pedestrian heavy streets and spaces to provide maximum benefit to York's citizens as pedestrians and not car drivers. This is following national and indeed international best practice,</p> |

|   |  |                                      |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
|   |  | formal guidance and official policy. |
| 3.4<br>Conservation<br>Area Advisory<br>Panel | The panel were in favour of this document being adopted as soon as possible. | Noted.                               |

3.5 English Heritage

Thank you for your e-mail requesting that English Heritage comment upon the City of York Streetscape Strategy & Guidance Consultation Draft.

We have studied the draft document, and consider it to be a sound and comprehensive approach to putting in place a coherent streetscape strategy for the uniquely important City of York. We would however make a few specific observations, which we hope will improve the document.

Firstly we note that only limited reference is made to English Heritage's "Streets for All" guidance, although we acknowledge that the spirit of our advice appears to have been adhered to.

Secondly in relation to street lighting (Part 3: Strategic Framework Street hierarchy-Priority A: specifics page 33, column 1, para. 3), the text states that:

"Street lighting should always be wall mounted."

Although as a general principle, this is the correct approach, the significance or sensitivity of the building to which the lighting is to be affixed should be assessed to determine whether or not this is appropriate, and additionally, what the most appropriate location is. We suggest that the advice of your in house Conservation Team is sought in this regard.

We would advise that the text be amended in accordance with the previous paragraph.

Conversely, reference is later made to the need to ensure that:

"Wherever possible and practical street lights should continue to be wall mounted, (Part 4: Guidance-Street furniture-Lighting, page 53, column 1, final

Will review the body text to see if this document can be given more prominence

Noted and will amend text as below.

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>paragraph &amp; column 2, paragraph 1).</p> <p>English Heritage supports this more qualified approach.</p> <p>We also consider that illustrative detailing of differing public realm elements approaches would assist the reader in understanding the City of York’s aspirations, and would suggest that the approach set out in Sheffield City Council’s “Sheffield City Centre Urban Design Compendium” part 3.3. pages 93-95 &amp; part 5.1, pages 195-215, (Sheffield city Council, Sheffield One, Objective 1, September 2004 - <a href="http://sccplugins.sheffield.gov.uk/urban_design/">http://sccplugins.sheffield.gov.uk/urban_design/</a> ).</p> | <p>Noted but the Sheffield Design Compendium is quite a different piece of work that would require a significant extra period of time to deliver that current resources preclude. However, the use of further graphics and some new text may in part address this shortcoming.</p> |
| <p>3.6 Wheldrake Parish Council</p>                             | <p>all councillors were in favour of the proposals in the Streetscape Strategy</p>   | <p>Noted.</p>  |
| <p><b>3.7</b><br/>Wheatlands Educational Community Woodland</p> | <div data-bbox="353 743 875 1091" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Here are reviews to the draft Streetscape Strategy and Design Guidance consultation and summary leaflet <b>of preferred designs for York’s streets...</b></p> <p>It is welcomed and necessary and we value this document in principle to Reinvigorate York</p> <p>This response is on behalf of the natural environment sub group chair of York Environment Forum. I am vice chair of Tree-mendous York, also ex-</p>  |  |

Horticulture/Agricultural businessman, founder of wheatlands educational community woodland [www.wheatlandswoodland.co.uk](http://www.wheatlandswoodland.co.uk)

Because COY has no green Infrastructure strategy and it's multiple benefits of the Natural Environment, it has no tree strategy (this manual only refers to a tree strategy?) nor does it refer to Living landscape design codes. These natural environment value's are still not recognised as important to York as the historic element is.

It does refer to city beautiful report (but I refer to living natural beauty real natural environment distinctiveness of York)

In your leaflet summary of streets and places it mainly refers to supply and management of the hard landscaping no reference to design of soft landscaping. Please visit neighbouring town Harrogate has high standards of beautiful maintained and planted foliage & flowering beds, containers and trees. Trees in York could be features for places, be grown palletised as temporary structures and used in traffic management. Also trees assist with street cooling/furniture and are particularly valuable to reduce temperature to cool areas, be used as a cafe mobile temporary fence. Please see separate email with photo's taken around the world. Please read 'trees in the townscape' which our council leader endorsed attached for other examples

All seasonal green/flowering in open spaces increases value particularly to visitors and for local people

*I note that there is little reference to the standards and guidance of the above and not 'getting it right first time' will only increase costs to the city*

Green Infrastructure and Tree Strategy are currently being worked on. Streetscape Strategy is more to do with hard landscaping.

Noted.

There is a section on trees but this will be reviewed to see if further text needs to be added. A new section dealing with planters is to be added and can also address planting beds and other green spaces within hard landscaping areas.

Noted and agreed.

This strategy and guidance is designed to consider hard landscaping predominantly. The section on trees does reference a number of relevant publications.



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Why, the health &amp; safety issues of pigeons and geese that stop people using open spaces and also the cost of damaging these spaces are not referred too I cannot understand</p> <p>Other points why not make available defibrillators on lamp posts and consider cash machine in original post boxes, see photo's</p> <p>Without clear soft Living landscape design guidance codes, good staff skills, training for the new skills required, monitoring and management of the natural environment. York's distinctiveness and will fall well short of local people's and visitor expectations and standards</p> <p>Please listen and involved volunteer professionals we wish to help</p> <p>Hope to hear from you shortly</p> <p>(TDAG Trees in the Landscape document attached to email)<br/><b>Photos 1432 Landscaping traffic areas, 076 mobile planters cafe area, 1455 trees help with traffic control</b></p> | <p>Interesting point and there will be a <b>new section on cleanliness</b> which may be an opportunity to consider wildlife issues.</p> <p>Useful comment although the defibrillator would almost certainly be abused I would have thought. Different uses for redundant red phone boxes will be mentioned in the text.</p> <p>Agreed but is more the preserve of green infrastructure strategies. Will discuss with landscape colleagues.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
|--|---|--|



3.8 York resident

My general observations on the City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance are as follows:


- It is not clear what the programme of works is to rectify clear divergences from the proposed design principles e.g. cobbles in poor state of repair on Blossom Street, inappropriate guard rails at Bootham Bar etc. Is the intention to invite residents to report examples of bad design so it can be addressed and when can we expect these things to be attended to?
- There appears to be an error on page 67 of the guidance material, there are two photographs of the solar compressor - one is incorrectly described as being the Broxap bin.
- The Broxap bin has a number of design faults and in some ways is inferior to the Edinburgh bin it is replacing for the following reasons:
  - o People generally prefer to drop rather than post their litter. Posting litter tends to lead to more misses as people try to avoid putting their hands into the bin.
  - o Although in theory a slightly bigger capacity bin than the half-Edinburgh it replaces, the Broxap's covered top prevents litter from being easily compressed which causes the bins to rapidly fill up and overflow. In addition, the side openings mean that overflowing items tend to fall out leading to litter problems. The new

The strategy and guidance is written to provide advice and guidance to CYC staff (highways etc.) and developers and utility companies. Essentially anyone who is involved in impacts on the public realm. Noted and will amend.

Noted.

Noted. This is a point made by others and will discuss with waste management colleagues.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>bins will therefore require more frequent emptying at additional cost. There have been several instances this week where I have had to inform the council that the new style bins on Micklegate require emptying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o In comparison to the full Edinburgh, the opening of the Broxap is too small to easily accept a pizza takeaway box - a not unpopular choice of sustenance amongst late night revellers.</li><li>o Given the number of bins which have been removed as part of a cost saving initiative, the roll out of new bins which needed to be attended to more frequently and before the consultation exercise has been completed looks clumsy, ill judged and dismissive of residents' views.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whilst I understand the general principle not to have seating located next to, or close to, refuse bins for health and nuisance reasons - this principle needs careful clarification. It is fair to say that seating is frequently used because it provides a convenient place to eat and drink whilst on the go. Consequently seating areas do unfortunately become litter hotspots and this is particularly so where there are no bins in the vicinity. At one time, St. Helen's Square had four bins (including a pilot recycling bin) and had fewer issues with litter as a result, certainly in contrast to Kings Square where there were considerably fewer bins. The benches on the Bar Walls near Lendal Bridge have no obvious bin close by leading to litter issues in this area. Sadly, we do need bins near benches.</li><li>• Is there not scope for further protection of grass verges by banning the practice of parking on them? Whilst the use of timber bollards can be an attractive and effective alternative, there is a cost involved and Highways are remarkably reluctant to install them - by their own admittance, cosmetic maintenance is something in which they have no interest. How is this department going to be whipped into line given the key role they will need to play in delivering the design recommendations?</li></ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and the text will be amended for clarity.</p> <p>We do need to encourage people to take responsibility for their rubbish – is it too much to ask people to walk a short distance to dispose of litter?</p> <p>Noted and agree. The guidance recommends timber bollards in grassed areas and the section on trees could be amended to include a statement relating to tree planting on grass verges where appropriate.</p> |
|--|--|

