

Area of Concern	Comment Made By	Comment	CYC officer comments
Raw data required to support document	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>We are confused by the "year" in the various graphs and tables. Sometimes it is eg 2009/10 and at others just a year. Since some include 2010, we assumed that 2010 refers to 2009/10, but why then do all tables not reach 2010?</p> <p>Graphs 1 & 2 are certainly some we would like backed up by raw data - and we would also like to know if we are correct in thinking that this is a measure of all those who move, by any form of transport including foot, to or from University Road and to or from the accesses to the University off Heslington Main Street West and off Field Lane. (ie people walking from Heslington Hall to the Post Office and back would count as 2 pedestrian movements). Would it be correct to assume that people who park on University Road near the Tuke centre or in residential streets would be included as pedestrians?</p>	<p>We understand from the University that the data that has been used to prepare Graphs 1 and 2 CYC will request that it be included in the revised Travel Plan. The data is taken from the annual classified count surveys, which take place in March each year. The counts monitor all traffic entering or exiting a University car park, as well as all pedestrians and cyclists entering or leaving the University campus and persons boarding and alighting buses on campus between 0700 – 1900. We understand from the University that any person leaving the confines of the campus and then returning (for example to visit Heslington Village) would be classed as 2 pedestrian movements. Internal movements within the campus itself are not counted. Those parking outside official University car parks would be counted as pedestrians.</p> <p>The key purpose of the surveys is to provide a year on year comparison, so consistency of methodology is of utmost importance.</p>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>We would like the raw data for table 7 - could it not continue to 2010? Does it include related research company staff? Do you have similar data for students?</p>	<p>We understand that Table 7 shows the data collected at the last round of staff travel surveys (questionnaires), which were undertaken in 2006. At that time no student surveys were undertaken. The research related staff on York Science Park are independent of the University and as such the University has no remit to undertake surveys with Science Park based staff. Notwithstanding this, the Science Park has its own Travel Plan and undertook staff travel surveys to inform this in 2009 (November). Further surveys will be conducted in 2011. The Science Park Travel Plan is entirely voluntary, there is no planning requirement for it on the existing Science Park site. Surveys are currently being undertaken with staff and students at the University to update the data in Table 7. The survey period closes on 3rd December after which analysis of data will take place and a report of findings will be presented to CoYC and the Community Forum. The results will be used to confirm the targets in Tables 9 and 10, which are indicative at this stage.</p>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>Is table 6 the total number of individuals who bought monthly or weekly tickets or is it the total number of such tickets bought? (ie are some people included more than once?).</p>	<p>The University advises that Table 6 shows the total number of tickets (of each type) purchased. If a person purchased 2 monthly tickets they would be counted twice.</p>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>It is very difficult to make sense of the information as it is largely presented as percentages – so a small addition to an initially small number (eg cyclists) appears to have more significance than a larger increase in a larger base (eg population). Additionally not all the percentages have been cited correctly (eg on page 20 the fifth bullet point states an increase of 68%, but from the data shown this should be 46%). So not only do we not see much useful raw data (I have asked for this twice, but have not received it) but we cannot have confidence in the calculated data.</p>	<p>The University have stated that there is no intention to mislead in terms of the impact of the Travel Plan thus far.</p> <p>This issue was raised by Cllr. Moore who requested data in addition to percentages. The Council is yet to receive the data.</p>
Annual University Pedestrian / Cycle Bus User Counts	HPC and HVT	<p>The 74% increase in cycle trips only exists if you take 2003 as the baseline - a year with uncharacteristically low cycle usage. In the years 2004-10 and 2002-10, there has been no significant increase in the proportion of people cycling, that is, there has been no mode shift to cycling, particularly if you ignore intercampus trips. This needs further investigation.</p>	<p>These figures are not referenced in the Travel Plan document, which refers to data obtained since academic year 2006/2007 (i.e. since the last travel survey questionnaire was undertaken)</p>

	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>We query the meaning of the 12-hour survey data. It would appear that everyone going into or out of Heslington West by any valid route has been recorded in the data for the past several years. Does this mean that if someone walks from Alcuin College to Chemistry without using the bridge they will be counted as 2 pedestrian trips? Likewise will they be so counted if someone walks to the Post Office and back? If so the numbers are purely arbitrary and bear little relation to what is supposed to be the primary function which is how people are reaching the University in the first place. Inevitably pedestrian movements will be high as once parked driving would be ridiculous.