

**Executive Member Decision Session  
TSAR Traffic Signal Refurbishment – Bootham/Gillygate/St  
Leonards Place**

**Annexe D**

**Summary of Consultation Replies received outside the online consultation**

As part of the consultation process, the TSAR project team contacted an established list of external and internal stakeholders to make them aware of the online consultation. In some instances, these stakeholders chose to respond directly to the project email inbox with their feedback which is recorded below.

In addition, our press release also indicated that any resident who could not access the online consultation or would prefer to correspond with us directly could write to us or request a phone call to discuss the design options. This offer was taken up by a small number of residents and their feedback is also recorded below.

**1. Reliance Buses**

Reliance Motor Services provide bus services to passengers in the City of York as well as North Yorkshire. Our services create key links for passengers arriving and departing the city. Every service we operate passes through this junction at some point in the day and many use Exhibition Square as their terminus. This junction is a key bottleneck on the inner ring road and we feel strongly that bus priority and traffic throughput should be top of the agenda when considering replacement strategies.

Having evaluated the schemes, I would offer the following comments;

Option A

This option appears to offer a similar road layout to the current one.  
There is no capacity change at the junction  
Widened crossings improve pedestrian access

Option B

This option changes the layout of the junction significantly  
Reduction in capacity at the junction of 30%

Increase in waiting time by 50%

Our preference would be see Option A advanced for the following reasons;

- Option A maintains throughput of the traffic at the junction in conjunction with the benefits of replaced signals
- Option A would not increase waiting times at the junction
- Option A increases pedestrian access to the junction at a proportionate level
- Option B would decrease capacity at the junction by 30% and thus increase wait time by 50%.
- Option B makes material changes to the junction that would have a detrimental impact on vehicles.

In summary, of the changes proposed via the consultation, we support Option A. The alternative Option B would have what we believe to be detrimental impact on traffic through the junction and whilst we support the reduction in private journeys in the city made by car, we cannot afford to allow significant changes such as those outlined in Option B to reduce all vehicle times and thus impact on buses. The national bus strategy that has just been published talks about bus priority measures, it would be prudent to take this into account when drawing up final recommendations for this project.

## **2. Transdev**

Whilst an improvement to pedestrian and cyclist safety is amiable, the resulting increase in traffic could result in a higher risk to pedestrians and cyclists as a consequence. The additional waiting time that our bus services would reduce the appeal using public transport.

An upgrade to the technology used for the traffic light system would greatly benefit the bus services that use this junction.

This area is already congested and any efforts that are made to make the junction more efficient would be welcomed.

A reduction in the road space available of 30% would impact the City Sightseeing York bus tour hugely. The additional traffic, which is forecast to increase of up to 50% would result in our services being heavily delayed or result in additional resource having to be added to ensure the

service was reliable. The added resource would be at an additional cost to the business.

Design Option A is preferred.

### **3. First York**

First York provide the largest proportion of urban bus services to passengers within the City of York, as well as keeping these communities moving, we operate 6 Park and Ride sites which are a major, and proven component in reducing congestion in the City.

At peak periods we can have up to 20 buses per hour in each direction using this particular junction, a mix of double deck, single deck, and articulated vehicles. We believe that bus priority, and traffic flow need to be the major factor when considering replacement of existing infrastructure, given that this key junction is a thoroughfare to the majority of services serving York Hospital, as well as a frequent Park and Ride service.

We have reviewed both options, and strongly believe that “A” would be our preferred option.

Our rationale behind this is that option A offers a comparable road layout to what exists currently and retains the much needed capacity at the junction. We would also welcome the proposed signal improvements and would be keen to understand any added benefits these would bring. We also welcome the crossing improvements outlined.

Option B would present a huge challenge in delivering reliable, and sustainable transport for the City by the wholesale reduction of capacity at this junction which is quoted in the consultation as 30%, coupled with the 50% waiting time quoted increase. If this was considered, effective bus priority measures would need to be introduced on approach roads to offset the expected delays bus service will experience. We would be seriously concerned over anything that would increase waiting time at this junction, extended journey times would make the transition from individual car traffic to sustainable public transport even more challenging and further increase congestion.

The compound delays this would bring in the immediate areas are a particular concern for congestion and air quality and need more detailed modelling and study especially around the Gillygate, St Leonard's, Lendal Bridge areas. Journey times in bus timetables would have to be significantly increased into and out of York City Centre to reflect the 50% modelling at the junction alone. There is a further impact to consider, reliability issues as a result of increased congestion which have the potential to be commonplace with a significant reduction in lane capacity.

