

PARISH COUNCILS	
Acaster Malbis	The Parish Council did look at the Route Network and noted that there was no impact on Acaster Malbis
Askham Bryan	Askham Bryan Parish Council wish to convey their thanks for the opportunity to study and comment on the Strategic Cycle Route Network. It has been both studied and discussed extensively by the Parish Council, at a recent Parish Meeting. Whilst we are aware that the new criteria may wish to remove us, we do request that Askham Bryan should remain connected to the Cycle Network. We wish to retain at least some if not all of our green cycle routes. A common reason that some of our Residents do not cycle, especially children, is because they perceive the roads are not safe ~ a failure to defend our green routes will ensure this never gets any better. That said, there are a number of residents who still do cycle to and from work within and around York, from Askham Bryan. They do need that protection afforded by a green cycle route. They are also rate payers and are deserving of the same service as all other rate payers within York. We would suggest that financial savings should not be given priority over the safety of Residents and their use of our roads. We would appreciate your efforts to retain our cycle routes within your network. I initially forgot to mention one of our largest cycle users ....the College! They have a floating population turn-over of up to 2,000 students and a large number of teaching and administrative staff. A large number of them travel to and from York by bike and would clearly wish to be able to continue to do so.
Askham Richard & Copmanthorpe	No response received
Bishopthorpe	No response received
Clifton Without	The Parish Council last evening considered the documentation, received under the above heading and have the following observations for your attention. The Parish Council have appreciated the cycle route through the parish area, from the River Ouse to the River Foss, which have always been well used by very many cyclists, but also pedestrians, both as routes to work and also part of routes for leisure. It is the very strongly held views of the Parish Council that all of the current routes through the parish area should be maintained within the strategic cycle route network. It is felt that best practice should always be retained for the good of all who utilise that system.
Deighton	<p>In response to your Cycle Network review, Deighton Parish Council would like to offer the following comments with regard to the southern end of the proposed route 068 which runs along the Parish boundary :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Tilmire is an area of Special Scientific Interest and an advertised cycle route would increase the volume of traffic with potential detrimental effect.</li> <li>• The cycle path is already a public bridleway and attracts walkers because of this - cyclists might pose a risk to those who already use this route.</li> <li>• The proposed cycle route leads onto a road which is already very dangerous to cyclists.</li> <li>• Increased maintenance costs are unacceptable.</li> </ul> <p>Please could you take these comments into account when finalising your plans.</p>

Dunnington	On reading explanations of colour codes it seems you have a nightmare situation. As for Dunnington Parish we are very straightforward as follows :- Route 66 – From Grimston Bar via A1079 Hull Road – to York Road into Dunnington to Village Cross – turn right down to Village Greens and left along Intake Lane to end of road. In other words no change to the established route of existing Cycle Route 66 in respect of Dunnington.
Earswick	Earswick Parish Council met on 23rd July and discussed the 2012 Strategic Cycle Network Review. The Parish Council have asked me to inform you that they have no objections and support the proposals set out in the documents you supplied. Please let me know if you need any further information.
Elvington	No response received
Fulford	No response received
Haxby	No response received
Heslington	The Parish Council has looked at the review and can see it shows University Road (code 016) in red which is designated as on "the proposed Strategic Network which have been prioritised on the spreadsheet" and scores 10.05 making it, effectively, the 16th scheme in the priority listing - ie not very likely to be progressed in the near future. The Parish Council is concerned that what the spreadsheet does not take into account is the new student housing at the old Dairy site on Lawrence Street which will increase the potential usage enormously. It also takes no account of the substantial rise in student numbers and the HMO clusters in the area of Hull Road, Green Dykes Lane, Heslington Road &c. Nor does it make any comment on the danger of University Road to cyclists - or the way the buses do not have lay-bys.
Hessay	No response received
Heworth Without	The Heworth Without Parish Council offers the following comments on the proposed routes: 069 - essential & timely, considering the increasing use made of the Sports Ground & the desirability of encouraging citizens to go thither by bike 090 - useful; Stockton Lane is always busy with bikes. The section specified here is, however, ordinarily infested with parked cars, & we believe that any attempt to ban parking in Stockton Lane would provoke a hostile response. 124 - useful; many cyclists use this stretch of the Lane - parts of it, though, are really quite narrow; & outgoing & incoming cars - plus bikes! - don't get on.
Holtby	No response received
Huntington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed cycle route through <u>Highthorn Road</u>: concerns raised as to the suitability of this road, although traffic calming in place, road is very narrow and a considerable number of parked cars line the road.</li> <li><u>Huntington side of the River Foss</u> proposed cycle route: concerns reiterated with regard to suitability due to flooding and width of pathway.</li> </ul>

