

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General	Objection - the Plan shows a large movement of vehicles (over 5,000 a day) into and out of the City from/to East Yorkshire. Inevitably much of the traffic to and from the Heworth/Rowntrees, Huntington Road/Clifton districts uses the route through Murton.	69/13850	Murton Parish Council
	Comment – request further engagement with the York Economic Partnership Board. Objection – concerned that neither the importance of road infrastructure nor the need for it appears to have been taken properly into account in the plan, particularly in light of the need to move freight and skills.	153/14984	Without Walls (York Economic Partnership Board)
	Comment – there is an over reliance on changing people’s habits – from car to walking, cycling and public transport – especially considering an ageing population. Much smaller buses should be encouraged as they would also help ease congestion. It is essential that the housing and employment sites approved for inclusion in the Plan should not go ahead before adequate infrastructure is in place to avoid exacerbating congestion.	192/14020	
	Comment – Low Poppleton Lane should be reopened to all traffic. Main Street is too congested with traffic both parked and waiting for the doctor’s surgery.	362/14198	
	Comment - would like to see more reference to provision made specifically for it being safer for children and young people to walk and cycle alone.	387/14206	Active York
	Comment – expand second bullet to include full content of NPPF Paragraph 32. Objection – option 2 for <i>Transport infrastructure to mitigate local impacts of new development</i> is not consistent with the NPPF or the requirements on the use of planning obligations as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations which state that planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. On this basis, it is considered that alternative 1 should be the preferred approach.	434/16588	Associated British Foods plc
	Objection – it is evident the Plan doesn’t tackle the city’s major transport problems. The Plan does not provide the one holistic and sensible plan for transport York needs. Whilst the move away from cars is noted as being important, the plans in place do not address the issue enough. We should be pushing for pedestrians (and cyclists) as far as possible, certainly, but need to make sure that all other modes of transport are viable alternatives. There should be real consideration for how trams or similar modes of transport could be implemented and the city’s rivers should be considered a viable alternative for great quantities of transport.	525/16638	
	Comment - the topic is being approached in an over-emotive way with the “Get York Moving” tag.	671/16818	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
General Continued	Comment - should we not be more ambitious and develop a more futuristic plan with transport systems that the city can be proud of?	693/16865	
	Comment - need to know much more about schools systems. If these are developed, good.	973/230	
	Comment - two rivers, four bridges, a stone wall with gates too small to admit a bus – recipe for constant traffic chaos. No reference to provision of a bus station which is badly needed.	1272/210	
	Support – Option 3 for <i>Location, layout and accessibility</i> , Option 3 for <i>Sustainable modes of transport</i> , and Option 5 for <i>Providing transport capacity to accommodate growth</i> . Comment - the Plan should provide the long campaigned for traffic lights to be installed at the junction of common Road with the Hull Road at Dunnington.	1457/17433	
	Comment – can a cycle path not be made from Nether Poppleton on the north west bank towards the old sugar beet site? Why not a road bridge over the railway linking Holgate hill with the back of the railway station	1590/17585	
	Support – Option 3 for <i>Location, layout and accessibility</i> , provided it is evidence based in seeking to secure the most sustainable transport options, Option 3 for <i>Sustainable modes of transport</i> , and Option 3 for <i>Determining area for development and associated transport needs</i> where the local criteria takes account of the historic nature of the city, existing transport infrastructure and the relatively compact nature of the urban area. Objection – do not support the preferred approach [Option 5] for <i>Providing transport capacity to accommodate growth</i> as it is believed that the level of growth proposed is unsustainable and suggest that a lower level of growth could be catered for by increasing existing capacity for sustainable transport. It is also believed that the proposed increase in road capacity will not be sufficient to meet the higher demand but will undermine the viability of major increases in sustainable transport provision, Preferred Option 2 not supported as support a maximum level of parking provision applied rigorously [Option 1], but with some flexibility in small developments outside the urban area. The current statement is too weak and ambiguous, The preferred approach [Option 2] should require all major developments to include demand management measures and smaller developments to identify smaller scale measures as identified by the local authority, Believe that smaller developments should be required to contribute to off site measures and major developments should make more significant financial contributions to mitigate their impact.	1665/13011	York Environment Forum
	Comment – it is high time the airfield at Elvington was developed. Although it is	1900/9907	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	admitted that there is a lack of growth in airlines at present there are other forms of air transport, executive flying for one. Farnborough in Hampshire has been developed for this and one could be developed at Elvington, close to the main railway line and the road network.		
General Continued	Comment – would welcome the plans for corresponding infrastructure development.	2009/602	
	Comment – congestion charges for all vehicles within inner York i.e. 1 mile York City Centre, all directions. Free for Copmanthorpe and other residents in satellite villages.	2287/6518	
	Comment – beyond “acknowledge the need to improve the Ring Road” in the Plan, what measures, what actions will be included to provide a Ring Road which can carry traffic around York. It is a matter of concern that LGV’s and Coaches and Buses can enter the city and are barely able to turn corners in certain spots. These large vehicles create significant pollution and noise.	2358/6546	
	Objection – to 20mph speed limits throughout Bishopthorpe and Dringhouses as have not seen any evidence detailing road accidents arising from speeding in these areas. Also object on the grounds of putting the measure [20mph speed limits] into place and the additional street furniture it will entail.	2363/6553	
	Comment – improving and directing vehicles from the inner ring road is necessary as are the provision of a proper bus station; improving interchange with the railway station; opening new local stations and facilitating public transport usage. Simply putting in more speed humps and piecemeal road surface patching will not be adequate and a freight depot seems unfeasible.	2416/6686	
	Comment – to assist towards traffic control in Strensall, adopt a 10mph speed limit and parking controls on selected sections of road (see representation for more detail).	2486/6772	
	Comment - would appreciate a local bus service.	2526/6810	
	Comment – York is congested with traffic in the city centre. Buses are unreliable. Stuck in traffic.	2676/7093	
	Comment – please can the traffic problems be tackled before more homes are built?	2787/17739	
	Support – preferred options for all alternatives except for <i>Demand Management-travel planning</i> and <i>Transport infrastructure to mitigate local impacts of development</i> . Comment – <i>Sustainable modes of transport</i> – people will always use their cars. Objection – <i>Demand management - travel planning</i> and <i>Transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development</i> Option 1	2846/7575	
	Comment – Low Poppleton Lane should be re-opened (no lorries) which would greatly help with traffic during disruption due to road works. This would be restricted to local traffic only.	2880/7869	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – York cannot cope with projected traffic increases which these new developments will generate.	2995/17740	
General Continued	Comment - York Road through Strensall is used currently by commuters to cut the corner off the A64 link.	3075/17742	
	Objection – do not support any of the preferred options for each of the alternatives. <i>Location, layout and accessibility – Option 1</i> <i>Sustainable modes of transport - Option 2</i> <i>Providing transport capacity to accommodate growth –Option 1</i> <i>Determining areas for development and associated transport needs - Option 1</i> <i>Demand management-car parking – Option 1</i> <i>Demand management -travel planning - Option 1</i> <i>Transport infrastructure to mitigate local impacts of development. – Option 1</i>	3208/8260	
	Comment - <i>Providing transport capacity to accommodate growth – Whilst broadly agree with increasing existing road capacity and capacity for more sustainable modes of transport it is important to remember York has an ageing population and this will have an impact on mobility in a variety of ways.</i>	3243/8318	
	Comment – the plan does not come up with any traffic alleviation proposals.	3450/8836	
	Objection – York’s prevailing Achilles heal is its communications issue. Every expanding city treats as fundamental the urgent needs for good transport and access, seen in booming cities here and abroad. Yet York’s notorious ring road, heavy with stagnant traffic and already cited as a deterrent to further employment gets scant attention in the plan.	4691/14250	
	Comment – pages and pages of the plan talk about cycling, public transport and demonise the car. Like it or loath it the car and roads bring visitors and commerce to the city. The A1237 problem and other traffic bottlenecks in York have not been addressed correctly and congestion will only get worse. The A1237 needs overpasses built at each junction and the city centre bottlenecks need underpasses. New thinking is needed and is a long time overdue. Don’t use the usual road/transportation construction companies. Incorporate a non-profit making company with other local authorities solely for road-work projects. Existing council staff with transferable skills can be used for raw manpower.	4771/14273	
	Comment - Key Evidence Base, Transport Implications of the City of York [Local Plan Preferred Options] – Welcome this document and recognise York does have transport, pollution and congestion problem. The plan does not appreciate and act on the many benefits that the natural environment can bring to the City. Green Infrastructure could	4819/14319	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	mitigate pollution, assist in flood defence, and help get more people off the road, on foot / cycle and so on. Should build more natural environment into capital projects.		
General Continued	Comment – the main issue is traffic. The ring road cannot cope with the current level of traffic never mind the city centre.	5490/14856	
	Comment – to help alleviate the heaviest traffic congestion in the morning and evening periods and to help reduce air pollution consideration should be given to introducing congestion zones. These should be set up from the ring of park and ride sites into the city centre, operating between 7am and 10am and between 3pm and 6pm. The Council should also consider working with local employers who should be encouraging staff who travel in to the city from outside the park and ride system to use this facility. The charge for the congestion zone should be such that it makes the use of the park and ride attractive. This would also help to reduce the number of people who drive in to the outer limits of the city, park in unregulated residential streets and then use folding bicycles to make the remainder of the journey. Exemption to charges should be made for disabled drivers and over 60 year olds.	5578/13070	
	Comment – consideration should be given to how to facilitate an electric car club such as Autolib in Paris. This would reduce CO2 emissions, lead to reduced car use and improve air quality. To help reduce congestion further the car club could be integrated with a car lifts scheme. Electric cars for York taxis should be considered, which could start initially with CYC taxis however means of exerting pressure through licensing for an eventual switch over amongst other operators could be considered, giving fair warning. Electric buses or greener fuels to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions should be considered. Alongside voluntary co-ordination of bus timetabling amongst companies. For example the coastline and first York buses leave from similar times from Copmanthorpe and from York to Copmanthorpe this clearly reduces the overall quality of the bus service which could provide more frequent services to residents. Return tickets could be permitted on competing buses under a voluntary reciprocal arrangement. This would allow travellers to take the next available bus, reducing journey time and increasing time for other pursuits, work or leisure. The overall experience and satisfaction levels of public transport would be improved.	6132/15565	
	Comment – in order to deliver a modal shift to sustainable modes of transport such as a cycle a radical new approach is needed in York, to make bicycles more easily available and to make cycling a preferred mode of transport. York must show the courage to look at best practice examples in those other European Cities that really do understand how to increase cycling figures.	6137/15591	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Support – the plans provisions, however, should go further to pedestrianise the centre and improve the cleanliness; creating areas like the cultural quarter.	6213/15751	
General Continued	Objection – one of the main aims of the plan is to 'get York moving' which is admirable however it is surprising that the approach to transport is so weak and relies almost exclusively on buses and bikes. These may have their place but the anti-car approach is not consistent with the aspirations that the plan has for the city, even if these must be realised at an ambitious level.	6363/17706	
	Support – for the general thrust of the policies. Comment – it is how they are implemented that is the crucial factor.	6516/16344	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – depending on the locations of new commercial and residential developments, transport systems could not cope with the implied influx of new workers.	6517/17746	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection - while a range of sustainable transport measures are referred to in the plan, as set out in LTP3, there is a lack of certainty about their deliverability which would be vital if the new housing developments proposed are not to lead to gridlock. Support – Option 3 for <i>Location, layout and accessibility</i> , provided it is evidence based in seeking to secure the most sustainable transport options, Option 3 for <i>Sustainable modes of transport</i> , and Option 3 for <i>Determining area for development and associated transport needs</i> where the local criteria takes account of the historic nature of the city, existing transport infrastructure and the relatively compact nature of the urban area. Objection – do not support the preferred approach [Option 5] for <i>Providing transport capacity to accommodate growth</i> as it is believed that the level of growth proposed is unsustainable and suggest that a lower level of growth could be catered for by increasing existing capacity for sustainable transport. It is also believed that the proposed increase in road capacity will not be sufficient to meet the higher demand but will undermine the viability of major increases in sustainable transport provision, Preferred Option 2 not supported as support a maximum level of parking provision applied rigorously [Option 1], but with some flexibility in small developments outside the urban area. The current statement is too weak and ambiguous, The preferred approach [Option 2] should require all major developments to include demand management measures and smaller developments to identify smaller scale measures as identified by the local authority, Believe that smaller developments should be required to contribute to offsite measures and major developments should make more significant financial contributions to mitigate their impact.	6518/16455	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T1 Location And Layout Of Development	Comment – mention is made of the PROW Network. However, work on this is incomplete and would wish to see completion of the Definitive Map for the former County Borough and the revision of said maps for the remainder of the Council’s area as a matter of importance. Public space and footpaths should be incorporated into developments in accordance with DEFRA Guidelines, rather than included as an afterthought with little regard to public enjoyment and accessibility.	91/12849	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Comment – Policy T1 vi – several existing public rights of way, such as the network of snickleways, are a key element of York’s historic character. The Policy should make it clear that the loss of such rights of way will not be permitted. Suggested addition to end of Policy T1 iv: <i>‘Extinguishment of public rights of way which contribute to the special character of the historic city will not be permitted.’</i>	238/14121	English Heritage