|                                      |   |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>York resident</p>                 | <p>One other thought concerns the lack of a standard design for notice and information boards around the city. Please see attached.</p>   | <p>There will be a wayfinding strategy and implementation programme emerging over the next twelve months which will address this point.</p>                      |
| <p>3.9 York resident</p>             | <p>My view as a blue badge holder is concerned primarily with access , parking spaces and traffic restrictions particularly because of potential traffic violations as well as ease of continued use of facilities.</p> <p>The provision of seating is most welcome, the reduced disabled parking will prove difficult. All of the moves we make for example are planned in advance, distance to walk , carrying ? , seats, toilets. Where ever possible we will use P&amp;R, which for us is an easily accessible service but quite dependent on why and what the journey is about. Access thro Goodramgate is a lot more problematic than Lendal or Blake Street but still gets you to the centre, Kings Square is difficult but it is shop and out as it were. Seating I found well used , fortunately I have access to the churches for seating and toilets .</p> <p>Broadly I hope good coverage is given in the Press to include graphic detail for disabled folk as a group as the work moves forward.</p> | <p>Noted and will discuss blue and green badge parking with colleagues to see if this document should have a section dealing with the subject.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>3.10 Janet Kay, York resident</p> | <p>Could the City of York Council please take a long hard look at the state of streets in the city? Changes in street furniture and design etc appear as mere cosmetic dressing when the streets themselves are almost "medievally" filthy. Even the city centre is absolutely squalid with chewing gum, old ice cream, spilled drinks and</p>  | <p>Noted and the text will now include a section on cleanliness and street management and enforcement.</p>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>various other stains and litter. A city such as ours should surely have proper street cleaning equipment (like water cannons) as seen on the continent. Areas around and underneath the bins that are left are dreadfully soiled.</p> <p>I am retired now, but when I had a weekend job at the local chemist in my schooldays, my first task each morning was to clean the shop doorway and then to swill the pavement in front of the shop. This was not in some twee middle class market town but in the mining belt of south Yorkshire. All the shops in the parade did the same and there was a pride in doing it.</p> <p>The Minster Plaza is superb and long overdue, but could the area not be softened with some form of planting by way of tubs and baskets? If the city can't afford this, perhaps this would be an area for provision by individuals or companies.</p> <p>Lastly, the council will inevitably end up with egg on its collective face when Lendal Bridge is closed. Virtually everyone realises this with the exception of the responsible council members.</p> | <p>See above and will include reference to partnership working with local business to keep the streets clean.</p> <p>Noted and the strategy will include guidance on planters.</p> <p>Noted but not part of this strategy</p> |
| <p>3.11 Joseph Rowntree Foundation</p> | <p>My interest is clearly about linking opportunities to redesign streetscapes in line with the York Dementia without Walls initiative.</p> <p>I have had a quick look but can't find any reference to the advice we had from Dr Lynne Mitchell on dementia-friendly design – could you let me know if this is an oversight or if the advice was not felt to be useful or relevant? It would seem a real pity to miss the opportunity of including the latest thinking on how our streets can make the growing numbers of our citizens affected by dementia feel welcome, safe and included.</p> <p>More specifically, it would be very helpful to have any feedback on how Dr Mitchell's site visit and meeting have influenced the Reinvigorate project and</p>  | <p>Noted and replied to in separate cover. Main issues around dementia will be picked up by the wayfinding strategy.</p>  |

|                                    |  |   |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                    | particularly the plans for Kings Square.   |   |
| 3.12<br>Reinvigorate<br>York Board | Annotated comments on a copy of the guidance   |   |
| 3.13 York Civic<br>Trust           | <p>York Civic Trust welcomes the streetscape strategy and believes this document will make a significant contribution to improving the quality of York’s public realm. We do, however, have some minor comments which we hope will be helpful.</p> <p><b>p.37 Gateway streets</b></p> <p>Our own experience of using tree planters on Foss Islands leads us to the belief that this is not a solution which has any merit in the longer term. We would counsel caution with this approach.</p> <p><b>P39 Lighting</b></p> <p>Would it not be sensible to specify height for lighting columns (for the avoidance of doubt).</p> <p><b>P60 Trees</b></p> <p>We welcome the guidance on the planting of trees in an urban setting. A good case in point are the trees in front of Peasholme House that block the view of a handsome Georgian building; perhaps a photograph of this will illustrate the issue adequately.</p> <p><b>P63 Street Cabinets</b></p> <p>We suggest that whenever possible every effort should be made to set the workings in the ground at pavement level. Some utilities do this, but others need</p> | <p>Noted. There will be a new section dealing with planters.</p> <p>Agreed and text will be amended.</p> <p>Noted. Will in fact ad example of tree in front of church on pavement.</p> <p>Noted and will amend text</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>to be persuaded to follow suit.</p> <p><b>P64 Street fixtures and fittings</b></p> <p>Might it not be useful to include references to <b>railings</b> which contribute to the setting of listed buildings?</p> <p>There are many a case in point, but those on St Leonard’s Place, designed by John Harper and made in the York foundry of Thomlinson &amp; Walker, are important features which must be preserved.</p> <p><b>P66 Amplified Sound</b></p> <p>We welcome the suggestion that the Council should review its policy on amplified sound. Some groups take this to extreme levels and it no longer allows the public to have the quiet enjoyment of public spaces. We also welcome the comments about licensed pitches which significantly detract from the setting of historic buildings.</p> <p><b>P68 Traffic signs</b></p> <p>We recommend that the guidance avoid pejorative statements such as ‘design, layout and application <b>must</b> comply with statutory requirements’.</p> <p>There is considerable flexibility available for historic cities and the <b>Department of Transport Traffic Advisory leaflet 01/13</b> should not be relegated to a footnote, but embedded in the body of the text.</p> <p>We hope these comments will be useful.</p> <p>Members of the Trust are greatly encouraged by this guidance and earnestly hope</p> | <p>accordingly.</p> <p>There is an example in the document but mabey not so clear. Will amend text and add new photo.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and text will be amended accordingly.</p> |
|--|--|

|                    |  |   |
|--------------------|--|---|
|                    | that those implementing works in the future, use this document effectively.  |   |
| 3.14 York resident | <p>I wish to register my objections to the removal of cycle racks from Parliament St and any other city centre locations. There is already an acute shortage of designated cycle parking in the city centre, as evidenced by the random parking of bikes anywhere they can be attached such as railings, benches etc. This will only be exacerbated by the removal of what are the biggest capacity racks. Their relocation to just outside the pedestrian area is not a solution -there is a need for short-term parking close to shops and city-centre facilities. If you remove some of the benefits of cycling in York - viz speed and ease of access to the centre - you will make cycling a less attractive option and defeat your objective of increasing the number of cyclists.</p> <p>My suggestion is that you retain cycle racks in Parliament St for short-term parking, but also locate a greater number of racks just outside the centre for all-day use, encouraging commuter cyclists to use these.</p> | <p>Noted and text will be amended to take account of these comments which we have from a number of sources.</p> <p>Short-term parking will be impossible to secure. CYC is continually identifying new sites for cycle parking.</p> |
| 3.15 York resident | <p>I wish to object very strongly about the proposal to remove bike racks from Parliament Street. The fact that the racks are nearly always full surely shows that there is a very strong demand for them. From the many people who work in the City Centre and who use their bikes to get to work, to people like me who use their bikes to shop in the market and other shops in the centre. What is the point of buying my fruit and veg in the market and then carry heavy bags a significant distance to my bike? The whole point is that my bike is also my shopping trolley. The whole emphasis in the City Centre seems to be discouraging the residents of York from using it at all - and just making it 'nice' for the tourists. On the one hand you want to encourage people to cycle in York, then you make the City Centre even more inaccessible than it is at the moment for cyclists. Please leave the racks alone</p>  | <p>Noted and text will be amended accordingly.</p>  |



|                                      |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                      | <p>- in fact give us more - then we won't be forced to lock our bikes to the ever diminishing number of railings!!!</p>  |  |
| <p>3.16 York resident,<br/>Haxby</p> | <p>We write as residents of the city for 50 years and because we appreciate the importance of the City Streetscape, which we believe is a fundamental part of the answer to the question '<i>What is special about York?</i>'.</p> <p>We welcome the Streetscape Strategy and applaud the <i>City Council</i> and <i>Invigorate York</i> on the work it has done in preparing such a comprehensive document. We hope it will be constantly referred to by all those whose actions affect the City's streetscape.</p> <p>A few points upon which we will make specific comment:</p> <p><b>Page 60 - Trees</b></p> <p>We generally welcome the trees in the City's urban setting. However, trees which make a beneficial contribution to the streetscape during the initial years of their life, can become seriously detrimental to the streetscape as they grow to maturity. I do not believe that trees once planted should of necessity be left to grow and grow irrespective of the detrimental impact they have, until they either die or removal becomes necessary for safety reasons. Once trees reach the point where they are too big for their location, they should be removed and replaced. I would like to see a statement in the strategy to that effect. To illustrate my point I would refer you to the following locations where trees have outgrown their location – in front of Peasholme House, the tree in front of the West Front of the Minster and the ornamental tress planted on the bank to the City Walls alongside Lendal Hill which now obscure the view of the City Wall. Further we would</p> | <p>This point is covered in the Strategy but will review the text and consider strengthening if appropriate.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>welcome a statement that trees should be managed for aesthetic reasons rather than just for health and safety reasons</p> <p><b>Page 64 - Street Fixtures and Fittings</b></p> <p>Unless mention is made of 'railings' elsewhere, we would suggest they are referred to in this section as they make an important contribution to the streetscape.</p> <p><b>Page 65 - 'A' Boards</b></p> <p>We support the banning of 'A' boards on the public highway</p> <p><b>Page 66 - Street Trading Pitches etc</b></p> <p>We would urge greater attention to the siting and design of semi-permanent trading stalls and pitches, so that they do not detract from the settings of historic buildings and that temporary structures are of an appropriate quality to avoid the often 'tacky' appearance that they can create.</p> <p><b>Page 67 - Commercial Waste Bins</b></p> <p>We support the intention to work with city centre retailers to find alternative arrangements for commercial waste bins, as their 'permanent' storage in lanes and alleyways is a serious blot on the streetscape.</p> <p><b>Page 68 - Traffic Signs</b></p> <p>The recent publication - <i>The Traffic Advisory Leaflet 10/13 - Reducing Sign Clutter</i> - is a most welcome and encouraging document and deserves to be centre-stage in this section, rather than as a footnote. The guidance it provides aligns superbly</p> | <p>There is a separate section on railings but the point has been made elsewhere that residential railings have a positive impact and the text will be amended to strengthen this point.</p> <p>Will review existing text and strengthen if appropriate.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will consider adding reference in the body text.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
|--|--|--|