This would be a retrograde step for the City and is hard to understand how this would be aligned with any of the objectives in the recently published National Bus Strategy regards to bus priority measures.

The First Bus services that use this junction are served predominantly by Cross City routes 1, 5, 5A, and 6 which are designed to ensure a reliable and high frequency service is provided between York Hospital and outlying districts, a major employer, and a keen advocate of reducing car use given their limited parking capacity.

The effect on the Park and Ride service 2 service must also be considered as this is a key component in keeping cars out of the City Centre. Park and Ride customers expect a fast, frequent, and reliable service, which is provided on a "turn up and go" frequency. The attractiveness of this service would be seriously compromised by anything that lengthens the time of the current journey, which is scheduled at between 13-16 minutes from Museum Street.

In summary, as set out in our response we would be supportive of option A. We would not be at all supportive of option B as we believe this will fundamentally damage the excellent bus services in York, reversing the excellent work undertaken over the years to reach this level of excellence through the collaborative working of Bus Operators, City of York Council and the York Quality Bus Partnership.

#### **4. Sustrans**

It is a very busy and intimidating signalled junction which is not pleasant to cycle through and for people crossing on foot it takes ages to cross the road and the corner by Gillygate is very narrow and constrained by guardrail – this should be removed and the footway made wider.

Accidents at the junction for cyclist are too high they need protected space in line with LTN 1/20. There have been 20 collisions reported to the Police according to Bike Data and many other incidents will be unreported.

Cycle use at junction is declining e.g. in 2008 2,147 cyclists used Bootham in 2019 this had fallen to 1149. Source DfT traffic counts A19 Bootham.

Lack of two way access for cycling in High Petergate footstreet meaning the NCN 658 uses St Leonards Place for northbound movements which is not as pleasant or safe and does not meet NCN design standards.

We support the reallocation of road space to pedestrians and cyclists at the junction but the present plans do not go far enough given the setting by a historic Bootham Bar and square in front of the Art Gallery. It should be a place for people which motor traffic passes through slowly and safely.

Comments on Option A:

Advanced stop lines - LTN 1/20 says these offers the least amount of protection for cyclists see para 10.6.5 and in 10.6.44 ASL should only be considered on lower flow roads < 5,000 PCU per day. So we do not consider them to be suitable for this location.

Other ways of protecting cyclists from motor traffic in time and space should be considered including Hold the left turn using a protected lane for cycling well in advance of the current cycling stop lines as shown on the plan above in red.

Combined with early release this will enable cyclist to clear the junction, low level cycle signals should be used.

National Cycle network (NCN) Route 658 southbound goes through Bootham Bar down High Petergate but Northbound is via Duncombe Place and St Leonards Place – we recommend making High Petergate two way for cycling with a cycle crossing phase at the exit.

St Leonards Place – the central cycle lane is not to LTN 1/20 standards and is often blocked by buses. We recommend a protected bike lane bypassing the relocated bus stops, removing a traffic lane and refuge crossing as in Option B

Comments on Option B:

The same comments for Option A apply to Option B.

While a traffic lane on St Leonards place is removed the cycle lane is between the bus stops and traffic lane so it does not offer protected space for cycling so is unlikely to arrest the decline in cycling at this junction or improve safety.

The principles of separating cyclists from motor traffic in time and space at junctions as outlined in Chapter 10 of LTN 1/20 do not seem to have been considered adequately.

The junction offers so much more scope for public realm improvements to match the magnificent historical features surrounding it.

Neither option is adequate to ensure safe and comfortable cycling

## **5. York Quality Bus Partnership**

On behalf of Bus Operators as part of the York Quality Bus Partnership we would like to feed back on the consultation on the Bootham / Gillygate TSAR Scheme. We share the intention of the local authority to ensure junctions and signals are of sufficient standard both in safety and technology.

York Quality Bus Partnership (QBP) is an organisation formed of the 7 bus operators who offer services in York, and City of York Council. Its principal objective is to improve bus services across York and increase the number of people using the bus.

This is a significant junction for bus movements with a mixture of vehicle types and is a key through route serving York Hospital and Park and Ride services. Feedback from operators suggests that option "A" would be our preferred option.

Option A offers a comparable road layout to the current junction design and retains the much needed capacity at the junction. We would also welcome the proposed signal improvements and would be keen to

understand any added benefits these would bring. We also welcome the crossing improvements outlined and the improvements for pedestrians.