	Objection – plan would benefit from the deletion of unnecessary policies such as T1.	544/16755	
	Support – Clause i of the Policy. Also support the first sentence of the last paragraph of the Policy that recognises that in some circumstances developments will not be able to achieve these criteria.	659/15091	Persimmon Homes
	Support - broadly supported, might be improved with some reference to water-borne transport. Thinking of moving goods and some leisure journeys.	671/16819	
	Comment – as a point of clarification for Policy T1 Public transport accessibility criteria, do all of the criteria have to be met for a location to be considered accessible or just one? Should strategic development not make specific contributions to improving the public transport network? The impact on visual quality of the roads radiating into the city centre needs to be managed in order to protect the integrity of the character of these important strategic routes. This point also needs to be taken into account in relation to increasing existing road capacity. Objection – the Highways Agency has concerns regarding the accessibility criteria for the sub urban locations and the lack of specific criteria for the new settlement, given that sub urban and the new development equate to almost 40% of the allocated housing not already committed.	1264/17158	Highways Agency
	Objection – whilst support location of development in areas which are served by high quality and frequent public transport services, consider the policy wording to be flawed and that a minor change to the text can rectify this. For recommended amendment see representation paragraph 13.7	1337/17297	Halifax Estates
	Support – welcome the integrated approach that requires new development to be integrated with and accessible to, existing development, services and transport infrastructure. Also support Clause i	1523/17512	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
			Fields Ltd
Policy T1 Location And Layout Of Development Continued	Support - the general thrust of the Policy in so far as it sets out expectations for how new development should take advantage of existing infrastructure or else contribute to its improvement, however, concerned that the Plan is not clear as to how large scale developments across the district will impact on the existing infrastructure without adding to existing problems, including air quality concerns and congestion.	1592/17621	York Civic Trust
	Support - Clause i, with the addition of specific mention of safe walking and cycling routes to the local school (and provision of secure cycle parking therein). Support Clause v, but include consideration of appropriate buggy/wheelchair/tricycle parking. Public transport 'accessible' Clause 1 support 15 min frequency as maximum. Objection – Clause iv, the proviso of commuted payments should be deleted. Any new development should provide covered cycle parking, unless a refurbishment of an existing building in which case commuted payment might be acceptable. Clause vi last sentence add at end 'and does not destroy historic street and alley-way patterns in the city centre'. Clause vii after 'retains (and enhances where required' add 'to increase their usability or attractiveness'. Add new clause 'Developments of more than 300 houses will provide a minimum of one parking bay for car club vehicles at a central location or one which also serves nearby existing residents. Comment – public transport 'accessible' Clause 1 i add (max hourly evening/Sunday service). Public transport 'accessible' Clause 2 i in suburban locations and villages the frequency should be at least every 15 minutes for any new settlement or urban extension of greater than 500 houses. Public transport 'high quality' Clause 1 proposes: Vehicles shall meet Euro IV emission standard and be fitted with hybrid technology to run on alternative fuels within any Air Quality Management Area in its route. Distance to cycle route 'reasonable' Clause 2 for other locations specify that the stop should provide cycle parking at the location or within 50m of the stop (to promote integrated use). Last sentence needs to be tightened to specify development over a certain size will require higher standards.	1665/12991	York Environment Forum
	Objection – it is unfair and outside of a developers control to be responsible for public transport vehicles to meet, as a minimum, Euro IV emission standards and therefore this part of the policy should be deleted. It is difficult to comprehend how this part of the policy will be applied at the decision making stage given it is unlikely that a public transport operator can guarantee such standards. Also unaware of what viability testing has been carried out to support the list of requirements for bus stops. All of the requirements come at a cost, especially the real time display.	1668/15046	Barratt & David Wilson Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T1 Location And Layout Of Development Continued	Objection – too onerous especially in relation to railway requirements. The railway network in York is small and requiring a railway station within a 10 minute walk or 15 minute cycle time is unrealistic and would preclude most sites from coming forward including the new strategic allocations in many parts of York city itself. Access to rail is only one element of sustainability that should be considered alongside many other factors influencing the sustainability of the site.	1705/9797	Gladman Developments
	Comment – remember to put buses on all day and all night till 11:30 - 12 midnight in all York areas.	2418/6694	
	Comment – had any consideration been given to the use of trolley buses to provide a modern, quiet, non-polluting mode of transport? Ideally tram would be the best solution. Only trolleybuses (or trams) can provide a sustainable cost effective solution in the long term.	2472/6758	
	Comment – one thought is to have smaller bus system for estates whilst using longer buses on the main trunk road out of and into York.	2787/7383	
	Objection – access by bus into the villages needs to be greatly improved. Routes are not planned to connect neighbouring areas.	3004/7833	
	Support – yes to all improvements to public transport, and support for cycling and walking.	3242/8301	
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T1. Comment - as part of the carrot and stick approach to rush hour congestion in the approach corridors should there not be a policy aimed at employers (private as well as public) to restrict and be taxed for parking spaces which is currently free?	3356/8596	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach and providing detailed local criteria to guide accessibility in relation to location/layout of new development.	5178/12372	
	Objection – a bus service operating once per hour is not sufficiently accessible to discourage car use. Services need to be at least half hourly to offer an attractive alternative to driving from the villages to central York. Comment -where services are provided by more than one operator, tickets should be valid across all operators at no extra cost.	5767/13643	
	Comment - the Plan notes that new car parks should take account of the requirements to be contained in the Council's emerging Car Parking Strategy, (include parking standards) the emerging strategy is yet to be drafted and therefore the Plan should be clear what standards are to be sought.	6159/15659	Pegasus Group
Comment – concerned about the location of strategic housing sites on the A1237 between the A19 and the B1363. In the morning and evening peaks the entire stretch	6498/16242		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of the A1237 between the A59 and Huntington Road becomes very congested and this proposed housing development will add a quite substantial number of cars to the existing flows.		
Policy T1 Location And Layout Of Development Continued	<p>Support - Clause i, with the addition of specific mention of safe walking and cycling routes to the local school (and provision of secure cycle parking therein). Support Clause v, but include consideration of appropriate buggy/wheelchair/tricycle parking. Public transport 'accessible' Clause 1 support 15 min frequency as maximum.</p> <p>Objection – Clause iv, the proviso of commuted payments should be deleted. Any new development should provide covered cycle parking, unless a refurbishment of an existing building in which case commuted payment might be acceptable. Clause vi last sentence add at end 'and does not destroy historic street and alley-way patterns in the city centre'. Clause vii after 'retains (and enhances where required' add 'to increase their usability or attractiveness'. Add new clause 'Developments of more than 300 houses will provide a minimum of one parking bay for car club vehicles at a central location or one which also serves nearby existing residents.</p> <p>Comment – public transport 'accessible' Clause 1 i add (max hourly evening/Sunday service). Public transport 'accessible' Clause 2 i in suburban locations and villages the frequency should be at least every 15 minutes for any new settlement or urban extension of greater than 500 houses. Public transport 'high quality' Clause 1 proposes: Vehicles shall meet Euro IV emission standard and be fitted with hybrid technology to run on alternative fuels within any Air Quality Management Area in its route. Distance to cycle route 'reasonable' Clause 2 for other locations specify that the stop should provide cycle parking at the location or within 50m of the stop (to promote integrated use). Last sentence needs to be tightened to specify development over a certain size will require higher standards.</p>	6518/16440	York Green Party
Para 23.06	Objection – add in reference to the need to consider provision for mobility scooters, disabled cyclists (larger adapted cycles) child cycle buggies and pick up / set down point near entrance for taxis, with safe separate access route to the cycle parking area (avoiding conflict with pedestrian routes).	1665/12992	York Environment Forum
	Objection – add in reference to the need to consider provision for mobility scooters, disabled cyclists (larger adapted cycles) child cycle buggies and pick up / set down point near entrance for taxis, with safe separate access route to the cycle parking area (avoiding conflict with pedestrian routes).	6518/17747	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements	Support – the expansion and improvements of Park & Ride facilities at Designer Outlet.	9/11656	Selby District Council
	Objection - to the proposal for additional bus lanes on A19. It would harm the character and appearance of the Fulford Conservation Area because it would require the removal of green verges. As such it would be contrary to the statutory duty imposed on the Local Planning authority under section 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.	62/12718	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – current bus arrangements are not satisfactory. Comment - there is an urgent need for a more frequent service that would serve Clifton Moor and Monks Cross. Objection - until there is some recognition of the need for a more frequent bus service and a commitment to invest in this provision, people will not be able to avoid using their cars.	63/12725	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – clarification of proposed ‘enhancements’ to transport links at Manor Lane / Hurricane Way: Strongly objects to opening of this transport link to all for vehicular use Comment - if the intention is to open solely for bus usage, the Parish Council would expect to be included in any consultation/decision making process with regard to this transport link in the future.	73/12746	Rawcliffe Parish Council
	Objection – the site shown on the Proposals Map for a station at Strensall would require sufficient car parking spaces as such a facility would attract travellers from surrounding villages as well locations within Strensall which are remote from the station and current public transport service. It is noted that the same problems would apply at the proposed site in Haxby. Suggest that investigations are conducted into providing a station on Towthorpe Road in the vicinity of the site earmarked for a wind farm. Such a station would attract patronage from both settlements and could also be served by a connecting bus service which could run from Strensall via Towthorpe to Haxby centre calling at the station site.	77/12777	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – would also like to see statutory requirements for different transport companies to work in sync to improve the existing transport system.	90/12820	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Support - the long term proposals for the provision of a new railway station in Strensall. It is considered that the development of allocated sites will provide the opportunity to fund it.	144/12889	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	Comment – dialogue between network rail and CYC for bringing forward tram/train with halts at Haxby and Copmanthorpe will be important. Whilst acknowledge this is a complex issue, as finding an operator was a major barrier, Network Rail is open to	153/14987	Without Walls (York Economic Partnership Board)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	discussion.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support- welcome the commitment to investment in public transport and other sustainable means of transport.	187/13924	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Support - support recognition within this policy that the existing Designer Outlet Park & Ride facility should be expanded and relocated. Comment – in order to meet the shorter term sustainable economic development at the Designer Outlet, the Park & Ride will need to be relocated in the short to medium term (not the long term 2024 to 2030). The policy should recognise that the ‘safeguarded land’ abutting the southern boundary can be used for a relocated Park & Ride facility.	244/14133	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Comment – consideration needs to be given to local railway stations that will act as Park & Ride.	258/14153	
	Comment – the proposed location of the rail halt at Strensall is not in the best location to serve the site or the wider village. New location proposed [at Annex 1 of response]. Comment – concerned that there appears to be no provision for car parking at the proposed rail halt in Strensall. Access to the halt will most likely have to be taken across the proposed housing site H30. This could lead to the existing and proposed residential areas around the rail halt becoming a parking area for commuters. Land to the rear of houses fronting Lords Moor Lane and site H30 could be made available to provide a car park for the rail halt.	304/14178	Shirethorn Ltd
	Objection – at the current time the tram/train and potential new railway stations/halts are not firm proposals but long term aspirational proposals that do not currently have confirmed funding. Given this and the absence of any detailed appraisal for such a scheme, it is inappropriate that provision for the tram/train and/or halts, either in terms of reserve land or financial contributions, should form a planning requirement for the redevelopment of the former British Sugar site within the Plan. In addition, it is considered that financial contributions towards the tram/train/station/halts or any other form of public transport infrastructure improvements should be assessed as part of a detailed transport assessment in support of the planning applications for the redevelopment of the British Sugar site. Financial contributions towards such infrastructure should only be applied where they meet the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations which state that planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale kind to the development.	434/16589	Associated British Foods plc

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – a central bus depot, connecting virtually all bus routes, is necessary for buses to become a viable contender in the city.	525/16641	
	Objection – the proposed new railway station at Strensall is inconsistent with funding requirements since it cannot be financially supported because of the cost of improvements to the level crossings.	529/16681	
	Support - fully support Policy T2 and consider that the policy is justified and soundly based. Fully support the creation of a railway station at Haxby as it will also make the settlement one of the most sustainable locations to direct future growth. This railway station should be brought forward at the earliest possible opportunity. Fully support the creation of a railway station at Strensall as it will also make the settlement one of the most sustainable locations to direct future growth. This railway station should be brought forward at the earliest possible opportunity. Comment – one of the ways of bringing the creation of a rail halt forward is to cross fund this with contributions from the proposed housing developments in Strensall.	534/16711	DPP One Ltd
	Support - satisfied that policy gives due recognition to heritage importance of York Station and associated listed railway buildings and contribution of railway to history and environment of York.	641/3268	Railway Heritage Trust
	Objection - concerns about current park and ride schemes as well as that proposed for Clifton Moor. Support - plans for rail provision at Haxby and Strensall is supported. Comment – Copmanthorpe [rail station/halt] should be added as a medium term option.	671/16820	
	Support – new railway stations/halts. Excellent idea. Will reduce car commuting.	698/16868	