|                           |   |  |
|---------------------------|---|--|
|                           | <p>with the whole intention of the Streetscape Strategy.</p> <p>Lastly we reiterate that we hope this Strategy will be a constant source of reference and inspiration for all who are involved with the City's 'streetscape'.</p>   |  |
| <p>3.17 York resident</p> | <p>The general aim of the Streetscape Strategy is laudable. The footstreets area certainly does need tidying up and its surfaces to be made more consistent (and not looking like they are designed for motor traffic, as many streets still do) across the whole area, lest York's city centre's pedestrianised area continue to look like a poor relation to its continental counterparts.</p> <p>However, removing the cycle parking stands in Parliament Street is likely to have unintended consequences if they are not replaced in the immediate vicinity. There appears to be an assumption by the author of the consultation document that everyone who brings a bicycle into the footstreets area is riding it. This is not so. It is helpful (especially for older people) to be able to walk one's bicycle when shopping in the footstreets area as the bicycle itself bears the load in a basket or in pannier bags hung on the rear rack. However, when doing this, cycle parking stands are still needed for those occasions when the bicycle has to be left to allow its owner to go into a shop or eating establishment.</p> <p>A policy to promote cycling cannot ignore the issue of access. An effective cycling policy is one that recognises that, to be attractive, cycling has to be as nearly as possible a door-to-door activity and that, consequently, parking for cycles has to be accessible and convenient, including for a short stay. If it is not, people will look for other places or street furniture to use for parking or visit the city centre less often.</p> <p>If CYC is insistent on moving the Parliament Street cycle stands, I suggest</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and text will be amended accordingly. The intention to remove the racks and replace with similar on Piccadilly and elsewhere was to free up space on Parliament Street rather than deter cycle riding in the footstreets.</p> <p>Noted and see above.</p> <p>Noted. There are stand at back on Newgate Market but not used. Fear of crime possibly. Will examine possibilities of re-siting racks in Parliament Street.</p> |

|                           |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
|                           | <p>that some of them ought to be moved just around the corner into the Newgate Market area, near the back entrance to M&amp;S. There they would be out of sight of Parliament Street but still near enough to be convenient.</p> <p>However, why not leave them where they are now and plant a privet hedge (of the same height as the stands, or slightly higher) at each end of the bank of cycle stands? This would define the boundaries more emphatically and tidy up the area.</p> <p>PS: It has occurred to me that, if York were in Denmark or the Netherlands, a large cycle parking facility (for long- and short-stay parking) would already have been fitted under Parliament Street. Some countries are, so to speak, streets ahead of the UK!</p>  | <p>Noted.</p>  |
| <p>3.18 York resident</p> | <p>I have unfortunately not got time to study the draft "City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance" in detail.</p> <p>However I'd like to use your invitation to comment on a couple of things that have been of concern to me for a while.</p> <p>- One aspect of putting pedestrians first is the facilities for crossing roads safely. In this context, I think a lot of the pedestrian phases on crossings are too short. Motorists tend to get much longer to use junctions than pedestrians. I recently saw an elderly gentleman crossing Blossom Street at its junction with Nunnery Lane and Queen Street. He couldn't get across in the time provided.</p> <p>Related is the time it takes for traffic lights to switch to the phase for pedestrians to cross, after the button has been pressed. At some junctions this is a long time. Sometimes it seems as if the pedestrian phase is activated only when there's no</p> | <p>Noted. The new puffin crossings are sensitive to pedestrian movt. And will only change when clear. These are being rolled up in the city.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |

|   |   |  |             |  |
|---|---|--|-------------|--|
|   | <p>longer any traffic!</p> <p>To improve things in the two situations above, I suggest a significant increase in the length of the “green man” phase (or its equivalent), and more frequent such phases. This would “put pedestrians first”.</p> <p>-Secondly, although there is a facility for pedestrians to cross at the Museum St-St Leonard’s Place junction, frequently vehicles block the area for pedestrians to cross in St Leonard’s Place. This usually occurs because drivers can’t see round the corner when they’re in Museum St, and thus don’t know that traffic is not moving in St Leonard’s Place. The result is that pedestrians often have difficulty crossing, especially if a large vehicle is blocking the whole of the pedestrian crossing area and more.</p> <p>For pedestrians to be put first, this needs sorting out.</p> <p>I'd be grateful if you'd acknowledge that you've received these comments. I would love to have time to consider your document in detail, but haven't. I hope the above two points are useful.</p> | <p>Noted. See above.</p> <p>Noted. Highway colleagues are examining this junction with a view to re-modelling.</p> |             |  |
| <p>3.19 Culture, Tourism and City Centre officers in CANS</p> | <p>The introduction to the Guidance proposes a vision for York, recognising that the historic environment is a key economic driver and that York’s aspiration is to become a world class city. Need to “enrich our streets and spaces” and have policies and guidance that “empower people to reach those goals”.</p> <p><b>Vision and key principles</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="353 1342 1626 1422"> <tr> <td data-bbox="353 1342 763 1422">Principle</td> <td data-bbox="763 1342 1626 1422">Key message</td> </tr> </table>  | Principle  | Key message |  |
| Principle   | Key message   |  |             |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| York must be for people  | Always put pedestrians first – especially the most vulnerable (e.g. older people with mobility issues)                 |  |
| York must be for everyone (access and mobility)                        | Consult with communities of interest as per Disability Act   |  |
| York must be by design   | Keep things simple and consistent and be aware how streets and space are used before “intervening”                     |  |
|  |  |  |
| York must be distinctive   | Use historic character assessments and statements to base decisions on the layout and use of streets and spaces        |  |
| York, as a network, must be clear how it wants to be read (wayfinding) | Consider how people orientate themselves how they can find their way around and through the area                       |  |
| York must be revealed through light and dark                           | Keep street lighting to the minimum needed for safety and respecting key buildings. Use LED and sustainable technology |  |
| York must be managed   | Planned activities – repairs, festivals, street trading etc  |  |

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| in a self-sustaining way | must consider mobility and access issues and impact on heritage assets, quality outcomes and sustainability, |
|--------------------------|--|

New City Beautiful is quoted, i.e. in how the decision in the 1980s to create footstreets was key “in creating the city’s human qualities that we enjoy today”

**Officer comments:**

The quote from New City Beautiful is very justified and is an important reminder of how recently (in terms of York’s 2000 year history) was the footstreets project. Celebrating York’s history is fine, but modern interventions are not only possible but indeed are in many ways desirable.

The principles from this introduction dovetail in with the aspirations reflected by York@Large (to release the creativity of the people of York so the city’s culture is recognised nationally and internationally) and in the emerging tourism strategy – highlighting York as a Compelling, Exceptional World City.

The report and especially the guidance notes very much focuses on the physical fabric of the city centre, its streets, squares and open spaces. It would be useful if the report was more positive and upfront about “welcoming” cultural activity in public spaces – just as important in “creating the city’s human qualities”. The statement “York must be by design” isn’t strictly true – the pavement cafes that emerged following the development of the footstreets was in practice “a happy accident” and was by no means “by design”. That willingness for York to adapt and change is surely a phenomenon to be cherished?

Noted.