Option B would change the present layout significantly and would reduce capacity at the junction by 30% and increase waiting time by 50%. This would be unacceptable to bus operators and to passengers experiencing increased factored in delay time which would further inconvenience to passengers using sustainable travel modes. The impact would also be experienced far wider including considerations on viability of current timetables and level of frequency of services, or increasing the number of vehicles operated to maintain existing levels of frequency – this would be deeply concerning in the pandemic recovery.

The recently published National Bus Strategy highlights the benefits of bus use and intends for operators and local authorities to work in partnership together – we are pleased to say this partnership approach is very much valued in the City of York. The strategy also highlights making buses more attractive with faster journey times through increased prioritisation, again option B does not meet this criteria. The journey times of buses is essential to modal shift, the Park and Ride services already provide a highly attractive alternative to driving into the Centre and any additional delay incurred which effect the attractiveness of the service. It is acknowledged that car drivers are aware of delays and traffic more in higher capacity modes than their own vehicles.

We look forward to continuing our positive work with City of York council. Finally, we would ask that the construction phase to realise the changes is carried out with the minimum of inconvenience to buses.

## **6. York Cycle Campaign**

We support the reallocation of road space to pedestrians and cyclists at this junction but we believe the proposals need to be far more ambitious. We'd expect to see the junction scoring tools from LTN1/20 being used to assess the junction, and for the new design to meet LTN1/20 design guidance. If this isn't done CoYC risks not being awarded funding from Active Travel England in future. We support the measures proposed by Sustrans and would like to see these being explored further. In addition we think Phil Pinder's ideas are interesting and would like to see these explored also.

### Comments on Option A:

The Current layout and lights at the junction do not provide for a safe junction that meets the requirements of LTN 1/20

Option A does nothing to address the issues at the junction. These include:

- Cars going through the amber for the left turn from St Leonard's Place to Gillygate
- Crowding of pedestrians, especially on the corner of Bootham / Gillygate and Gillygate / High Petergate, who sometimes spill out onto the cycle lanes
- Parked cars blocking of the cycle lane on Bootham especially between Bootham Row and the junction
- Cycle lanes too narrow especially for trikes and trailers. The cycle lanes on Gillygate are dangerously narrow and do not meet any standard for cycle lanes
- Bikes often endangered by close passes from cars turning left from Bootham to Gillygate
- The position of the traffic lights would not easily allow for a northbound cycle lane to be instituted on High Petergate.

This looks like an option that would be good for motorists but do nothing to help either cyclists or pedestrians.

### Comments on Option B:

Option B is a huge improvement to the current layout, but still leaves some problems. It is especially an improvement for pedestrians who will be able to cross any road in a single turn of the lights, and the new crossing from St Leonard's Place to the North side of High Petergate is to be welcomed. However, the layout of the junction still gives priority to motor vehicles over bicycles. For instance:

- There is a gap in the cycle lane at the mouth of Gillygate
- The bus stops on St Leonard's Place pull out into the Bicycle priority area (advance stop line), and should end before the first stop line
- The pedestrian waiting areas at the end of Gillygate (both sides) are too small to accommodate the number of people often waiting there, who then spill out onto the cycle lanes.
- The Northbound cycle lane on Bootham appears to start well North of the junction, when it should be continuous round the corner.

There are far too many close passes from vehicles turning left at that corner already and this will not help.

- As the stop line on Gillygate is already set well back it should be possible to build the pavement out on both sides so that there is more space for pedestrians to wait at the junction.
- The cycle provision does not meet the standards laid down in LTN1/20 with cycle lanes that are much too narrow, non-continuous and unprotected.

It would also be sensible to ensure that the position of the traffic lights allows for them to have lights added for bikes emerging on High Petergate should that become two ways for bikes at some point in the future.

We would expect that the timings will allow for a bike only phase at the start of each "green".

With regard to the possible extra delays, we know from experience elsewhere that much of that will be temporary as traffic "evaporates". That is people choose not to make that journey, use alternate routes or alternate methods (such as walking and cycling). The Council has a climate emergency policy to be carbon neutral by 2030 and a policy to remove non-essential private motor traffic from the City Centre. The former will require reducing the amount of traffic anyhow, and the latter will mean that fewer cars will be coming to the City Centre, both of which will reduce the amount of traffic on the roads.

Neither Option is supported

## **7. Private Resident (JL)**

I am one of a number of tour guides in the city.