	Objection – the proposed new railway station at Strensall is inconsistent with funding requirements since it can not be financially supported because of the cost of improvements to the level crossings.	835/16905	
	Comment – anything that reduces the need for cars to go into York must be prioritised. A purpose built bus station/proper link up of routes would help people navigate the city without a car. This could be near Lendal Bridge.	995/17030	
	Comment – consideration needs to be given to new stations at Copmanthorpe, Askham Bar and the Hospital as well as the Haxby and Strensall sites.	1207/17112	
	Support – particularly welcome the emphasis on sustainability, reducing carbon emissions and improving public transport.	1261/17142	
Comment – the kind of rail services required for the main envisaged purpose of the Haxby and Strensall stations (i.e. local commuting into York) would be more akin to	1317/17251		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	those provided by Northern Rail than those provided by First Transpennine, the present train operating company (TOC) on that line. If both TOCs are to use this line, one or both of the new stations will require passing loops. If the purpose of opening Haxby and Strensall stations is to reduce motor road traffic into York, then train services would need to run every or 15 minutes in the rush hour periods. A tram-train operation might be more suitable for this route. There is little point in opening stations at Haxby and Strensall if the result is a timetable as thin as that experienced by, for example, Ullskelf, Church Fenton or Sherburn-in-Elmet.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment - York is constrained by its past. It used to be a 'rimless' wheel with the radial spokes all offering access to the centre, near which all the large employers were situated. Now York has a 'rim' to the wheel (the bypass) and jobs have moved to the rim, but the public transport system is still focussed on the spokes to the centre. Perhaps development of ST14 will help Clifton Moor employees.	1331/17259	
	Support – welcome the reference to improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure and the proposals to enhance the A19 Designer Outlet Village Park and Ride in the short and long term, including improvements to the access for that site.	1337/17298	Halifax Estates
	Objection - the plans for new train stations at Haxby and Strensall are desirable but unlikely to both be deliverable.	1355/17319	Mr J Sturdy MP
	Objection – already have heavy traffic on York Road and Eastfield Drive; things will just get worse if a rail halt is built	1392/17344	Mr G Cockburn (Haxby Town Council)
	Comment - any new station proposal needs to be developed along Rail Industry guidelines which are available on Network Rail's web site. Any new station proposal should be supported by the Local Plan and should be accompanied by a Transport Needs Assessment to confirm that all transport modes have been effectively considered and to demonstrate why a new station has been identified as the best public transport solution. The Plan includes a proposal for a new station northwest of York, Haxby and Strensall. It is also our understanding that a new station at York hospital is being considered which does not appear to be in the draft plan. Any new station needs an agreement from the Train Operating Company that they will call here to be incorporated into a franchise agreement. The business case for any new station will need to examine new demand, abstraction as well as the loss of revenue from extending existing customer journey time unless it is consider line speed increases to offset the overall dwell time. 3 new stations (Hospital, Haxby and Strensall) could extend journey time by circa 6-9 minutes on this route. There is currently strong stakeholder support to speed up journey time between Scarborough and York/beyond	1466/17438	Network Rail

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and the economic benefits of doing this might outweigh those of a new station. Impact of level crossings will need to be assessed for any new stations.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support - Clause iv for the provision of a new Park and Ride facility at Clifton Moor.	1523/17513	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
	<p>Objection – short term Clause ii needs to be removed or cross referenced to T3. Comment – Clause iv evidence needs to be provided to show that this will not generate increased traffic along the outer ring road, and how greater use of cycling and walking to the site from surrounding is to be facilitated. Support - long term (2024-30) support the tram train, new stations and light rail options. Although viability of these could be undermined by greater investment proposed for the outer ring road highway measures. Objection - long term (2024-30) do not support the relocation and expansion of the Designer outlet Park & Ride facility. Its hours of operation should be extended into the evening. Comment - long term (2024-30) if the Whinthorpe development goes ahead there should be a high quality accessible bus shuttle service linking both Grimston Bar and Designer Outlet park and ride services to limit the traffic impact of the development.</p>	1665/12993	York Environment Forum
	Comment – the proposed employment and leisure development at the Designer Outlet would make provision for a dedicated Park & Ride facility at this location (see detailed submission). The Elvington Proposal would also provide for new and enhanced public transport improvements. Subject to support for these schemes, Policy T2 would need to be amended.	1736/9836	Oakgate Group PLC
	Comment – in agreement with the proposal to open the rail stations at Strensall etc although this may well generate a bigger traffic problem. People will still use their cars to get to the stations and unless there is ample provision for parking this will result in the roads round the stations becoming clogged with parked cars.	1900/65	
	Objection - making a station at Haxby will be a waste of money. Most people in Haxby /Wigginton live far from the proposed site and will use a bus to get to from the station. When doing this, one might as well stay on the bus and go straight to York.	1908/88	
	Objection – buses used on the new proposed schemes will need to be in keeping with York’s roads, and not the bendy buses currently used on some routes. The buses are too big for York’s roads and are a danger to other road users as you cannot overtake and they take so much road when turning.	1913/103	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – nothing shown on e.g. Strensall / Haxby railway station developments should be a significant part of the transport plan for the city.	1947/215	
	Comment - a cycle path could be created between Hessay and the new Park and Ride on the A59. Existing station at Hessay on the York to Harrogate line could be reopened.	2281/3265	
	Comment – free parking for Copmanthorpe residents at the new Park and Ride facility, fast buses into York. The reopening of Copmanthorpe railway station. Shuttle train services from Copmanthorpe to York Station every half hour, and twenty minutes during rush hour with a halt at the new Park and Ride facility near Tesco with bridge to car park, reducing bus travel to centre.	2287/6518	
	Objection - the traffic around the Railway Station is not being organised at all – and what about a proper bus station?	2470/6753	
	Support – applaud the plans to locate two new rail stations at Haxby and Strensall.	2513/6794	
	Objection – there are few trains on the York-Scarborough line and fewer in winter as it only goes to Malton and Scarborough. No train company will run trains only to Haxby and Strensall; if it was commercially viable it would have been in operation by now.	2549/6850	
	Comment - concerned that recent news was that the Haxby Station had been delayed again - yet the plan seems certain Haxby station and now Strensall station will re-open to cater for the additional volumes.	2585/6934	
	Objection – cannot understand why a new Park & Ride is being created at Poppleton when the Rawcliffe one is never full and it is less than a mile away.	2603/3542	
	Comment – local rail stations at Strensall, Haxby and Hospital etc...Please get on with it. Please join up public transport with neighbouring regions - Leeds / Bradford is York's local airport.	2656/7035	
	Support – generally in favour of better public transport.	2663/7054	
	Comment – one thought is to have smaller bus system for estates whilst using longer buses on the main trunk road out of and into York.	2787/7384	
	Comment – transport and roads needs more radical/drastring attention. Much thought and tough negotiation is needed to provide an efficient, reliable and more affordable bus service to entice people into buses and out of cars. A shuttle bus service across the city has been widely suggested and could be an asset. Park & Ride is excellent but doesn't solve the problem.	2995/7784	
Comment – there should be a very frequent circular route/routes around the centre so that many different through routes could be altered by the public changing buses.	3004/17741		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support - a new railway station at Strensall as a mechanism to provide an alternative greener transport facility.	3062/7926	
	Objection – opposed to the joining of Manor Lane / Hurricane Way in this way. It would be heavily used as a rat run by those wishing to avoid the ring road. What is the advantage to local people in widening it for buses?	3072/7945	
	Comment - the Plan shows a railway station in Strensall. The station will only be developed if money to build this becomes available.	3075/7949	
	Comment – would encourage a review of the pricing policy for park and ride services to encourage cars with more than two people to use the services. Currently the services are too expensive which discourages their use. Especially for residents.	3116/8027	
	Object - why should the city centre roads be reallocated for cycling, walking and tourists at the expense of local residents of the city who want to drive into town?	3151/8119	
	Comment – more public transport needs to be provided as there will be big areas without anything.	3206/8251	
	Support – yes to all improvements to public transport, and support for cycling and walking.	3242/8302	
	Comment – consider whether there is a safe and economical way to use York’s waterways for public transport as other cities do.	3243/8319	
	Comment - why is there no mention of developing the old Derwent Valley Railway line from Dunnington into York as a Tramway or Light Railway? This would also take in commuters from the new Osbaldwick housing development, Tang Hall area, and could be extended to link in to the proposed rail link from Strensall, Haxby, City Hospital, and York Station and further. Comment – while the intention of new and expanded Park & Ride sites is good, two of these sites have missed the opportunity to use existing infrastructure. Rawcliffe Park & Ride should have used the River Ouse using a “Water Bus” network into the city. The new Park & Ride at Poppleton should have been built next to the existing railway station.	3254/8359	
	Support – on balance in support of a new railway station in Haxby. Many residents oppose the idea because people using the train would drive into Haxby from further afield and leave their cars parked in residential points which is an important point, although there isn’t any consideration of this in the plan.	3256/8364	
	Objection – the planned railway station in Haxby will inevitably introduce more cars from the surrounding areas, compounding the present traffic congestion.	3273/8408	
	Support – in favour of the new Park & Ride at Poppleton and creating a new railway	3353/8551	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	station at Haxby. Comment – if it were possible to use the railway more, for instance at Strensall, that could only be a good thing. Bus fares need to be held down at a reasonable level to encourage bus usage.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support – generally supportive of Policy T2.	3356/8597	
	Comment – can see no more Park & Ride sites planned for the south and east of York, A19, A64 or A1079. Before any development takes place plans should be in place to reduce traffic in/out of the city centre if we are to avoid complete gridlock of our roads.	3360/8619	
	Comment – four new Park & Ride sites and two railway station halts will go some way to ease a permanent traffic problem.	3450/8837	
	Comment – Poppleton merits a more frequent rail service but intermediate stations would detract from the appeal of this.	3468/8935	
	Support – rail station/halts at Haxby and Strensall welcome. The rail operating company and network rail must be pressure into action to relieve commuter traffic from roads. Comment - rail capacity is not a problem, only one train per hour in each direction is currently timetabled with an additional series in AM and PM peak. Platform space at York is available.	3549/9514	
	Support – yes to Haxby railway station, it should have opened over 20 years ago. Yes to a station in Strensall as well, the sooner the better to both.	3588/9556	
	Comment – there is currently a long waiting list for allotments in Haxby which will only lengthen should the train station reopen and allotments be taken for car parking.	3619/9629	
	Comment – when the new Askham bar Park & Ride is moved to the new site this will made an additional impact on traffic on Tadcaster Road. Understood that the Highways Agency feel the impact will be great.	3625/9642	
	Comment – a railway station in Haxby has been discussed for at least 10 years but nothing has ever happened. A railway station would improve transport choices; perhaps even get people out of their cars.	3632/9647	
	Comment – what Haxby needs is improved transport infrastructure to cope with the current demand such as re-opening Haxby and Strensall railway stations, improved bus links and more Park & Ride facilities.	3793/10216	
Comment – what Haxby needs is better coordinated public transport to cope with the current population such as re-opening Haxby and Strensall railway stations, improving bus links and Park & Ride facilities.	3794/10220		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – can see major problems both in having a station in Haxby and its proposed location on Station Road. Will increase the times the crossing is closed which would cause extra traffic tailbacks and more pollution in the area. The amount of extra traffic caused by the location of the station and the parking facilities will cause a build up of traffic on an already busy road. The road is already used as a rat run to avoid congestion on the ring road. The other problem is whether York Station would need to have extra platforms to cope as quite often trains have to wait outside York to have a platform allocated.	3851/10343	
	Comment – consideration should be given to re-opening the Derwent Valley line from Dunnington to Layerthorpe	3949/10508	
	Comment – the policy to reduce cars in the city is admirable but not at any cost. This will put additional pressure on the infrastructure of the outer regions of the city. New roads/routes will be required to service the housing developments. All this means more traffic/buses entering the city as not all housing is served by the Park & Ride. More pollution, more noise etc.	4049/10717	
	Comment – cannot be emphasised enough that the only way this plan can work is if public transport is massively improved. How can you get bus companies to increase their services before there is an acceptable demand? Or people to use buses when the services are still poor? What happens in severe weather when walkers and cyclists may prefer to use public transports? How can you prevent bus companies from changing their routes?	4052/10725	
	Comment – new railway halts proposed to the north of the city at Haxby and Strensall and at the British Sugar site but there are no identified improvements to the south of York.	4222/10975	
	Comment – Rougier Street is not a nice place to get on or off a bus. The buildings are so high the road so wide and busy and uncertainty if the bus will stop, will give you time to get on or will go where you want to be. Hull and Leeds have nice bus stations, we need one in York.	4244/11015	
	Comment – traffic situation at the Tadcaster Road/Tesco roundabout can only get worse with the proposed developments even if the relocated Askham Bar Park & Ride takes some cars off the road.	4284/11110	
	Comment – major improvements in public transport are needed in the Dringhouses/Woodthorpe/Copmanthorpe area to reduce dependency on cars. Increased frequency, evening service and reduced costs are essential to promote the use of public transport. Improved connecting services across the city are also needed	4305/11175	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	as amenities north and east of the city expand. A local station/halt for Copmanthorpe and Askham Bar would be beneficial although it is understood that technical issues may preclude this. Alternatives to road transport are essential to relieve pressure on Tadcaster Road. Should be encouraging Transdev to take over from First as primary bus service provider as they appear to be more customer focused and First entirely profit motivated.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – to encourage people to use public transport or bikes the plan needs to improve bus services (there is not a regular service from Haxby to Monks Cross and Clifton Moor which people who work at these out of town area can use to travel to work), subsidise bus fares and provide safe cycle routes to Monks cross and Clifton Moor.	4317/11202	