Noted. There is reference to cultural activity in public spaces but the text will be reviewed to consider strengthening this aspect. Agree on cafes but the point of ‘by design’ is to ensure that decisions effecting public spaces a more thoughtful and considered from now on to ensure that there is a consistent and harmonious approach taken.

|                              |   |  |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| 3.20 York resident           | <p>Excellent work. Well done Sir Ron. This may not be relevant, but since we have had many new seats and the new waste bins, will any other new ones match them? presumably this was factored in when they were purchased.</p> <p>The city needs a coherent 'look' to compete with other cities in attracting tourists and a plan is obviously needed. and despite the comments of all the moaners, this will benefit residents too.</p>  | <p>The seats currently being placed in the city are the new default seat for York so yes, more will follow as and when funds become available.</p> |
| 3.21<br>York Cycle Campaign  | <p>York Cycle Campaign wishes to respond to this consultation.</p> <p>We agree with endorse all of the points made by ***** in his response on behalf of CTC (copy attached).</p> <p>In addition, we would add that we believe that the current provision for cycle parking in Parliament Street should not be removed because, whereas its current level of use demonstrates that there is a demand for cycle parking in this part of the city centre that is at least as great as, and probably greater than, the current capacity, there is no suitable alternative site or combination of sites where replacement facilities can be installed. To be used, cycle parking needs to be visible and convenient to the cyclist's destination. Of the list of sites we understand to be under consideration for the installation of alternative cycle parking only one - on Piccadilly - fulfils this basic requirement for an alternative to Parliament Street.</p> <p>We believe that if the current provision on Parliament Street is removed or reduced, it will be impossible to provide adequate alternatives, resulting in a modal shift away from cycling, greater nuisance caused by informal parking of cycles, increased cycle theft, or all three.</p> | <p>Noted and text will be amended to take account of this.</p> <p>Noted as above.</p>  |
| 3.22 Transport Planners, CYC | <p>Please find below my comments on the Draft Streetscape Strategy &amp; Guidance recently published on the CYC website.</p>  |  |



|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>I have tried, wherever possible, to be specific about page numbers rather than just provide general comments on the principles.</p> <p>I agree that having a Streetscape Strategy is the way forward and once agreed needs to be circulated to all members of CYC staff whose work has an affect on the city. Some of the less controversial aspects should be circulated now to prevent any abortive work being undertaken.</p> <p>P14 – the date on the footnote should read 2011 not 20011. The paragraph on 20mph zones assumes an outcome which hasn't yet been proved and the Acomb zone hasn't even been implemented yet.</p> <p>P31 – Missing Footstreets – Back Swinegate, Castlegate, Coppergate Walk, Feasegate, High Petergate (remainder), Jubbergate, Patrick Pool, St Andrewgate (Kings Sq to first set of bollards)</p> <p>Missing squares – St Helen's Square, Library Square (both could probably be improved in some way)</p> <p>P33 – Core Medieval Streets - opportunities to widen footways in the city centre are few and far between although removing parking on some streets would free up some space but may be controversial especially if it is disabled parking.</p> <p>City bars – it may be very difficult to resurface footways and carriageways 20m away from each bar in natural materials as this will encompass quite a few large inner ring road junctions (Walmgate Bar and Micklegate Bar will both involve a</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments will be made.</p> <p>Noted. Will review text and graphics.</p> <p>Noted. This was an issue raised by the access and mobility audit and the intention of the reference in the document is to focus effort on achieving pavement widening where possible.</p> <p>20m is arbitrary measurement that can be shortened if necessary. Text will be</p> |
|--|--|---|

huge expanse and be very costly). Is there any particular reason why 20m was chosen as the default distance?

P34 – Gateway Streets – would you not class Gillygate as a Gateway Street as that is where users of the coach park enter the city centre from?

Secondary Shopping Streets – other suggestions – East Parade, Fishergate, Burton Stone Lane, or Crichton Avenue. Also should Heworth Green really not be Heworth Village? and should Clifton (local) not be Clifton Moor?

P36 – it is probably going to be quite difficult to get consistent paving materials outside many of the small parades of shops as in many cases they have private forecourts between the shop front and the back edge of the adopted highway. The highway boundary is usually distinguishable by the change in surface material. Shop-owners may be reluctant to pay for more expensive paving to match that which the council apply to the adopted highway section. It may not always be appropriate to replace lighting columns with something similar if the original column was deemed to be dangerous or not suitable for that location.

P37 – Cobbled margins – Blossom Street could only be re-cobbled if traffic lanes were removed. Cobbles are dangerous to cyclists and can cause them to lose control if they are forced onto them by traffic or use them to try to pass stationary traffic. Street trees – need to be carefully positioned in order that they don't block sight-lines at junctions or near bus stops, they also need to be far enough away from kerb-edges that they don't damage kerbs and project low shoots out into the carriageway which are a danger to cyclists. **There needs to be regular maintenance of the trees to remove dead or low-hanging branches and growth from the base of the tree.** Secondary shopping streets – **cycle parking should be provided to serve**

**amended to make this clearer.**

Noted but no. Gillygate is a secondary shopping street but will review with colleagues. Noted and will review with colleagues.

**Noted. Text will be amended to make this point.** The point about lighting columns is made in the document but will review and amend to make it clearer.

Noted. The caveat will always be "where possible" but the purpose of the current text is to ensure that this issue can be seriously addressed. Will review text and amend where appropriate. Comment on street trees noted. There is a forthcoming tree strategy which will cover these issues.

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>small clusters of shops in a convenient location.</b> Footway widening may not be necessary in areas where there is private forecourt which isn't used by the shop-owner.</p> <p>P46 – When dealing with dropped kerbs it is crucial that they are as flush as possible for wheelchair users whilst avoiding low spots where surface water may gather.</p> <p>P47 – excerpt from Manual for Streets (P72) 6.4.12 As a general rule, the geometry, including longitudinal profile, and surfaces employed on carriageways create an acceptable running surface for cyclists. The exception to this rule is the use of granite setts, or similar. These provide an unpleasant cycling experience due to the unevenness of the surface. They can prove to be particularly hazardous in the wet and when cyclists are turning, especially when giving hand signals at the same time. The conditions for cyclists on such surfaces can be improved if the line they usually follow is locally paved using larger slabs to provide a smoother ride.</p> <p>P48 – The width of dropped crossings should be based on pedestrian flow at the crossing.</p> <p>P52 – The phrase “some existing sites such as Parliament Street conflict with other uses” can be read both ways, many cyclists would argue that “some festivals and</p> | <p>This is referenced in the document.</p> <p>Noted. The document references the appropriate govt. Guidance but will review text to clarify point.</p> <p>The granite setts to be used in York from now on are squared off and not as the traditional rounded ones are. This point is made in the document but will review to clarify where appropriate.</p> <p>There is national guidance and standards which are referenced but will review and clarify.</p> <p>Noted. <b>The text will be amended to remove reference</b></p> |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>events conflict with the cycle parking” as the racks are there and used 365 days a year whereas festivals and events aren’t. It is essential that some cycle parking be retained on Parliament Street, possibly in smaller more spaced pockets. If a decision is taken to remove all the racks I can guarantee cyclists will resort to locking their bikes to street furniture, trees or leave bikes leaning against shop fronts.</p> <p>Here is an excerpt from LTN02/08 Cycle Infrastructure &amp; Design – “Parking facilities should be easy to find and as close to destinations as practicable. Numerous small clusters of stands in a town centre are generally preferable to one large parking area. If stands are underused in any particular position, they can be relocated to areas of higher demand if appropriate.”</p> <p>Although there is abuse of the Footstreets regulations by some cyclists, many of the people using the racks within the area arrive at them before the Footstreets regulations start or leave after they finish so do not break the law. The key priority of finding secure off-street parking areas isn’t necessarily what cyclists want, they want to park as close as possible to their destination and will not walk as far as drivers are prepared to, they also don’t potentially want to pay to park either. The Bike Hub was set up as a secure off-street solution but take-up has been very poor, potentially it was too far away from the city centre for many people.</p> <p>The standard spacing for Sheffield stands should be at least 1000mm and more where there is a high turnover of use or the potential for non-standard cycles or many with baskets, child seats etc. 900mm may be acceptable at workplaces and schools where turnover is much lower.</p> <p>P55 – you may want to consider relocating the large post box at the end of</p> | <p>to removal of racks but there may be scope for re-positioning them. Text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and text will be quoted in the document.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. 900mm was taken from published guidance but will amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will investigate.</p> <p>There have been many</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Parliament Street (which causes a bit of a pinch-point when large events are taking place) as part of the Pavement / Piccadilly public realm improvement scheme. If the utility cabinets are retained it may be worth moving it near these.</p> <p>P58 – are we suggesting all pedestrian guard-rails should be gloss black irrespective of where they are in the city? If so there will be an additional maintenance liability associated with them as the paint or powder coating tends to get chipped or scratched off. I agree it is appropriate in the historic core but may be less of an issue in the suburbs.</p> <p>P59 – is there anything CYC can do to prevent garish advertising panels on telephone kiosks?</p> <p>P60 – Street trees – need to be carefully positioned in order that they don't block sight-lines at junctions or near bus stops, they also need to be far enough away from kerb-edges that they don't damage kerbs and project low shoots out into the carriageway which are a danger to cyclists. There needs to be regular maintenance of the trees to remove dead or low-hanging branches and growth from the base of the tree.</p> <p>P62 – care needs to be taken with heights of contemporary seating, half of the seating in Library Square is only suitable for giants with very long legs. Although bins next to benches should be avoided there needs to be one fairly nearby</p> | <p>comments relating to the concentration of effort on the city centre and we should ensure that for street furniture at least we work towards a qualitative approach. Why should guard railing be substandard in the places where people live? Therefore the answer is yes.</p> <p>I believe so yes. Consider expanding text on advertising.</p> <p>Noted and to be dealt with in forthcoming tree strategy. Will review text to make this clearer.</p> <p>Noted. Text is clear on this point (seat height). Rubbish. There will be a new section on enforcement and cleanliness. Why would we want to place a bin near or next to every seat in the city? People can walk.</p> |
|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>otherwise rubbish will tend to be left on, under or next to the bench.</p> <p>P63 – There is a growing trend (mostly by BT) to have adverts on the side of their utility cabinets, this should be prevented somehow as they are unsightly and could encourage fly-posting.</p> <p>P64 – care needs to be taken with cross-footway rainwater channels, some of those in the city centre which have a galvanised finish are very slippery when wet, some sort of non-slip type should be selected as a standard York type.</p> <p>P66 – There is no reason why the people operating the fun fair cannot leave a gap for pedestrians between the cycle racks and their perimeter fence. The issue of amplified sound emanating from some city centre shops also needs addressing as they can be more annoying than buskers.</p> <p>P69 – the repositioning of secondary traffic lights which are near the city bars may prove to be tricky as these are nearly all major junctions on the inner ring road</p> <p>.</p> <p>P70 – the “bad” example of the no parking sign attached to the street sign seems contradictory to the advice that signs should be fixed to walls or existing poles where possible.</p> <p>P73 – I would recommend the inclusion of someone with Transport Planning Policy background in addition to the public transport side as pedestrians and cyclists also</p> | <p>Noted. This issue will be included in a revised text on utility infrastructure.</p> <p>Noted. Will amend text.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended to make the point. Amplified sound from shops tends to have a restricted noise cone whereas external amplified sound has a very wide noise cone but it is a good point and text will be reviewed to see how this point can be included.</p> <p>Noted. Will find a better example.</p> <p>Noted and will discuss with colleagues.</p> <p>Noted. Will discuss with</p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |   |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
|   | <p>need to be considered.</p> <p>P74 – the Process Diagram – the only Key Group which seems to be consulted at every stage is the Design Group, this looks a bit over the top. Surely other stakeholders also need to be consulted.</p> <p>Sorry, this is quite a lot of feedback but some of the issues raised are quite crucial to pedestrians and cyclists.</p>  | <p>colleagues.</p> |
| <p>3.23 RNIB Regional Campaigns Office for Yorkshire and Humber</p> | <p>I have been working with a group of blind and partially sighted people in York and have helped them respond to the consultation questions. The online survey, whilst easy for some residents of York to complete, it is not an ideal way to respond for Blind and Partially Sighted people. As a compromise we had a discussion group. Thank you for allowing us to submit our response via e-mail and in writing to you. Making consultation activity accessible is really about being flexible and making reasonable adjustments when asked. You did this when I asked you to accept our response in a different way. If you ever want to speak to me about the different ways groups may wish to be consulted and what could be considered reasonable I would be happy to talk to you about it.</p> |                    |
|   | <p>The York Campaigns Group welcomes the opportunity to feed into the Streetscape Strategy Guidance. The group is made up of Blind and Partially Sighted members from York Blind and Partially Sighted Society (YBPSS). Six of the group participated in the review of the Streetscape Strategy Guidance. Tracy Dearing, RNIB Regional Campaigns Officer facilitated discussions and prepared this response.</p> <p>1. Do you agree with the seven key principles</p>   |                    |