</p>	<p>We understand that the data is the combination of counts at each pedestrian access to the University, so includes only people arriving at or departing the University (rather than internal trips). It is the case however, that movements made between the Campus and Heslington Village, for example, would be counted as two trips. It would be impractical to try and discount these. The methodology for counting pedestrian (and indeed all) movements has been agreed with us and is consistent year on year in order that comparisons can be made in terms of overall trends. The University explains that this data has not been used to identify mode split in terms of targets – this will be confirmed by way of the forthcoming staff and student travel questionnaires – it is merely provided as supporting evidence with regards to overall movements by each mode.</p>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>2009-10 showed a marked increase in bus trips which is likely to be largely because students living on Heslington East had to commute to Heslington West for everything. No mention of this reasoning is made in the text.</p>	<p>The University has committed to provide figures for movements including and excluding Heslington East for academic year 2009/2010. The figures indicate that numbers boarding and alighting increased even without taking into account movements to / from Heslington East.</p>
	HPC and HVT	<p>While the bus figures look good, the movements between campuses caused by the development of the new site should be ignored. The travel between Heslington East and Heslington West is newly generated, solely internal and due to the split campuses. It is not caused by an increase in people coming to University by public transport. For proper comparison, it is necessary to determine the increase in people coming to the University by bus, not the number travelling between campuses. The movement between campuses is only useful as a separate measure to determine how well the policy is limiting car movement between campuses.</p>	
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>What is the reason the data for 2009/10 are not shown in Appendix D?</p>	
Cycle Routes	Mr and Mrs Odell	<p>We are pleased to note that the cycle track on the south side of Field Lane, constructed by the Council, is being well used. It is good children now have a safe cycle/scooter route to school. We also welcome the University's moves to encourage more people to cycle. A similar safe route along University Road is a long requested need.</p>	<p>University Road and Hull Road are adopted and therefore fall within the jurisdiction of the Council. A feasibility study is currently being undertaken to understand what might be deliverable in terms of off-road cycle provision on University Road.</p> <p>A combination of off and on-road cycling facilities is available for cyclists travelling from Heslington West to the campus via either Heslington Road or Walmgate Stray. The Council is, however, keen to further improve dedicated cycling facilities to link both campuses to the city centre.</p>
	HPC and HVT	<p>In the Travel Survey page 21, "safer cycle routes to the University" were considered to be respondent's cycling and walking priorities". To provide safer routes to the University, cycle paths need to be for whole journeys to be meaningful; thus - at the very least - paths along University Road and even Hull Road must be provided. There is at present no car-free safe route for cyclists from either campus to the city. This must be given a priority.</p> <p>These routes should be included on page 31 in the Infrastructure Timetable</p>	
	Dr J Stern	<p>Cycle paths need to be for whole journeys to be meaningful; thus - at the very least - paths along University Road and even Hull Road must be provided.</p>	
	R Visick	<p>Our street parking has, since term began, become dire on Field Lane and the top of University Road. It is also becoming a hazard on Low Lane due to parking on the footpath causing an obstruction to wheelchair users needing access to the Main Street bank.</p>	

Car Parking	H Telfer	<i>There was no on-street parking in low Mill Close or on the Field Lane slip road prior to the construction of Heslington East. The City of York Council ought to have established this baseline in advance of the development. In the absence of such a survey it should accept the word of local residents rather than always according with the wishes of the university.</i>	<i>The baseline surveys were undertaken in March 2009, prior to any buildings on Heslington East being occupied.</i>
	H Telfer	<i>Methods used to count university generated on-street and on-verge car parking are not sufficiently rigorous. It is interesting to note that no detailed methodology has yet been agreed between the university and City of York Council for the assessment of university generated on-street parking. If no method has been agreed a meaningful first survey and comparative follow up surveys cannot take place. The first such agreed survey was to have been completed before the commencement of the development according to Condition 10.</i>	<i>The Council has agreed a survey methodology. As stated above, the baseline surveys were undertaken prior to any buildings on Heslington East being occupied.</i>
	H Telfer	<i>The university regards students living in multiple-occupancy dwellings in adjacent neighbourhoods as residents and does not regard the resultant on-street parking generated by their presence as university generated. It prefers to regard it as residential parking. This is a philosophically unsound stance.</i>	<i>Further advice is being sought from our Parking Services team.</i>