	Comment – to encourage people to use public transport or bikes the plan needs to improve bus services (there is not a regular service from Haxby to Monks Cross and Clifton Moor which people who work at these out of town area can use to travel to work), subsidise bus fares and provide safe cycle routes to Monks cross and Clifton Moor.	4321/11213	
	Comment – to encourage people to use public transport or bikes the plan needs to improve bus services (there is not a regular service from Haxby to Monks Cross and Clifton Moor which people who work at these out of town area can use to travel to work), subsidise bus fares and provide safe cycle routes to Monks cross and Clifton Moor.	4322/11217	
	Comment – to encourage people to use public transport or bikes the plan needs to improve bus services (there is not a regular service from Haxby to Monks Cross and Clifton Moor which people who work at these out of town area can use to travel to work), subsidise bus fares and provide safe cycle routes to Monks cross and Clifton Moor.	4323/11221	
	Comment – plans for increases of well over 100 houses in a rural area would necessitate an increase in bus service. Given that services are already under threat would like to see the public transport plan to go with the plan proposals.	4358/11296	
	Support – the idea to reopen stations on the Scarborough line to York or any other line has full support.	4381/11346	
	Objection - the proposed new railway station in Haxby will attract more traffic, not reduce it.	4385/1904	
	Objection - the promise of a Rail Station at Haxby is a white elephant and not viable from a cost point of view and the local bus service is unreliable and the buses get	4396/11392	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	caught up in the same congestion.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Objection – providing a Park & Ride on the A59 is only part of the answer to address traffic congestion. The much spoken of Haxby rail station is yet to appear after years of talk.	4400/11401	
	Support – the proposed new Park & Ride sites and new local railway stations are praised. Anything to help the movement of people without further log-jamming our roads has to be a good idea. Comment - extra bus services to service the new “villages” will be needed. Has any thought been given to this?	4681/11953	
	Comment – have you any plans to reopen the railway station in Copmanthorpe so people can get into York. Recently the buses were reduced on an evening, there is a coastliner service but this is not sufficient.	4764/12059	
	Comment - note that the proposed Haxby Station plans (a very important piece of necessary infrastructure for the town) have already been “scuppered” by the DFT and Network Rail. Unable to prevent this despite the fact that the station has been an ambition since 1993. The station earlier this year was at one point second or third on the list for almost certain delivery.	5139/12258	
	Comment - opening local railway stations is an idea long overdue for implementation if only to reduce the road congestion.	5145/12266	
	Support - warmly welcome the proposed new railway stations/halts at Haxby and Strensall. They will reduce road congestion and hence reduce the pollution caused by road traffic.	5148/12277	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach and providing local policies for new development to give priority to more sustainable forms of transport, such as public transport, walking and cycling.	5178/12373	
	Support - approve the general trend away from the use of private cars and towards public transport and bicycles. Comment - it should be remembered that closing the city centre entirely to cars will hurt some vulnerable people. If you close much more of the central city area to private cars with appropriate badges, some people will be finally excluded from the city centre altogether.	5192/12463	
	Comment – should consider building a new park and ride site next to the new homes at Clifton Moor outside the outer ring road as this would help to reduce some of the increased traffic. If it were built inside the outer ring road it would ease inner city routes but not the outer ring road.	5213/12477	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	<p>Objection - misgivings about the proposed link road between Manor Lane and Hurricane Way. Very concerned that linking the two roads together by removing the existing footpath and cycle lane will be detrimental to the quality of life for residents living in the immediate area of Manor Lane. Removal of the cycle lane and footpath will effectively connect a wholly residential area with a shopping retail park. This will almost certainly create a rat run for drivers trying to avoid the A1237 ring road and also late night traffic visiting the drive thru restaurant which will cause noise nuisance for residents in the early hours of the morning. Holyrood Drive will effectively become an island between 2 busy roads .The air quality between the 2 roads will surely suffer due to the sheer volume of traffic. Surely if you want to relieve traffic on the A1237 ring road then maybe creating a dual carriage might be the answer. Cannot find any supporting evidence in the plan for this proposal to link the two roads and would point out that Hurricane Way was intended to be a service road for delivery vehicles servicing the retail park. Apparently it has been suggested that this proposed link road would only be used by cycles and buses but cyclists can already use the excising cycle lane and there is no bus route down Manor Lane so why create one? This whole proposal is poorly thought out and residents have not been properly consulted or given valid reasons why there is a need for a link road between Manor lane and Hurricane Way.</p>	5236/12556	
	<p>Support – the long term proposals for the provision of a new railway station for rail services in Strensall which would further improve access between the settlement and the wider area including the city centre. It is considered that the future residents of the proposed local plan residential allocations in Strensall would help support and provide an opportunity to fund this proposed service.</p>	5245/14342	Hogg Builders (York) Ltd
	<p>Comment – if a station could be provided in Haxby perhaps this would take some of the load off the roads.</p>	5260/14354	
	<p>Comment – there is a serious campaign underway to eventually re-instate the direct railway between York and Hull alleviating the terrible congestion on the A1079. East Riding Council is currently developing its local plan and is looking carefully at protecting the likely route of the reopened line. York’s plan should protect the route too.</p>	5265/14366	
	<p>Comment – a railway station in Haxby would help traffic problems leaving and entering Haxby but would create a lot more traffic through the village and require a car park at the station site.</p>	5272/14371	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – pleased to note the addition of commuter rail stations on the Harrogate and Scarborough lines. However these services will still terminate at the main station which does not have adequate foot passenger egress and access along Station Road without having road crossings when the volume is high. To relieve this suggests a subway or bridge and also another station at Bootham Park Hospital where adequate land is already available. Would greatly assist the Hospital for staff and patients.	5292/14431	
	Support – welcome the proposals to develop new railway stations around York at Strensall and Haxby. Comment – suggest that a station is also opened at Copmanthorpe to improve access to that substantial village.	5297/14442	
	Comment – the possibility of a rail link in Haxby with minimum parking will do nothing to alleviate the congestion in the area.	5302/14456	
	Objection – why is there no plan for a bus station in York linking routes? Some routes have already been shortened or cut in number of services from outlying villages.	5313/14477	
	Support – linking Strensall and York by railway shuttle is one of the best ideas. There is land available to move this forward.	5336/14517	
	Comment – the Park & Ride system is a joke for Skelton residents, we may as well drive all the way. You cannot use tickets on all public transport as in other cities so confusion reigns and residents use their cars there are little benefits to York residents from the city as it stands.	5356/14549	
	Objection– the plan clings onto outdated proposed location for Haxby train halt.	5357/14550	
	Objection – object in the strongest terms to the proposed link road between Manor Lane/Hurricane Way. This would have an adverse effect to the local community in terms of noise, traffic and road safety. Would lead to rat runs for traffic between Clifton Moor and Rawcliffe. The proposal must not proceed; there are plenty of local buses without the need for an additional bus route. The Park & Ride is close by as are buses from Tesco/Clifton Moor.	5369/14577	
	Comment – consider that the plan should concentrate on improving the public transport around the city.	5370/14579	
	Comment – the lack of a rail link in Haxby creates the need for everyone to use motor transport to get to York. More cognisance should be made of alternative transport methods including self propelled electric and rail.	5378/14596	
	Objection – the proposed site for the railway station in Haxby is likely to make traffic in the town even worse so does not provide a solution.	5384/14612	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support – the addition of rail stations at Haxby and Strensall is an excellent move.	5385/14614	
	Comment – consider it sensible to add another railway station/halt in conjunction with the new Park & Ride at Askham Bar. Having a Park & Ride where the ride was on a shuttle train rather than on the huge buses would allow much more capacity in each journey. By removing the buses it would also free up capacity on the already congested Tadcaster Road and Blossom Street, perhaps reducing the need for the bus lanes there.	5394/14642	
	Objection – the plan seems obsessed with trying to get everybody to either walk or cycle and do not give enough consideration to car users. Comment – there should be public transport incorporated into the plan to ensure there is a bus service to all of York’s business parks.	5397/14649	
	Comment – would like to see suitable off road cycle ways from congested population centres into the city with due care and planning to create a safe environment for families to cycle without the fear of parts of the route spilling onto the busy road. Cultivating a true cycle friendly city must be a priority.	5399/14654	
	Support – strongly support the plan for 4 new stations.	5410/14692	
	Support – encouraging to see the proposals include the opening of the railway station in Haxby. Support this which will benefit young children growing up in terms of job links to other major cities other than York.	5411/14686	
	Support – the short term goals of policy T2 are good. Agree with developing extra rail stations on the Scarborough line. The plans proposed expansion of Park & Ride sites and mooted tram line are welcome (See representation for detailed comments on suggestions as to how residents and visitors could be encouraged to reduce car usage). Objection – consider that the Harrogate line is slow enough without adding an additional stop at York Central.	5419/14713	
	Support – replacing the platforms at Haxby and Strensall is a no brainer. Comment – unfortunately after 30 years the new railway stations project has continually failed to reach fruition, largely it seems on financial grounds and it seems unlikely that the situation will not change in the future. Is not European Funding available? Why has York got 24 hour bus lanes when we have no 24 hour buses? Other large cities in Yorkshire, Hull for example operate rush hour bus lanes 7am to 9am inbound and 4pm to 6pm outbound. This helps traffic flows and reduces both congestion and pollution. Why are taxis considered as public transport, how are taxi’s more efficient than the private car or contributing to public transport?	5520/14934	Campaign For Real Democracy

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Objection – how will putting two new stations at Haxby and Strensall help ease congestion, who will use the stations? Not the people of Huntington that is for sure. Why do you think Haxby station was closed in the first place? Lack of use presumably.	5528/14946	
	Objection – the proposed location of the new station in Haxby will lead to a substantial increase in traffic flow through the village and past Ralph Butterfield School as people drive from the A1237 into Haxby to use the station. The Station should be located close to the Haxby junction of the A1237 to minimise the number of vehicles entering Haxby and the subsequent congestion, pollution and endangerment. There is enough room to build a station and provide a large car parking area to the south of Haxby that would be more accessible and suitable to the current transport need of the wider community. The original station was built in the correct position in 1845 but this does not mean it is the correct position 2013.	5548/14980	
	Objection – no improvements to local bus services and routes, only changes relating to Park & Ride.	5568/13047	
	Support – the provision of a station with adequate parking facilities in the Towthorpe area to serve both Haxby and Strensall would help the current and future traffic situations.	5587/13098	
	Support – strongly support the bias in favour of an improved public transport network with an emphasis on alternatives to the car.	5599/13140	
	Comment – Haxby Station was refused funding recently. It is a hasty and ill-thought-through plan which ought to be more carefully planned. E.g. a Parkway style station near to the bypass with a Park and Ride could be a more practical alternative.	5605/13207	
	Comment – there has always been a plan to build a rail station in Haxby, this should be promoted as part of the plan.	5658/13310	
	Objection – how many Park & Ride sites do we need? Some are so close together, cannot understand the reasoning behind their construction.	5672/13356	
	Comment –there are few/no bus services between villages so cars are essential.	5674/13365	
Comment – supportive of any moves to develop a new railway station at Strensall at or around the same time as at Haxby, for an Oyster Card system for the setting and paying of fares to be introduced across York’s public transport networks and for the maximum level of timetable dove tailing to take place. Would be generally supportive of proposals to provide good-quality facilities for the movement of people and goods by river.	5706/13444		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Objection – adding the carrot of a station in Haxby will not improve the increased congestion and pollution but make matters worse. Understand that only 59-81 parking spaces have been proposed at the station .Roads in the vicinity will face environmental, parking and access issues from the incoming traffic attracted by the station in an already restricted area. Haxby will become a Park & Ride for outsiders to travel by train to Leeds and London. The cost of travel will not compare to the cheaper and excellent number 1 bus service to and from York.	5715/13468	
	Comment – there is no budget for a cycle path linking Strensall and York so unsure where the funds will come from to build a train station in Strensall.	5751/13573	
	Support – welcome the proposals to develop stations at Haxby and Strensall. Comment – it would be nice to see Copmanthorpe on the rail network once more.	5754/13600	
	Support – welcome the Park & Ride at Askham Bar and its proposed extension.	5772/13653	
	Objection – Policy T2 appears to simply utilise existing rail links, is there really room to add a potential tram route alongside any of these? Alongside the East Coast Main Line into York from Copmanthorpe? Any new rail provision is hugely expensive, no funding from central Government, where would funds be sourced?	5776/13666	
	Comment - the provision of new stations at Haxby and Strensall is welcome but rail travel is very expensive and unaffordable to some.	5786/13700	
	Support – for the proposal for a new station in Haxby with future potential for a halt at Strensall. A new tram-train system would be a great addition to the transport offer across the city, albeit unfortunately not one that would reach development sites at Monks Cross, Clifton Moor or Whinthorpe. Comment – would like to know why the previously proposed halt at the hospital has been dropped. Such a halt would if positioned carefully be able to serve both the hospital as well as the new developments at Nestle south and Bootham Crescent (ST7 and H7). Perhaps consideration could be given to an additional halt at the southern end of Haxby e.g. Haxby Gates, this would bring benefits to the southern area of Haxby and could potentially be used as a mini Park & Ride with close proximity to the ring road. Cannot find much evidence of increased use of the river, has its potential been investigated as additional transport artery across the city? In the past Park and Sail has been occasionally used for events at the racecourse. Could this no be rolled out on a more permanent basis at the A19 Park & Ride and a new site to the south of the city? Would make a novel entry to the city for tourists. Another option could be a shuttle service running purely through the more central section of the city – an electric/eco waterbus could run frequent service up/down the Ouse from Water Bridge	5826/13788	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to Millennium Bridge with piers at suitable locations between including the main bridges plus Rowntree Park and Marygate car park.		