- A city for people
- Access and mobility
- Design
- Distinctiveness
- Way finding and legibility
- Light and dark
- Management

Please explain:

The group agreed in principle that the guidance concentrated on the right key priorities for York. The group had an in-depth discussion around a number of the priorities. The following presents these discussions:

A city for people – „puts the needs of pedestrians and vulnerable users before the needs of vehicles’.

Several members fully supported the idea of reducing the dominance of cars in towns and cities, especially where this means a more attractive environment can be created. However, had concerns that the guidance promotes the use of Shared Space design as a way of achieving this. The group were clear that under no circumstances should Shared Space design be introduced into York City Centre.

Others had concerns that many vulnerable people held blue badges and

Noted. Current discussions on possible shared space at Parliament St/Pavement/Piccadilly involve retaining signalised crossings and tactile boundaries.

Noted but not an issue covered by the strategy.



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>relied on vehicles to gain easy access to the city centre and the goods and services available. They felt that the guidance needed to consider</p> <p>blue badge users and strike a balance between vulnerable pedestrians and vehicle users.</p> <p>Access and mobility – „Ensure that York becomes a fully accessible city. Consult with communities of interest early in the process.’</p> <p>Once again, the group held grave concerns that the picture out lined in the consultation document (London Exhibition Road) used a Shared Space option of achieving an accessible environment. The group have serious concerns over the implications of Shared Space for blind and partially sighted people: The following presents some of the key concerns the group discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Shared surfaces rely on eye contact between road users - pedestrians and drivers - so this completely fails to take into account the needs of blind and partially sighted people.</li> <li>□ Navigating the street without designated crossing points will mean depending on drivers to notice and stop when a blind or partially sighted person wants to cross. Whilst many drivers are considerate, some are not! We are seriously worried about safety issues and want to see safe crossings included in street design.</li> <li>□ Kerbs are a very important part of street layout for blind and partially sighted people, but shared surface schemes mean kerbs are removed. The kerb is vital for street orientation for long cane users, whilst guide dogs are</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. Signalised crossings to be retained in schemes. Will consult colleagues.</p> <p>Noted and see above.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended to reinforce this point.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended to reinforce this point.</p> <p>Noted. Comment as above</p> <p>Noted and good point about children. Comment as above</p> |
|--|--|

trained to navigate by them. Removal of the kerb risks leaving people in danger as it is difficult to work out where the safe area stops and the roadway for vehicles begins.

□ In order to create a shared space, a road can be wiped clear of all markings, signs and street furniture, sometimes including tactile paving. Tactile paving is vital to street navigation and informs people about risks and safe places to cross the road. Without it, yet another aid to mobility and safety for blind and partially sighted people is lost.

□ There is a fear factor that will cause another barrier to blind and partially sighted people. Without a defined safe space away from traffic, Blind and partially sighted people will lose confidence and will stop using these streets and they will become "no-go" areas.

The group discussed how concerns over shared surfaces are held not just by people with sight difficulties but come from many different user groups. There are worries about children's safety as basic rules of crossing the road cannot be used, and people with learning disabilities may also find it difficult to understand how to cross the road safely. Older people may find it difficult to see or hear traffic and may have mobility problems and may not be confident getting traffic to stop.

The group welcomed the guidance commitment to consultation early in the process. Members felt that It is essential, right from the beginning of the process. They stated that The City of York Council should, rather than present the public with a list of options, engage with the people that walk the area daily and discover what they really want their streets to be like. It is also important to consult with groups representing older people, children, and disabled people. Often compromises can be reached through open

Noted. Text to be reviewed and amended to reinforce this point.

Noted. Text will be amended to take this into account.

Noted. Will discuss with colleagues how best to integrate this into the council's work.

Noted.

Noted.

Noted. These issues will be

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>discussion.</p> <p>The group also stated that The City of York council should undertake an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) at the initial planning stage. The EIA should be used to determine how a proposed scheme would affect different groups and highlight any negative impacts. In the light of an EIA's findings, the local authority should seek to promote equality by addressing any issues raised.</p> <p>The group also suggested that local authorities invite the same groups back to evaluate the scheme once it is up and running. On-going monitoring of pedestrians" experiences should ensure that any teething problems can quickly be identified and remedied.</p> <p>Members also suggested that following implementation, schemes need to be evaluated thoroughly to ensure that they do not unduly discriminate against any user group.</p> <p><b>Design – 'Keep things simple, use a consistent pallet of materials and street furniture. Be aware of how the space is used and the accessibility issues and opportunities'</b></p> <p>The group reiterated their concerns around Shared Space as a means of design.</p> <p>Way Finding and Legibility – 'Consider how people orientate themselves and find their way. Improve the experience for vulnerable groups.'</p> <p>The group discussed how the current options for way finding across the City of York and described the approach as inconsistent. The group felt that for way finding to be affective for blind and partially sighted people that</p> | <p>covered by the forthcoming wayfinding strategy and implementation programme. Special interest groups will be key stakeholders.</p> <p>Noted and will discuss with colleagues.</p> <p>Noted and text will be reviewed and amended accordingly. It will not be possible however to fully translate the guidance into easy read. Will explore possibility of preparing suitable summaries.</p> <p>Noted. Comment as above for wayfinding.</p> |
|---|---|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>consistency would be key. The group felt that street signs needed to be positioned in easy to find places (not too high up). They also talked about the use of high contrast lettering and how the guidance should advocate its use on street signage. Several members discussed how street signs were often placed on lampposts opposite the street they were promoting. The group stated that this approach was very confusing and should be avoided where possible.</p> <p>The group did praise the use of audio way finding which is available in some places across York. The group suggested that at a street level this should be rolled out in as many places as possible to support written way finding.</p> <p>The group also discussed that the guidance needed to promote the use of information in different formats for people who were unable to access the information presented to them at street level. The group agreed that the guidance could also include a small section on the Equality Act 2010 and confirm the City of York's commitment to it. These formats included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Braille – maps and written information</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Large print – different contrasts to meet individual needs</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Audio</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Easy read and pictures</li></ul> <p>Several members of the group stated that where the guidance supports the development of wayfinding that it needs to be clear that websites and information applications are fully accessible for blind and partially sighted people.</p> | <p>Noted. Text will be reviewed and amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
|--|---|--|

Management – Consider access and mobility issues, impact on heritage assets and their settings, quality outcomes, need and sustainability.”

The group understood the need and importance of assessing the impact on heritage, when considering access and mobility issues. The group felt that the guidance could include examples of what would be reasonable and consult with disabled people to find both accessible and heritage friendly options.

2. Do you agree that the streets and spaces with the highest pedestrian activity should be priorities for investment?

Yes

Please explain:

The group agreed that this seems to be a sensible use of resources as well as vital to the local economy.