	H Telfer	<i>I have proposed several times that the sensible way to establish the extent of university generated parking on Badger Hill is to carry out an initial on-street parking survey during the long summer vacation when most students are at home and another survey in term time, say November. The additional parking could thus be easily determined.</i>	<i>The surveys need to be undertaken in 'neutral' months. To undertake them during the summer holidays when residents are more likely to be on holiday may well underestimate the baseline. During the summer, there is also a greater chance of staff not being at work and as such not all University generated parking would be recorded.</i>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<i>The document states that less people are applying for parking permits. We know that people who had paid often could not find any spaces in which to park, so they either left their cars behind or found free places. Many are using on-street parking to avoid paying. We live on Field Lane and prior to the start of building work, asked for measures to be taken to prevent our road (the Service Road) from becoming an overflow car park for Heslington East. We were told this was unlikely to happen. Table 12 shows that the number of cars allowed in zone 9 to prevent the 20% increase being breached is 10. Our road is a tiny part of that zone and since term started it has had more than 30 cars parked each day (an increase of at least 375%), often dangerously, inconsiderately or illegally across a crossing point for the blind/partially sighted. There have also been around 10 (excluding those of 2 student Field Lane residents) at night (compared with 0). We trust this will trigger consultation with the residents and immediate remedial action. There now seem to be plenty of spaces available in University car parks, especially on Heslington West (although there has not yet been a wet day). The University must give more than lip service to "minimising the impact on local street parking".</i>	<i>It is recognised that the initial surveys indicated an increase in on-street parking beyond acceptable limits. Secondary surveys were therefore undertaken during the first week in November 2010 to establish the cause of on street parking. We have agreed the methodology for these surveys in advance of them being carried out. Should parking be shown to be due to the University then measures will be agreed with the Council to control on street parking.</i> <i>The vast majority of companies occupying the Science Park are independent of the University and as such the University has no authority to impose parking controls on the employees of these companies. The Science Park itself has a (voluntary) Travel Plan in place.</i>
	HPC and HVT	<i>The survey details have revealed that total parking in zones 3 to 13 has increased by 65% and daytime parking by 64%. This, when compared to Peter Evely's statistic that normal daytime fluctuations are 13-14% shows a staggering additional amount of on-street parking. There can be little doubt that most of this increase - and much of the base 2009 figures - will derive from University related vehicles including some relating to 'knowledge transfer' persons in the Science Park who are thus 'University related'.</i>	<i>The secondary surveys (November 2010) were undertaken in all zones (3 – 13).</i>

	HPC and HVT	<i>The second stage on-street parking survey is due in October and this will impact on the traffic flow figures. This survey needs to be on all of zones 3 to 13 and not just 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 as proposed by AECOM in their report.</i>	
	HPC and HVT	<i>We believe that the University will not fully understand the results of its next traffic and travel survey until it installs the car park barriers for which it has permission. It is currently proposing one such at Field Lane only.</i>	<i>The University has obtained planning permission for barriers, and we understand that these will be subject to phased implementation, commencing with the Field Lane interchange car park. However, further surveys are currently taking place with staff and students to better understand travel patterns.</i>
	Dr J Stern	<i>The parking fiasco at the top of University Road near the Tuke Centre still continues, with the police obviously indifferent to the danger caused to pedestrians and road users by the long row of carelessly parked cars. It is illegal to park on the path - but for some reason it doesn't seem to matter. I understand some regulation is projected but this incident demonstrates that there is clearly a great appetite for parking in the University area - despite the "all is and will be well" ethos of the University Travel Plan. Consequently I would urge that active restrictions are in place BEFORE such an incident reoccurs (for example, along Field Lane).</i>	<i>Following consultation on the parking restriction proposals for University Road, the Council has now reviewed its position. The proposed application of double yellow lines along the full length of University Road has been advertised and comments are currently being sought.</i>
Peripheral Parking Strategy	Mr and Mrs Odell	<i>The Committee Report when the Catalyst building was approved (September 2009) required the UTS to be operational when the Catalyst building opens "due to the high number of people forecast to use the building, the associated peak flows, the distance from the proposed bus interchange and the limited on-site parking." This suggests that the Committee was expecting the peripheral parking at Grimston Bar to be up and running by now and that the people working in the Catalyst building would park there and be bussed to the building, rather than use the car park at the bus interchange.</i>	<i>The Travel Plan reports measures aimed at providing staff with opportunities to travel by means other than the car. Peripheral parking is one of a whole range of measures aimed at achieving this objective. A UTS service in the form of route 44 (supported financially by the University) and route 4 (operated commercially) has been introduced. The University also provides a shuttle service between Heslington West, Heslington East and Campus South as required through the planning conditions. The University was not required to have the Grimston Bar parking scheme in place for the opening of the Catalyst building.</i>
	H Telfer	<i>The peripheral parking strategy was central to the implementation of a Sustainable Transport Travel Plan. It was to be the principal means of reducing travel to the campus by car, yet now it is not to be introduced before 2015. This is a great disappointment and a great inconvenience for local communities.</i>	
