Annex 2 - Residents' Comments

Reference no.	Comments	Summary of relevant comments made on the Chantry Close petition	
	Option 1 - Revoke the order	**Do you agree to the gate being closed to residents?**	**Do you agree that Chantry Close is an area of high crime and anti-social behaviour?**
Carrfield			
1)	I think the closing could in fact create even more problems. i.e - pedestrians reaching the gate to find it locked could cause problems of a frustrated nature.		
2)	We want to keep all accesses to and from Carrfield the way they were in 1987 when we purchased this freehold property. As shift workers (both of us) we find this route handy for a short walk through the next close and back with an elderly dog, as it provides a degree of safety in the early hours of the morning, as other areas as Hob Moor or near the rugby ground does not. We both wish we had not signed any petition, as we now feel it was misleading about all the exits in Carrfield being closed. This whole business is to do with a few people trying to increase the market value of their properties next to the pathway in question, at the council's cost. If the gate goes ahead, everyone in both closes should have the code tot he gate, so it can be used 24 hours a day byt both closes residents. The problem snicket where thugs disperse is between 22-24 Carrfield near the play area - a new estate where we've had vandalism done to garden etc on countless occasions (the last time I had a hedgehog thrown at my living room window).		
3)	(No comment)		
4)	With the closure of that snicket it leas to bringing the problem into our street through another snicket making the trouble increase.		
5)	I do not want the gate as it will stop me having access to my elderly sister in Chantry Close. I also think it's in the wrong place, and should be inbetween Carrfield and the Woodlands.		
6)	We do not really agree or disagree. We have had not trouble with the land and feel if the gate is locked youths could climb in our garden to get round the gate.		
7)	The footpath access is currently not considered to be an ongoing problem, as it may have been at certain night times in the past. The two incidents in the past, 1991 & 2000, have been day time house breaks, which would have not been covered by option 2. The snickets are footpaths and not officially cycleways. It would, of couse, be unkind to go against the neighbours, or visitors, who may use the snciekt for access, providing adequate care is taken. Details are on the deeds of the house re Carrfield to Foxton snicket, which is know to be the subsequent proposal. I do now have a new fence. It does not state that this/these are cycle paths, as required by law. It is cycling only where it sates that this is permitted. The snickets do not appear on the map of cycle routes provided by CYC.		
Chantry Close			
8)	Sooner the better!	No	No
9)	The pattern of crime and ASB in Chantry Close are recently very low.	No	No

10)	If as residents we cannot have the PIN code for 24 hour access, then we have no choice but to vote for no gate. Apparently there should be no fence or gate, as this was deemed on emergency access route. Also, as few people in Carrfield use the snicket, why should they be included in the vote, plus there are more houses in Carrfield than Chantry Close so we are outnumbered.	No	No
11)	(No comment)	No	No. Ridiculous.
12)	(No comment)	-	-
13)	The gate is not needed or wanted. Chantry Close is not and never has been a high crime area and should be left open plan like it was designed and meant to be. It is also unfair the residents of Carrfield get to vote because they have four exits in their Street, (Chantry Close has two), therefore the majority do no use or need to use the cut through, the residents of Chantry Close do.	No	No
14)	I prefer the snicket to be open for two reasons: I have lost confidence in living alone and have someone who comes to clean who lives on the other side of the snicket. She holds a key to my home should I need help. I would not feel I could ask her to do this if she had to walk all the way round. When my grandchildren visit me they come that way as the distance is much shorter.	No	Object strongley. Definitely not.
15)	(No comment)	Did not wish to discuss	
16)	I work unsocial hours so the gate only being open at certain times is very inconvenient for me.	No	No
17)	Since we are not supplied with a code enabling us to use the snicket between 8pm and 6:30am, we will not be able to walk the dog before bed or early before work as we are used to doing.	No	No
18)	When are we to have the consultation as promised? This form does not represent consultation as the options are not comprehensive and there is no means of discussion. A large number of recipients (Carrfield Close residents) of this missive are not affected by the gate as it does not cut off their primary access to nearby leisure facilities. (A bit of local knowledge would not go amiss!). Only the first option does not contravene the Highways Act 1980. The PIN code statement in the letter is incorrect.	No	No. Totally ridiculous.
19)	(No comment)	No	No
20)	As there has been no problems for the last year or so I feel there maybe if the snicket is closed off.	No	No
21)	I firmly am of the opinion that closing will create problems: i.e. 'frustration'. Particularly, young men at weekends after time at a pub not being able to walk through. I can image tims and bottles being thrown at windows, not an attractive situation. Also I feel closing creates a crime area situation.	No	No
22)	We do not agree to the gating order, as in our opinion the gate is in the wrong snicket - it should have been placed in the Carrfield/Woodlands snicket. The gate has in fact attracted antisocial behaviouir, and has had to be removed because of vandalism. It is our belief that it is illegal, as it blocks an emergency route into Carrfield and blocks disabled access - you couldn't open it and use the PIN pad if you were in a wheelchair. This gate only came about because of the actions of individuals who had no interest in the security and well-being of local residents, and only wished the corner to be blocked off so they could appropriate the land in the corner of the close for themselves - a fact well known to our local councillor, Anne Reid. This whole fiasco has cost a fortune in taxpayers money, because the council has allowed itself to be led by the nose by individuals obsessed with obtaining land for free.	No	No
Total = 22 (7 from Carrfield, 15 from Chantry Close)			