Kexby	No response received
Murton	Murton Parish Council did discuss your Network map, but had no official response to make. The only comments that were made were concerns about the proposed cycle path running to the south of Murton village, near the light industrial estate. There were fears that it may encourage criminal activity in the area. The scrap-yard is already the target for regular thefts and the cycleway might enable an easier egress. The only other comment was, if lit, the cycleway would cause light pollution in the countryside.
Naburn	<p>Thank you for all your correspondence last month with reference to the above. We discussed the map at our last Parish Council Meeting and there are two comments Councillors wished me to comment on.</p> <p>The links shown on "previous adopted network 1996/97" - shown in green appears to link the with the network in "existence prior to 1996/97 study" and travel toward York along the side of the river. Councillors are of the opinion the land belongs to Yorkshire Water and would like verification of the cycle network giving permission for public use.</p> <p>The proposed link 123 would be of great value to the village, the area is, at the moment a safety issue for both cyclists and pedestrians, especially over Howden Dyke before joining the existing route.</p> <p>Once the Cycle Route Map has been confirmed, it is our intention to display a copy in our telephone kiosk (now our new information centre). We at Naburn appreciate your efforts in producing such information.</p>
Nether Poppleton	The Councillors considered the City Council's schedule showing cycle routes in the village. The Councillors expressed their support for plans to widen and improve cycling facilities across the River Ouse and East Coast Main Line. The proposal is to narrow the traffic lanes and build-out the pavement to enable cyclists to pass each other or pedestrians whilst slowing down traffic on a short section of the ring road. The Clerk is to advise the City Council's Cycling Officer of the Parish Council's support.
New Earswick	I am writing to confirm that Members from New Earswick Parish Council do not wish to make any formal comments on the 2012 Strategic Cycle Network Review.
Osbalwick	No response received
Rawcliffe	<p>Councillor Case outlined the proposals for the area and recommended full support of said proposals.</p> <p><b><u>It was unanimously agreed</u></b> to support said proposals for the area in and around Parish of Rawcliffe.</p>
Rufforth & Knapton	Councillors have not asked me to respond to the Strategic Cycle Route network consultation sent out in July. Rufforth with Knapton's councillors are mainly concerned with the Rufforth to Knapton Cycle Track and wish to see it completed as soon as possible. I can confirm that we received the consultation and councillors have looked at it.
Skelton	Skelton Parish Council did receive consultation pack and considered it. The Council resolved it did not wish to make

	any comments.
Stockton on the Forest	No response received
Strensall & Towthorpe	<p>Thank you for providing the information and assessments relating to the Strategic Cycle Network Review (SCNR) and for offering Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council the opportunity to input to the review.</p> <p>We would like to open by confirming our support and commendation for the significant and valuable building of cycle infrastructure over the last 15/16 years. It affords, residents of York, leisure and commuting amenity in a safer environment, benefiting all road users.</p> <p>It is on the aspect of safety that we would like to open our feedback on the SCNR. Whilst we are pleased to see a comparable assessment of all schemes has been undertaken, the predominant focus appears to be on ease of construction and cost. There appears to be no value assessment given to safety, in terms of the scoring basis and the risk improvements for the users of the proposed schemes.</p> <p>We feel strongly that a revised assessment and weighting basis is required, in order to avoid naturally selecting against non-central development, where costs are likely to be higher. On the assessment and scoring system, currently applied, central York schemes are likely to command an unfair advantage. Indeed the assessment provided to us shows this skew, meaning a disproportionate number of the low scoring schemes are those further distant from the centre of York.</p> <p>In addition we would question how the assessment and allocation of investment is linked to the Local Transport Plan. It is not apparent from the documentation to what extent the scoring has taken account of alignment to the strategic aims of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing Quality Alternatives to the car to provide more choice and enable more trips to be undertaken by sustainable means.</li> <li>• Improving Strategic Links to enhance the wider connections with the key residential and employment areas in and around York, and beyond.</li> <li>• Encouraging Behavioural Change to maximise the use of walking, cycling and public transport and continue improving road safety</li> <li>• Tackling Transport Emissions to reduce the release of pollutants harmful to health and the environment.</li> <li>• Enhancing Public Streets and Spaces to improve the quality of life, minimise the impact of motorised traffic and encourage economic, social and cultural activity.</li> </ul> <p>With regard to specific considerations concerning Strensall and Towthorpe, we have two points of note:</p>

	<p>Scheme 119: We wonder whether the “Potential usage” assessment is conflicted, on the following bases:</p> <p>Current likelihood to use that route; usage would likely be higher, and grow, if a safer route were offered (for leisure and commuter use).</p> <p>The assessment notes that this scheme is “much requested” (this does not appear against any other scheme) whilst usage is considered low/medium – this appears contradictory to the demand noted.</p> <p>We are concerned at the lack of further proposal for developing Cycling amenity in the Parish area. We would welcome additional proposals to support alternatives to car based school runs and to facilitate recreation and exercise.</p> <p>It is for the above reasons the Parish Council is concerned by the proposals outlined in the SCNR. Furthermore we are anxious that Strensall and Towthorpe will run a continual disadvantage and, therefore, be consigned to a substandard cycle network infrastructure. In particular the continued lack of a link to the existing cycle path network (and by extension the York City centre).</p> <p>We call for the assessment to be recalculated on a basis which provides a fairer opportunity to all schemes, taking account of safety (protection of life), real demand (to allow for gain when built) and strategic alignment to the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>We consider it may be appropriate to split assessment and funding arrangements for development of the cycle networks, for instance, between ‘central’ and ‘outer’ York. As such it may provide for a fairer scheme comparability basis, as we propose.</p> <p>We look forward to your thoughts and confirmation of any changes considered in light of our feedback.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the opportunity to input.</p>
Upper Poppleton	No comments to make
Wheldrake	<p>The information you sent out was discussed at the Parish Council meeting held last Wednesday 25 July. It was agreed that we would like the green coloured route from the west end of the village via Benjy Lane and which links on to New Road in Deighton (past the North Selby Mine site) to stay on the new map. This link is useful to provide a safe route to Escrick and via Naburn to the National route along the old East Coast Main Line formation. If the North Selby proposals are approved it could provide a route for locally recruited employees and it may be that the developer could be required to make some input to its development and maintenance.</p>

