

Pinch Point Scheme, A19 south Transport Corridor – Phase 1

Feedback from consultation

Consultation was undertaken with statutory consultees; interested parties; and key stakeholders. This annex contains responses to this consultation, including Officer responses to specific points/questions.

Being a scheme with a lot of local interest, there were some very lengthy responses. Therefore questions, concerns and specific points raised by consultees have been collated into the following four sub-headings:

- Comments related to the design of Phase 1 as proposed
- Comments related to the Pinch Point Scheme generally (including Phases 2 & 3)
- Comments related to the consultation
- Comments related to other matters, not the subject of this decision

1) Design elements of Phase 1

Respondent	Comment	Officers Response
Highways Agency	Support in principle.	Noted.
North Yorkshire Police	Re: The proposed closure of the northern section of the southern circulatory carriageway to all traffic except buses – Observe that there is likely to be a relatively high level of non compliance and asks whether any control measures will be put in place.	To highlight this new restriction, it is proposed to surface-dress this short stretch in a contrasting colour, with prominent BUSES ONLY markings and appropriate regulatory signs. It is noted that any non-compliance experienced here would not cause any danger to other users of the A19/A64 interchange.
York Older Peoples Assembly	Pleased that the main targeted improvement from these proposals is the creation of additional Bus Lanes approaching the City. Therefore they warmly support the general thrust of the Scheme.	Noted.
English Heritage	No objections to the proposed works on heritage grounds.	Noted.

J Suur	Issue with visibilities for cyclists and pedestrians crossing the slip-roads on/off the A64, particularly the A64 eastbound on-ramp.	This has already been partially-resolved to the resident's satisfaction. We have improved sightlines and inter-visibility by removing some vegetation on the central island of the northern roundabout.
CYC Cycling/Walking Officer	<p>Regarding the new bus lane under the A64, will the Armco barrier be retained kerb-side to protect cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles?</p> <p>Concern for cyclists and pedestrians attempting to cross the slip-roads on/off the A64.</p> <p>Is there any chance of bringing north-bound cyclists off the A19 straight out of the end of the layby south of the relocated bus-stop, thus avoiding them ever having to try to overtake stationary buses at this stop with high-speed traffic behind them?</p>	<p>The HA have confirmed that the barrier is no longer necessary here, following reductions in speed limits through this interchange.</p> <p>We are very limited as to what, if anything, can be done to improve the slip-road crossings. The 'on ramps' are free-flowing with vehicles accelerating onto the A64, so as above, we can only aim to make inter-visibility as good as possible, in addition to clear road markings so that users can judge a vehicles intended course/direction of travel off the roundabout(s).</p> <p>This suggestion is noted and will be investigated.</p>
R Baker	Concern that there will be a squeeze for traffic in the new proposed inbound bus lane and adjacent traffic lane (A19 northbound) when they exit the northern roundabout at the same time.	The proposal is to adjust some of the kerb-lines (and a slight widening of the carriageway) to accommodate the 2 lanes coming off the northern roundabout so that there is a good transition from one bus lane to another (even when the A19 York vehicular lane is blocked by queuing traffic).
York Cycle Campaign	<p>No objections to the principle of the proposals, but seek reassurance that all existing shared-use cycle and pedestrian paths will remain shared-use.</p> <p>Also that access to the path inbound by Lingcroft Lane is not obstructed by grass-verge as shown in the proposed layout.</p> <p>Additionally, if the scheme involves any reinstatement of the paths, that this will be done with due reference to DfT standards.</p>	<p>The status of existing off-road paths is not proposed to be changed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There is very little alteration to the paths within our proposals. But with user numbers so low, we wouldn't be proposing any widening of existing paths (within this Phase).</p>
Cllr K Aspden	Concerned that the proposed bus-only section on the southern roundabout has the potential to cause additional congestion, by requiring all A19 southbound traffic to go all of the way around.	This will add some additional traffic to the interchange, especially at <i>peak shopping times</i> at the Designer Outlet, although this is often outside <i>peak commuter times</i> .