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Comment – a station in Haxby may help reduce the traffic but unless public transport is cheaper you won't persuade the majority to change.	5851/15100	
	Support – new rail station at Haxby is appropriate for a local centre. Comment – new rail station at Haxby must also come with more ambitious thinking on Haxby as a small transport hub. Present demography of Haxby makes radical improvements to bus services in the area a priority.	5865/15137	St Mary's Parochial Church Council
	Support – infrastructure for Haxby should include the building of a rail station with ample parking.	5870/15149	
	Comment – badly need a reinstatement of a proper bus service along Rawcliffe Lane. The area is very badly served by bus services leading to overcrowding on the Park & Ride service. This results in slowing of that service making it less attractive to users from outside the city.	5922/15254	
	Comment – considers that there should be a local railway station for Copmanthorpe, on the Leeds to York line. There is evidence to support this proposal on the basis of populations of other towns either served by stations on this line or other lines in the York area. A station in Copmanthorpe would reduce car journeys to York Station. Trains are a safer form of transport than cars and produce less greenhouse gases and directly harmful air pollution. Would reduce traffic congestion around York Station, this was a matter discussed in the Local Plan. If it could provide price competition with the bus, then even for shorter journeys, a station may discourage the apparently rapid increases in bus fares.	6132/15566	
	Comment - York should be aiming to create a tram network that links the new Park & Ride to the north of the city to the railway station in the city centre, passing through the north of York and the through the old British Sugar site and the York Central site to provide a viable and attractive alternative to the car.	6137/15592	
	Objection – the proposed rail stop in Haxby is a waste of money The rail line is in the wrong place for all houses and £6m is a disgraceful price for two small platforms.	6141/15609	
	Comment – the extension of the use of rail is to be applauded but at the same time, the use of a car to get to the station must also be accommodated with adequate car parking provided to avoid congestion and misery for householders near the halts.	6143/15613	
	Comment – buses just add to road traffic and are ridiculously expensive in York. York needs mass transport – trams/light trains/overhead cable cars. Not buses which just add to congestion.	6168/15688	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Support – Park & Ride is an excellent idea well executed, continue to expand as much as possible.	6179/15714	
	Comment - we should further reduce car use and radically improve public transport to centres close to the boundaries of the historic core.	6213/15750	
	Support – the proposed extra Park & Ride on the ring road should help with transport issues.	6316/15965	
	Comment – the Whinthorpe development should set the standard for connection to the mainline rail service (the importance of the HS2 extension to York should be acknowledged). It is plainly impossible and unsustainable for residents to have to continue to trek into the centre of the city to catch the train. A new parkway type station should be development at the Park & Ride at Askham Bar near Tesco.	6363/17705	
	Support – like the plan for the new station at Strensall.	6376/16104	
	Support – the projected idea of railway halts on the Scarborough railway is excellent facilitating transport without cars.	6423/16146	
	Support – the prospect of a train station in Strensall is one received positively.	6492/16220	
	Support – note the new station in Haxby which is sensible development, if long heralded. Approve the Park & Ride on the corner of Wigginton Road and the northern ring road and elsewhere as shown on the map.	6493/16227	
	Comment – should consider moving the proposed site of the Clifton Moor Park & Ride to north of the A1237 (link with Rawcliffe Moor) to reduce the volume of traffic negotiating the A1237/B1363 roundabout. Should also consider constructing a foot/cycle bridge link between Clifton Moor retail park and Rawcliffe Moor to encourage reduced car usage. May need to provide a bridge on the B1363 at Bootham level crossing due to increased usage. Will HMRI and Network Rail be consulted? Other road improvements will be necessary along Water Lane and Green Lane particularly at the mini roundabout.	6497/16235	
	Comment – the bus service in Strensall must be the worst in York. Why does Strensall seem to be the only place not to be able to get a direct bus to Monks Cross?	6501/16244	
Support – both higher degree of transport infrastructure investment and soft measures. Objection – believe that the Conservative Group’s proposal of a ‘bus on rails’ to provide ‘park and ride ’ frequency of service between the railway station, possibly the hospital, Haxby and Strensall (which would not need the infrastructure proposed for the station at Haxby currently under discussion) has merit and should be considered.	6508/17688	City Of York Council Conservative Group	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T2 Strategic Public Transport Improvements Continued	Objection – should try to promote public transport and cycle use but it will never be realistic to expect this to be a total solution. The Plan shows potential rail stations at Haxby and Strensall but there are no guarantees of investment to support either road or rail infrastructure improvements. Major housing development of the scale proposed without significant infrastructure improvements will only lead to further gridlock in the City.	6514/16312	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Objection – short term Clause ii needs to be removed or cross referenced to T3. Comment – Clause iv evidence needs to be provided to show that this will not generate increased traffic along the outer ring road, and how greater use of cycling and walking to the site from surrounding is to be facilitated. Support - long term (2024-30) support the tram train, new stations and light rail options. Although viability of these could be undermined by greater investment proposed for the outer ring road highway measures. Objection - long term (2024-30) do not support the relocation and expansion of the Designer outlet Park & Ride facility. Its hours of operation should be extended into the evening. Comment - long term (2024-30) if the Whinthorpe development goes ahead there should be a high quality accessible bus shuttle service linking both Grimston Bar and Designer Outlet park and ride services to limit the traffic impact of the development.	6518/16441	York Green Party
	Comment – a new rail halt at Haxby and a greatly improved bus service to serve the entire area are essential aspects of any such sustainable transport plan.	6522/16505	Cllrs. P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
Para 23.07	Objection – TEMPRO 6.2 data suggests that annual traffic growth for the City of York area between 2008 and 2013 was around 1% per annum for the peak periods. It is unlikely that the Plan will result in an average annual traffic growth of 2.5%. This overestimated growth figure may therefore result in an overestimation of the impact on transport capacity and therefore the need for strategic infrastructure improvements.	434/16590	Associated British Foods plc
	Objection – the predicted increase in road traffic is not practical. It would cause unacceptable delays in travel and an unacceptable deterioration in air quality.	529/16681	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T3 York Railway Station And Associated Operational Facilities	Support – for the proposals to enhance the Grade II* Station and its setting.	238/14122	English Heritage
	Support - satisfied that policy gives due recognition to heritage importance of York Station and associated listed railway buildings and contribution of railway to history and environment of York.	641/3269	Railway Heritage Trust
	Support – for Policy T3. Comment – should also include a cycle facility that links National Railway Museum to St Paul’s Square are using Wilton Rise. Enhancing the historic station is important in this policy and should include reluctance to accept any proposal for ticket gate and barriers.	671/16821	
	Comment – a central bus station must become a priority to reduce car use. There must be a reliable bus service meeting the needs of the population. A central exchange point at York Railway station would be ideal.	679/16861	
	Support – for Policy T3 in general.	1466/17440	Network Rail
	Objection – amend opening statement to delete word ‘any’. Support - strongly support the statement ‘The Plan will support any proposal to improve pedestrian access to, within and through the station’, in particular, emphasise the importance of a permeable, disabled accessible route from the main concourse through to the Leeman Road / York Central site. There currently is no disabled access provision. Objection - reference should be made to the importance of cycle parking and taking opportunities to expand capacity and accessibility in any new development.	1665/12994	York Environment Forum
	Objection - the traffic around the Railway Station is not being organised at all – and what about a proper bus station?	2470/6753	
	Comment – any bus station development at the front of the rail station should also respect its character while maintaining/improving connections between bus and rail passengers.	2765/7308	
	Support –yes to all improvements to public transport, and support for cycling and walking.	3242/8303	
	Support – good to see some reference made to improving pedestrian access to, within and through the station. Doing a good job at York train station is important and overdue.	3243/8316	
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T3.	3356/8598	
	Comment – the last traffic system at the railway station is not good for pedestrians. Used to cross from the hotel in one place when there was a gap in traffic now we have to cross three crossings.	4244/11014	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T3 York Railway Station And Associated Operational Facilities Continued	Comment – hopefully the proposed new ‘business development near the railway station’, will also incorporate a Coach and Bus Station: York must be the only place in the UK with no facilities for people using coaches. Pensioners are not the only passengers who object to standing in the Memorial Gardens with neither shelter from the elements nor facilities while they await their holiday transport.	4359/11302	
	Support – mention of a new public transport turn around and interchange facility at the station is welcomed but little information on the proposals could be found.	5568/13048	
	Comment – the proposals for railway halts will make no useful contribution to traffic problems without a bus station adjoining the main railway station and adequate free parking at the Haxby and Strensall halts.	5601/13143	
	Comment – any building at the station should be of exceptionally high quality and complement the listed station building.	5754/13593	
	Objection – Policy T3 appears to simply utilise existing rail links. Any new rail provision is hugely expensive, no funding from central Government, where would funds be sourced?	5776/13667	
	Comment – a bus station is a must. What is wrong with designating an area for this on the teardrop site rather than trying to squeeze it in somewhere that is already congested?	6169/15695	
	<p>Objection – amend opening statement to delete word ‘any’.</p> <p>Support - strongly support the statement ‘The Plan will support any proposal to improve pedestrian access to, within and through the station’, in particular, emphasise the importance of a permeable, disabled accessible route from the main concourse through to the Leeman Road / York Central site. There currently is no disabled access provision.</p> <p>Objection - reference should be made to the importance of cycle parking and taking opportunities to expand capacity and accessibility in any new development.</p>	6518/16442	York Green Party
Figure 23.2	<p>Support - for the Access Concept Plan.</p> <p>Objection - oppose any proposal for multi storey car park provision closely adjacent to the Grade II* listed railway station.</p>	1665/12996	York Environment Forum
	<p>Support - for the Access Concept Plan.</p> <p>Objection - oppose any proposal for multi storey car park provision closely adjacent to the Grade II* listed railway station.</p>	6518/17748	York Green Party
Para 23.21	Comment - whilst the detailed history of York Railway station is fascinating not sure paragraph 23.21 needs to be in such detail.	1665/12995	York Environment Forum
	Comment - whilst the detailed history of York Railway station is fascinating not sure	6518/17749	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	paragraph 23.21 needs to be in such detail.		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements	Comment – it is important to note that the significant levels of development proposed in the Plan are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar interchange. It is highly likely that an improvement to the Grimston Bar interchange will be required to accommodate the City of York and East Riding of Yorkshire’s combined development aspirations. As such, this should be referenced within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is also suggested that it should be listed in Policy T4.	10/11696	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Comment – clarification of the ‘short term improvements’ to junction of A1237/Clifton Moor Gate is required.	73/17731	Rawcliffe Parish Council
	Objection – concerned that much needed improvements to the Strategic Road Network, particularly the western and northern outer ring road are left to the latter stages of the Plan and then only as selected link upgrades.	187/13925	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Comment – must ensure that the wider strategic road and transportation network can accommodate anticipated traffic levels. Should liaise with the Highways Agency to ensure the strategic highway network including the junction of the A64 and A19 has sufficient investment within it to accommodate growth potential.	244/14139	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Comment – plan needs a vision of when the A1237 outer ring road will be dual carriageway with grade separated interchanges.	258/14152	
	Objection - there is a greater need for widening the outer ring road beyond the Plan’s suggestions.	525/16640	
	Objection - the roundabout improvements proposed for 2013-19 and 2015-24 are totally inadequate for the scale of development proposed. The extra capacity created by these schemes is soon taken up regardless of additional development. The long term “pursuit” of dualling between Haxby Road and Wetherby Road roundabouts on the Outer ring road and grade separated junctions is simply an aspiration. There is no evidence for how it is to be achieved and no funding plan set out.	527/16654	
	Objection – page 48 of York Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the outer ring road as ‘local wildlife corridor no. 12’ which connects a number of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs). Widening the outer ring road to accommodate the new housing would obliterate this wildlife corridor.	529/16682	
	Objection – too tied-up with alleged traffic congestion, should not be designing highway measures that deal with peak hour capacity.	671/16822	
	Comment – the Northern Ring Road should be moved ahead of other proposals as the density of traffic at present is unacceptable.	703/17057	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Objection – page 48 of York Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the outer ring road as 'local wildlife corridor no. 12' which connects a number of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs). Widening the outer ring road to accommodate the new housing would obliterate this wildlife corridor.	835/16908	
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Comment – Can the dualling of the A64 immediately after the Hopgrove roundabout, heading towards Malton, be given some serious consideration?	995/17029	
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Objection – the Highways Agency has serious concerns in relation to the lack of evidence to support Policy T4. Without further evidence on the case for specified improvements and traffic impact of the Plan as a whole; and particular concentrations of development (e.g. the new Settlement at Whinthorpe, urban extension at land east of Metcalf Lane) the Agency would consider this policy unsound. Comment – The Agency wants to continue to work with the Council with the objective of resolving these matters through the development of a more comprehensive evidence base relating to the impacts of the Local plan on the Strategic Road Network.	1264/17162	Highways Agency
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Objection - the plan does not include for all the ring road to be made into dual carriageway.	1297/17173	
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Support – welcome the construction of new accesses to major development sites to a suitable standard to form part of the strategic highway network. Objection – consider the wording of this policy should incorporate minor amendments to give greater comfort to those who will be delivering the aspirations of the plan. For recommended amendment see representation paragraph 13.15	1337/17299	Halifax Estates
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Objection – whilst the A1237 is highlighted for dualling in the Plan, there is no guarantee that the necessary investment will be achieved and there is no reasonable suggestion for how to achieve this investment, other than relying on the Local Enterprise Partnership. The focus should be on achieving the infrastructure improvements that York already requires and then deciding how much further development would be sustainable.	1355/17318	Mr J Sturdy MP
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Support - for the approach for the short-term and medium-term and would work to ensure that Clifton Gate and the timescale of the junction improvements are compatible.	1523/17514	Commercial Estates Group, Hallam Land Management & T W Fields Ltd
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Support – look forward to improvements to approaches to the Great North Way (York Business Park). Objection – have reservations on the proposal to dual carriageway the A1237 as the land take to facilitate this will take up even more of the Green Belt reserved land.	1589/17578	Nether Poppleton Parish Council

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Concerned about any proposal regarding a link road through the York Business Park (Great North Road) the Sugar Beet site and into York Central. Recommend that no actions should be considered until the A1237 works are completed.		
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Comment – no assessment has been made of the potential trip generation effect of A1237 grade separation and dual carriageway. No evidence has been provided to estimate the traffic impact in particular of ST14 which proposes over 4000 new houses adjacent to this highway and the more distant provision of over 1500 houses at ST8 (Monks Cross) and 1800 at ST7 (East of Metcalfe Lane) furthermore grade separation particularly at the B1363 Wigginton Rd junction of the outer ring road would conflict with the primary purpose of the Green Belt within which it is located to preserve the setting and special character of York.	1665/12997	York Environment Forum
	Comment - subject to support for the Naburn Designer Outlet Scheme, strategic highway network capacity improvements would be delivered at the A19/A64 interchange. Subject to the support of the Elvington Airfield redevelopment, capacity improvements would also result at the Grimston Bar roundabout.	1736/9837	Oakgate Group PLC
	Support – agree that some dualling work on A1237 needs to be carried out.	2547/6838	
	Comment – original design of ring road was short-sighted, it should have been dual carriageway, and it is inadequate for York’s needs.	2660/7043	
	Comment – have heard nothing about improvements to the road infrastructure around York to cope with the inevitable increase in traffic that will go alongside the additional houses.	2806/7445	
	Comment – support the proposed dualling of the ring road in its entirety.	3116/8028	
	Objection - no to any highway improvements that may actively encourage car use.	3242/8304	
	Comment – can find no mention of any improvement planned for the growing problem of queuing traffic on the A1079.	3254/8360	
	Support- generally supportive of Policy T4.	3356/8599	
	Objection – the proposed short and medium term improvements to the A1237 are superficial and are not the ‘major enhancements’ which the plan confirms are necessary to cope with the extra traffic. The increased traffic generated by the nearby housing and commercial developments will take the A1237 well beyond its current capacity and the plan indicates that there is no intention to pursue major enhancements to upgrade this road for over a decade at the earliest by which time many of the developments will have been completed.	3428/8791	
Comment – whether the plan goes ahead or not action must be taken on the A19 (north and south) and A1237 (east to west) before new develop brings fresh	3450/8838		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pressures.		