Wigginton	The review documents were considered last night by the Parish Council's Planning Committee and I have been asked to raise with you the following point. The route 114 Wigginton Road priority level should be raised to HIGH. The Parish Council has for some time been raising concerns about pedestrian (and cycle) safety along Wigginton Road. This is a fast feeder road in both directions without footpaths or a safe cycling route. We have previously expressed concerns to the C of Y Planning Team and currently we are trying to arrange to meet with them to discuss our concerns. Your review states the level of build ability as DIFFICULT due to nature of adjacent verge. We believe that this improves the opportunity to build a cycle way not reduce it. If the aim is to improve safety and reduce the number of vehicle on the road then this should clearly be a high priority. I look forward to your comments.
<b>ELECTED MEMBERS</b>	
Cllr. A. D'Agorne	<p>I suggest that the route from Fulford Rd along Kilburn Rd and through the allotment to the University should be retained – it is well used by students, though I realise it would be better if the proposed diversion along the edge of the allotments had been completed. I also think Cemetery Rd should still be in at least to junction with Kent St/Hes Rd. and the path from St Lawrences School on Hes Rd over the stray to join the West –East track should be kept as potential route to school (or more likely downhill from school!)</p> <p>Moving down into Fulford, I would question dropping the path from near Fordlands Rd down to the river since this is supposed to be a planning condition of Germany Beck. Also the red routes on Germany Beck need to join up (ie include School Lane and Heathmoor Drive) otherwise they are pretty meaningless.</p>
Cllr. D. Levene	<p>Thanks for this. I have a few questions/comments regarding scheme 16 (University Road/Field Lane):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination Factor       <p>The scheme should be given an additional 3 points under “Destination Types”: 1 for shops and 2 for leisure destination. For shops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The West Campus has two supermarkets, a number of shops including a bookshop, a print shop, an off-licence, a bank branch and a couple of others</li> <li>○ Heslington Village has 4 bank branches, a Post Office, a grocery shop and a couple of others</li> </ul> <p>For leisure destination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Village includes the Sports Pavilion which is used by local football and cricket teams that is about to undergo a major refurbishment</li> <li>○ The West Campus has a Sports Centre which includes a gym, squash courts, a race track, an Astroturf pitch, and several sports fields. These facilities are used by a variety of community groups.</li> <li>○ Of course the new Sports Village at the East Campus, one of the key leisure centres within the City that</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>includes one of the best equipped swimming pools in Yorkshire, a state-of-the-art fitness suite, studios, one full-size and three 5-a-side 3G pitches, and will be home to York Athletics Club in the near future with an athletics park and 1km circuit).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The University also features around 200 student societies and 60 sports clubs covering a range of leisure activities; a number of drama and audiovisual facilities such as recording studios, performance areas and screening spaces all to the highest specifications, and a plethora of catering and social spaces.</li> </ul> <p>This would give a total of 12, rather than 9, points, and so a Destination Factor score of 3.00 rather than 2.25 and an Overall Score of 10.80 rather than 10.05. This alone would move the scheme from 16<sup>th</sup> place to 10<sup>th</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mean Added Value Score <p>Can you provide a breakdown about how you arrived at a score of 9.80? This scheme would have a big impact in terms of improving safety and addressing a pinchpoint (both of these relating to the interaction of cyclist, buses, and other traffic – Jonathan Pickles, a CYC Transport and Safety Engineer who I’ve CCd in, can provide more information on this) and should certainly score full points for both “fills gap in strategic route” and “link to new development” (the latter of course being the Sports Village, the still-growing East Campus, and potential development of the old Lawrence Street dairy site into student accommodation)</p> </li> <li>● Usage Score <p>Does this take into account at least 1 extra college of 500 on the East Campus from this October, potentially another college after that, the aforementioned dairy site development, and the trend towards cycle usage as identified in the recent AECOM survey and planned into the University Travel Plan (<a href="#">Jeffrey Stern</a>, a Parish Councillor, can provide more information if needed)? If not then I would strongly imagine this will be a 5 rather than a 4, giving an Overall Score of 11.8 and 4<sup>th</sup> place.</p> </li> <li>● Cost Score <p>Does this take into account the very real possibility of a substantial University contribution? Again, Mr Pickles has been working on this and can provide more information. Though in all likelihood it would still probably remain in the £50k-250k band.</p> </li> <li>● Buildability score <p>Once again, Mr Pickles has been doing some valuable work on this that may be of relevance, but a “medium” rating on this is probably fair.</p> </li> </ul>
Cllr. N. McIlveen	I have no comments to make at this stage other than a general gripe that as a long term cyclist (and motorist, motorbiker and walker) it is frustrating that one often has to get off the bike in order to negotiate awkward road