		<p>However, to leave this link open, the number of vehicles using it often exceeds its limited storage capacity at present – thus the rear end of the queue occasionally protrudes into the main section of inbound carriageway. The proposed carriageway widening at this point, to allow 3 inbound lanes, reduces this reservoir further (by approximately 1 car length), exacerbating this issue.</p> <p>In terms of additional journey-times – At quieter periods, when traffic is relatively free-flowing, the closure of this section of the circulatory carriageway will add up to 1 minute to the journeys of southbound A19 traffic from the Designer Outlet. During peak times, there is unlikely to be much of a change as it is comparable to the current delay experienced getting into the existing-reservoir, then queuing (finding a gap) to get out of it.</p>
Fulford Parish Council	<p>The bus-only access to the southern roundabout from the Designer Outlet has the potential to cause additional congestion. This could increase emissions and journey times at certain times of the day but no supporting information has been provided.</p> <p>The alterations affect only northbound traffic, but no assessment of impact on southbound journey times, especially during the PM peak, and particularly more congestion outbound on the A19 through Fulford.</p> <p>The additional lane on the northbound approach to the southern roundabout will be of some benefit, but the impact of a further set of lights at Naburn Lane and at Germany Beck is highly likely to negate any minor savings. There is no evidence to substantiate the suggestion that the Naburn Lane signals will smooth the flow of northbound traffic.</p>	<p>Please see response above.</p> <p>The ‘pinchpoint’ experienced on the A19, and particularly at this interchange is most severe during the AM peak. Improvements are for inbound traffic, the greatest beneficiaries being traffic getting on to the A64 (in both directions) from the south, and inbound buses. This will have a positive impact on travel times for inbound traffic, south of the Designer Outlet roundabout. Officers are of the view that the proposed alterations will have a negligible impact on outbound traffic on the A19 through Fulford.</p> <p>Modelling, including micro-simulation, has been undertaken holistically for all phases of the Pinch Point Scheme. Initial concepts for Phase 2 (A19/Naburn Lane junction) has indicated that signalization would help rebalance the traffic flow priority in favour of major traffic route (A19 inbound). This should reduce the level of ‘<i>shock wave</i>’ queuing currently experienced when the A19 traffic allows Naburn Lane traffic out of the currently uncontrolled junction. It will also have a positive effect further upstream (at the new proposed A19/A64 layout from Phase 1), effectively improving the efficiency of the interchange further, and reducing the queues on the A64 eastbound off-ramp. It should be acknowledged that much of the delay experienced on this route is due to queuing beyond</p>

	There is no evidence to support the claim that levels of 'exceedance' in the Fulford AQMA will reduce as a result of Phase 1, or that queuing and emissions won't increase along Selby Road.	Naburn Lane (towards York) which this scheme will not address. Proposals for Phase 1 will not affect the Fulford AGMA.
G Cheyne <i>(on behalf of residents of Selby Road and Naburn Lane)</i>	<p>The routing of all southbound A19 traffic (except buses), involving the need to travel to the northern roundabout before heading towards Selby will cause chaos in the evening and add to congestion on the interchange.</p> <p>Already one link on the roundabouts (i.e. the northern one) has been closed, creating unnecessary journey times, pollution and pressure on traffic signals, creating tailbacks through Selby Road.</p> <p>What evidence is there that traffic is using Naburn Lane to avoid the A19 queues and intersection?</p>	<p>Please see above responses.</p> <p>This link was closed as part of the Highways Agency scheme which involved part-signalisation of the interchange. The link served no discernible purpose and was very rarely used. There were no traffic movements which it facilitated (with the exception of outbound vehicles on the A19 Selby Road making a U-turn to return inbound).</p> <p>The disproportionately large number of vehicles using Naburn Lane inbound during the AM peak (but not at other times of the day) can not be accounted for by local traffic alone. Officers are of the view that the level of traffic far exceeds what would be expected from the small number of villages served by Naburn Lane (B1222), thus reached the conclusion that some traffic is currently diverting onto this road from (and to avoid) the A19.</p>