	Option 2 - Install the gate as intended		
Carrfield			
23)	I think it would be better if there was a gate between Foxwood & Carrfield.		
24)	Best option would be for both gates to be open and closed at the same time to prevent other people from using them, (which makes common sense).		
25)	(No comment)		
26)	(No comment)		
27)	(No comment)		
28)	(No comment)		
29)	(No comment)		
30)	Although we agree to the gating order, we can not see how this will be of much value whilst the snicket between Carrfield and Foxwood remains open. This snicket has the most amount of people using it and is the main 'escape' route for burglers etc. There have been quite a few residents in Carrfield who have been burgled and feel that our concerns have not been listened to despite correspondence from you.		
31)	(No comment)		
32)	I should point out I never at any time use the snicket in the gating order, but know others who have experienced problems, particularly at night. Therefore, I feel that option 2 would be appreciated in this case.		
33)	(No comment)		
34)	Sad if they come down, people want things doing but don't like the idea of walking a few extra yards to get peace and quiet. I feel some people who have voted the gates to come down have been influenced by one or two certain individuals. It's the first time I have got involved in anything like this and it make one think is it worth doing. Also makes you appreciate what councillors have to put up with! Whatever the outcome, thankyou for your time and effort you have put into this matter.		
35)	(No comment)		
36)	My comments refer to the lack of planning and preparation yet again. Why was formal notification of conditions not made know before work as commenced as the taxpayer yet again may witness waste of public funds in removing the erected gates, not to mention the cost laready expended in the erection.		
37)	I trust that these gates will go ahead as planned, or is this another example of York Council throwing money away - something that they seem good at. We keep being asked to vote but it makes you wonder who for as decision makers seem to be somewhat lacking. It would appear that councillors are afraid of being taken to court over these gates - so what?! - at least money spent fighting these threats in my opinion would not be wasted.		
Chantry Close			
38)	(No comment)	Definitely not.	Do not agree.
39)	(No comment)	-	-
40)	(No comment)	No	No
41)	(No comment)	No	No. Definitely not.
42)	We agree that a gate is needed, but there are a few residents who feel they need the PIN code for various reasons. Would it be possible to contact these people with a vew to who has the PIN code. (I don't need the PIN code though could have if wanted as my husband is disabled with a blue badge).	No	Had incidents. Better than a few years ago when had 2 incidents.
43)	(No comment)	No	No. Definitely not.

44)	I think the gate is a fantastic idea and the council should be commended for it's actions. The only minor crticisms are: I live right on the snicket and don't get a code. I believe the gate should be locked for longer during the winter months. Of those objecting or who are disabled how many actually use the snicket between these hours? The answer is the odd one or two, certainly not the majority. I don't have time for those who need access to get back from the pub when my house on the snicket is repeatedly subject to attack.	Yes	No answer
Total = 22 (15 from Carrfield, 7 from Chantry Close)			
Option 3 - Vary the order by amending the times of closure			
Carrfield			
45)	Alter the times in the summer months to left open a little later.		
Chantry Close			
46)	It would be more appropriate for all to have access code or a swipe card system/fob access.	No	No
Total = 2 (1 from Carrfield, 1 from Chantry Close)			
No option selected			
Carrfield			
47)	Do not use the snicket at all for anything, no need for access. Does not apply to me.		
Chantry Close			
48)	No opinion.	No	No
Total = 2 (1 from Carrfield, 1 from Chantry Close)			