	junctions / barriers and anything that can make a seamless connection between various routes is to be encouraged.
<b>GENERAL PUBLIC</b>	
Mark Davies	<p>Link 114 – Residents of Wigginton have no choice but to get in the car as it is too dangerous to cycle. It will be costly but instead of having to go through Haxby it would be great. Apart from Haxby there is no cycle route. Many residents of Haxby / Wigginton work on Clifton Moor so there will be the use.</p> <p>Links 070 / 072 – They also need to be in the plan to enable residents to cycle into the city.</p>
Romy Dunn	<p>Ref No.28 – I have been until recently a regular (3/4 times a week) user of this route using the pavement alongside the Knavesmire. This pavement is the same width for its whole route but shrinks seasonally when the hedge grows. Rather than uprooting the hedge why not pay for a regular summer trim. Along with signs asking cyclists and pedestrians to share the path nicely this would bring a well used route back into use.</p> <p>Consider the alternatives – would you allow your child to cycle alone in the dark down the racecourse path? No. Would you allow your child to cycle south down Bishopthorpe Road in the dark? No again!</p> <p>There are other routes where pedestrians and cyclists live happily together so please consider this one too.</p>
Lucy Pell-Walpole	<p>I am a council employee, working in libraries including Bishopthorpe, Dringhouses and Haxby. I cycle part or all of the way to each library in a daily commute.</p> <p>Therefore the following routes are particularly relevant to my journey:</p> <p>#54</p> <p>A new route here would be very useful, benefiting students, commuters and anyone from Bishopthorpe wishing to get into the city. Existing options over the ring-road bridge are either a narrow, badly paved footpath with little/no space to pass pedestrians without mounting the verge, or a fast, bumpy road containing frequent drains which must be avoided, bringing the bike into the path of traffic, or ridden over, causing potential damage to wheels/frame. (The issue of on-road cycle-paths containing regularly placed drains which bikes must navigate is city-wide.)</p> <p>#114, #55</p> <p>It appears (from the hard copy map available in libraries, though not from the website version) that several direct routes North of the city are proposed to be removed and replaced with routes further from built up areas, e.g. #114. Is there a need to remove useful existing routes while adding appropriate new ones?</p>
Robert Elliott	<p>It appears that the red route Number 82 would be off-road- because a blue on-road route already exists. If so that would be helpful as a safer alternative to using Tadcaster Rd.</p> <p>It would also be good however if the South end of route Number 82 could be linked to the East end of Number 106 because this would take the off-road alternative to Tadcaster Road further South.</p> <p>Looking at the Blue circular on Micklegate Stray/ Knavesmire- on the South(ish) West part- on the Knavesmire- adjacent to where the map has a label saying Race Course- it would also be good if there was another single crossing point around there to Whin Road.</p>



	<p>From Whin Road- a route could be extended to Dringthorpe Road and then to Middlethorpe Drive. This would even further increase the off-road alternative to Tadcaster Road.</p> <p>There may even be an off-road path possibility linking Middlethorpe Drive to the Askham Bar round-about, furthering the same policy.</p> <p>I think in relation to Link No. 82 and where I have suggested extensions to this, that the character of the Knavesmire should be taken into account in developing the cycle path. In my view, a wide concrete path should be avoided, and perhaps thinner gravelly paths would be less intrusive and more in keeping with the area.</p>
Catriona Tippin	<p>There are many good ideas in your Review, but I feel three fundamentally important issues need to be sorted in York's transport/traffic/cycling strategy, and my third point is specifically about one cycle route into the city centre:</p> <p>1 - York's 'ring road', the A1237, needs to be widened to dual carriageway throughout, with appropriate junctions at every arterial route into the city. Until this is done York's traffic problems will continue, and the planning of cycling etc will continue to be piecemeal and unstrategic.</p> <p>2- York's bus service is lamentable. It consists of infrequent buses, on bus routes which are shortened or curtailed or removed, and are all inadequate. At the bus stop I use most frequently, for years there has been a pathetic waste of electricity on a digital display which counts down to fictional bus arrivals, proclaims a bus due, then returns to displaying a 10 or 20 minute countdown again - whether a bus has arrived or not. This bewilders tourists, or anyone who has come across a real 'bus due' display as used elsewhere. York needs frequent buses, with correct arrival times displayed. This would encourage drivers onto public transport.</p> <p>3 - York's cycle network is uncoordinated because of the historic nature of the city and its narrow main roads, etc. But uniquely you have a big opportunity to transform one route into the centre, for cycling and public transport. The plan for the 'park and ride' for the A59 appears to involve attempting to take more buses down Poppleton Rd - a route where a typically bad mix of cycling and cars/buses occurs. When Poppleton Rd is wide enough for cyclists to use the road, a cycle track is provided. When Poppleton Road narrows (Carrington Ave /Oak St area) - there is no cycle track, nor anywhere to create one. I'm sure this sort lipservice to traffic 'management' puts people off cycling.</p> <p>My suggestion is to create a cycle track, and perhaps bus lane, from the A1237 all the way through the old British Sugar site, then following the railway line to the 'Teardrop' site, all the way into the city centre. This could be a proper planned cycle track, not a bit of painting on a busy road, and an opportunity for some real cycling strategy. A lot of the cycling planning I've seen recently in York only creates bottlenecks and inconvenience and pollution, and doesn't appear to be creating any increase in the use of cycles, unfortunately.</p> <p>I mention this potential cycling route as I know this area of York, I hope more strategic planning could be used on other routes into York too. Bottlenecks etc etc help no one, and do not encourage cyclists.</p>