2) The Pinch Point Scheme *generally* (including Phases 2 & 3)

Respondent	Comment	Officers Response
CYC Arboricultural Manager	Understands that the scheme may require the removal of some mature trees on the inbound side (between Naburn Lane and Landing Lane). Requests that provision is made for a reasonable amount of new tree planting along the A19.	A consideration for Phase 2.
Fulford Parish Council	It is clear from the phasing plan that the proposed A19/Germany Beck access has now been removed from the Pinch Point Scheme altogether. This is surprising since the junction was included in the original bid and forms an integral part of the	To clarify, the element of the Pinch Point Scheme (and the three phase approach we are undertaking) being delivered directly by CYC and made possible by the grant from the DfT, is for complimentary works, south of the point where the Germany Beck

	<p>scheme with essential flood walling to protect the A19.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that this crucial element of the whole scheme should now quietly be discarded. It also raises the question as to why Persimmon has agreed to contribute 30% of the total fund value, if no part of their development falls within the Pinch Point Scheme boundaries.</p>	<p>access road and road-level raising is proposed to be constructed by Persimmon, and which has outline permission from the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Everything related to the design and construction of the Germany Beck junction is covered in the planning process, and is outside the scope of the element of the project which is being directly progressed by the Council. The proposed highway works which CYC plan to undertake are south of this (Landing Lane to Designer Outlet) and are proposed to tackle existing issues, by easing congestion and ultimately (by Phase 3) interface with the boundary of the Germany Beck site (and the new junction).</p> <p>The Pinch Point application does indeed make mention of a 'flood wall', but this is in reference to the retaining wall required when Persimmon raise the road level at their junction, and for which they have permission. The council are not undertaking this work, but it is included as part of the overall A19 'package' of works in the area identified in the bid.</p> <p>This element still forms part of the overall package of works, but is outside the scope of the element of the project which is being directly progressed by CYC. Regarding the terms and condition for funding contribution from Persimmon, the 'minimum of 30% local contribution' funding referred to was a DfT stipulation of bidding for Pinch Point funding. This is not the percentage of funding which Persimmon have committed to contribute to the overall package of works for the A19 (which includes both Pinch Point and Germany Beck), nor is it a cap. In reality, the costs which will be incurred by Persimmon when constructing the new junction and raising the road level will amount to a greater percentage of the overall A19 works costs than the 30% figure which the DfT wanted assurances for.</p>
<p>G Cheyne <i>(on behalf of residents of Selby Road and Naburn Lane)</i></p>	<p>No evidence was forthcoming or given at the presentation as to why there was a need for the scheme.</p> <p>Also no evidence given to support any benefits.</p>	<p>The objectives of this scheme are outlined in the bid to the DfT for Local Pinch Point Funding in February 2013 and also within the main body of this report.</p> <p>The estimated journey time savings stated at the presentation and within the main body of this report are gathered from a combination of modelling, traffic surveys and on-site observations.</p>