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Comment – there is no statement that infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with the proposed building, no plans for the dualling of the A1237 for example. This road is already reduced to an end to end traffic queue at peak times of the day.	3799/10242	
	Comment – A1237 is already extremely busy and a full dual of this road would be costly. Who would pay for this? Would it ever happen?	3888/10434	
	Comment – traffic on the A1237 is already horrendous how can it cope with hundreds more cars? Dualling it is just a pipe dream in the present economic climate.	3902/10443	
	Comment – the only identified improvements to infrastructure in the plan are to the ring road to the west and north of the city. There are no identified improvements to the south of York.	4222/10976	
	Comment – consideration should be given to a proper city wide traffic control system that adapts to traffic volumes. This would improve flows and help to reduce pollution from queuing traffic.	4305/11176	
	Comment – the first priority of any plan for York should be to upgrade all of the major access routes, especially A64 and by-pass.	4359/11303	
	Comment - the first priority for the plan that should be instituted is upgrading the local transport infrastructure.	4400/11402	
	Objection – the proposal to dual part of the A1237 between Copmanthorpe and A64 clockwise to either Wigginton Road or Haxby Road junctions, once again shows further disregard for the people who live in Huntington and work at the Monks Cross shopping complex which is nearing completion. There have been improvements on some of the roundabouts on the A1237 but these are not going to be adequate for the vast increase in car and commercial usage taking into account plans to facilitate a 30% increase in the city’s population.	4467/11477	
	Objection – to the A1237 being turned into a dual carriage way outside Knapton. The main bottlenecks are from the roundabout at the A59 and the A1237 towards Clifton Moor and Monks Cross. Until this area and large sections of the A59 are turned into dual carriage way can see no reason for the section of the road near Knapton.	4648/11775	
	Comment – it is also to be hoped that plans have been made to make the northern ring road a dual carriageway because if not that will be permanently grid-locked.	4681/11954	
Comment - the main roads into the city are currently overburdened now with the proposals listed - see no resolution to the current traffic problem. Will installation of future roads needs take up further greenbelt, or should we create helicopter Park & Ride?	5177/12324		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Support – agree with the preferred approach for the Plan to increase existing road capacity, provide new road capacity, increase existing capacity for more sustainable modes of transport and provide new infrastructure for sustainable modes of transport to support new development.	5178/12374	
	Objection - the partial duelling of the carriageway of the Northern relief road will merely create bottle necks at the points at which the road returns to a single carriageway.	5186/12397	
	Comment – the dualling of the A1237 is only partial, has this been based on an informed assessment of traffic flows? Experience of the road suggests that the parts where proposed dualling is not shown are likely still to create such congestion as to deny benefit to the economic in general and in the individual road user in particular.	5224/12517	
	Support- improvements to the junction of the A1237 and Haxby road are welcomed but will not help the dreadful state of traffic queuing to leave and enter Haxby at rush hour times.	5272/14372	
	Comment – assumed that a guarantee would be put in place that the entire length of the outer ring road would be dualled before any approval was given to the site to the north of the city.	5274/14379	
	Comment – it is paramount that the north side of the by pass is made a dual carriage with junction flyovers to relieve the traffic congestion situation both as it exists now and for the future.	5292/14430	
	Comment – to solve transport problems there needs to be a bypass of Kexby and Dunnington and traffic for the Leeds area from Hull and East Yorkshire needs signposting to the M62 and M1 via the Holme on Spalding Moor area as it goes massively out of its way with present signage.	5337/14520	
	Comment – concerned about the impact on Heworth if an extra A64 junction were added and the lack of any plan to improve the north ring road. This must happen if sustainable increase in housing and business is to take place.	5385/14615	
	Comment – the plan hints at the possibility of the York outer ring road becoming dual carriage way, a dual carriage way with roundabouts will just create two lanes of queues as the traffic would still have to stop. Please look at creating proper intersections with flyovers and underpasses. The traffic could continue to flow and it may not even require dual carriage way. Would personally vote for completely future proofing the road and do both dual carriageway and intersections.	5395/14644	
	Objection – widening the A1237 from the A59 to Haxby Road will cause chaos in the area. Why are you not widening the road all the way to the A64 which is what should	5397/14650	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	have happened when the road was built in the first place?		
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Support – support the improvements to the outer ring road but more needs to be done urgently.	5410/14693	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach to provide sufficient road capacity to accommodate growth in the economy and housing provision.	5427/14749	
	Comment – the ring road should be a dual carriageway.	5459/14801	
	Comment – how is the dualling of the A1237 going to be financed? What is the timescale?	5543/14969	
	Objection – no amount of dualling of small sections of the A1237 will solve the problems	5588/13103	
	Comment – without improvements to the A1237 northern ring road how does the council expect to cope with the increased traffic associated with Clifton Gate?	5589/13105	
	Comment – the bypass creates major problems in Haxby at peak times because of roundabouts that cannot cope with cross traffic easily.	5617/13206	
	Comment – the plan hints at the possibility of the York outer ring road becoming dual carriageway, a dual carriageway with roundabouts will just create two lanes of queues as the traffic would still have to stop. Please look at creating proper intersections with flyovers and underpasses. The traffic could continue to flow and it may not even require dual carriage way. Would personally vote for completely future proofing the road and do both dual carriageway and intersections.	5683/13388	
	Comment – given estimates on page 22 that journey times by 2031 will be 2.5 times the present day timing it is not time therefore for the city to take on board that the strangulation of the city by non expansion of the ring road to dual carriageway is long overdue?	5686/13398	
	Objection – oppose the idea of a new roundabout from the A64 leading onto Stockton Lane. It will lead to Stockton Lane and surrounding roads becoming much busier and more dangerous for children. It would also lead to gridlock at the Malton Road/Stockton Lane roundabout adding to pollution levels.	5701/13432	
Support – approve of the intent to dual the ring road. Comment – concern that the section east of Haxby has been omitted from dualling of the ring road, particularly in light of the scale of proposed development in the vicinity. Objection – even if the outlined upgrade for the ring road takes place as indicated would argue that the Haxby/New Earswick roundabout needs to be upgraded to include full grade separation (not indicated on the proposals map).	5826/13784		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Comment – the dualling of the northern ring road should be a priority.	6141/15608	
	Support - a dual carriageway would be important and beneficial for everybody living and working in York. Comment - due to noise and therefore health and safety reasons, would not agree having a dual carriageway built between the Wetherby Road and the A59. The noise level is already very high and it would increase even more if a dual carriageway is built along this road. Knapton’s residents would also not be able to turn right on to the Outer Ring Road from the Main Street in Knapton. I believe it would be sufficient having a longer second lane built for driving towards the A59 turning left towards Harrogate.	6222/15770	
	Objection – the grade separation of part of the northern ring road is another waste of money unless the upgrade is to be extended to both junctions of the road with the A64. Should press the Highways Agency to upgrade the remaining stretches of single carriage way north of the Hopgrove roundabout.	6363/17704	
	Objection - unhappy about the upgrading of the section of the by-pass from Clifton to Haxby junctions, but apparently not from Huntington round to Monks Cross.	6428/16153	
	Comment – dualling of the A1237 throughout must be a pre-requisite of any Rawcliffe Moor development.	6497/16236	
	Objection – no benefit in dualling the A1237 as the delays all stem from the intersections which need to be grade separated if any improvement is to be made to the flow of traffic with priority given to the A19 followed by the A59 and B1363.	6498/16241	
	Support – both higher degree of transport infrastructure investment and soft measures. Objection – note that ‘Clifton Gate’ presumes that the Northern Ring Road will be upgraded and grade separation will be constructed at the main junctions. This is highly speculative and has a high risk of not happening. A speculative developer is likely to take advantage of Clifton Gate being adopted in the plan and commence large housing development on the site without the guarantee of the ring road’s upgrade.	6508/17691	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – note that ‘Clifton Gate’ presumes that the Northern Ring Road will be upgraded and grade separation will be constructed at the main junctions. This is highly speculative and has a high risk of not happening. A speculative developer is likely to take advantage of Clifton Gate being adopted in the plan and commence large housing development on the site without the guarantee of the ring road’s upgrade. Objection – a ‘dualled’ outer ring road with grade separation at the Rawcliffe roundabout would have a severe impact on the narrow band of green space between	6510/16291	Cllr Joseph D Watt

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Skelton and Rawcliffe.		
Policy T4 Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements Continued	Comment - the money for dualling some of the A1237 will only be available if the huge expansion plans go ahead.	6516/16345	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Comment – no assessment has been made of the potential trip generation effect of A1237 grade separation and dual carriageway. No evidence has been provided to estimate the traffic impact in particular of ST14 which proposes over 4000 new houses adjacent to this highway and the more distant provision of over 1500 houses at ST8 (Monks Cross) and 1800 at ST7 (East of Metcalfe Lane) furthermore grade separation particularly at the B1363 Wigginton Rd junction of the outer ring road would conflict with the primary purpose of the Green Belt within which it is located to preserve the setting and special character of York.	6518/16443	York Green Party
	Comment – the area must have improved access to the road network, the dualling of the A1237 along its full length and not just to the Haxby roundabout.	6522/17755	Cllrs. P & I Firth & Cuthbertson
Para 23.24	Comment – there is no evidence to support the assertion that improvements to the outer ring road will transfer more cross-city journeys rather than capacity being taken up by increased numbers of journeys.	1665/12998	York Environment Forum
	Comment – there is no evidence to support the assertion that improvements to the outer ring road will transfer more cross-city journeys rather than capacity being taken up by increased numbers of journeys.	6518/17750	York Green Party
Para 23.25	Comment – there is no evidence that in the absence of other measures to reduce capacity on Foss Islands Rd the James St link will do anything other than increase overall traffic levels across the two routes, thereby increasing pollution and worsening air quality. The completion of this link is dependent on developer decisions for an adjacent site.	1665/12999	York Environment Forum
	Comment – there is no evidence that in the absence of other measures to reduce capacity on Foss Islands Rd the James St link will do anything other than increase overall traffic levels across the two routes, thereby increasing pollution and worsening air quality. The completion of this link is dependent on developer decisions for an adjacent site.	6518/17751	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements	Support - the proposal to improve the cycling route along Germany Lane and to provide a linkage to Heslington Golf Course.	62/12719	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection - there needs to be provision for cyclists and pedestrians on all routes in and out of both Haxby and Wigginton. Until there is a commitment to invest in this provision, people will not be able to avoid using their cars.	63/17730	Haxby Town Council
	Objection – the basic provision of cycle lanes in the plan does not fully recognise the complex nature of cycling culture and the Plan should not be limited to material considerations but actively raise awareness for cyclists and motorists through education and incentivise cycling through campaigns and schemes.	90/12821	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Support – a pedestrian link from Poppleton Park / Ings & British Sugar to Water End, to reinstate the riverside path alongside the York Waterworks.	91/12856	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support- welcome the commitment to investment in public transport and other sustainable means of transport.	187/13924	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Comment – reemphasise the need for new pedestrian and cycle routes within T5 to be developed practically and sensitively. The development of routes that would impede essential maintenance and flood risk management either through time or costs must be avoided especially where closure orders may be required to undertake such routine or emergency works. Any intention to introduce surfaced accesses must remain cognisant of fact it needs to be resilient enough to accommodate heavy vehicles. Objection – The Boards would tend to suggest that the aims of NPPF in terms of partnership and the protection of assets and future demands (i.e. flood risk etc.) has not been robustly addressed within the context of this policy area [This objection relating to T5 may also equally be a general objection to the Transport Section]	190/13986	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Objection – to criterion iv - Pedestrian / Cycle bridge across from Tanner’s Row to City Screen / Guildhall would spoil the view and aesthetic of the sweep of the river between Lendal and Ouse Bridges.	192/14021	
	Objection – prefer that neither route [for improvements to the cycle network routes along both sides of the Tillmire] is designated as frequent and regular disturbance to breeding waders for which the Tillmire is designated an SSSI. Suggest that with the establishment of a buffer zone between the Tillmire and site ST15 a new cycle route be established at the eastern edge of this buffer zone. This new route would then link more directly with the proposed cycle route through Wheldrake Woods. In addition it proposes the creation of a new green space between the buffer zone and any housing development which could also accommodate the relocated cycleway. If it remains in the Local Plan then strongly advise additional but appropriate planting to minimise	401/16521	York Ornithological Club

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	disturbance by screening the Tillmire from the proposed cycle route plus signage advising of the area’s sensitivity for nature conservation.		
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements Continued	<p>Comment – in respect of the short term pedestrian cycle link from the former British Site to York Central via Water End, it is accepted that the opportunity to provide for such linkage within the former British Sugar site as part of the comprehensive masterplanning and planning application exercise can be undertaken. However the delivery of a linkage, in so far as it relates to land outside of the former British Sugar site, is not fully in control of the land owner or applicant and therefore should not be made a requirement for the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Objection – to the policy relating to medium term pedestrian / cycle bridges across the York / Harrogate / Leeds rail line and the East Coast mainline from the former British Sugar site on the basis that these improvements have now confirmed funding, and whilst opportunities to link areas adjoining the strategic allocation can be considered, such linkages should not be a requirement of the planning policy for the site. This should be assessed as part of the detailed transport assessment for the site prepared in support of a future planning application.</p> <p>Comment – it is accepted that the master planning exercise can ensure that such future linkages are not prejudiced by the redevelopment of the former British Sugar site.</p>	434/16591	Associated British Foods plc
	<p>Support – warmly welcome further proposals to pedestrianise inside the city walls and recommends that pedestrianisation of virtually all inner-wall areas is pushed.</p> <p>Comment – There needs to be a focus on providing cyclists with more of an incentive; ensuring that certain cycle paths don’t flood every year, that the paths are always in good condition, that there are enough cycle racks around the edges of the core area and that all major junctions have cycle lanes on the road leading up to them from the end of the average queue length.</p>	525/16639	
	Support – further improvement to existing cycleway running along New Lane and to the far northern boundary of the site [ST11] towards the Monks Cross development.	659/15059	Persimmon Homes
	Comment – supported and should include link referred to in respect of Policy T3. There are other strategic links, some of which have been submitted previously to officers for consideration.	671/16823	
	Comment – more reserved cycle lanes with proper kerbs to prevent cars driving / parking in cycle lane.	698/16871	
	Comment - very much in favour of the proposed cycle path north from York along the B1363, however, can it not be continued to the Shipton turn-off? Also in favour of a	1008/17018	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cycle route from Elvington to York. Two other route proposals submitted for inclusion in York Cycle map.		