	H Telfer	<i>Since the activation of the traffic signals near Heslington Church the morning peak hour traffic queue on Field Lane regularly extends back to the Park and Ride entrance and sometimes to the Grimston Bar roundabout. It now seems that the university expects local residents to just put up with this for at least another five years. This is neither reasonable nor fair. The peripheral parking facility adjacent to the present Park and Ride site must be constructed and brought into use sooner than this. It is not reasonable to impose this level of traffic on local communities for this length of time. To include a strategy in the Outline Plan which offers some traffic alleviation on Field Lane and then delay its implementation for at least another five years is not good enough and is tantamount to misrepresentation.</i> <i>The now proposed strategy of replacing peripheral parking by greater penetration of service buses into the Heslington East campus may help with the university's transport issues but it does not help with the additional traffic problems being generated for local communities.</i>	<i>The University's strategy is to introduce parking proportionately as the site develops, this then caters for the buildings constructed but does not provide too much parking that would encourage use of the car.</i> <i>From October 2011 it is intended that a 150 space car park within the north-east corner of cluster 2 with barrier controlled to restrict access will be constructed, with this being limited to University Staff, visitors and knowledge transfer staff arriving from the east. The University state that depending upon the take up from commercial users it may be necessary to give them access to this car park too. This represents the commencement of the first phase of the peripheral parking strategy.</i> <i>The University's undertaking is that Increasing bus service penetration is complementary to the Peripheral Parking Strategy and not meant to replace it.</i> <i>The Field Lane / Church Lane signal controlled junction signal timings have been amended to give</i>

	<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p><i>Peripheral Parking Strategy. The early implementation of this was a core requirement resulting from the planning inquiry and set out in Planning Condition 8. It was not part of any additional measures required if traffic escalated beyond anticipated limits. The current statement in para. 5.5</i></p> <p><i>“Because of the successes to date in minimising University generated growth there is not the same imperative to introduce these measures in full in this academic year.” is not only based upon incorrect methodology in producing the traffic flow figures but is directed at evading the clear intent of Condition 8. The strategy should be fully implemented by October 2011. This should include a minimum of 750 spaces with access off Hull Road to cope with anticipated staff and students coming from the East and with a corresponding reduction of spaces on Heslington West.</i></p>	<p><i>more green time to Field Lane to reduce delay.</i></p> <p><i>Alterations have been made to the timings on the Field Lane / Church Lane signals which should have improved queuing times. The Council is happy to re-visit this work should the problems be persisting. It should be noted that the signals were erected to provide a high level pedestrian and crossing facility connected with the new campus. This would inevitably lead to a reduction in traffic capacity.</i></p>
	<p>Mr and Mrs Odell</p>	<p><i>At the Public Inquiry the point was made that despite an expected increase in traffic to the University the measures being brought in by the University (including peripheral parking) would considerably reduce the traffic on our roads. This has not happened. Field Lane is already at a standstill or crawl for at least 40 minutes every morning and we haven't yet had a wet or icy day. The travel plan reiterates that the University is being pro-active towards peripheral parking by getting planning permission to put up barriers to control the traffic entering the car parks. Erecting them and using them to require people to park near their point of arrival at the University would be more pro-active.</i></p>	
<p>Parking – Knowledge Transfer</p>	<p>Dr J Stern</p>	<p><i>The plea made for relaxation of car regulation for the Science Park (5.5 para 2) is wholly disingenuous and is formulated in terms beloved by every commercial concern - seeking concessions that are undeserved. The Science Park was imposed on this sensitive area and should live within the same terms that are shared by its neighbours - not expect concessions to pollute, congest and further degrade. The whole point made by Peter Eveley at the Inquiry was that parking spaces across the whole area had to be highly restricted - even starved - otherwise the inadequate feeder highways (such as Melrosegate, Hull Road, Heslington Road) would be constantly jammed.</i></p>	<p><i>The proposed 150 space car park which will be accessible to the Knowledge Transfer uses forms part of the total cap on parking spaces for the University (it is not an addition to the level of parking agreed). The parking will be located on the periphery of the existing development to the north east of the Field Lane car park.</i></p> <p><i>The car park will be accessible only via Grimston Bar Park and Ride and will thus not be attractive to those arriving from the west via Heslington Village or from the city centre as drivers cannot access the Park and Ride from Hull Road (eastbound). A more direct route from the west will be via the A64, avoiding Heslington Village and Field Lane.</i></p> <p><i>The Council understands the position with regard to current progress on the delivery of the peripheral parking strategy but is of the view that this must be closely monitored this and in coming years.</i></p>