3. Does the guidance cover all the right issues?

Not sure

Please explain:

The group felt that guidance did concentrate on a wide range of issues and were particularly pleased to see that it promoted the idea that advertising boards and other street furniture as hazards. The group were however

Noted. Quoted in the final document

Noted. Will take advice on appropriate wording.

concerned that the current City of York A-board policy is currently under review and consequently, would not feature in early versions of the publication. The group felt that the writers of the guidance needed to be part of the review of A-boards policy and put forward the findings of this consultation.

The group discussed at length A-boards and the potential hazard they cause blind and partially sighted people.

Members talked about how heavy many of the boards are and how they are often scattered across walkways, sometimes causing a dangerous obstruction. The group talked about how it is essential for many people including blind and partially sighted people to have a clear route along a pavement. They stated that the proliferation of A-boards can make it difficult for those with sight difficulties to negotiate the path. This can result in them walking into A-boards and injuring themselves, or inadvertently walking into the road whilst attempting to avoid these obstructions. One member stated that

‘falling over or bumping into an A-board can be painful and can adversely affect blind and partially sighted people’s confidence and mobility. The over use of A-boards can restrict their freedom and opportunity to participate in their local community’

Consequently, the group insist on a complete ban on A-boards. A complete ban will enable many people to walk along their local streets without fear of colliding with heavy, painful obstructions. Currently, there is no evidence which suggests that a complete ban will have an adverse economic impact on traders. The group members believe a complete ban places all traders on

Noted and will review text to include direct reference to legislation.

Noted. Amendments will be made.

the same footing regardless of the width of pavement outside their premises.

The group agreed that the guidance could highlight points from the Highway Act which would then reflect the legal responsibilities that Local Authorities have in relation to pavement obstructions.

#### Highways Act 1980

Section 130 (1) of the Highways Act 1980 imposes a duty on the Highways to assert and protect the rights of the public to use and enjoy the highway. This general duty is reinforced by s.130 (3) which states that the highway authority have a duty to prevent, as far as possible, the obstruction of the highway.

Not every obstruction of the highway will be unlawful, some obstructions such as vehicles unloading or erected scaffolding may be considered a reasonable use of the highway. Use of the highway is a matter of give and take. However, in groups view, obstructions to the highway caused by A-boards, parking on pavements or (wheelie) bins are unlikely to be considered a reasonable use of the highway.

Gain the group felt that the guidance should have a section on the Equality Act 2010 and how this works in relation to highways. For example:

#### Equality Act 2010

Under the provisions of the Equality Act 2010, it is unlawful for service providers and those exercising public functions, including highways functions, to discriminate against disabled people. This includes a duty not to indirectly discriminate and to make reasonable adjustments where existing arrangements place a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage. In

Noted. Text will be strengthened

RNIB's view a failure by a Highways Authority to

exercise its duties under the Highways Act to prevent obstructions to the highway, places blind and partially sighted people at a particular (substantial) disadvantage and therefore is in breach of the Equality Act.

As the duties under the Highways Act are statutory duties, we consider that it is unlikely that a local authority will succeed in arguing that exercising their duties under the Act would be unreasonable or not proportionate.

4. Does the guidance adequately consider the needs of disabled and older people?

Yes

Please explain:

The group agreed that by in large disabled people and access did feature in the guidance. The group however felt, as described in earlier sections, that the guidance should have a legal section which pertain to the different Acts and Duties surrounding disabled people and the built environment, for example:

- Equality Act 2010
- The Highways Act 1980
- Public Sector Equality Duty

Noted. A new section on cycle tracks will be added. A section on shared surfaces will be considered.

There will be a revised section dealing with management.

Noted. Advice will be sought on timeframes.

Noted. Will review text and ensure taht there is clear identification of disabled groups as key stakeholders in public realm design.



5. Does the document fully reflect the findings of the access & mobility audit?

Unsure

Please explain

The group have read the Access and Mobility Audit and feel that the guidance does reflect it. The group were concerned that the access and mobility audit was extremely vague in regards to pavement obstructions. The audit failed to offer any guidance or ways of tackling pavement obstructions and the legal framework that exists surrounding it. It was agreed that this guidance needs to address this and be clear on what the

Local Authority are suppose to do, in regards to managing pavement obstructions.

6. Do you have mobility impairments?

Yes

Please explain:

Visual Impairment

7. Are the next steps for 2013-2014 the right ones?

Unsure

Please explain:

Noted. There is a delivery section but it will be reviewed and strengthened to be clearer.

The group felt that the next steps needed to include the following:

- How the Local authority manage cycle tracks and shared space
- How the local authority manage wider pavement obstructions; such as waste management, recycling bags and wheelie bins.

The group were really happy to see that the next steps did include a review of the A-board policy. However, were disappointed that it did not include a time frame. The group felt that there needs to be a time frame connected to each next step so that they are planned and resourced appropriately.

General feedback and comments

The guidance needs to consider and outline how it is going to involve disabled people in shaping York's built environment

The DfT „Transport Note 1/11“ clearly states that:

„Consideration of the needs of disabled people...is an important part of built environment design. The duties under the Equality Act 2010 are particularly relevant“

As a public authority, local authorities are subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty and are required to have "due regard" to equality outcomes in everything it does. In particular, the authorities are required to ensure that it eliminates discrimination, advances equality of opportunity and fosters good relations between, amongst others, disabled and non-disabled people.

|                           |  |               |
|---------------------------|--|---------------|
|                           | <p>Undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) at the initial stages of planning a scheme, by a local authority is one way of demonstrating “due regard”. The EIA should be used to determine how a proposed scheme would affect different groups and highlight any negative impacts. In the light of an EIA's findings, the local authority should seek to promote equality by addressing any issues raised.</p> <p>Local Access Forums are also a way of consulting with disabled people s.94 (5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 requires the Council to have regard, in carrying out their functions, to take advice given to them by the Local Access Forum. Where one does not formally exist in an area the Act requires the local authority to set one up.</p> <p>Finally, the group had a number of questions relating to the guidance.</p> <p>How is guidance going to be used?</p> <p>Who will use the guidance?</p> <p>How is it going to be enforced?</p> <p>Who will enforce it?</p> |               |
| <p>3.24 York resident</p> | <p>I write in response to the consultation on the new Streetscape strategy, it having just been brought to my attention.</p> <p>In general, I welcome this new strategy which demonstrates a clear vision, based on sound principles with a commendable attention to detail. The fact that there <i>is</i> a vision that expresses a set of priorities for this city is a good thing!</p>  | <p>Noted.</p> |

However I do have a very particular concern. As a frequent cyclist and as a cycle retailer, I have a major reservation - based on over twenty year's experience of cycling and working within the cycle trade in this city. It concerns this proposal from page 52:

*The cycle stands in Parliament Street and St Sampson's Square are very popular, especially with city centre workers but they are an intrusion and a hazard for disabled people. As this is a footstreets area it would seem sensible to place parking at the edges. Piccadilly for instance offers significant opportunity for this. Other roads may be more limited in scope.*

In my view, this proposal to remove cycling parking from such central and accessible locations within the city is based on an unrealistic expectation of cyclist's behaviour. Cyclists are not in the habit of 'parking up' in a single fixed location, going about their business and then returning to that location in the manner of a motorist using an NCP type facility. This notion of such a 'round trip' is simply not realistic if the parking is too far removed from the amenities.

On the contrary, cyclists are far more likely to keep their cycle close at hand when visiting locations in the city centre - and use conveniently sited cycle stands very close to their destination. They become pedestrians during this time, but for a whole host of reasons they like to keep their bikes with them. This is a good thing - as it maximizes the utility of the bicycle as a form of transport - a very desirable outcome if you want to deliver on your oft-stated desire to increase cycle usage in York. Remove these facilities and you will risk creation of a number of disfunctional

Noted. Text will be amended.

Noted. Text to be amended to include some of these substantive points.

outcomes - namely:

- Haphazard and irregular cycle parking - in shop entrances, against windows and street furniture, which is likely to cause a greater hazard to those with mobility issues than the cycle stands that you are proposing to remove.
- The inevitable complaints that such behaviour will generate will lead to calls to police such behaviour - which in itself, will raise serious resource issues. In short, greater regulation will cost you money and will in general be treated with the same disregard as poorly thought out and ineptly sited 'Cyclists Dismount' signs.
- Should such a policy be imposed 'successfully' (i.e. achieving the narrow goal of the removal of 'unsightly' cycles and cycle racks from conveniently accessible central areas such as Parliament Street), then you run the risk of reducing the marginal utility of many cycle journeys and therefore a reduction in cycling itself.
- Cycling is already banned in the city centre and this measure would reduce its 'permeability' and hence its attractiveness to cycle users even further. It would also send out a strong message that despite its stated policy, City of York Council is not really interested in actually seeing any cyclists around the centre – in other words cyclists should appear in the stats, but remain invisible in practice. Please take note that visibility is an important part of the promotion of this socially and culturally beneficial activity!
- (On this note, it is interesting that in your publicity you are likely to cite various examples of best practice from other European cities, but neglect to observe that in many of these, cycle access is permitted and cyclists and pedestrians mingle freely).
- The cycle racks in Parliament Street are full to capacity when the weather is fine. Their removal would lead to a serious shortage of secure and overlooked cycle parking – a cycle thief's dream. Where do you propose to accommodate existing demand, let alone the extra demand if you are to