We have an ongoing problem when crossing from the Art Gallery to Bootham Bar. This is a much used route for most guided tours around York.

Some time ago I wrote to the council and expressed my concerns about the bias towards vehicles at the expense of pedestrian safety at this junction. Whilst the recent improvement to the central wait area was welcome, the light sequence didn't seem to improve and with a large group the centre is often overflowing with people not able to stand safely. It can take 4 minutes to get from one side to the other. This is the amount of time we get of a nuclear attack. It is little wonder that many

people do not wait and cross on red, probably believing that there is a malfunction. Lockdown isn't the right time to do a survey, but I would suggest that, on a typical, (as was and as will be) summer day, there is a very high proportion of people crossing on red.

Can I suggest you look at replacing this crossing with one somewhere between Bootham Bar and the corner of St Leonards and Museum St. Probably opposite the theatre, but in the form of a zebra rather than a light controlled version. People could cross at will. This would free up more potential for traffic and pedestrian flow at the Bootham Gillygate junction.

Alternatively I do favour a green crossing period, ie. no vehicle movements at the junction, whilst people can cross where ever they wish even diagonally. A timed count down display as used in other cities would be of great benefit also...

#### **8. Private Resident (JG)**

As a resident of Gillygate, I can tell you that whenever traffic lights malfunction, traffic flows so much better - leading to quieter cleaner roads and fewer delays to road users. So drop options A and B and go for option C - get rid of traffic lights and put up some give way signs and lines and paint the road box yellow. Will save electrical power as well.

#### **9. Private Resident (DM)**

I enclose a suggestion for the above junction. I live nearby and see so many near accidents at this junction as people do not always wait for the correct light change before moving off. Cyclists are especially in danger as the junction is difficult and they have to move in limited space with the flow of traffic.

Myself and some neighbours did take up the issues at this junction with our MP and also with the City Council. We asked if the Bus stop outside the residential properties could be moved as the pavement there is narrow and when people are getting off the buses they have to contend with a queue waiting to get on the bus together with pedestrians walking both ways on the pavement .If there is a pushchair, a wheelchair or an

elderly person's pusher the pavement is blocked and now with Covid restrictions no possibility of social distancing.

We were told this wasn't possible because the buses need space to pull to the outside lane from the bus stop so that they can be in the outside lane at the traffic lights to enable them to travel down Gillygate.

We suggested a change in the lights sequence so that buses only went first, then cyclists and then all other traffic- three designated lanes .This would make it much safer for the cyclists who have to negotiate buses and other heavy traffic at that junction. It would stop buses from having to cross traffic lanes to move into the outside lane and make it safer for all traffic which at the moment often finds cars in the wrong lane either blocking the junction or changing lanes and going forward on the red lights.

I hope you will give consideration to these suggestions when making your decisions on the junction.

## **10. Private Resident (MF)**

Resident with sight issues would like to express a preference for preliminary design option B.

The single stage crossing of St Leonards place is welcomed as capacity of the existing island is usually at its maximum.

The inclusion of an all red stage allowing the use of an audible crossing signal for pedestrians with sight issues would be welcomed.

The widened pedestrian areas around bootham bar are very much required given the number of pedestrians passing through the area.

The removal of a traffic lane on St Leonards will have significant impact on bus services running through the area (resident has already encountered long delays whilst using buses in the area sometimes taking as long as 30 minutes to pass from the Station to Lord Mayors Walk) Will First be consulted on these changes?

Near side puffin signal technology for pedestrians waiting to cross could do with the high level indicators being placed slightly higher as currently even the highest ones can be obscured.

Resident appreciates that all cycling facilities are kept on carriageway. The "shared space" nature of some pedestrian/cyclist facilities across the city causes significant safety implications for partially sighted pedestrians.

Preferential treatment for motor vehicles still appears to be the case across much of the city which is representative of a wider UK approach.

## **11. Private Resident (RP)**

Having inspected the consultation proposals and, writing as a driver and pedestrian, I personally prefer and support Option B. I almost drove forward in error last week through looking at the wrong exit light in St Leonard's Place on Thursday evening!

I have one further comment to make.

I hope that the council will take advantage of the discretion afforded by the government to retain far side 'green man' pedestrian lights. These are much preferred by all the people I've spoken to. Far side lights can be seen by all the people waiting to cross the road, show the direction to take and provide assurance of the time remaining. Guide dogs are taught to respond to far side signals. Near side signals offer a far lower standard of service and take pedestrians' attention away from scanning vehicular traffic movements in both directions.