	Mr and Mrs Odell	<i>We are very concerned that the University is trying to wriggle out of its obligation to introduce peripheral parking because it feels this will have an adverse affect on take-up of space by business users. Since the only businesses which are to be allowed on the site are restricted to "University uses" and have to show that there is an "overriding need for them to be located on the site", this precludes businesses that are already set up and just want a better home. The Inspector accepted the need for these specified businesses, but did not suggest that they should be treated differently for car parking. The whole of the University was to comply with peripheral parking – to protect the residents in the area. If the business users are allowed to park in Heslington East because they work there, regardless of whence they travel they could travel east along Field Lane while other University employees arriving from the east are having to travel west along Field Lane to reach other car parks. So the traffic quadruples, the air quality, noise etc are negatively affected and it is against the plans put forward by the University at the Public Inquiry and against the Inspector's decision.</i>	
	HPC and HVT	<i>We are strongly against the easing of the parking policy for YSP workplace parking on Heslington East. We made it very clear in the Inquiry that attracting business users would be difficult. We also see from our notes of the Inquiry that we made it clear that the parking arrangements proposed would make it very difficult to attract business. At the time, the comments we made were repudiated by the University. We believe that the University cynically ignored this advice knowing full well that they could play the "need for industry" card. We fully expect a request to ease the restrictions on types of business next. The City of York will benefit from businesses being attracted to York but this does not mean they may all come to this campus. CYC should maintain the stance set out in their proof of evidence for the Inquiry.</i>	
	H Telfer	<i>Heslington East was originally proposed as a virtually car-free campus but this principle is being eroded. Several people, including myself, pointed out very early in the planning process that Science City York businesses and their visitors would not accept peripheral parking only, but university representatives were instantly dismissive of these assertions. To now claim that the present less favourable economic conditions make it necessary to provide adjacent parking for these businesses is disingenuous. The car parking spaces for Science City York businesses should be located at the present Heslington East car park with access from the Park and Ride access road.</i>	
Parking – Sports Village	Dr J Stern	<i>The projected numbers of additional car spaces for the Sports Village (see 5.4 et seq) seem excessive; why is this yet another "special case" - what would be wrong with Park and Ride?</i>	<i>The sports village will be accessible to the general public for the majority of its opening time, therefore additional car parking has been provided in accordance with the CYC guidelines. The concern is that if no additional parking was provided, parking by the general public would displace University parking into adjacent residential areas. It is therefore necessary to provide parking for public users to prevent this. It is envisaged at this stage that parking at this location will be limited to the length of duration of sports village use, with mechanisms put in place to avoid people using the sports village and parking for a longer period.</i>
	Mr and Mrs Odell	<i>The Inspector commented on the proposed publicly accessible swimming pool, sports pitches and fitness centre. He did not suggest that this would require any further parking spaces.</i>	

	H Telfer	<i>The Sports Village is a separate consideration. It is to be located near the Park and Ride extension so the required car parking should be located there, with a short walk to the facility.</i>	
	HPC and HVT	<p><i>We are concerned about the traffic associated with the introduction of the sports facilities. Two issues arise.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The first is the potential increase of the flow of traffic through Heslington village from Fulford Road.</i> <i>The second is the potential use of the new sports facility car park to increase the available parking for the University, thus generating extra traffic on the network.</i> <p><i>The new Sports village should only be accessible from Grimston Bar and there should be no roadway linking it to the Field Lane entrance. To protect the village, it is necessary to condition any changes to the original plan so that the overall flow through the village does not increase as a result of these developments and that, if flow does increase, measures are taken to restore traffic to current levels. We can measure flow through the village simply by moving the traffic measuring point from the junction of Heslington Road and Fulford Road to the junction of Broadway and Heslington Lane and monitoring all traffic to the east of the junction in Heslington Lane .</i></p>	<p><i>The car park will be accessible only via Grimston Bar Park and Ride and will thus not be attractive to those arriving from the west via Heslington Village or from the city centre as drivers cannot access the Park and Ride from Hull Road (eastbound). A more direct route from the west will be via the A64. However, work is required to ensure that Grimston Bar Park & Ride site is protected from University student/staff/visitor use.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has agreed the location of the traffic counters and will remain as currently in order to provide a year on year comparison. However, there is a traffic count undertaken on Heslington Lane near the sports centre.</i></p>