	<p>It is clear to residents of Selby Road that the Pinch Point Scheme will bring widespread congestion to the locality, not only in AM peak time, but more so in the evenings and weekends.</p> <p>No Air Quality Management assessment was included in the presentation.</p>	<p>Modelling, including micro-simulation, has been undertaken holistically for all phases of the Pinch Point Scheme. We aim to reduce the level of 'shock wave' queuing currently experienced when the A19 traffic allows Naburn Lane traffic out of the currently uncontrolled junction. This would also have a positive effect further upstream, improving the efficiency of the interchange. Much of the delay experienced inbound on this route is due to queuing beyond Naburn Lane (towards York) which this scheme will not address.</p> <p>The proposals for Phase 1 were not considered to have any significant impact on air quality in this area, which is already a major highway interchange.</p>
Chas Jones	<p>Do you intend to allow work to start on the Germany Beck access road before approving the pinch point scheme which it integrates? They are dependent on one another so need approving together.</p> <p>Phase 3 is contiguous with the Germany Beck access road, clearly requiring planning permission as the flood wall needs to be built here.</p>	<p>The Germany Beck development has outline planning permission which includes the access road and its junction with the A19. The 'Pinch Point Scheme' which the Council is delivering is complimentary works to the highway, and thus is treated separately.</p> <p>Phases 1 and 2 of the PinchPoint Scheme are beneficial as stand-alone schemes which can be delivered as highway improvement schemes in their own right, and are not dependent on the Germany Beck development commencing prior to their approval (or even at all). The tie in with the Germany Beck junction identified to be delivered in phase 3 is obviously dependent on the progress of the Persimmon scheme.</p> <p>The Pinch Point application does make mention of a 'flood wall', but this is in reference to the retaining wall required when Persimmon raise the road level at their junction, and for which they have permission. The council are not undertaking this work, but it is included as part of the overall A19 'package' of works in the area identified in the bid.</p>

3) The consultation process

Respondent	Comment	Officers Response
Cllr K Aspden	Hopes that more extensive public consultation will be forthcoming for Phases 2 & 3 of the Pinch Point Scheme.	As Phase 1 was considered merely a capacity improvement scheme at an interchange, with no residential properties in

		<p>proximity, a decision was taken by the Project Board (consisting of the Director of City and Environmental Services and two Assistant Directors) that consultation would be limited to statutory consultees; interested parties; and key stakeholders, so that a proposed design could be advanced in January 2015.</p> <p>It was widely recognised that Phase 2 (& 3), being in an area with residential properties and close to the proposed Germany Beck development, would attract a lot more interest from members of the public. Therefore it is proposed that for subsequent phases we will progress a 'co-design' method of consultation/public engagement, by working with interested parties – to develop a preferred scheme. This to include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitation to every property with direct frontage access to the lengths of carriageway within scope for phases 2 & 3 (i.e. properties on Selby Road and Naburn Lane) to consult on the design of the scheme. • In addition, Fulford and Naburn Parish Councils to be consulted, representing the wider nearby communities. • Publicity of the consultation in all local media. • All consultation documentation to be publically available on the council's website. • On-highway notification boards inviting users of the road(s) to the council website to participate in the consultation. • Public drop-in session / ideas workshop within Fulford to be held, displaying concepts and to work with Officers to develop a scheme.
Fulford Parish Council	<p>The Pinch Point Funding was allocated on the basis of a single integrated scheme that was supposed to improve traffic flows and air quality and also to provide flood defences on the A19. Why has the scheme been split?</p> <p>The documents do not provide sufficient supporting information to clarify the reasoning underpinning the choice of proposals for phase 1, or whether any alternatives were considered and what they were.</p>	<p>Because of the complexities involved with such a lengthy stretch of highway (~1.2km of the A19) and as certain elements of the Pinch Point Scheme were not restricted to Germany Beck's commencement, and would be advantageous to implement independently, the Project Board made the decision to separate the Scheme into three manageable Phases. The DfT are aware of our approach.</p> <p>As Council Officers, we need to be certain that what we propose is feasible in terms of engineering, provides the most benefit for users, and most importantly – is realistic. It is not normal for Officers to present the public with aborted/redundant concepts which have</p>