Anthony Hammersley	<p>Ref Item 111</p> <p>We write on behalf of the St Martin and St Helen PCC.</p> <p>The northern exit from the suggested bridge appears to presume access to Coney Street across the churchyard of St Martin. This land is owned and controlled by the PCC on behalf of the church and the Church Commissioners.</p> <p>At present the public has access across the churchyard to City Screen and other business tenants of the site by virtue of a licence granted in favour of the business tenants and their customers for their business purposes only. There is no public right of way.</p> <p>We note that the consultation document rates this item as very difficult and expensive to achieve. We concur with this assessment.</p>
David Whiter	<p>Having read the introduction and viewed the maps I'd just like to say that crossing the river remains a problem. The lack of a safe route across Lendal Bridge and the difficulty in carrying a bike over Scarborough bridge render any journeys by bike in this direction difficult entailing a large loop around Water End.</p>
Dr Ambrose Field	<p>Regarding the consultation, the cycle route from Bishopthorpe to town marked priority 94 is quite dangerous currently and really could do with a much higher priority.</p>
Chris Rainger	<p>Whilst I welcome these proposed improvements, I would like to also encourage the council to be bolder in its use of painted cycle lanes on roads, to provide more continuity in the prioritisation of the right of way of cyclists over vehicles.</p> <p>At present, many cycle lanes end where the road narrows, giving the impression of priority to vehicles over cyclists just when the opposite is required.</p> <p>There are many examples, but one is on the northbound lane of Fulford Road at Cemetery Road. Here, the cycle lane stops where the road divides to provide a right turn lane, so cyclists and drivers have to share the remaining available lane. I always feel nervous here and when walking past I have seen many occasions where cyclists are in unnecessary danger by cars trying to squeeze past.</p> <p>In other parts of the country, I have seen similar situations where the cycle lane continues at its normal width and reduces the apparent width of the vehicle lane. This works well, as when there is no cyclist, the vehicles use the cycle lane as part of their space, but when there is a cyclist in the lane they give way by slowing to drive behind until the road widens again or they overtake by crossing the centre line of the road.</p> <p>I see no reason why such a design could not be adopted in York and I'm sure cyclists and motorists would welcome an improvement in the definition of space on shared roads.</p> <p>The other area where cycle lanes stop just where they are needed most is at crossings and other short narrow points. Again, the same approach of continuing the cycle lane through the narrow point would show clear priority to cyclists</p>

	<p>and make cycling safer.</p> <p>I hope these suggestions are clear and helpful and will be given serious consideration.</p> <p>I would be very happy to discuss them further, should you wish.</p>
Paul Hepworth	<p>I've perused the many parish/ward-based maps for the above consultation, and offer the following personal comments. Copied to Richard Twigg who may wish to respond formally and with additional comments on behalf of CTC.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing and planned Park &amp; Ride sites will be significant attractors for "cycle &amp; ride" journeys. They and the existing/planned cycle links that serve them should all be included.</li> <li>2. Sustrans have a long term ambition to link York with their route from Thorp Arch/Wetherby. Not sure where this is intended to enter CoYC territory, but it may be useful to have an indicative route on the York maps.</li> <li>3. Acaster Malbis - Question the value of the purple-highlighted route to Tadcaster/Leeds via minor roads. A route from Acaster Malbis should now perhaps utilise the Bilborough flyover and the minor roads route described next below.</li> <li>4. Askham Richard - York Road has an existing signed cycle route sign (Highways Agency) to Tadcaster. Presumably this is intended to direct cyclists to their route alongside the A64. Cyclists who follow this route from Askham Richard can avoid the A64 by turning off just it, and instead follow a quiet route via Cat Lane into Bilborough thence Moor Lane and Catterton Lane to join the old A64 east of Tadcaster, into that town.</li> <li>5. Deighton - May be useful to indicate the short offroad cycle link south of Deighton, which runs alongside the A19 northbound carriageway into Escrick. That has a signed A19 crossing point with a rural road continuation towards Skipwith etc.</li> <li>6. Bishopthorpe - To help cyclists travelling to/from the West/Bolton Percy direction, suggest that a route is signed from Moor lane into Bridge Road thence a short spur of Copmanthorpe Lane to the motor vehicle closure point with the Sustrans path.</li> <li>7. Holgate - Does route 017 include any improvements to Cinder Lane footbridge that could ease the wheeling of bikes up/down the steps at either end? It could do with lowering plus ramping at the City end, but this would require Network Rail co-operation and future developer funding from York Central.</li> <li>8. Naburn - Is there scope for a short offroad link alongside the A19 southbound carriageway, south of Crockey Hill, between the junctions with Wheldrake Lane (for Wheldrake) and Howden Lane (for Naburn). This would require a A19 crossing (possible centre refuge) and facilitate local utility/leisure journeys and create a link from the Wheldrake area to the Sustrans path at Naburn.</li> <li>9. Heslington - Suggest an A1079 inbound offroad path or on-road with-flow lane, between the P&amp;R site and Field Lane. This would assist inbound travel from the area of the A64/A1079 roundabout, towards the City centre.</li> </ol>