Bus Services	Mr and Mrs Odell	<i>Although we appreciate that the University has made some progress negotiating with the bus companies the situation is considerably overplayed. The behaviour of First Bus show that the University is still at the mercy of the bus operators. Sadly, although First said it would not continue an intercampus bus, after Pullman had agreed to taking this on First decided to run in direct competition to the 44 with its number 4 service, but withdrew the number 6 loop (even to Heslington East), thus depriving those living on or near that route (e.g Osbaldwick and Tang Hall) from having a bus service to the University. Additionally this service only runs to the Derwent Arms in Osbaldwick Village (a very long way from both Campuses) after about 7.45pm.</i>	<p><i>It is a benefit to the University to have both the 44 and 4 services running to Heslington East, this has driven down prices on the number 4 (in order to compete with Pullman), which is beneficial in terms of encouraging bus use and reducing car dependency. It also means that the Field Lane interchange and the Movement Spine (Lakeside Way) are served by frequent bus services.</i></p> <p><i>There is also benefit in providing the current type of UTS (i.e. free intra campus travel) by way of commercial bus services – as these provide an onwards link to the city centre without requiring people to change services (which may be a disincentive to bus travel).</i></p>
	R Visick	<p><i>The originally planned green University Transit system seems to have been forgotten with Pullman and First buses providing transport between the campuses.</i></p> <p><i>At certain times of day, the buses are so full of students from Heslington East to the Morrell Library that it is difficult for residents to get on. This is obviously extra frustrating when the bus half-empties at the next stop.</i></p>	<i>Prior to the construction of Heslington East, neither the number 4 or 44 travelled along Field Lane. The University expansion has therefore had a positive impact on accessibility to the city centre for residents wishing to use the bus, with services running frequently throughout the day.</i>
	HPC and HVT	<i>The University is to be congratulated on extending the No 44 service, however it finishes quite early in the evening at the moment (19:45).</i>	

	<p>Mr and Mrs Odell</p>	<p>We think the bus services shown on pages 13 and 14 are misleading. Basically there are 4 daytime bus services that visit both campuses (4, 44, 746 and shuttle) and one that visits Heslington West (55), as per the frequency charts. There are no bus services after 7.30pm (6.30 on Sundays) between the campuses except the 746 which has 2 buses leaving York (at 8.20pm and 10.20pm) and we doubt that students even know of their existence. From 7.30pm the number 4 bus runs no further than Heslington West and the 44 has finished for the day. There are 3 late evening number 10 buses (run by Pullman) that visit Heslington East. Again students are probably unaware of these. For the rest of the day number 10 buses (then run by First) along with the 6, X46 and 8 stop no nearer than the Hull Road (and the 8 only has one stop on Hull Road and that is a long way from both campuses).</p>	<p>The table can be supplemented with appropriate text. The number 44 has now been extended into the evening and runs every 30 minutes until around 2300 Monday to Sunday. The University publicises bus service timetable information to staff and students continuously (e.g. at the Freshers' Fair and through the intranet / internet sites)</p> <p>A registration has now been received for route 4 to extend operations to Heslington East in the evening. The University now benefits from 12 buses per hour linking both campuses with the city centre.</p> <p>The introduction of the 'closed' uni-bus service, when combined with the service buses, more closely resemble the 'UTS' than services operated previously. The Council will work closely with the University to understand how both parties can improve bus links to other parts of York (and surrounds).</p>
	<p>Mr and Mrs Odell</p>	<p>The deals that the University has set up with the bus companies would be far more constructive and helpful to the students if they could be valid on other companies' routes. The fact that the special deals (eg £2 return to town) are tied to one company's services is a disservice both to students and to Pullman (who have shown so much more cooperation) who run very few evening buses.</p>	<p>This is a city-wide limitation; cross ticketing is not available on any services / operators. Pullman has now increased evening service provision (as detailed above). The Council continues to work with bus operators to review the possibility of introducing an integrated ticket. Bus services have operated in a de-regulated market since 1986. As a result, the introduction of an integrated ticket can only be achieved with the agreement of bus operators.</p>
	<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>It seems that in spite of the repeated promises of a hi-tech mode of transport linking together all parts of the campus the UTS is now to be nothing more than a collection of bus services linking together Heslington East and Heslington West.</p>	<p>There is benefit in providing frequent, reliable bus services – as these provide an onwards link to the city centre without requiring people to change bus (which may be a disincentive to bus travel). Additionally the University operate a bus service which links Heslington East Campus with Halifax College and the southern area of Heslington West Campus.</p>
	<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>The university now only guarantees a free-to-user service for five years. What is to happen at the end of this period? If charging is introduced the present efforts to reduce car use might well be negated.</p>	<p>The University states that it is committed to providing free intra-campus travel in the long term. The 5 year period relates only to the agreement with Pullman to provide the 44 Unibus service. As the 5 year period nears its end, the University will identify the most appropriate means to provide continued free intra-campus bus travel at that time.</p>