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements Continued	Objection – a new cycle way is shown on the Plan on Temple Garth, part of this road is unadopted and this provision would add to the dangers of those using this road.	1124/17071	
	Comment – the entrance/exit to the station from Leeman Road – riverside footpath that was opened a year or two ago is a good start on improving access to York Station. Is there any chance that, during the term of the Plan, this project will be completed, i.e. by installing the new cycle / walking bridge, with approach ramps, to replace the present ancient and narrow one alongside Scarborough Bridge?	1317/17252	
	Objection – emphasise the need to protect Royal Mail sites from development that may adversely affect mail services provided from them. Should any land within or surrounding Royal Mail’s sites be redeveloped, it would be vital that any new uses be designed and managed so that they are both cognisant and sensitive to Royal Mail’s operations. As such, object to the proposed location of the potential new bridge crossing the River Ouse between Lendal Bridge and Scarborough Bridge, as shown on the Proposals Map.	1408/17381	Royal Mail Group Ltd
	Comment – proposals should be assessed for cost benefit and funding sought in the short-medium term. Objection – clauses ii to vi should be a higher priority than currently.	1665/13000	York Environment Forum
	Comment - the proposed redevelopment of Elvington airfield would make positive contributions to the surrounding cycle and pedestrian network. It would also open public access links through the airfield site.	1736/9815	Oakgate Group PLC
	Objection – the plan shows very little thought for cycle tracks, other than regurgitated idealised limited lines on a piece of paper.	1947/219	
	Support - the off-road cycle track and improvements to access on the Ring Road for between York Road and Wigginton section. Objection – oppose the cycle track development to the rear of Hilbra Avenue as viewed as being unnecessary.	2419/6702	
	Comment – propose a safe cycle route along the River Foss from Strensall and Huntington.	2656/7036	
	Comment – there is little provision for cycle parking outside the footstreet zone.	3181/8186	
	Comment – New Lane is too narrow there is only one cycle track. When will the second cycle track be added?	3192/8216	
	Support – yes to all improvements to public transport, and support for cycling and walking.	3242/8305	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements Continued	Support – generally supportive of Policy T5.	3356/8600	
	Objection – Haxby is a conservation area with a 20mph speed restriction. It would seem inappropriate to make this a cycle route.	3619/9630	
	Objection – to cycle route from Hessay to Burlands Lane, Upper Poppleton. Low Moor Lane is private. Each time it is shown on a plan, trespass is more common, this is unacceptable. Request the removal of this proposal from the Plan once and for all.	4070/10755	
	Objection – the Proposals Map shows the route of a ‘Proposed Improvement to the Cycleway Network’ running along the north boundary of the Portakabin site. Land within the Portakabin site is not available to accommodate the cycleway. The route of the proposed cycleway would also require the removal of trees and a hedgerow on the Portakabin boundary. The Proposals Map should be amended to indicate the route of the proposed cycleway away from the boundary of the Portakabin site.	4378/11336	Portakabin Ltd
	Objection – introducing the natural environment (GIS) [Green Infrastructure Strategy] into policies will encourage more people to make alternate choices for sustainable travel. There’s no GIS introduced into policy links.	4819/14308	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection – there is a linking bridleway section that completes the only close at hand way out of Fulford / Heslington and over the A64 by bicycle heading east or south east out of York avoiding main roads (plan included in rep). The Local Plan does not show this route but it is important that this route is preserved since it now passes the proposed Whinthorpe site and safeguarded land. The route will need safeguarding and integrating into these developments. Support - fully support the other cycle routes shown in this area, which look excellent and much needed.	5222/12493	
	Comment - would like to see suitable off road cycle ways from congested population centres into the city, with due care and planning to create a safe environment for families to cycle without fear of parts of the route spilling onto the busy road. Cultivating a true cycle friendly city must be a priority.	5399/14653	
	Objection - there is no need for an additional bridge north of Lendal Bridge, for it is only a minor inconvenience to dismount and use the Scarborough Rail Bridge. Comment - the bridge level with the City Screen could work, especially if the land immediately to the north of the Park Inn on the opposite bank is used as a city centre cycle park. If it was set a few metres above the river, parking for 200-300 cycles would be in a convenient place for shopper and for those on nights out, as well as those commuting into the city along the riverside cycle path.	5419/14714	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements Continued	Support – in favour of all improved / additional cycle paths	5425/14736	
	Objection – accept that York has a cycle strategy, but painted white lines down the gutter is neither attractive nor safe. Neither is building separated cycleways, only not to maintain them. Unless a decent, well funded transport infrastructure strategy is developed, all residents of York would be urged to oppose the Local Plan.	5458/14798	
	Comment – should try to provide more off road cycle routes across the city to completely separate cyclists from other road users. Combined footbath/cycle lanes are not user friendly for pedestrians.	5578/13071	
	Comment – would welcome an improvement to the link between Manor Lane and hurricane way (Policy T2) not to the extent that it is opened up to all vehicles. Current footpath does not really allow cycles and pedestrians to pass safely and if possible the path should be upgraded to a proper cycle/pedestrian path.	5628/13246	
	Objection – the noise generated by the cycle path proposed in Haxby will see detriment to the wildlife in the area.	5663/13329	
	Objection – the proposed cycle path to the rear of the properties on Hilbra Avenue raises serious issues of security and privacy for residents living in this area.	5680/13386	
	Comment – cycle parking provision should be increased close to the centre of York and at all shopping areas throughout York such as Poppleton main shops at the green where there is no cycle parking at all at present. More defined cycle lane space needed on the new Minster concourse could be done with tasteful stone surfacing, see how Holland and Belgium do it.	5799/15006	
	Objection – bike lanes destroy existing footpaths and don't really get used en masse, they don't take cars off the roads.	6168/15687	
	Comment – often see walkers, cyclists and horse riders on Bland Lane. Why not try to maintain and emphasise this walk for residents in Knapton and west York and create, for example, a circular walk along Bland Lane, Wetherby Road, Beckfield Lane, Knapton Lane, Ten Thorne Lane, Beck Lane and Main Street? This walk could be extended to Upper Poppleton or Rufforth.	6222/15768	
	Comment – pedestrian and traffic calming schemes in Holland are marvellous. It is the only country the respondent cycles in without fear. Drivers need to be educated in being more aware of pedestrians and hazards if street barriers are removed and more pavement / road areas are 'merged'.	6316/15966	
	Support – like the plan for a new cycle path between Strensall and the Ring Road.	6376/16105	
	Objection – the emphasis in the Proposals Map is on cycle routes. Surprisingly, footpaths seemed not to be part of the thinking.	6450/17241	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T5 Strategic Cycle And Pedestrian Network Links & Improvements Continued	Objection – should make considerably more off-road cycling provision between the outlying towns and the centre.	6493/16228	
	Comment - would a park & cycle scheme not be viable?	6497/16237	
	Comment - should consider providing a safe cycle path to link Strensall with Earswick and into Huntington.	6514/16313	Cllr Paul Doughty
	Comment – proposals should be assessed for cost benefit and funding sought in the short-medium term. Objection – clauses ii to vi should be a higher priority than currently.	6518/16447	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T6 Development At Or Near Public Transport Corridors, Interchanges And Facilities	Support - the longer term aspiration to protect disused railway corridors.	10/11697	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Comment – clause i; public space and footpaths should be incorporated into developments in accordance with DEFRA Guidelines, rather than included as an afterthought with little regard to public enjoyment and accessibility.	91/12850	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support – the requirement that higher density development should not have an adverse impact upon the historic environment of the surrounding area.	238/14123	English Heritage
	Support – this policy.	671/16824	
	Support – the protection of sustainable transport corridors and their importance in their current state for recreation and wildlife.	1665/13001	York Environment Forum
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T6.	3356/8601	
	Objection – introducing the natural environment (GIS) [Green Infrastructure Strategy] into policies will encourage more people to make alternate choices for sustainable travel. There’s no GIS introduced into policy links.	4819/14309	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Comment – allocation of the current Park & ride site at Askham Bar to housing seems in opposition to Policy T6 given the potential of this site to accommodate a rail halt/station in the future.	5642/13274	
	Support – the protection of sustainable transport corridors and their importance in their current state for recreation and wildlife.	6518/16448	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T7 Demand Management	Objection – would like to see integrated infrastructure systems and transport networks required for all development plans to reduce carbon emissions and query the adequacy of the provision of sustainable transport to the proposed locations. Currently there is a lack of car-free housing developments in York. The Plan should require that a significant number of new housing developments should be designed to be inhabited by people who do not own a car.	90/12820	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection - concerned at the proposal to reduce the number of long stay commuter car parking spaces in and around the city. Further reductions in car park capacity would adversely affect city centre trade.	187/13926	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Comment – whilst acknowledge that the management and control of car parking spaces are essential components of an effective transport strategy, due consideration must be given to the commercial requirements of developments outside the city centre and the need to allow residents to have reasonable choice of transport mode. Full account should be taken of NPPF when consideration is being given to the parking needs of new developments.	434/16592	Associated British Foods plc
	Support – supportive of this policy.	671/16825	
	Comment - be more pro-active in discouraging cars. Close Marygate car park. No new workplace car parks. Close Micklegate Bar – at least during the day.	698/16869	
	Objection - alongside the flow of traffic in and around the city centre, need to consider the flow of traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The A64 undoubtedly plays a role in local trips within York however it has a significant strategic purpose which will be undermined by the level of congestion likely to arise from this plan. It is acknowledged that given the level of aspirations within the Plan, York are unlikely to achieve a no worse off with development position and moving forward this is unlikely to be the Highways Agency’s position. However the level of congestion which is acceptable on the local network is likely to be different to that which is acceptable on the SRN which has a wider function. Comment – the Agency will continue to work with the Council to determine whether it would be possible to implement traffic management measures on the local road network that would regulate overall traffic flows in line with available capacity on the SRN.	1264/17159	Highways Agency
	Objection – opening sentence should be changed to reflect the transport hierarchy: ‘To improve road safety, provide / enhance the environment for walking and cycling and to better managed the flow of essential traffic in and around York city centre the following will be pursued.’ Clause i should be linked to the increased capacity in park	1665/13002	York Environment Forum

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and ride sites i.e. all council controlled car parks converted to shorter stay as new park and ride sites open, (at least Mon – Fri). Not sure how clause ii will assist demand management. Clause iii should explain how this might assist demand management. In clause iv should delete reference to 'reduce congestion' as likely to be used to justify increasing road capacity. It is not clear how this is intended to assist demand management.</p> <p>Comment – there should be a specific presumption against any parking provision other than disabled within the footstreets area of the city centre.</p>		
<p>Policy T7 Demand Management Continued</p>	<p>Comment – a reduction in long stay parking might affect tourism</p>	<p>3353/8552</p>	
	<p>Support – generally supportive of Policy T7.</p>	<p>3356/8602</p>	
	<p>Objection – visitors will have a need to park in the city centre, for business meetings etc. so we need to keep a provision for longer stay parking, e.g. up to 4 hours for these visitors and the disabled. York is not London and a wide traffic ban will lead to less visitors and business revenue.</p>	<p>3970/10569</p>	
	<p>Comment – the phasing of traffic lights seems problematic in York. Consideration should be given to a proper city wide traffic control system that adapts to traffic volumes.</p>	<p>4305/11177</p>	
	<p>Comment – suggest the introduction of layered restrictions on traffic and two congestion charge zones, one restrictive inside the inner ring road where all would have to pay to use vehicles with the aim being to have a pedestrian zone during the day, and another less restrictive zone to local residents but requiring anyone living outside the ring road to pay a congestion charge 7 days a week to encourage use of trains and Park & ride. Could also encourage a reduction in cars by imposing greater Council Tax charges on properties where more than one car is registered.</p>	<p>5628/13247</p>	
	<p>Comment – encourage serious consideration of a congestion charge to further encourage visitors and commuters to use Park & Ride schemes.</p>	<p>5645/13279</p>	
	<p>Comment – removing road humps but leaving speed limit in place will reduce pollution both in air quality and noise. Remember that York residents do sometimes need to travel across York using private transport, please ensure this can be done in a reasonable manner and without the ecological impact of travelling 10 miles further each way round a congested ring road.</p>	<p>5740/13538</p>	
	<p>Comment - there should be appropriate consideration of traffic management issues in relation to other new developments, aside from major new developments, with opportunity for dialogue regarding travel plans in the case of all new development.</p>	<p>6132/15567</p>	
<p>Objection - there will be a detrimental effect of reducing long stay car parking.</p>	<p>6169/15696</p>		

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T7 Demand Management Continued	Objection – opening sentence should be changed to reflect the transport hierarchy: ‘To improve road safety, provide / enhance the environment for walking and cycling and to better managed the flow of essential traffic in and around York city centre the following will be pursued.’ Clause i should be linked to the increased capacity in park and ride sites i.e. all council controlled car parks converted to shorter stay as new park and ride sites open, (at least Mon – Fri). Not sure how clause ii will assist demand management. Clause iii should explain how this might assist demand management. In clause iv should delete reference to ‘reduce congestion’ as likely to be used to justify increasing road capacity. It is not clear how this is intended to assist demand management. Comment – there should be a specific presumption against any parking provision other than disabled within the footstreets area of the city centre.	6518/16449	York Green Party
Para 23.31	Comment – support this paragraph but it should also make reference to providing designated spaces for car club vehicles, pool cars and electric delivery vehicles involved in transshipment.	1665/13003	York Environment Forum
	Comment – support this paragraph but it should also make reference to providing designated spaces for car club vehicles, pool cars and electric delivery vehicles involved in transshipment.	6518/17752	York Green Party
Para 23.32	Comment - this section needs to be updated with the outcome of the trial on Lendal Bridge in particular evidence of the impact on traffic flows and air quality/public realm benefits.	1665/13004	York Environment Forum
	Comment - this section needs to be updated with the outcome of the trial on Lendal Bridge in particular evidence of the impact on traffic flows and air quality/public realm benefits.	6518/17753	York Green Party
Para 23.33	Comment – emerging evidence of the impact of the personalised travel work of itravel should be referenced here.	1665/13005	York Environment Forum
	Comment – emerging evidence of the impact of the personalised travel work of itravel should be referenced here.	6518/17754	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T8 Minimising And Accommodating Generated Trips	Comment – would it not be possible to include a policy to encourage travel plans for certain types of existing developments e.g. schools, large employment sites?	192/14022	
	Support – the approach that any new development should be supported by sustainable modes of transport. Objection – concerned that it would appear that a transport assessment and travel plan for any development proposal need to be agreed by the Council. It appears to be an unreasonable requirement and could mean, unless, agreed by the Council, development proposals cannot commence. Instead would wish to see a transport assessment and travel plan be used as a guide and not rigidly adhered to. Propose a slight amendment to Policy T8: <i>"Produce a transport assessment and travel plan, where a significant transport impact is likely."</i>	659/15092	Persimmon Homes
	Support – policy T8 is supported.	671/16826	