	<p>10. Huntington - Note that the stadium developer has now offered a signalled crossing of Jockey Lane into the existing Kathryn Avenue. The latter to be truncated and act as an access to the stadium and other developments.</p> <p>11. Askham Bryan - I spotted some intriguing bits of road/lane/path just north of Manor Heath roundabout, which might jointly have scope to create a cycle route between Askham Richard/Bryan and York College. Attached Google earth image refers. If it could fit into your grand scheme (which I'm currently reviewing) might it be a serious contender...?</p>
Rachel Baker	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Upper Poppleton</b> - I feel the proposed crossing of the A59 at the Red Lion Bridge could be problematic given its location on the rise of the road as it goes over the railway line together with the impact of the Park &amp; Ride on traffic movements and driver behaviour. The extension No. 115 to Hessay will certainly be an attraction to "touring" cyclists, avoiding the A59, but I'm not sure whether - in its suggested layout - residents of Hessay looking to travel into York/cross over the river to the Sustrans route 65 etc, would not be equally well-served by bringing the route either down the A59 or through the Park &amp; Ride site to join up with the new road layout at the junction with Station Road in Poppleton. Alternatively, is there a possibility of bringing the route through Northminster Business Park to join Knapton Lane instead? In addition, cyclists approaching the junction between Black Dyke Lane (termination of extension 115) and Station Rd have to be aware of cars/vans parking up abruptly outside the post office plus commuting traffic zipping across.</li> <li>2. <b>Upper Poppleton</b> - Proposed extension No. 122 terminates in the old British Sugar site, which I assume is due to uncertainty as to how this area is going to be developed. Should you not indicate an intention to have it ultimately connected to Millfield Lane? Also, is there anyway it can be extended to join the end of the Great North Way as there are several businesses in that area (plus sites still to be developed) whose employees work unsociable hours on low pay and they may be encouraged to cycle if their journey to work were to be made easier.</li> <li>3. <b>Nether Poppleton</b> - Please could you give consideration to cyclists who use the Sustrans 65 route to travel north up to Skelton and then need to cross the A19 to journey eastwards e.g up to Sutton on the Forest, Sherrif Hutton etc. I would have thought this was a frequently used route and crossing the A19 can be a pain in the neck.</li> <li>4. <b>Fulford</b> - Re. proposed extension No 93 along the river bank. I thought Fulford Ings was an environmentally protected area? Would you be allowed, and is it appropriate, to put a cycle path down the bank? What would be the maintenance costs given the flooding issue? I haven't been down there for quite a while but when I did live in Fulford there used to be several houseboats moored up there with vans parked etc which might be an issue. As an alternative have you considered constructing a path (e.g. a raised timber path) along the back of the Ings (i.e. along the edge of the property boundaries where the existing path is) and then turning up the track by Gate Fulford Hall to join Fenwick's Lane &amp; out onto Fulford Road?</li> </ol>
Mr. C. J. Edghill	<p>I would like to object to route 59 as a walker in this city this is one of the few areas where a pedestrian should be able feel safe although the City is poor at enforcement on cyclist as they are out of control and cycle where they</p>

	<p>please and break every law they can route 59 should not be given over to cyclist even though they use this route already. The Lendal bridge end is narrow and cyclists come flying down the hill after riding on the footpath bringing them into conflict with walkers. I myself have been nearly knocked over on several occasions the foot path up the hill is also narrow. When are the City council going to do something for pedestrians in this city instead of allowing cyclists to do as they please.</p> <p>I will also say that if I am knocked down by a cyclist on this unsuitable route I will take action against the city, and the cyclist. When is the council going to do something about cyclist in this city instead of encouraging them to do as they please.</p>
Patrick Ray	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals for the Strategic Cycle Route Network. The reasons why it's important to have safe cycle routes are obvious. Nationally, there was a 16% rise between 2010 and 2011 in the number of cyclists seriously injured on the roads*, and anyone who regularly cycles in York, or even reads some of the anti-cyclist (and anti-pedestrian) vitriol on the Press website will have a good idea why. I am in favour of York having all the provision for cyclists that it's feasible to put in place, and the city has done a good job already. I'm particularly impressed by the route between Rawcliffe and Layerthorpe, using the old railway line to provide a traffic-free route into the city centre. The road markings on the Crichton Avenue/Burdike Avenue roundabout are excellent, guiding you neatly into the right lane for the exit you need to use. I use my bike for commuting from Rawcliffe to Fulford, generally following the route along Bootham and through the city centre on the outward journey, and coming home via the Millennium Bridge, Skeldergate, the riverside path, Salisbury Road and Water End. Generally speaking, I am quite happy with the existing cycling facilities on these routes, with the following provisos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existence of on-road parking on the south side of Clifton Road (just before The Avenue, if I remember rightly), causing a discontinuity in the cycle lane that forces riders to pull out into the traffic flow, is less than ideal.</li> <li>• It's fairly common for drivers to park illegally on the cycle lane outside the Londis shop on Clifton Road and outside the takeaway on the south side of Bootham, just before Marygate. Similarly, Low Petergate can be unpleasant early in the morning, with numerous delivery vehicles (including articulated lorries far too big for the narrow streets) parked on double-yellow lines, and car drivers mounting the pavement to get past them.</li> <li>• I come back along the wrong side of the Ouse, crossing it twice, partly because there's no satisfactory westbound cycle route through the city centre (and in fairness I can't see how one could easily be provided) and partly because I think the approach to the Clifton Green junction along Clifton Road is dangerous. I used to use it, as the most direct route home. However, as a cyclist wanting to go straight on, you have the choice of reaching the advance stop line either by squeezing along the nearside of vehicles in the left-hand lane - there isn't enough space to do this safely - or pulling out into the right-hand lane, where you will be wrongly positioned if the lights change to green before you reach them. On top of that, there is the hazard posed by very long</li> </ul>