<p>Traffic Count Methodology</p>	<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>The method used to identify university generated motor traffic is not sufficiently rigorous, counting as it does only those vehicles which enter university car parks. There is an underlying assumption in the university's methodology that all vehicles which drive past the university car park entrances are not on university business, which is clearly not the case. Many university-generated vehicles park in locations other than on university car parks; witness those parked on Field Lane slip road, Low Mill Close, Main Street and University Road, as well as other locations, during the hours of university business. Such vehicles, which are in the main university related, are not included in the traffic counts used to establish the numbers of vehicles travelling to and from the university. Thus the requirement of Condition 6 in this respect is not met. The university's data always underestimate the traffic travelling to and from the university.</p>	<p>The issue of methodology for the annual traffic surveys is outwith the remit of the Travel Plan, this having been agreed with the Council before this iteration of the Travel Plan. Whilst the Travel Plan refers to the results of these surveys, the University considers it is not wholly reliant on them to</p>
	<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>Some university car parking spaces have been taken out of use, either for maintenance or because temporary buildings have been located on them, since the first survey was undertaken. This will inevitably have resulted in fewer vehicles visiting university car parks in subsequent surveys and so give the false impression of a reduction in university generated motor traffic.</p>	

<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>No counts are undertaken at the 3 principal junctions specified in Condition 6 and the alternative method used of conducting traffic surveys with university car park users will always underestimate the university generated traffic through these junctions - for the very same reason outlined above. University data will only include those vehicles which both travel through the junctions and visit university car parks and will exclude those vehicles which are travelling to the university but which park elsewhere.</p>	<p>demonstrate its achievements to date or in the future. The annual traffic surveys are to address conditions 6 and 7 and so are dealt with separately from this report. The Travel Plan considers the results of these surveys in the context of uptake of University sustainable travel initiatives and, ultimately, annual staff and student travel questionnaires (which are the Council understands are currently being undertaken).</p>
<p>H Telfer</p>	<p>The agreement with City of York Council to amalgamate the figures for all three junctions and review the percentage figure for the total percentage increase is most unorthodox and does not agree with the demand of Condition 6. The process of averaging could well result in a problem at a particular junction going unnoticed and so result in no necessary remedial action being taken.</p>	
<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p>By only using the flows into and out of the University car parks the methodology ignores other University related traffic, particularly University related vehicles that park on local roads (for example in Main Street West, in the Science Park, at the top of University Road and in the Badger Hill area or in any of the 11 parking survey zones where on street parking has increased, on average, by 65% from 2009 to 2010)</p> <p>It also ignores delivery vehicles and contractor's vehicles, all University related.</p>	
<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p>This view that the methodology is wrong is reinforced by the fact that, even with the anticipated improvements in modal shift and occupancy, there is an increase in parking demand well above the provision of parking permits. (see Appendix D of the Travel Plan). We believe that many of these cars have parked locally and are therefore not being picked up by the traffic survey.</p> <p>In other words there is insufficient change in modal shift and occupancy to account for the reduction in traffic flows.</p>	
<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p>The statement in 6.2 that "University generated peak hour traffic has not increased" is based upon a flawed methodology and therefore it is not an indicator that phase 1 mode share and occupancy targets are being achieved. Only a full survey of staff and students will determine this.</p>	
<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p>In addition the number of on-campus parking places available at the time of the 2010 on street parking survey was reduced to 1384 – some 136 down on the permitted cap level. This impacts on traffic flow conclusions.</p>	
<p>HPC and HVT</p>	<p>The actual trip generation shown in Table 11 for 2010 of 562 and 520 is strikingly different from the forecasts (some 70 and 80% respectively less than forecast). It is important to understand why this is so, as there is no indication from any other measures such as modal shift and occupancy which explains this large improvement. The only reason can be that the current methodology is wrong. A reconciliation of these inconsistent figures should be provided.</p>	

Travel Plan Initiatives	HPC and HVT	<p><i>In light of the number of people on campus (currently over 15,000) the successes of some of the initiatives are poor.</i></p> <p>Car share group 338 (2%) City Car Club 48 (0.3%) Cycle2Work 173 (1%) Pool bike scheme 31 (0.2%) Get cycling 38 (2.5%)</p>	<p><i>The University considers that the percentages referred to by HPC & HVT underestimate impact in some instance, given that not all initiatives are applicable to both staff and students (and as such the target audience is much less than 15,000 in some instances). The University outlined a number of 'action-type' targets for sustainable travel use. These should be reviewed and updated on annual basis to account for both citywide initiatives and the levels of uptake.</i></p>
	HPC and HVT	<p><i>In view of the low current figures, the targets for Cycle2Work of a 5% increase (8 people) and Carshareyork of 5% (16 people) are not very ambitious in a population of 15000. They are not going to make a significant contribution to modal shift.</i></p> <p><i>There are also no targets at all for;</i> City Car Club Pool bike scheme Get cycling</p>	