## **12. Private Resident (MB)**

Regarding the potential changes to the Bootham/Gillygate junction unfortunately, I don't think there is any way that option B can even be considered. The removal of the left turn lane from St Leonards Place into Bootham would, cause a catastrophic amount of tailbacks leading to higher pollution and longer journey times which, on buses the council are trying to help lower.

It would be rendered pointless changing the layout of the junction at Clarence St/Wigginton Road a year or so ago for the purpose of quicker journey times, to then set that all the way back again by causing further delays somewhere else.

If the council want people to be invited onto public transport then increasing wait times and tailbacks at traffic signals is not the way to go about it. Surely the people who are involved in these decisions know that it doesn't take much to bring York to a standstill. Just like when we have a normal return to traffic flow we will all count the cost of the closure of the Groves. You really need to think about the traffic implications.

A few years ago the layout was changed at Clifton Green. This ultimately caused chaos and horrendous queues and was subsequently returned back to its original state. What a waste of money. Option B would end up the same.

I'm all for changing the traffic signals to better ones (when they work properly) but it would be a step backwards to go forward with Option B.

### **13. Private Resident (RB)**

Thank you for your letter of 24 Feb. I have responded to the consultation online but as there was no opportunity to comment on the general principle I thought I would contact you direct.

As a resident in close proximity to the historic core of York I regard it as important to do everything possible to maintain the economic viability of the core, which is suffering from the effects of the pandemic both directly and indirectly as a result of the continued shift to online shopping.

There is not a lot that can be done by means of transport planning to help improve the situation except to discourage the use of private cars and encourage the use of buses and cycles which offer much better use of the limited road space available.

At present buses and cars suffer equally from the delays resulting from the conflicts at the junction in question so the bus can not offer a more attractive journey than the car. If a bus priority scheme were feasible this could make the bus service more attractive than the private car and encourage its use. With the introduction of a more sophisticated traffic light control system at the junction would it be feasible to introduce bus priority by introducing bus lanes at locations remote from the junction and holding cars at lights until capacity were available so that buses experienced little or no delay?

I would be interested to hear if this has been considered or indeed implemented. Of course the motoring lobby would object although the total delay to motorists would barely increase.

#### **14. Sound Organisation, 2B Gillygate**

I am a director of The Sound Organisation which is based at 2B Gillygate. We have been trading on Gillygate since 1985 but, as your records will show, purchased this premises in the early 1990's. As you may be aware we are near the junction of Bootham and Gillygate and thus directly affected by both proposals that have been suggested as part of your consultation.

Our main objections are:

In both Option A and Option B, the pedestrian crossing is to be widened directly outside of our store. It is currently only at the very edge of our premises but the proposals will see it occupy the entire store frontage. This will impede customers and especially delivery drivers ability to access our store. In particular, how do you suggest we accept deliveries and arrange collections after the proposed changes have taken place? Due to the nature of our goods which are often fragile, expensive and heavy, we rely on being able to load and unload outside the front of our property. The widening of the pedestrian crossing will make this very difficult or even impossible.

In Option B, the loading bay which is currently in front of 1a and 1 Bootham, Ashtons Estate Agents, appears to have been removed. This loading bay we use daily both our shop and our customers. Without having access to this facility it will have a real and demonstrable affect on our business, especially when combined with the widening of the pedestrian crossing as covered above.

These proposals, especially Option B will materially affect access to our business and I would like to hear your proposals in taking these objections into account in your design.

#### **15. Private Resident (RB2)**

Thank you for another opportunity to express my views as a citizen of our city; whatever decision is made about Bootham, the only sustainable

future for York is to make the City Centre restricted to pedestrian, cycle, public transport, local taxis and other necessary vehicle traffic.

#### **16. Private Resident (KM)**

I am writing to express my view that the option I support for changing this junction is the option that reduces to one the number of lanes on the approach to the junction on Lendal Terrace in front of the Art Gallery. I have seen a number of incidents caused by confusion with the current arrangement. I also think that any solution should include a camera being erected to monitor the traffic approaching the junction along Gillygate. I have noticed that there is very poor compliance with the red light at that junction from Gillygate. As a pedestrian many times I have had to wait for cars that are trying to beat the lights despite the pedestrian crossing light having already changed to green.

#### **17. Private Resident (RS)**

##### **SAFETY**

Safety is more important than delays. Confusing road layout leads to danger.