	<p>Difficult to provide a response to Phase 1 proposals in isolation, as they need to be seen in context with Phases 2 & 3.</p> <p>If Phase 1 were to be implemented as a stand alone project before plans for later phases are agreed/published, any opportunity to modify the scheme as a whole will have been lost.</p> <p>It is crucial that all those affected by a proposal are properly informed. Regular users of the A19 corridor or the wider community have not sufficiently been made aware.</p> <p>There is no cost estimate for Phase 1 and how this cost may impact upon the fund as a whole or the viability of later phases.</p> <p>A further criticism is that three separate consultations will lead to 'consultation fatigue' and increase the costs.</p>	<p>since been dismissed.</p> <p>Phase 1 is beneficial as a stand-alone scheme which can be delivered as a highway capacity improvement project in its own right. Features of Phase 1 are not conditional on any future works proposed for Phases 2 or 3.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Please see previous response to Cllr Aspden above.</p> <p>The cost estimate for Phase 1 is contained within the main body of this report.</p> <p>Because of the timescale uncertainty of the progression of the Germany Beck development – and because Phase 3 is reliant on it's commencement – Officers considered that separate consultations would be necessary.</p>
<p>G Cheyne <i>(on behalf of residents of Selby Road and Naburn Lane)</i></p>	<p>The consultation process is flawed. Other than the CYC website, no wide spread publicity has taken place. The proposals affect the regional community using Fulford Road, including thousands of motorists. No signage has been placed near the highway to make users aware of the radical changes proposed.</p> <p>At the public Parish Council meeting, no alternative plans were shown, or what had previously been considered. It's a done deal.</p>	<p>Please see previous response to Cllr Aspden above.</p> <p>As Council Officers, we need to be certain that what we propose is feasible in terms of engineering, provides the most benefit for users, and most importantly – is realistic. It is not normal for Officers to present the public with aborted/redundant concepts which have since been dismissed.</p>
<p>C Jones</p>	<p>Why has the consultation for the pinch point fund been split into three phases? The funding conditions imply that once started, the whole project must be undertaken, so the whole scheme needs approving together.</p>	<p>Because of the complexities involved with such a lengthy stretch of highway (~1.2km of the A19) and as certain elements of the Pinch Point Scheme were not restricted to Germany Beck's commencement, and would be advantageous to implement independently, the Project Board made the decision to separate the Scheme into three manageable Phases.</p>

4) Other matters, not the subject of this decision

Respondent	Comment	Officers Response
Cllr A D'Agorne (Green Party)	Is any of the proposed cycle provision along the riverside being looked at in relation to this scheme? I think the opportunity should also be taken to look at providing more cycle lanes on Main street itself and biting the bullet of the indiscriminate parking that is a deterrent to cycling and causes delays to the buses which cannot pass each other at the point nearest the Plough (which has an underused rear car park).	These issues are outside the scope and/or boundaries of this particular scheme.
Fulford Parish Council	The traffic lights already installed at the A64/A19 roundabouts and at Crockey Hill appear to have worsened outbound queuing times through Fulford on the A19.	The part-signalisation of the interchange was a scheme undertaken by the Highways Agency with the objective of reducing incidences when the off-ramps from the A64 onto the roundabouts were unable to cope with the sheer amount of vehicles queuing on them. Previously at peak hours, these queues regularly exceeded the slip-roads' respective capacities and protruded onto the (70mph limit) A64, causing a very serious safety concern.
G Cheyne <i>(on behalf of residents of Selby Road and Naburn Lane)</i>	<p>CYC have been responsible for the congestion in and around the A64/A19 interchange. The installation of signals at Crockey Hill has been responsible for queuing throughout the PM peak onto the interchange and A64 westbound.</p> <p>The part-signalisation of the interchange have not alleviated queuing back onto the main A64 carriageway in the AM peak. They have however created more congestion in the evening and weekends down the A19 from Fishergate.</p>	<p>Regarding the Crockey Hill signals, whether they are correctly timed and working to full efficiency will be investigated.</p> <p>Please see above.</p>
Chas Jones	<p>Why does the pinch point application claim there is only 1% risk of archaeology disrupting the plan? Can you identify this basis?</p> <p>Likewise the claim there is 35% chance of disruption due to wildlife?</p>	<p>This is referring to the elements of the Pinch Point fund which we, as a council are planning to deliver, on-highway. This does not refer to the Germany Beck junction or access road (already covered by the planning process). As we know that the scope of the Pinch Point Scheme is all within existing highway boundaries, this is why the risk of archaeological disruption is considered to be so low. However there of course remains the risk of encountering archaeological materials during the construction process.</p> <p>For the same reason.</p>