	<p>bendy buses pulling up at the Clifton Green stop. From time to time, the junction is obstructed by motorists who have illegally stopped on the box markings because the tailback of traffic from Salisbury Road stretches all the way back to Clifton Green, and prevents them getting onto Water End from the A19. This is well documented: the police issued a warning against the practice, without much effect. For a cyclist, the approach to Clifton Green along Water End is, currently, far safer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having said that, you won't be surprised to hear that I think the decision to remove the existing on-road cycle lane on Water End at the Clifton Green junction is insane. I have been over this many times before, so suffice to say that there is no evidence justifying this in the report submitted by Council officers, and it is clearly no more than a sop to a vocal minority of motorists who refuse to confront their own responsibility for causing congestion. This stretch of road is clearly marked on the maps accompanying this consultation as an established cycle route. To talk about the need to close gaps in the existing provision in order to complete a strategic network, while simultaneously being committed to <i>removing</i> a crucial and safety-critical stretch of that same network, is utterly perverse and illogical.</li> <li>• I have some reservations over Priority 102, the path round the lake in Rawcliffe. From long experience as both a cyclist and a pedestrian, the two don't mix on the same path unless there's a clear division into two dedicated halves, and I don't think there's enough room for that in this case. Pedestrians are on edge in case someone comes charging up on a bike, and cyclists are frustrated at constantly having to weave between pedestrians.</li> </ul>
Peter Huxford	Bishopthorpe Map - what is proposed for the banks of the Ouse on this – doesn't look realistically achievable.
Henry Bainton	<p>I like your ideas in general very much, and this is important work. However, I think :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that provision should be made for a cycle route through the Footstreets area as a matter of urgency - crossing York (from, say, Bootham or Clifton to Hull Road) can be a frustrating process at the moment</li> <li>• I'm not sure I understand your value added scoring, because it seems that too much depends on 'safety' and not enough on ease of use. For example, one of the simplest things you could do is remove/change the gates in Tower street gardens, which is currently ranked 25 in your list. It's clear enough that the gates as they stand at the moment are not unsafe. However, navigating the gates involves a manoeuvre that almost always proves stressful for pedestrians, and in fact makes it very unclear that there is a cycle route going through the park at all. Removing the gates will signal clearly that there's a route going through the park and pedestrians and cyclists would be clearer what bits of walkway can be used for what. Would there be any scope to include a score for ease of use/likelihood to encourage cycling? Surely the point of this plan is to get as many people out of cars and on bikes as possible.</li> <li>• A more general point is that much still needs to be done to mark cycle paths more clearly so that cyclists and pedestrians do not stray into the wrong areas.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have you considered a fact-finding trip to Danish or Dutch local authorities to see how cycling routes are planned there?</li> </ul>
Dr Mick Phythian	<p>Rawcliffe route #037 - As managers of the land involved in the 'proposed' route across Rawcliffe Meadows we feel it would have been polite to consult the actual Friends of Rawcliffe Meadows directly before publishing this. As it is, as far as we know, this is not the potential route agreed with the landowners the Environment Agency being several versions out-of-date.</p> <p>Any route on or through Rawcliffe Meadows will affect hay cutting, collection and quantity and must take into account the management of the site, which is one of the Council's draft SINC sites.</p> <p>Whilst it is difficult to see clearly at the scale provide where route 037 is intended to go, as it stands it is unacceptable.</p>
Alison Bayliss	<p>Comments re the proposed cycle routes (Strensall)</p> <p>The majority of the green route proposed in 1997 but not developed is alongside the River Foss - a muddy track that floods, is uneven and often overgrown. I do not like walking along it, and would not contemplate cycling along it. By all means drop it from the cycle map, BUT there is a need for a cycle route through and out of Strensall. I was disappointed to see the route along Strensall Road (red) is way down the priority list. Strensall lies within the city of York, but has only a few metres of cycle lane.</p> <p>I cycle at my peril down the main street (The Village) to get to the village school, but would not contemplate cycling into York due to the volume of cars, lorries and buses using the Strensall Road at peak times. Please reconsider ways of getting Strensall residents onto the cycle paths that the council is so proud of by creating an off road cycle path to the ring road</p>
Stuart Brown	<p>As part of my reply to the consultation I would like to stress the importance of Strategic Route 070 (Bumper Castle - Wigginton Rd - Nestle) in terms of cyclists safety.</p> <p>I am a regular Road user and cyclist but would not cycle on the B1363 between the Bumper Castle and Nestle due to the unlit road and speed and proximity of traffic. I feel sorry for the cyclists that do cycle here and feel it is a matter of time before an accident will occur. I know there are alternatives, but there is room for a cycle path on the verges.</p>
John Mackle	<p>Please can you explain or point me to where I can find out in more detail what is being proposed. All I can see is a series of maps which I understand mark where cycle routes might be expanded. But how? On road routes, off road routes, signposting, traffic calming? In the absence of any detail, it is difficult to comment how useful a suggested route is going to be or not.</p> <p>I use 21 73 71 and 3 a lot.</p> <p>What about Dalton Terrace and the Iron Bridge which is a key junction?</p>