Layout at this junction causes much confusion.

The danger results from motorists passing red lights. This may be deliberate, common in Gillygate or inadvertant common in St Leonards. Deliberate offending would be deterred by a prominently sited camera recording number plates crossing the line when the signal is red.

Inadvertant offending requires improved clarity and simplification of layout.

The time allowed for pedestrians to cross Gillygate is inadequate for the less mobile.

##### **DESIGN OPTION A**

This would be tolerable if and only if the traffic signals northbound from St Leonards were timed identically for Traffic to Bootham and traffic to Gillygate. A left filter from Bootham would be safer and more use than the present right filter. A left filter from Gillygate to St Leonards could be added.

There should be no left filter from St Leonards into Bootham. This is because the route into Gillygate, currently signed as straight ahead, is in

fact left and immediately right. This I am sure is a major cause of the confusion.

#### DESIGN OPTION B

I applaud the increase in width of footpaths especially that from Gillygate to Bootham Bar. Along the east side of St Leonards I would though sacrifice a small part of this increase to widen the northbound cycle track to equal the southbound. A further sacrifice might be worthwhile to retain a pedestrian island on the crossing this could increase the time when crossing is not possible. I am unsure of the value of the new crossing.

#### **18. Private Resident (AP)**

Here is my response, as I refuse to use the robot form, which is a farce. As with all Survey Monkeys, it is impossible to look through the options before entering a choice. When one is being asked to choose between 2 options one needs to know what they both are before making a decision, or entering any meaningful comments, especially when you are not allowed to go back.

I object vehemently to the removal of the island in Option B, & the crossing on the corner of Gillygate would be lethal. Have you never seen the speed with which ambulances come round that corner? Not that I'm suggesting they have any choice.

Whose idea is it to make changes to this junction? Of course it's far from ideal as it is but can we please have an intelligent appraisal of the options, such as they are, before any proposals are made? As it stands this is worse than useless.

#### **19. Walk York**

WalkYork is a recently-founded organisation to represent York residents who walk to work, school, shops and other facilities. Or walk for relaxation or exercise.

Our membership is small - 30 - but will grow when we formally launch the organisation post-Covid.

We would therefore ask you to include us in future consultations.

New members have been encouraged to visit your consultation site, to complete the survey and to let us know their views.

I can tell you that the majority support Option B. However, a substantial number support Option A because they are concerned about the increased congestion and loss of air quality you suggest.

My own views reflect these concerns. I believe that a decision is now best deferred until further evidence is available of traffic movements post-Covid and the new junction arrangements subject to additional modelling. You may well advise Cllr D'Argorne that the scheme cannot be deferred because the lights are time-expired and funds may not be available. As a council officer, I've heard and made these shroud-waving arguments many times before. They're rarely true.

## **20. Private Resident (JK)**

My entire working life has been running a small business in our city, since the closing of Penleys Grove/Lowther Streets to vehicular traffic we spend much more time sat in queuing traffic, there is no alternative means of delivering our goods. During Lockdown it's been fine, yesterday, not usually a busy day the journey time from our Clifton work place to Stockton Lane, normally a journey of 10/12mins took 25mins. Much of the time sitting in a van in Bootham, Gillygate, Lordmayors Walk in continuous traffic in both directions, such frustration created by a lack of common sense. Unimaginable chaos would be created by taking out a traffic lane plus the nonsense of no left turn into Exhibition Square. Where does that thinking come from?, Obviously by people who have no idea of the needs of running a business where essential travel is required within our city.

To those involved in making these decisions please observe the 'real' working world and not rely on ideas based on the drawing board!

## **21. Private Resident (DM)**

Just wanted to say further to my on-line response in favour of the more radical option B, that I think it could nonetheless do with some tweaks,

particularly thinking about cyclists. The neck of the junction between St. Leonards Place and the rest of the junction is perhaps overly constrictive and dangerous. I'd like to suggest think you could look at providing a continuous dashed outbound cycle lane from St. Leonard's Place into Bootham to join up with the new Rawcliffe bound lane proposed further along it by pulling the pavement kerbs at the new crossing back a bit particular on the north east (Bar side) and moving the crossing perhaps a metre or so southwards to move waiting pedestrians more out of the way of pedestrians simply passing along the footpaths. On Gillygate you could set the southbound signals much further back where the road is wide enough to allow an outbound cycle lane - using a call on arrangement like the end of Holgate road to minimise ordinary traffic delay linked to the adjusted entry arrangements at the Lord Mayor's junction the Civic trust have suggested in their response. We also need separate advanced cycle signals on each arm to allow cyclists to get away first and avoid right turning cyclists versus left turning vehicle conflicts.

