

A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull

TR010016

Applicant's comments on additional information or submissions received by Deadline 5



A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull Development Consent Order 20[xx]

Applicant's Comments on additional information or submissions received by Deadline 5

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010016
Application Document Reference	
Author:	A63 Castle Street Improvement Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	27 August 2019	Final

Page Left *Intentionally* Blank

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
2.5	Historic Environment		
2.5.1	Applicant, HCC, Historic England	<p>Earl de Grey public house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide an update on any further progress and discussions in respect of proposals for the partial rebuilding/relocation of this listed building. • What bearing should the recent grant of planning permission and listed building consent for a development which includes the partial reconstruction/relocation of the Earl de Grey public house (reference nos. 19/00333/FULL and 19/00334/LBC) have on the ExA's assessment of the Applicant's current proposal for this listed building? Is there any reason why that permitted scheme should not be implemented instead of the proposal within Work No 30 of the DCO if circumstances permit? • Paragraph 5.131 of the National Networks NPS advises that, 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State 	<p>Following the grant of planning permission and listed building consent on 5th June 2019, HCC awaits receipt of conditions compliance submissions in connection with the approved scheme. HCC understands that agreement in principle has been reached between the Applicant and Castle Buildings LLP (the applicant for the redevelopment scheme in question) and that financial arrangements have been identified to the broad satisfaction of both parties.</p> <p>HCC cannot see any reason why the permitted redevelopment scheme referred to in the question cannot be implemented instead of the scheme proposed under work no.30.</p> <p>At Issue Specific Hearing 5 the Applicant contended that there was no actual need for the Earl de Grey to be relocated in accordance with the HCC approved scheme, but that the delivery of the road improvement scheme only necessitates that the building be moved to the extent described under Work No. 30 of the authorised development in the dDCO. HCC notes that within the Applicant's response to its Deadline 3 submission, reference is made to 'substantial additional cost' which would be incurred were the Earl De Grey to be moved further than proposed under Work No.30, but notes that no explanation of the cause of this additional</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>cost is provided.</p> <p>HCC maintains its position that the relocation of the building through the utilisation of the HCC approved permissions is indeed necessary for the scheme to comply with NN NPS and NPPF policy, which require decisions to minimise conflict between the conservation of heritage assets and any aspect of the proposal (NN NPS para. 5.129 & NPPF para.190), take into account the economic viability of heritage assets and give great weight to their conservation (NN NPS paras. 5.130 – 131 & NPPF para. 193). Both documents set out that substantial harm to Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional, especially given that, in HCC’s view, clear and convincing justification for that harm has not been presented, nor that that harm is actually necessary, in the context of a less harmful, available alternative solution (NN NPS para. 5.131 and 5.133, & NPPF paras. 194 and 195).</p> <p>Similarly, relevant Local Plan Policy 16 states that ‘Development that would cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will only be approved where it has been convincingly demonstrated that the harm cannot be avoided and there would be public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm or loss caused.’ Again, whilst HCC accept that harm to the asset cannot be avoided, and that public benefits set to accrue from the scheme would be sufficient to outweigh harm, the greater degree of harm set to be caused by the relocation proposed under Work No.30 has not been convincingly justified, given that the alternative relocation scheme would serve to minimise that harm by comparison.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>HCC understands the Applicant's preference for avoiding the involvement of third parties, and straying beyond the envelope of the Order Limits for the delivery of mitigation measures. At Issue Specific Hearings 3 and 5, and within Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 written submissions, HCC made reference to a recent example of where the inclusion of land for mitigation purposes outwith the order limits of a DCO have been accepted and consented subject to a legal agreement with Natural England, namely the Able Marine Energy Park (AMEP) NSIP scheme (TR030001), and which, in fact is currently the subject of a non-material amendment application to include yet further land outside of the order limits for mitigation purposes. At Issue Specific Hearing 5, the Applicant pointed out a distinction between the AMEP scenario and this improvement scheme, in that the parcels of land outwith the order limits in the former were within the applicant's ownership, whereas the site for the relocation of the Earl de Grey as approved by HCC, is not.</p> <p>The applicant also contended that the DCO could not grant consent for works outwith the order limits.</p> <p>HCC draw the ExA's attention to the Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Power Station NSIP (EN010061), the DCO for which came into force in November 2015. This NSIP has subsequently been subject to an Amendment Order which came into force in September 2018, following consideration of an application for non-material amendment. The amendment in question involved the substitution of land identified within the original order, and located within the order limits for the provision of landscape and biodiversity enhancement,</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>with alternative land outside of the order limits, and within the ownership of a third party. The proposed amendment was accepted as non-material, with limited revision of associated documentation, and the land and the enhancement works thereon were secured through a Section 106 agreement signed by the applicant, the local authority, and third party landowner in question.</p> <p>With regard to this improvement scheme, given the Applicant's stated support for the HCC approved Earl de Grey relocation proposals and positive efforts to reach agreement with the applicant for that HCC approved scheme over financial arrangements for the same, and the support for such an approach expressed by a representative of the latter at both Issue Specific Hearings 3 and 5, HCC recognises no obvious and insurmountable impediment to such off-site mitigation being secured through a Section 106 agreement. Such a vehicle would not require any amendment to the order limits or significant change to the dDCO.</p> <p>Concerns expressed about the efficacy of HCC's proposed additional requirement for the rebuilding of the Earl de Grey on land outwith the order limits would also be addressed thereby. No additional permission beyond the order limits would be required, as the proposed S.106 agreement would facilitate the Applicant's utilisation of the existing HCC consents.</p> <p>Within HCC's written submission at both Deadline 3 and Deadline 4, concern was expressed about the absence of information within the submission on the impact upon or mitigation in connection with the Earl de Grey, and the absence of evident compulsion upon the undertaker</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>to implement every work listed under authorised development at schedule 1 of the dDCO, or indeed any such work to its full extent. Consequently, such an obligation under S.106 may be considered necessary to address such concerns. HCC would be pleased to work with the Applicant, landowner for the HCC approved scheme, and Historic England on the content and wording of a draft S.106 agreement, and could submit its recommendations for such a draft to the ExA .</p> <p>The HCC approved scheme has been through full public consultation, and in so doing has garnered the approval and support of Historic England, The Georgian Society, and Hull Civic Society, and attracted no outstanding objections despite widespread consultation. It has been assessed as constituting less than substantial harm to the the Earl de Grey by the applicant's expert heritage consultants, HCC's own conservation officers, and Historic England, and would serve to minimise harm to the significance of the heritage asset in question, constituting the optimal available mitigation for the scheme's currently proposed impact upon the same.</p>
<p>The Applicant's Response 2.5.1</p> <p>The Applicant has already submitted its answer to this question and does not propose to repeat its position.</p> <p>However, the Applicant would like to comment on HCC's mention of a different DCO scheme (Ferrybridge Multifuel 2 (FM2) Power Station NSIP) and the suggestion that a s.106 agreement could be used in a similar way in this scheme.</p> <p>Firstly, it is worth noting that in the Ferrybridge Scheme, the additional land that was acquired was for the provision of landscape and biodiversity enhancements. That is a completely different scenario to this scheme where the additional land under discussion</p>			