	HPC and HVT	<p><i>The Car Free Day promotion should be in term time.</i></p>	
Monitoring & Targets	H Telfer	<p><i>The university tends to presents the summaries of its collected data in the form of Mode Share Tables e.g. page 36 of the Traffic Plan. Whilst these demonstrate its success at promoting alternative forms of transport - for which it is worthy of congratulation - it does not show the actual increases or decreases in vehicular traffic, which is a requirement of several of the Planning Conditions. It is possible for the mode share for car traffic to decrease while the number of vehicle movements actually increases, because of an overall increase in all-mode traffic movements.</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.3 (P22) indicates that the 2010 survey will again determine mode share, which by itself does not meet several Planning Conditions e.g. Conditions 6 and 7. It would be more useful and meaningful to present actual numbers and percentages for the various modes of traffic movement as well as modal share.</i></p>	<p><i>The mode share targets are intended to enable the University to monitor travel trends over time and provide a good indication of modal shift (the key aim of the Travel Plan). The University explains that whilst numbers can be attributed to these percentages, the ever changing staff and student numbers mean that these are more difficult to project. Furthermore, the travel surveys (questionnaires), which are the key mechanism for monitoring the progress of the Travel Plan will be completed by a proportion of staff and students only (albeit a representative sample). As such any numbers provided on the basis of this survey would be extrapolated, rather than recorded.</i></p> <p><i>The annual traffic / pedestrian / cyclist and bus user surveys which are separate from the Travel Plan (and reported separately) are the mechanism for meeting Conditions 6 and 7.</i></p>
	HPC and HVT	<p><i>In the initial proposals to the Inquiry a couple of indicators of success were quoted. These are Car Occupancy and Modal Splits, as set out in the initial papers, split by students, staff and business staff on site. Current figures are not reported in the Travel Plan, nor are interim objectives set, though there is an indicative mode share figure in p 36.</i></p>	<p><i>The long term targets (indicators) are referenced in Table 1 of the Travel Plan document. The University believes that the interim target can only be assessed when 40% of the Heslington East development is complete (in terms of anticipated population for Heslington East). Notwithstanding this, current vehicle occupancy will be determined by way of the staff and student travel questionnaire that is currently being undertaken. Once the baseline is understood, short term targets for increasing occupancy will be set (and incorporated into Tables 9 and 10 within the Travel Plan).</i></p>
	HPC and HVT	<p><i>Targets should be set and monitored for the years 2012 to 2014 and include occupancy as well as mode shift. These measurements were central to the University's arguments at the Inquiry. Flexible working is also a key element of the strategy and there is no evidence supporting its success or otherwise.</i></p>	

Miscellaneous	HPC and HVT	<i>First of all, we think it should be made clear that the 2008 Travel Plan was accepted by CYC for one year only on the basis that it would be updated within this period. It was not.</i>	<i>The development of the latest Travel Plan document has taken place over a protracted period, reflecting ongoing discussions / comments with the Council. However, the University have continued to implement initiatives that are additional to the 2008 Travel Plan.</i>
	HPC and HVT	<i>In several places the report mentions the 5400 students expected on the new campus (e.g. 3.2) for which the university are required to supply 3600 beds i.e. 66%, so any increase in the number of students will of course result in extra accommodation needs. There is no statement of the number of students that will be using phase 1. The maximum number is currently 900, because of the amount of accommodation currently available. To ensure these conditions are met, the current number of students and the accommodation available should be reported as part of the travel plan measurements and targets.</i>	<i>The level of student accommodation is something that will be monitored through the planning process and not through the Travel Plan.</i>
	HPC and HVT	<i>A retail shop should be established on the new campus to ameliorate the need for student movement between the new and old campus and journeys to the city for essential supplies. It is a testament to how poor the University's forward planning was, that Market Square was established on the original campus at the furthest possible point from Heslington East. Some standard commercial resources now need to be made available to those thousands of students on the new campus. Relying on Sainsbury's delivery lorries (themselves polluting) is a very long way from responsible planning.</i>	<i>The University will review this as the site develops.</i>
	HPC and HVT	<i>The Travel Plan makes an issue of its green credentials. There is no mention of targets, or measurements to show success or otherwise in achieving these aims.</i>	<i>Information that is non-transport related is outwith the remit of the Travel Plan, however, the transport related items will have targets when the staff and student surveys have been finalised.</i>
	Dr J Stern	<i>A retail shop and a bank (at least) should be established on the new campus to ameliorate the need for student movement between the new and old campus</i>	<i>The University will review this as the site develops.</i>
	Dr J Stern	<i>Main Street Heslington should be pedestrianised - at present it is often a danger-zone for pedestrians - and as their number is increasing such a plan should become a priority</i>	<i>This has to be considered as a Network Management issue, outside the remit of the Travel Plan.</i>