## **22. City of York Council, Design Conservation and Sustainable Development (CM & GH)**

If there are any ground disturbing works other than lifting/replacing paving stones you will need to fill in the Operations Notice for YAT for works within the Area of Archaeological Importance.

Option B decreases the highways impact on the setting of Bootham Bar through enlargement of areas of paving so is likely a significant enhancement. The main focus of my potential concerns on this option would be around the visual impact of the new crossing- both on the setting of Bootham Bar, scheduled monument (as something new in the foreground of the view below) and also for its impact on the setting of St Mary's Abbey precinct walls (the walls on the art gallery side), also a scheduled monument. I'm hoping these are not full height traffic lights. This aspect should be handled sensitively.

## **23. Private Resident (JJ)**

What issues do you have at this location currently?

Delays for pedestrians when using the junction Confusing Road Layout  
Road Safety Issues Pedestrian Congestion  
Other: Respondent would like to see the introduction of spoken signals for pedestrians with sight issues as are used currently on the London underground/in lifts etc.

Do you support reallocating road space to pedestrians and cyclists at this junction in an attempt to improve Road Safety?  
Yes as it not only improves safety but also the quality of the city centre for those moving through it.

#### Comments on Option A

Widening of the crossing points is of benefit. The respondent has no definite preference between the use of either near or far side green man signals and would go with whatever the general consensus is regarding this technology

#### Comments on Option B

Design option sounds much safer for pedestrians Decrease of capacity would have a negative impact on air quality in the area but motorists may choose to route away from the junction and the predicted change to electric vehicles should have an impact on this issue.

People would spend much more time in the city centre if it wasn't so dominated by cars. Emission management is essential to making the centre a pleasant space to be in.

Respondent would support more radical changes such as bus gates/restricting car movements in the city centre and also suggests larger/better car parks within 15 minutes walking time of the centre where we could utilise the long boulevards that we have running into the city e.g. Tadcaster Road, Bootham, Wigginton Road, Hull Road etc.

Which Option do you support?

Option B

#### Additional Comments

Infrastructure should be designed so that is accessible by all as a standard. Smart, connected technologies should allow us to do this much more easily than ever before.

York Civic Trust has been heartened and delighted by York residents' enthusiasm for taking part in the City of York Council's recently launched online consultation on options for replacing the life-expired traffic signals at the Bootham – Gillygate junction.

The Civic Trust's approach to the consultation has been to engage people in how York can develop as an historic, inclusive and sustainable city that is welcoming for everyone. Bootham, Gillygate and Exhibition Square are a significant part of the city's cultural life, heritage and thriving business community and welcome millions of people every year.

The Council's consultation presents two options. Option A replaces like with like, with some widening of the waiting areas for pedestrians. Option B involves reducing the approach on St Leonard's Place to a single lane, giving a green signal to each approach in turn, and having a period in each signal cycle when pedestrians can cross in any direction. This would remove the worst traffic conflicts in the junction, provide safer conditions for cyclists and allow pedestrians to cross St Leonard's Place in a single stage. It would also allow the pavement to be widened considerably alongside Bootham Bar, thus giving space for tour groups, most of which convene in Exhibition Square, to start their exploration of the city and its walls. We strongly support the principle of this second option, which offers the potential for much needed improvements to public realm in this historically important location. We think that it can be further enhanced, as outlined below.

Many people engaging with the Civic Trust across social media and in the press have pointed out the potential risk that Option B might add to congestion, as highlighted in the Council's consultation:

*Transport modelling of the redesign indicates that the changes would reduce the capacity of the junction by approximately 30%. This would see significant increases in general traffic delay at the junction and a large increase in queues which would impact on adjacent junctions across the network.*

While this seems to be a logical outcome, our own analysis suggests that any adverse impacts would be far more minor and could be mitigated. As drivers know, if congestion appears on one route, many will find an alternative; congestion is thus to some extent self-regulating. Evidence gathered from cities which have reduced road capacity confirms this. As the influential International Transport Forum said in its report *Reversing car dependency* published last month: *A growing body of evidence suggests that a well-planned reduction of road space for private cars does not add to congestion. ... Car drivers*

*adapt to changed conditions in many ways, often too complex for computer models to predict.*

We have conducted our own analysis, in which we have attempted to assess what drivers would do if the junction were modified. Our findings confirm that the capacity of the junction would be reduced, but only by around 15%, because vehicles would be using it more efficiently. We predict that up to a sixth of drivers would take routes which avoid the junction and the city centre, in many cases using the outer ring road. As a result there would be little change in overall congestion at the Bootham/Gillygate junction with no indication that queues would block other junctions.

