**From:** Cllr. P. Doughty <[cllr.pdoughty@york.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.pdoughty@york.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 30 September 2021 19:24  
**To:** [derek-jjones@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:derek-jjones@hotmail.co.uk) <[derek-jjones@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:derek-jjones@hotmail.co.uk)>; Sian Wiseman <[thewisemans@talktalk.net](mailto:thewisemans@talktalk.net)>; Pat Leveson <[pat.leveson@earswick.org](mailto:pat.leveson@earswick.org)>; Pat Leveson <[patleveson@outlook.com](mailto:patleveson@outlook.com)>  
**Subject:** Exec

Evening Derek, Sian and Pat

A bit of a fudge from the Council to say the least. Almost all the concerns brushed over as proposals in general were rubber stamped.

There was suggestion by Officers that the location of the crossing could be in a second location. I stress ‘could’ - we’ll see what they firm up in the planning proposals.

I share below my speech transcript which I gave at Executive and formed from some of your points and those of residents, along with my own views. It is tough fitting everything I wanted to say in the 3 mins.

You are welcome to share if you feel appropriate.

Best

Paul

**Executive 30th Sept 2021  - A1237 Ring road dualling / Earswick/Strensall roundabout**

Good afternoon Councillors

The Conservative Group have been calling for the dualling of the A1237 northern ring road for many years and it was a significant success for the city when Government funding was confirmed.

CYC has responsibility for the detail and delivery of the scheme, which will be judged by residents in the years ahead. These proposals are supposedly based on resident ‘consultation’ and have taken a year for you to look at; you would think plenty of time for the relevant due diligence to have taken place.

Imagine my shock then, when I heard from residents in properties closest to the Earswick/Strensall roundabout who shared communication to the Executive with me, stating that the first they heard of revised proposals was Monday afternoon this week, just a couple of days ahead of you (Executive) supposedly making decisions over the use of their land and property. One of the neighbours was told more of their front garden would be needed! At a point where they could no longer have an opportunity to attend Executive to give their views!!! **I implore the Council Leader to write to these residents at the earliest opportunity to apologise for this gross oversight and to open up dialogue to address their concerns.**

In my first viewing of the current proposals last week when I attended a presentation by a CYC Officer to Earswick Parish Councillors (detail which CYC insisted on taking away afterwards**), it became very clear aspects of what had been discussed over several years including repeated conversations about the critical location of the cycle and pedestrian crossing at the Earswick/Strensall roundabout as being dangerously close to the junction had been completely ignored.** Everyone I speak to – residents as well as both the Parish Councils of Earswick and Strensall believe the crossing proposal is an accident waiting to happen with the potential for traffic to be coming off the ring road at speed directly into a location where cyclists and pedestrians will be forced to cross Strensall Road to/from the underpass. The crossing needs to be further north along Strensall Road.

Earswick Parish Council have made several requests for the new dualling sections to be more fairly placed between Earswick and Huntington which would not only help protect more of Diamond Wood but the closest residents – who are on the Earswick side but were told this was not possible due to the position of a water main on the south side. However, this is the same water main that exists between Monks Cross and Little Hopgrove where the report now proposes to move the new road from the north to the south for environmental and habitat reasons. Why therefore is the same not being done in an equitable manner for Earswick residents?

I was shocked when the Officer confirmed last week that there has been no modelling at the roundabout for access to/from Strensall. A resident pointed out that he has been told by a Council Officer that traffic stopped by the crossing heading for Strensall would queue in its own feeder lane and would therefore not impede traffic flow on the dual carriageway. What wasn’t mentioned was traffic coming from the Hopgrove/Monks Cross direction would come round the roundabout and then have nowhere to go, so will be stationary on the roundabout. This will be the same case approaching from Huntington. Strensall has the population of a market town similar to Malton and Pocklington and we can’t all be expected to join an increasingly long and slow traffic queue along Strensall Road to get to York, no doubt more of a challenge when there are four lanes of traffic to cross. On the subject of access, we have long needed a safe cycle path from Strensall through Earswick. We have several hundred school pupils who attend Huntington secondary, most don’t cycle because it’s not safe - now is the time to have this included as part of an integrated strategy.

Looking at the ring road dualling overall, I have serious reservations about the number of traffic light controlled locations and the affect this will have. There will be more stop-starting of traffic. Developing CYC policies including closing access roads throughout the city pushing more traffic onto the ring road will mean potential dualling gains are severely compromised or worse - with more congestion misery for residents. Nowhere in this report is there any mention of actual savings in journey times with just a solitary mention in paragraph 50 of a “small decrease in carbon emission”. No details have been provided regarding the results from the Noise or Air Quality studies.

**While the Conservatives champion dualling, CYC only have one bite at this and you must get this right.** **You will show some gumption by instigating a short pause to reflect and amend proposals, with engagement with directly affected residents, Earswick Parish Council and Ward Councillors before the scheme comes back to you and forward to Planning.** **It would be far more beneficial to reach suitable agreements rather than potentially have to force compulsory purchases which could be long, drawn out and costly or have a situation where you have huge opposition when it comes to Planning.**