Noted.

|                           |   |   |
|---------------------------|---|---|
|                           | <p>make good on your cycle strategy?</p> <p>As I said, in general I welcome this strategy, as well as other initiatives – such as the bold move to close Lendal Bridge to private traffic, but please recognise the importance of <i>removing barriers to cycling</i> and not proceed to erect them at this important juncture.</p>   |   |
| <p>3.25 York resident</p> | <p>With reference to the consultation on the Consultation Draft City of York Streetscape Strategy and Guidance document it would be useful to make reference within the document to the need for Public Art within strategic developments and give some direction on the considerations which will be relevant to this. Currently the Local Plan Preferred Options does not make reference to this in Draft Policy DHE5: Streets and Spaces, although there is reference to it in the justification to Draft Policy IDC1 on Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.</p> | <p>Noted. A new section on public art will be added.</p>                            |
| <p>York resident</p>      | <p>General Comment</p> <p>There are several INSTANCES IN THE DOCUMENT WHERE THE NEED FOR COMPETENT CRAFTSMEN IS REFERRED TO, EG: PAGE 26, Principle 7; page 43, footnote 2; page 47, Cobbles, 3<sup>rd</sup> para. It is suggested there is a general point made at the beginning of the document encouraging the training and employment of craftsmen in traditional crafts.</p> <p>PART I Streetscape Strategy</p> <p>Page 12, Morphology: the creation of St Leonard’s Place was not an C18 improvement. It was created 1834-5.</p> <p>PART II Key Principles</p>        | <p>Noted. Will add reference to this point.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended.</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>Page 23, Distinctiveness, Principle A</p> <p>Agree that the retention of historic features contributes to ‘Distinctiveness’ . The replacement of original lamps on Lendal Bridge with lanterns of a different design contravenes this principle: likewise the replacement of the elaborate early C20<sup>th</sup> lighting column in Library Square during the ‘reinvigoration’ of that space.</p> <p>Page 23, footnote 2: what, and where, are the comprehensive historical character assessments of “main urban areas” which will include detailed Statements of Significance? Do they actually exist? If not, they should not be mentioned.</p> <p>Page 26, Principle &amp;, Management: <b>emphasise the importance of good craftsmanship such as the laying of paving, cobbles and setts.</b></p> <p>PART III Strategic Framework</p> <p>Page 28, Priorities 7: there should be a weight limit for vehicles loading and unloading in the City Centre, especially in foot streets.</p> <p>Page 32, Priority A: General Principles</p> <p>Suggest that Micklegate should be publicised as an alternative route into the City Centre from the station across Ouse Bridge. As the pre-Conquest Great Street, it is sinking into decline and needs to be promoted to assist its regeneration.</p> <p>Page 33, Priority A: General Principles</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> para: question whether street lighting should “always be wall-mounted” since virtually every building in the City Centre is a listed structure. It is not good practice to attach heavy lighting equipment to fragile medieval walling material or</p> | <p>Lamps on Lendal Bridge are accurate replica’s of original lamps based on the one surviving example. Lamps in Library Square did not replace early 20<sup>th</sup> century examples.</p> <p>The reference is to work on-going that will be complete in November 2013.</p> <p><b>Noted. Text will be strengthened.</b></p> <p>Noted. Will seek advice of highway colleagues for suitable wording.</p> <p>It has been identified as a priority in the document and the forthcoming wayfinding strategy and implementation</p> |
|--|--|---|

handmade soft C17<sup>th</sup> and C18<sup>th</sup> brick walls. Earlier guidance from English Heritage and City conservation sources advised that applications to place attachments on listed buildings would not be allowed. This prohibition should be continued.

Page 33, continued: Core Medieval Streets, 2<sup>nd</sup> para: who has sanctioned the replacement of medieval “lanterns”, and on what advice? Their replacement is counter to the statement on Distinctiveness on page 23 (see above).

Station to Centre, 2<sup>nd</sup> para: why has the “historic lighting” on Lendal Bridge been replaced by lanterns of a different design? What is the basis of the instructions about lanterns and lighting equipment in the last two sentences of this paragraph?

Page 34, Priority B, Locations

There are ‘City Centre’ bus routes along Pavement, St Leonard’s Place and Gillygate.

PART IV Guidance

Page 43, Issues: some types of paving material absorb moisture and stain easily becoming filthy and disgusting: these should be identified and prohibited.

Page 46, Carriageways and kerbs: a number of street corners are kerbed with reused metal tramlines, clearly a customary way of doing things which be retained.

programme will take the substantive point on board.

**Noted. Comment from English Heritage has been received on this point and the text will be amended. However, where appropriate this practice will continue and with EH support. There is no prohibition in place and never has been.**

Medieval lanterns are not being replaced. Carriage stuyale lanterns with LED technology are being used to achieve a better and more consistent approach in keeping with the charcter of these streets.

Lamps on Lendal Bridge are accurate replica’s of original lamps based on the one surviving example.

**Noted. Amendments will be made.**



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Page 51, Street Furniture, Informative: why is the default bollard to be the one chosen which has spurious gold banding at the foot and the neck which will deteriorate into shabbiness?</p> <p>Page 52, Cycle Parking: the large and obtrusive signs on the stands should be removed and disallowed as part of the 'decluttering' process.</p> <p>Page 53, Lighting: objection to the attachment of street lighting to listed buildings in the City centre is repeated.</p> <p>Page 55, Post boxes: it seems unlikely the City Council can ensure that these are retained unless they could be included on the List of Local Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Page 56, Pavement Cafes: full guidance on the establishment of these should be prepared and made available to potential applicants.</p> <p>Page 58, Railings: replacement railings, if permitted, should be 'like for like' including manufacture to imperial measurements as metric railings are invariably visually out of proportion with pre-metric buildings.</p> <p>Page 59, Telephone boxes: unlisted telephone boxes can be nominated for the List of Local Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Page 61, Seating: seats in Parliament Street should be sited so that they are never removed. If the City Centre is extended to cover Micklegate as proposed in the Local Plan, seating will be required on this side of the river as there is none at</p> | <p>Noted. There will be a section on street cleanliness but identifying more absorbent material will be problematic. Apparently they are not reused tramlines but were specifically manufactured as kerb strengtheners. Will ensure that they are adequately mentioned.</p> <p>This was a reinvigorate York Board decision.</p> <p>These are necessary for blind and partially sighted people.</p> <p>Noted. See comment above.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Separate planning guidance will need to be drawn up. Comment will be referred to conservation and design</p> |
|--|--|--|

|                      |  |   |
|----------------------|--|---|
|                      | <p>present.</p>  | <p>colleagues.</p> <p>The guidance is principally concerned with pedestrian barriers which have no historic value.</p> <p>Noted. Will consider amending text.</p> <p>Noted. The graphic identifying proposed seating areas will be amended. Parliament Street is a mixed use space and seats will always need to be removed. Opportunities for new seating outside the central area have been identified.</p> |
| <p>York resident</p> | <p>General Comments</p> <p>It is good that York has begun to formulate a Streetscape Strategy. Some Councils</p> |   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>have had an adopted strategy for more than a decade.</p> <p>The document is most interesting. It usefully adds to the surprisingly scanty details of materials in other documents such as the Central Historic Core Conservation Areas Appraisal, Heritage Topic Paper, etc.</p> <p>It is good that the strategy is being produced locally, rather than being an agency job.</p> <p>The illustrations are well chosen and (as I have commented before) they are embedded at a decent resolution.</p> <p>The contributors' roles should be identified; the list of names on p.78 means little beyond a very local – West Offices – context. (Compare Bath 1.02)</p> <p>The Strategy is too incomplete to be robust. It needs immediate expansion, not just 'modification from time to time'. Among the omissions are the city walls ramparts and ditches, public art, soft landscaping, and a host of things CABE's Living Places: Caring for Quality lists as the 'kit of parts'.</p> <p>Some of these topics may be covered in other documents. The strategy is inconsistent in referring to these – an opportunity missed.</p> <p>The strategy could record recent and ongoing achievement more strongly. One way would be to include before and after photographs showing improvements.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Text will be amended.</p> <p>Noted. There will be some extra sections added dealing with public art, green infrastructure, cycle tracks, cleanliness and management. It is impossible to reference everything or even read everything but there are certainly further useful documents that should be mentioned and text will be suitably amended.</p> <p>4. Noted. Will review the</p> |
|--|--|---|