	The map seems to be lacking points to cross the ring road for example to access countryside west of York.
Christopher Rutherford	<p>As a life long cyclist I am far from convinced of the need to create a citywide network of cycle lanes. I believe they have value on busy routes into the city centre but when you get out into the suburbs the number of parked vehicles will always makes them more or less unusable. Cyclists will not use a route simply because it appears on a plan as a designated cycle route. In my experience they tend to pick the shortest route to get to their destination. I suggest that a far better use of money would be to identify those points on the road network that are either off-putting or just downright dangerous to cycle users and make changes to remedy those problems. You don't really add anything by painting white lines on the approach. You cannot limit those safety improvements to some routes simply because you have designated them as cycle routes. Although experience tends to lead a person to believe that for the most part provision will only be made to improve the lot of either cyclists or pedestrians if it will not inconvenience car drivers I would suggest that until there is a culture shift that is comfortable taking road space away from cars even when it will result in more delays for car drivers nothing of substance can be achieved to improve the lot of either cyclists or pedestrians. Having said that the introduction of 20 mph limits on most roads will certainly contribute to a safer feel to a cycle journey</p>
Kevin Dixon	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to make the comment that it is not possible to view the whole plan without downloading multiple documents. As someone who cycles all over York, it would be appreciated if I could have access to an overall document (online) so that I can properly comment on the priorities. By only providing parish plans, the consultation is fundamentally flawed. Provide an online picture that can be zoomed in?</p> <p>More needs to be done for outlying districts to provide cycle lanes away from heavy traffic, there has been too much emphasis on inner city cycle lanes. For example, cycling from Deighton to the University requires a significant detour westwards before the Selby cycle track can be joined and that takes you in a direction that adds significant mileage. The cycle lane that currently exists alongside the busy A19 between Escrick and Deighton should be extended to the A64 roundabout providing a more direct link to the Fulford shopping area (our nearest) and the University.</p> <p>There are insufficient cycle lock facilities in the inner city. Too many large cycle parks often full, not enough small localized ones.</p> <p>Supermarkets do not provide enough secure cycle lock facilities. The cheap wheel only style brackets screwed to a wall are not secure enough - you can not get a U-lock through them and the bike frame. They need to provide the large diameter tube hoops that are properly concreted in place and not just expansion bolted to a paving slab. Poor examples are Asda at Monks Cross, Aldi at Fulford, Tesco. More needs to be done at the Planning stage to ensure there are sufficient high quality cycle locking facilities covered by security cameras for these developments. Existing poor facilities need to be pointed out to give them the opportunity to upgrade and if they do not, then publicly state</p>



	where poor locking facilities are to encourage upgrades.
Dr Jeffrey Stern	<p>Heslington village road scheme (Ref. 016).</p> <p>I am a long-standing Parish Councillor for Heslington and a member of the University Liaison Forum but wish to register my views with you on the proposed scheme as a private resident.</p> <p>Unfortunately this issue has generated a great deal of heat and not much light. The anti-petitioners mounted an aggressive and effective campaign to stop everything in reaction to CYC's initial project that was in some ways too revolutionary and which made one bad mistake – that of making more traffic penetrate the village through School Lane. Unfortunately, even after this was corrected, local people (including most of the PC) were blinded to the potential good effects of the scheme and CYC have never managed to popularly progress further without inspiring an inevitable blanket antagonism.</p> <p>As I see it the following possibilities and objectives should be pursued:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An integrated safer scheme for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians for the whole of Heslington and University is the ultimate goal. The key-word is “integrated”; one piece alone will not be effective.</li> <li>2. Motor traffic particularly through-traffic - must be discouraged from the whole area. This can be achieved by:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) making that part of Field Lane between the school and Church one-way.</li> <li>b) improving signage so that more traffic uses Innovation Way (though I personally do not see that this will make any substantive difference).</li> <li>c) controlling the heavy use of Heslington village Main Street for commercial purposes – it is wrong to allow cars to manoeuvre endlessly and dangerously; park on or over footpaths (opposite the NatWest bank for example) and jam the village. This is at a time when, because of the very substantial rise in student numbers, more pedestrians than ever use the village for banking, snacks, pubs etc; it is a potentially lethal mix. Those who come to Heslington by car (and I believe there are many hundreds every day) are a real problem which needs addressing. It never has been - yet it is a core source of problems. Coney Street has been pedestrianised for years; it is Main Street's turn. Parking should be by permit for residents only. What seems to be missed is that all the traffic that uses Main Street has to use the surrounding roads to get there.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>The only recent change made by CYC to the area was to <u>add</u> more short-term parking spaces to Main Street which in my view was an entirely retrograde step.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Deramore School drop-off point within the school grounds is essential.</li> <li>3. Cycling; this is on the increase in the area largely due to the University's constructive efforts – but also because of the rise in student numbers. The University has recently reported in a recent traffic survey that cycle journeys have</li> </ol>

increased by 32.5% (rising from 4,347 in 2011 to 5,764 this year).

The only new planned cycle route worth pursuing is one that is obviously accessible, joins desire points and extends far enough for a useful journey. What is therefore required is a route that joins the village, university road and the two campuses. The only route that does this needs to involve that part of the dual carriageway at the head of University Road that would become redundant as envisaged in CYC's original scheme. (Sending the route through the back of the Church would be a useful add-on perhaps but it is not primary or obvious enough). This would then also connect with the most important part of the whole scheme; a dedicated cycle path along University Road which is at present dangerous for cyclists. Local people widely recognize that this is "an accident just waiting to happen". The University Road cycle path must be given a very high priority in the Strategic Cycle Network Review – at the moment it is just 16<sup>th</sup> in the list which is just not acceptable. The Review does not take into account the fact that student numbers have now reached 15,000 (which was not anticipated by planners until the end of the decade). This substantial rise in student numbers and the fact that so many travel from HMOs in the area to the University, coupled with the fact that the old Northern Dairy site residence block is almost ready, all contribute extra urgency to this project.

4. Buses; these are substantially employed and on the whole work very well. There is one real problem which is at the pick-up point by the University bridge. Because there are no lay-bys provided (and they could be – there is the space) they block the main road. Moreover pick-ups for both directions are side-by-side so the road frequently totally jams, with resultant bad-tempered and dangerous drivers – putting both cyclists and pedestrians at peril.

5. Historic sense of place; I do believe that gaining some extra green space outside Heslington Hall is well worth doing. For the same reason I believe that Church Field should not be changed by the intrusion of cycle paths. I do believe that more green space would be some recompense for the destruction of Dean's Acre.