Care will be needed to ensure that the traffic which diverts does not cause problems elsewhere, but our analysis suggests that any problems will be minor. Residents in Gillygate are understandably concerned that pollution might increase there. Our assessment suggests that the main reductions in traffic would be on Bootham and St Leonard's Place, with little change on Gillygate. But the most effective way of reducing pollution in Gillygate is to avoid more traffic entering it than can leave. The Council has already upgraded the traffic signals at Lord Mayor's Walk and Clarence St so that it can achieve this, and we suggest that it should now implement these adjustments.

On balance, therefore, our findings suggest that there would be some delays at the junction as a result of this second option, but that queues on some approaches would be shorter. Certainly delays would not be on the scale suggested in the consultation, and not, we argue, sufficient to deny York the benefits of increased safety in the junction and greatly improved public realm in Exhibition Square.

The Council, in its consultation on upgrading the outer ring road last year made clear that one of its objectives was to "encourage traffic out of the city centre". We agree that this would be a major benefit of the ring road upgrade, and argue that it is sensible, in any redesign of city centre junctions, to allow for, enable and encourage such diversion. The Council's second option for this junction would achieve this.

We suggest that the design of this enhancement could be further enhanced for both cyclists and pedestrians. For cyclists we would like to see advanced stop lines, as at Micklegate Bar, so that cyclists can enter this awkward junction ahead of vehicles, and potentially a new route into the junction from High Petergate. For pedestrians we suggest that the

length of St Leonard's Place between Exhibition Square and Bootham Bar might be repaved, to emphasise that this historic location is a place to be in, rather than simply to pass through.

## **25. St. Leonard's Place, Museum Street and Mews Residents Group**

We are the only residential community inside the city walls which is on the 'Inner Ring Road' and as the Council gave Planning Assent to create the community we feel it has a 'duty of care' to ensure our well-being. As a consequence of the Planning Consent, we still have properties with fixed windows as a result of pollution levels around the development. The pollution levels, as measured by the diffusion devices in St. Leonard's Place indicate levels well above the recommended safe amounts.

We favour Option B of the proposal and dispute the information on the CYC submission that it will increase congestion in comparison with retaining the current arrangement. Gillygate has been closed on several occasions (sometimes for prolonged periods) during our residency and there was no observed increase in congestion in surrounding streets on those occasions.

We regularly observe confusion at the current junctions caused by the right hand filter from Bootham to St. Leonard's being inaccessible if the vehicle in front wishes to turn left, the right filter from St. Leonard's to Petergate being superfluous as it is blocked for most of the day. Regularly we observe vehicles leaving St. Leonard's in the wrong lane and subsequently cutting across traffic outside the light sequence.

There is no bike lane on the north side of St. Leonard's Place until you reach Exhibition Square, although one exists on the south side of the street. This leads to cyclists having to steer around stationary and moving vehicles eventually ending up in a lane between the two traffic flows with no light priority. The option B would create sufficient room for a cycle lane along the street and would create sufficient room to move the bus stop for N0.5 and 6 services nearer Exhibition Square, thus facilitating shelter/seating/information boards and litter bin use. In addition we frequently observe difficulties for disabled people trying to board and alight buses at the No.5 and No.6 bus stop and difficulties for the drivers deploying ramps which block pavement space.

There is considerable overcrowding of pavements by pedestrians around the traffic lights which has safety implications and severe access difficulties for disabled people.

Also we note that despite the presence of electric buses in the city, none are used in this part of the network and although the Clean Air Zone for buses requires Euro6 compliance we have yet to see any impact from this.

We regularly observe heavy goods vehicles along St. Leonard's Place which are not delivering as they turn towards Lendal Bridge. These are prohibited according to local regulation and we believe that option b will help deter this.

We fully support the Council resolution to reduce cross city traffic flows and note that much of the traffic using Lendal Brige/Museum Street and St. Leonard's carry 'Y' number registrations, the trade vehicles are normally local and the delivery services use this route frequently, again we believe that Option B will help deter this use.

If you would like further discussion on these issues members of our group would be happy to meet with you, at any time.