| Page | Identifier   | Comment   |
|------|--|---|
| 4    | ..it must not be put upon shelves and forgotten..  | This is a strange introduction for a LDP document. An exact renewal strategy would be better. (Compare Bath SS Manual 1.09.)  |
| 8    | Part Two describes the six strategic principles..  | Part Two has seven principles.  |
| 24   | Illustration: York sign<br><br>Illustration: Sheffield sign  | The signs would look better painted black, as recommended for other street furniture. Orientation of the flags needs to be checked periodically 'Connect Sheffield' signs are well-designed but too large for many locations in York. (Smaller versions are illustrated in the Greenwich Peninsula signage scheme.) Signs should not carry advertising. Power supply should be integral. Flat panels are better than 'kiosk' designs. Any scheme needs to be much more sensitive than the JC Decaux arrays proposed for York a few years ago.                                     |
| 24   | Contemporary digital technologies  | GPS augmented reality technology should be widely employed. Apps should be multi-lingual.   |
| 25   | ..enhancing dark skies..   | The Streetscape Strategy should state explicitly that the night sky is a component of streetscape. Though the council recognises that York is badly afflicted with orange sky glow and though its reports often mention dark skies, York needs the implementation of a comprehensive dark skies scheme. Then we might see stars over the Shambles.<br>LED lighting in itself it makes a negligible contribution to dark skies.  |
| 33   | Aco drains   | These need higher maintenance than dished drains, and they are not getting it. Those in Davygate are usually choked with cigarette ends and rotted manure.  |
| 33   | New carriage lantern style..   | Large empty looking lanterns are unsatisfactory. They need LEDs which suggest a traditional source of light.  |
| 33   | Kings Square project timed to commence..   | Needs a revised date.   |
| 33   | ..replacing..for approx. 20m either side of each bar..   | 20m is not enough. The aim should be to 'turn the corner' into adjacent streets, to avoid a contrived and patched look.   |
| 33   | Carriageways should be resurfaced.to enhance the special qualities of these remarkable structures. | The bars deserve better than to be displayed on the chill tray of a 'heritage' surface. Continuity of carriageways though the bars should not be compromised. Grey carriageway surfaces to match existing tarmac may be acceptable. Schemes which favour light surfaces draw attention to themselves rather than the assets, which then looks shabby. (The new surfaces in Deangate compromise the appearance of everything around.)<br><br>An example: Bootham Bar's status would be diminished by any scheme which divorces it from Bootham and Petergate. It should not become |

wording.

8. noted. Text will be amended

24. Forthcoming wayfinding strategy will cover these points.

24.as above.

25. the lighting section will be amended to take account of this point. LED lighting does in fact make a difference, partly because the design of LED lanterns directs far more light downwards and there is far less upward spillage. The revised section will consider the removal of existing lighting where safe and appropriate.

33. Noted. There will be a new section on cleanliness.

33. Interesting observation. Will discuss with lighting colleagues.

33. Noted and will amend text.

33. Interesting and useful contribution but majority favour the use of granite potts

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
|         |   | more visually associated with the Abbey wall than at present. (It could be related to the generally unnoticed section of city walls to the river by means of a diagonal crossing of St.Leonards, or by an inset marker, to aid interpretation.)                      |
| 37      | ..planting more trees to restore the original street environments on Blossom Street and Bootham.. | Many of Bootham's trees have gone in my lifetime, though their sites are still marked in the cobbles. It used to be one of York's 'magical green lanes' and should be again, with the planting of young mature trees.  |
| 37      | ..to reduce crossing time for pedestrians..   | The Lord Mayor's Walk/Gillygate splay are particularly dangerous to cyclists.  |
| 39 & 41 | Stable pavours  | The cover illustration shows them to be beautiful. It is time to stop covering them with slurry.   |
| 42      | Non-traditional materials   | The strategy does not give proper consideration to the most characteristic carriageway surfaces: tarmac/asphalt/resin bonded gravel, etc.. Coloured surfaces can work well in some locations (Station Rise); less well in others (Deangate).                         |
| 43      | blanc de beige is difficult to source now..   | This is surprising. Consideration should be given to reusing blanc de beige when street surfaces are renewed and – hopefully – simplified. Blanc de beige works well in Market Street; less well when used for build outs and nervous punctuation of other surfaces. |
| 51      | Bollards..a hazard to blind or partially sighted pedestrians.                                     | Bollards are a hazard to <u>everyone</u> in the overcrowded city centre: they are masked by people's bodies until it is too late!  |
| 51      | Manchester bollards   | Some Manchester bollards are more pleasing than others. Breakaway bollards should be standard to minimise damage to adjacent surfaces. In some locations the modest York bollard is best – Peter Lane, for example.  |
| 52      | Facilities fail to keep up with demand.   | Something needs to be done about the proliferation of advertising cycles.  |
| 52      | Cycles parking should be relocated from Parliament Street.  | Relocation of the cycle racks in Blake Street and Duncombe Place should be the priority.   |
| 52      | Stands should be spaced 900mm apart.  | Tight spacing increases the risk of damage to a cycle's fittings: Unhooked brake cables and brackets are potentially lethal. 1100mm would be safer.  |
| 57      | Passenger shelters & bus signs  | The policy that bus stop flags should not be mounted on lamp columns should be reconsidered. Square section columns, stripes, and box flags are ugly and unnecessary: flags can incorporate flat screen technology. Solar power tilts are inelegant;                 |

37. Noted.

37. Noted.

39 & 41 Noted. Text will be further strengthened.

42. Noted. Text will be revised and enhanced.

43. Noted. Document states that blanc de beige is a good product but it is true that sourcing is difficult. Will consult with highway colleagues on this point.

51. Noted. A good point and text will be amended.

51. Noted. York bollards to stay around the Minster.

52 Noted. Will add point to cycling and advertising sections.

52 Text to be changed to

|    |                 |   |
|----|-----------------|---|
|    |                 | <p>so are feeder pillars, as the illustration shows.</p> <p>Foster shelters (in the configuration shown) are not ideal. A more sympathetic Decaux shelter is at Clifton Green. Design competitions could be considered for bespoke shelters.</p>  |
| 58 | Railings        | <p>The inner side of Bootham Bar still has the 'gas tube' railings which the Civic Trust and Esher deplored fifty years ago.</p> <p>It is a pity that the improvements resulting from the removal of the Museum Street barriers and the reduction of those at Walmgate Bar are not illustrated.</p> <p>The illustrations of 'poor quality' and 'reasonably elegant' railings do not show a clear difference. (The Bootham railings need paint.)</p>   |
| 59 | Telephone boxes | <p>It seems odd to propose the relocation of the listed Duncombe Place box – the street's most notable fitting, consonant with the Red House. K6s are as iconic as the Routemaster, and it is appropriate to have one here. It needs straightening, though.</p>   |
| 60 | Trees           | <p>'Forest tree are right for York' - Civic Trust and Esher.</p> <p>The Minster used to be complemented by the trees along Duncombe Place; now they dominate it. Modest surgery could improve the view. As to the Civic Trust tree, planted when the west front was encased in seemingly permanent scaffolding, does anyone dare suggest its removal?</p> <p>Some site specific proposals would be appropriate in the forthcoming tree strategy.</p>  |
| 61 | Seating         | <p>The ongoing implementation of new seating is excellent. Broxap Blackburn is acceptable in many locations, but not all. Traditional wooden benches ('Royal Park') may remain more characteristic of York in proximity to historic buildings.</p> <p>Bespoke seating is not always successful. Very few people appreciate the symbolism of one bespoke seat in Library Square ; they just think that a vehicle has backed into it!</p> <p>Dwarf walls are a popular form of seating; they dry after rain more quickly than other types of seating. York notably lacks other runs or arrays of seating for group use. The want of sheltered seating should be supplied.</p> |

58. Noted. Difficulty in locating before pictures but will renew efforts .

59. Noted. Will amend text to include straightening.

60. Noted.

Noted. The strategy does take these points up but text will be reviewed and strengthened is necessary

|    |                               |  |
|----|-------------------------------|--|
| 63 | Street Cabinets               | Feeder pillars should be explicitly identified in the strategy (see Bath Manual). They are an objectionable form of street clutter. Some seem speculative: they apparently feed nothing. Power supply should be integrated within all structures requiring it.   |
| 64 | Street advertising            | Sponsorship signs in York are becoming blatant. They should be unobtrusive. We should not allow large signs such as the 'Guy Fawkes Inn 250m' sign in the flower bed outside the Tourist Office.   |
| 64 | 'A' boards                    | The strategy should identify single leaf advertising boards sprung from a substantial base as a greater hazard than 'A' frames. If one loses one's balance they offer no chance of recovery. Government guidelines cite York Minster as an area in which advertising is not permitted There are regularly up to seven 'A' frames in a row at the east end. |
| 66 | Caption: Acoustic buskers     | The photo shows amplified buskers.   |
| 67 | Commercial waste              | The waste skips on Duncombe Place shown on p.59 should be stored in the yard between Red House and Thatre Royal. Likewise, the purpose built skip enclosure by City Screen seldom seems to be used for skips. Enforcement could achieve much.  |
| 68 | Advisory and regulatory signs | It is good to see that the shaming array illustrated in Traffic In Towns 2 has been removed. However, over the last few years we have seen an increase in NBDN (never before deemed necessary) signs. Every bar is now flanked by NGDN signage. (see p.69)   |
| 70 | Signs                         | The city should not be littered with the sawn-off and rusting remnants of former signage/lighting columns/bollards etc. Columns should not be capped with plastic bags and duct tape (Duncombe Place, Parliament Street).  |

63. Noted. Text will be reviewed and amended where appropriate.

64. Noted. Text will be amended in the advertisement section to take this point up.

64. Noted and will include reference to spring loaded boards.

66. Noted. Image will be changed.

67. Noted. There will be a new section on enforcement.

68. noted.

|                      |        |  |
|----------------------|--------|--|
| York Access<br>Forum | Notes? |  |
|----------------------|--------|--|

**5. Next steps:**

Report back to Reinvigorate York Board (BS)

Feedback to respondents?