	Comment – request that Travel Plans should also accompany Transport Statements. Objection - the thresholds for what is classed as major development (and therefore what would be required to undertake a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment) differ from those set out in the DfT <i>Guidance on Transport Assessment</i> . Request clarification on how thresholds within Policy T8 have been derived and evidence to support the departure from the thresholds outlined in the DfT guidance.	1264/17160	Highways Agency
	Objection – this policy should specify not just the trips generated from the site but also anticipated additional trips along Air Quality Management corridors and the likely impact on journey times for public transport (with and without mitigation measures) paragraph iii should require evidence that they can be safely accommodated without significant detriment to congestion levels and air quality.	1665/13006	York Environment Forum
	Objection – policy T8 lacks clarity of how it will be judged if a development is 'major' or can 'reasonably be expected to have an impact on the transport network' and also which of these types of assessments will be required. This policy needs further clarity for developers/applicants so they can determine from the outset whether they will need to be preparing these transport documents.	1705/9798	Gladman Developments
	Comment – one thought is to have smaller bus system for estates whilst using longer buses on the main trunk road out of and into York.	2787/7385	
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T8.	3356/8603	
	Comment – as soon as the schools are on holiday a 35 minute trip to work on a morning becomes less than 10. It is obvious that schools need to be targeted to put on buses, and parents not to use a car each to drop their children off.	5211/12472	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T8 Minimising And Accommodating Generated Trips	Objection – against any attempt under the policies including but not limited to T8 to the introduction of any form of congestion tax for the city centre.	6508/17689	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Objection – this policy should specify not just the trips generated from the site but also anticipated additional trips along Air Quality Management corridors and the likely impact on journey times for public transport (with and without mitigation measures) paragraph iii should require evidence that they can be safely accommodated without significant detriment to congestion levels and air quality.	6518/16450	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T9 Access Restrictions To More Polluting Vehicles	Support – policy T9 is supported.	671/16827	
	Support – use of access restrictions to seek to improve air quality. Comment - there is no evidence to date to indicate that the measures in place or proposed will bring the air pollution levels down to within the health based legal limits.	1665/13007	York Environment Forum
	Support – generally supportive of policy T9.	3356/8604	
	Objection – against any attempt under the policies including but not limited to T9 to the introduction of any form of congestion tax for the city centre.	6508/17690	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Support – use of access restrictions to seek to improve air quality. Comment - there is no evidence to date to indicate that the measures in place or proposed will bring the air pollution levels down to within the health based legal limits.	6518/16451	York Green Party
Para 23.37	Support – the proposal to encourage the use of electrically operated vehicles in York, particularly buses. Comment – would like to see local forms of renewable energy developed so that electric cars are powered by renewable forms of energy rather than by electricity generated by the use of fossil fuels.	90/17732	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T10 Protection For Residential Areas	Support – policy T10 is supported.	671/16828	
	Objection – this policy should either apply to all major developments, or specify all the other strategic sites of 500 houses or more. It is not clear what measures are envisaged to achieve this laudable objective.	1665/13008	York Environment Forum
	Support – generally supportive of policy T10.	3356/8605	
	Objection – introducing the natural environment (GIS) [Green Infrastructure Strategy] into policies will encourage more people to make alternate choices for sustainable travel. There’s no GIS introduced into policy links.	4819/14310	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Tremendous York
	Comment - although this policy might be a reasonable approach paragraphs 23.39 and 23.40 only talk about the problems created by the York Northwest area. Other existing residential areas will also need protecting if this expansion is progressed.	6516/16346	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – this policy should either apply to all major developments, or specify all the other Strategic sites of 500 houses or more. It is not clear what measures are envisaged to achieve this laudable objective.	6518/16452	York Green Party
Para 23.39	Comment – based on assessments undertaken to date, the Former British Sugar site will not result in traffic having a detrimental impact on adjacent residential areas, due to the availability of appropriate strategic routes in the area. Any potential impact would be assessed and considered within the Transport Assessment, in support of any future planning application for the site, and appropriate mitigation measures provided.	434/17734	Associated British Foods plc

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T11 City Centre Accessibility	Comment – welcome the intention to review the extent and function of the footstreets across the City Centre. Extension of the footstreets to cover Fossgate is welcomed but should also be extended to encompass Goodramgate, Duncombe Place and Piccadilly as originally proposed in the Area Action Plan for the City Centre. Support – the proposals to revitalise the environment of Micklegate and its connecting streets.	238/14124	English Heritage
	Comment – some reservations about T11 with the prospects of vehicle restricted access on Fossgate which seems to have some road safety implications.	671/16832	
	Comment – extend the hours of footstreets. Look at Maastricht or Riga.	698/16870	
	Objection – view the proposal to extend the footstreets to include Fossgate with grave concern, particularly because it makes no reference to consultation or working with the businesses and residents. Much of the Merchant Adventurers Hall’s business is dependent on vehicular access during the day. If business is not able to be conducted vital income will be lost which in turn hazard the future of the building. Ensure full consultation takes place on any proposal to make Fossgate a footstreet and that provision is made for businesses which depend on vehicular access on Fossgate.	1422/17380	York Merchant Adventurers Company
	Support – support this objective and the vision in York New City Beautiful. Comment – the whole central core should be a 20 mph limit and one way systems returned to two way where possible to naturally calm vehicle movements and make city centre streets less attractive as a vehicular shortcut.	1665/13009	York Environment Forum
	Objection – against the closure of Lendal Bridge. If an alternative route across the Ouse were to be constructed would endorse the closure, but the bridges at Skeldergate / Ouse and Clifton should not have to cope with the extra traffic. Closing the bridge will not encourage many people to seek alternative ways of getting across York. It will be frustrating, especially for people on the west side of York trying to get to the hospital.	2363/6554	
	Support – fully support extending footstreets.	3243/8317	
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T11.	3356/8606	
	Comment – an easy and inexpensive provision would be the re-phasing of the traffic signals at Rougier Street, linked to and working in conjunction with the traffic signals at the Leeman Statue so as to provide a continuous run for buses from the railway station into Rougier Street.	4281/11097	
	Comment – for those living in the north of York Lendal Bridge is a key route for getting to the station. If Lendal Bridge is closed it will put huge amounts of pressure on other routes.	6042/17228	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T11 City Centre Accessibility Continued	Support – supports this objective and the vision in York New City Beautiful. Comment – the whole central core should be a 20 mph limit and one way systems returned to two way where possible to naturally calm vehicle movements and make city centre streets less attractive as a vehicular shortcut.	6518/16453	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy T12 Safeguarded Routes And Sites	Objection – do not support the use of the Designer Outlet for a potential freight consolidation centre.	244/14141	McArthur Glen Designer Outlet
	Support – policy T12 is supported. Objection – plans for the A1237 are too tied-up with alleged traffic congestion, and planners should not be designing highway measures that deal with peak hour capacity.	671/16829	
	Objection – Piccadilly/Castle Mills Bridge junction is inappropriate for coach parking and needs a right turn provision from Fishergate into Piccadilly to improve bus access and cut public transport delays.	1665/13010	York Environment Forum
	Support – generally supportive of Policy T12.	3356/8607	
	Support - support the concept of a Freight Consolidation Centre on the outskirts of York. Objection - do not feel that either Elvington (poor strategic transport connections) or Naburn (located in open countryside, beyond the limits of the ring road) are appropriate. Argue that the site at Grimston Bar is a more suitable and sustainable opportunity for both a commercial leisure scheme and the Freight Consolidation Centre than the options set out in the Local Plan. Moreover, both concepts could be accommodated on the Grimston Bar site as part of a comprehensive, mixed use, business park.	6364/17712	GMI Estates Ltd
	Objection – Piccadilly/Castle Mills Bridge junction is inappropriate for coach parking and needs a right turn provision from Fishergate into Piccadilly to improve bus access and cut public transport delays.	6518/16454	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 23.01	Support – believe overall that this approach should be adopted. Comment – care must be taken to ensure the approach is not unreasonably and unrealistically anti-car. E.g. it is inconsistent that there is no vision for an additional parkway-type station to ensure that travellers don't have to push their way in to the centre of York to catch a train. The plan should provide more detailed local criteria to guide accessibility in relation to location/layout of new development. The plan should provide local policies for new development to give priority to more sustainable forms of transport. The plan should increase existing road capacity, provide new road capacity, increase existing capacity for more sustainable modes of transport and provide new infrastructure for sustainable modes of transport to support new development. The plan should provide the long campaigned for traffic lights to be installed at the junction of Common Road with the Hull Road in Dunnington, for the reasons of road safety, improved commercial access to the industrial estate and preservation of amenity in the residential areas.	59/12677	Dunnington Parish Council
	Support – for the preferred approach.	190/17733	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Objection – the proposals for improving the A1237 are inadequate and fail to meet the needs that would be generated by the proposed housing allocations in the north of the city. See response for further details.	527/17735	
	Support – for the preferred approach.	671/17737	
	Support – the preferred approach should be appropriate.	943/16973	
	Support – for the preferred approach. Comment – preferred approach very optimistic. P & R need minibuses to take people to Station / Hospital / West Offices.	1109/17219	
	Support – on the whole the plan contains strong policy direction on sustainable transport. Objection – The policy direction on sustainable transport is not enough, both demand management and additional highway improvements will be required.	1264/17161	Highways Agency
	Support – believe overall that the preferred approaches should be adopted. Comment – care must be taken to ensure that the approach is not unreasonably and unrealistically anti-car. The Plan should provide the long campaigned for traffic lights to be installed at the junction of Common Road with the Hull Road in Dunnington. This is a busy and dangerous offset junction where there are difficulties for vehicles trying to enter or exit the Hull Road to access the industrial estate and the residential area of the village and also to help prevent the disruption caused by industrial estate traffic	1457/17432	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	exiting the village through the residential areas.		
Question 23.01 Continued	Support – for the preferred approach to sustainable transport.	1736/9816	Oakgate Group PLC
	Support – believe overall that the preferred approaches should be adopted. Comment – care must be taken to ensure that the approach is not unreasonably and unrealistically anti-car. The Plan should provide the long campaigned for traffic lights to be installed at the junction of Common Road with the Hull Road in Dunnington. This is a busy and dangerous offset junction where there are difficulties for vehicles trying to enter or exit the Hull Road to access the industrial estate and the residential area of the village and also to help prevent the disruption caused by industrial estate traffic exiting the village through the residential areas.	5178/12459	
	Support – for a more integrated transport system which promotes public transport and other sustainable forms of transport as well as providing sufficient road capacity to accommodate growth in the economy and housing provision.	5427/14748	
	Support – agree with the general philosophy contained in the preferred approach, but reserve the right to disagree with specific policy choices which may be made by the council in the future.	6508/17744	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Support – agree with the general approach. Comment – feel there has been an anti-car approach in the past and this must not be allowed to continue.	6519/16487	Cllr Jenny Brooks
Question 23.02	Objection – the Proposals for improving the A1237 are inadequate and fail to meet the needs that would be generated by the proposed housing allocations in the north of the city. See response for further details.	527/17736	
	Comment – low cost soft measure preferred.	671/17738	
	Comment – a higher degree of transport infrastructure investment in the longer term over and above that already committed or programmed is required.	943/16974	
	Comment – definitely higher degree of transport investment required in the long term.	1109/17220	
	Support – on the whole the plan contains strong policy direction on sustainable transport. Objection – the policy direction on sustainable transport is not enough, both demand management and additional highway improvements will be required. Objection – it is not clear from the analysis within the transport where specifically on the network the benefit of the currently proposed infrastructure is being achieved. It is a particular concern that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan makes no reference to the required improvements on the A64. At present adequate analysis has not been provided on the impact of development aspirations.	1264/17161	Highways Agency

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Comment – Highways Agency propose to continue to work in partnership with the council in order to establish the implications of the Local Plan on the Strategic Road Network and determine if and where physical mitigation measures might be required.		
Question 23.02 Continued	Support –for the more widespread application of ‘soft measures’ to reduce demand and long term investment in major public transport, walking and cycling measures. Objection – do not support proposals to further increase the outer ring road to dual carriageway status when this is likely to undermine the case for development of tram train and the proposed additional rail halts at Haxby and Strensall, as well as further deterring walking and cycling in the local area. It is not believed that it is deliverable or sustainable.	1665/13012	York Environment Forum
	Comment – the higher degree of transport infrastructure investment should be pursued.	2846/7577	
	Comment – in general consider that any soft measures should be avoided and that particularly where rail, bus and cycling facilities are concerned the highest degrees of infrastructure investment possible should be made. Would welcome moves to provide funding at least for high quality and detailed research into the possibility of river transport provision.	5706/13445	
	Comment – the city must be prepared to invest in its own long term future. To rely on soft measures is to condemn the city to further failure on transport issues	6137/17743	
	Support –for both higher degree of transport infrastructure investment and soft measures.	6508/17745	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Support – for the more widespread application of ‘soft measures’ to reduce demand and long term investment in major public transport, walking and cycling measures. Objection – do not support proposals to further increase the outer ring road to dual carriageway status when this is likely to undermine the case for development of tram train and the proposed additional rail halts at Haxby and Strensall, as well as further deterring walking and cycling in the local area. It is not believed that it is deliverable or sustainable.	6518/16456	York Green Party
Question 23.02 & 23.03	Comment - with careful consideration to the identification of locations of major development schemes these could make significant contributions to transport infrastructure investments.	1736/9817	Oakgate Group PLC
Question 23.03	Comment – a higher degree of investment can be delivered especially with regard to other agencies working with the Council i.e. developers and promoters and in regard to rail development, Network Rail with Government support.	943/16975	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 23: Transport Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 23.03 Continued	Comment - banks need to be encouraged to lend more to developers and Government persuaded that sustainability can only be achieved by better transport links i.e. greater investment required.	1109/17221	
	Comment – Yes a higher degree of investment is deliverable, sure that the council has worked well with other organisations in the past.	2846/7577	
	Objection – this is a speculative question which will depend on future political and economic realities which cannot adequately be answered at this time.	6508/17693	City Of York Council Conservative Group
	Comment – see no reason why the levels of funding and co-operating between public transport operators and local authorities that are evident in other UK cities such as London could not be achieved in York. Manchester and Sheffield have excellent tram services and Edinburgh’s locally-owned bus system is very successful. Perhaps these could be models for York.	5706/13446	