

SCARBOROUGH BRIDGE UPGRADE: PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS

Number of respondents: **142**

Addresses of respondents: Not stated 67; Clifton 23; Bootham 9; Holgate 5; Leeman Rd area 5; South Bank 4; Acomb 2; Poppleton 2; Tang Hall 1; Westfield 1; Bishopthorpe 1; Copmanthorpe 1; Hammerton 1; Clifton Moor 1; Micklegate 1; Huntington 1; Lancashire 1; [plus a Petition with 16 signatories]

Comments concerning:	No. of comments	Addresses (if known)	Response
Strongly support the proposed scheme	135	Not stated 62 Holgate 5 Westfield 1 Lancashire 1 Copmanthorp 1 Micklegate 1 Clifton 22 Leeman Rd 5 Tang Hall 1 Bishopthorpe 1 Hammerton 1 Huntington 1 Bootham 8 South Bank 4 Acomb 2 Poppleton 2 Clifton Moor 1 Petition 16	-
Currently difficult to haul bikes / cases up steps	29	Not stated 12 Bootham 3 Hammerton 1 South Bank 2 Acomb 1 Clifton Moor 1 Clifton 5 Leeman Rd 3 Poppleton 1	-
Endorse new sustainable pedestrian & cycle route linking station to other side of river	26	Not stated 9 Clifton Moor 1 Holgate 1 Clifton 7 Tang Hall 1 Hammerton 1 Bootham 5 South Bank 1	-
Would like new steps built on the outside of bridge to avoid potential pinch point	24	Not stated 13 South Bank 1 Micklegate 1 Clifton 5 Bishopthorpe 1 Bootham 2 Leeman Rd 1	Noted
Issue with narrow passing-point and archway where southern steps meet riverside route	22	Not stated 10 Bootham 2 Holgate 1 Leeman Rd 3 Clifton 2 Poppleton 1 South Bank 2 Acomb 1	This issue would be partially resolved if the steps were relocated to the outside of the new bridge, with the landing area relocated away from the archway
Proposed plans are well thought through	22	Not stated 11 Copmanthorp 1 Clifton 7 Bishopthorpe 1 Acomb 1 Holgate 1	-
Pleased to be able to use crossing during floods	13	Not stated 4 Clifton Moor 1 Clifton 5 Bootham 3	-
Prefer to segregate cyclists & pedestrians	12	Not stated 8 Clifton 3 Micklegate 1	Noted. Official segregation would be difficult to build in to the design, especially where widths are restricted. However this will be considered at detailed design
Unable to use existing bridge at present (mobility issues etc)	11	Not stated 3 Acomb 1 Clifton 3 Tang Hall 1 Leeman Rd 2 Bootham 1	-
Confusion over whether stepped access will be present on both sides of the bridge	11	Not stated 7 Clifton 1 Westfield 1 South Bank 1 Acomb 1	Stepped access would be available from both river sides. Still to be determined if existing steps to be retained or build new steps on the outside of the structure

ANNEX C

Would like improved entrance to station ramp / widen Post Office Lane	8	Not stated 4	South Bank 3	Leeman Rd 1	This area would be improved as part of the project. The existing gates to the station ramp would be relocated and palisade fencing would be removed throughout.
Would like a wider place to stand in centre of bridge, for meeting, photos, passing point etc	7	Not stated 2	Clifton 4	South Bank 1	Noted
Bit of a detour from riverside to use station ramps to access new bridge	7	Not stated 6	Lancashire 1		Due to the proximity of the existing station ramps it would be more prudent to utilise the existing structures
Proposed bridge should be wider	6	Not stated 4	Clifton 2		See section in report re: bridge width restriction
Should not feature any barriers	6	Not stated 4	Clifton 2		Noted
Loss of trees undesirable / Replanting required	6	Not stated 3	Bootham 2	Clifton 1	We would wish to include compensatory planting
Once in a lifetime opportunity to become iconic part of York, not to be missed	5	Not stated 3	Clifton 2		-
Ramps should allow for long bikes (i.e. cargo / recumbent / utility)	5	Not stated 1 Clifton 1	Holgate 1 Lancashire 1	South Bank 1	Ramps are proposed to be 3.0 m in width, with turning point areas of 9.0 sq m
Extension of northern ramp is welcome	4	Bootham 2	Clifton 1	South Bank 1	-
Would like the existing steps retained	4	South Bank 1 Copmanthorp 1	Bootham 1	Poppleton 1	Noted
Existing bridge fairly unsightly / Make more of a feature of new bridge – i.e. a “destination”	4	Bootham 2	Clifton 2		Noted
Enhance the bridge using shrubs / planters etc	4	Not stated 2	Bootham 1	Holgate 1	Noted
Station short-stay car park a conflict point – Needs altering to have a proper path through	4	Not stated 2	Leeman Rd 1	Bootham 1	Would be proposed in discussion with Virgin Trains East Coast and Network Rail
Maintenance / upkeep concerns, CCTV	4	Not stated 1	Bootham 2	Holgate 1	Noted. CCTV is proposed to be included in the project
Hopes river crossing will be closed for as little time as possible during construction	3	Clifton 2	Not stated 1		Disruption would be kept to a minimum
Design should discourage ‘love locks’	3	Clifton 2	Bootham 1		Noted
Ensure continuation of the latticework ironwork / fencing style	3	Not stated 1	Copmanthorp 1	Bootham 1	Noted
Would like restrictions on Lendal Bridge traffic	3	Not stated 3			-
Will need extra cycle parking at north end of station	2	Holgate 1	Clifton 1		Noted
Sufficient illumination required (and interesting – i.e. colour changing LEDs)	2	Not stated 1	Clifton 1		Noted
Use local contractors / materials if possible	2	Not stated 2			Noted
Estimated cost seems excessively high	2	Not stated 1	Bootham 1		The cost estimate has been validated
Disappointed with limited exhibit times	2	Clifton 1	Leeman Rd 1		A 2 day exhibit was held at York Station. There were insufficient resources for a longer exhibit

Would like design of new bridge to reflect York's railway history – not off the shelf	2	Not stated 2	Noted
Object to proposal – Current bridge adequate and could use money elsewhere	2	Not stated 1 Heworth 1	Noted
Further work required on the riverside paths for courteous shared use	2	Not stated 2	Noted
Network Rail should be fully committed to this scheme.	1	Not stated 1	-
Would like benches on the bridge	1	Clifton 1	Widths would be restricted with this suggestion
Needs a central 'landmark feature' such as a clock, weathervane, digital art etc	1	Clifton 1	Noted
Visual digital cycle counter? Webcam?	1	Clifton 1	Noted
Better lighting of station access ramp	1	South Bank 1	Noted
Would like solution / route for cyclists through centre of station	1	Bootham 1	Restrictions would remain on cycling through the main station concourse
Ramp surface material needs to be suitable	1	Not stated 1	Noted
Good value for money compared with a 'highway scheme'	1	Not stated 1	-
Object to project due to history of bridge, but would endorse a new stand-alone bridge	1	Bootham 1	A new stand alone bridge would be prohibitively expensive and may be considered by some as more visually intrusive
Existing bridge has historic and engineering interest. Changes to the structure would have harmful effects to the historic fabric	1	Bootham 1	Noted
Balustrade design incongruous and unrelated to historic bridge. Loss of upper parts of masonry piers is destructive and unwelcome	1	Bootham 1	See section of report re: stone pilasters