

Annex B(iii) - Online questionnaire responses Q8

Please use this space to tell us anything you particularly like or dislike about the proposals

Answered 40

Skipped 46

Respondents	Responses
1	Lack of access for business owners, people with limited mobility and limited access for people who live on the street. People cannot get to their own priorities or allocated parking spots.
2	#since I first replied in the paper version of this consultation, I have become more convinced that this is a lost opportunity to make the street really live up to the aspirations stated at the beginning of the consultation. It is timid - giving way to the lobby power of car drivers, rather than boldly giving us something that will go forward and make this street a landmark for other possible footstreets in York.
3	I would like to see a bollard at the top of Wlamgate to stop through traffic but allow cyclists
4	Cars will still be allowed.
5	Until there is full pedestrianisation implemented at certain times of day, it won't really improve the street for pedestrians. in the Alternatives Considered section of the plan, it was indicated that, under pedestrianisation, delivery vehicles and blue badge parking would be strictly limited "- as such we believe this option would have a negative impact on residents and businesses". Yet elsewhere in the plan it was indicated that business find the special pedestrian-only days beneficial. So on what evidence is it "believed" that (partial) pedestrianisation would not be good for business? I understand that for residents it is trickier. For cyclists, I see that five bike racks are planned. Could there be more? (And less car parking?)
6	No need to send 1/2 million on it. Fill the potholes in the rest of the city. Far more roads in need of repair or improvement.
7	Of course anything is an improvement but it all seems very half hearted. Surely the restaurants should have more space for outside seating. Make it truly cosmopolitan. Expose cobblestones if possible.
8	I like the sheffield style bicycle racks but think you should have some more of them as bike travel is ultra low emission, encourages fitness, and encourages people visiting local shops and supporting local, more circular economies.
9	The use of York Stone it is hopeless in wet weather the built out areas will break up when driven over by 4 x4s as it has on Goodramgate. The whole scheme is fussy there really isn't room for trees, the main need is for non slip paving and reduce the drop from the curbs I the cobblestones add little to the appearance of the street.

10	Works well as it is, don't waste money when it can be spent elsewhere
11	Cyclists are lethal! You can't hear them coming up behind you and they go too fast. At least you can hear a car coming. No cyclists please!
12	Too much money being spent on things that are not necessary
13	I don't like that still allows for parking. And the yellow lines are an eyesore. I like the idea for wider pavements, trees, benches.
14	Relaying pavements and making them wider would be good but please keep the unusual granite kerb stones. Mixing pedestrians and cyclists causes problems when cyclists have no road sense or awareness of what pedestrians may do. Will the cyclists be allowed to go both ways as they ignore one way signs. I strongly support the reversed traffic flow which has markedly reduced traffic and noise.
15	Like them all but do worry about business or tenant access.
16	It's a poor compromise - just have the courage to fully pedestrianise
17	The crossing at Pavement is not an improvement. There need to be pedestrian controlled lights directly at Whip Ma Whop Ma -- this is where pedestrians try to cross and it would more effectively connect Fossgate to the city centre.
18	I like the additional cycle parking and the narrow road.
19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retains vehicle access - get traffic out during the day with longer footstreets hours 2. Still looks and feels like a road and will encourage traffic to use/ park - make look and feel like pedestrian area, all level and same colour with greenery, benches areas for people to hang out. 3. Crossing into whipping gate makes it worse! It does not follow the desire line of pedestrians who walk directly across. Plan to put in 2 crossings either side (will not be used!) and take away speed bumps is retrograde.
20	I like the wider foot paths in nice materials, benches, seating and trees. I like the reduced vehicle priority but feel this could be taken slightly further by using a paving style road surface instead of tarmac, and having no kerb.
21	<p style="text-align: center;">Cycle Stands Outside No. 35:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A valuable addition - but possibly some access issues arising from installing a permanent / fixed narrowing of the road at this point...</p> <p style="text-align: center;">There is a regular (weekly) need to get larger vehicles (transit van etc) into the courtyard at 35.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">If the stands had been instated previously, would the current works at the Blue Bicycle, taking up part of the other side of the road. been possible?</p>

22	I think the survey questions - as in all other consultations - miss a critical point: whether you do something or, in this case, go somewhere now or not is not relevant. It is whether the changes would encourage you to do something, in this case, visit Fossgate and do so more often. They also never remind people that the changes are intended not only for the person answering the questions but also for who they might come with - an elderly relative if the surface were improved or benches provided. And, that the changes are not just for next year but will be there in a decade's time, for example, or perhaps two decades. People should be encouraged to think what they will want or need out of the location or street under consideration in the future when their needs might change. They should be asked to consider if they know people who don't use it now but might do if it changed and to state what those changes are. The consultation is about making improvements that will serve local people when they are made but also into the future.
23	Reducing the road width and making it one-way
24	Its a shame that the plans won't demonstrate how good a car free centre would be. If its open to cars, anyone will drive along it like the rest of the city centre and without sanction.
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The varying width of the pedestrian paths isn't useful, since the wider sections will just be blocked by tables and chairs and roped-off areas so we will still have to step in to the road. Just make the whole thing wider along the full length on both sides - It is a big step down from the path to the road, which is hard to navigate for the mobility impaired or heavily laden. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I like the proposal to use York stone - I don't like the increase in street furniture/signage - it's incongruous with the surroundings - Not enough trees or greenery
26	Direction of traffic and congestion that will be caused by delivery vans
27	its a shame there are no raised table areas where the surface can be shared.
28	It doesn't really go far enough. Why spend that amount of money on doing half a job?
29	The pavement widening is not sufficient. Particularly between the Gurkha restaurant and the Cosy club, where it is too narrow for two prams to pass.
30	They do not go far enough. This is a generational opportunity to grasp the nettle of city centre traffic problems and pedestrianise the street, with cycling permitted.
31	I think it should be pedestrianised. If this isn't feasible the level difference between the footpath and 'road' need reducing. The 'road' needs to be designed to feel like a space for pedestrians with occasional car use, not as a space where cars feel they control. Overall the current plans are a significant improvement subject to the use of high quality materials.

32	Pavements are not wide enough and deliveries by large vehicles often make walking difficult. Cyclists go against the correct flow of traffic. Alcohol abuse often seen from people waling from the Walmgate end
33	Pavements!
34	I dislike that this proposal is for restaurants,cafes and ignore traders and the hairdressers who need vehicle access for disabled customers and taxis for elderly. This proposal will close down these shops and would change Fossgate to just a street of cafes, coffee shops, restaurants which is a majority of what York city centre already is
35	Traffic restrictions are good but could be better. There is not enough cycle parking. It would be look a lot better if it could be paved like Coney Street or King's Square.
36	I don't think speed tables are a good idea given that you are already intending reducing the width of the road. Fossgate would be better cobbled due to the heritage / history why ruin the aesthetic of another street when the rest of the city centre has already been RUINED by modern materials!! York is losing it's identity due to a mix of modern infrastructure changes and is taking away the history and feel of our ancient city. Progress is one thing but do we have to turn the city centre into a mish mash of old and new and take away Yorks History??
37	do not know why there is still car parking on fossgate, and I can't see any bike parking.
38	As long as you incorporate the bridge in your works, it needs a facelift and is a lovely place to stop and look at the river.
39	Bike racks do not make it easier for pedestrians, neither do tables outside cafes and restaurants. Little Stonegate is not pedestrian friendly once these obstacles appear in the evening.
40	Fossgate should be converted to a footstreet.