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
		(the land subject to the planning permission) would be required to be used for a fundamental part of the scheme, namely the relocation of the Earl de Grey. If the Earl de Grey is not relocated then the scheme cannot be delivered whilst maintaining two lanes of traffic. As such, it is necessary for the Applicant to have solution contained within the DCO that it is certain will be able to be implemented. As mentioned in previous answers, whilst the Applicant is supportive of the scheme that is subject to the planning permission, the Applicant has no certainty that the planning permission will be built out and that it is outside of the Applicant's control. Therefore, the position as set out in the DCO is required as a back stop in the event that the alternative location is not viable.	
		Secondly, for the same reason as mentioned above, it would not be helpful to have a s.106 agreement included in the DCO which requires the Applicant to relocate the Earl de Grey to the alternative location. A s.106 agreement will not guarantee that the planning permission will be implemented or that the developer will not go into liquidation.	
		Therefore, for these reasons, the Applicant does not agree with HCC's suggestion and maintains that the position as set out within the DCO should remain as it is.	

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
2.7	Transportation and Traffic		
2.7.1	Applicant	<p>Central Reservation Barrier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council's suggested amendment to R12, which would require details of the design of the barrier, is noted (HCC's Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215]. What progress has there 	Following the issue specific hearing sessions in June, the undertaker has provided imagery (see appendix A, image) of an example of a central barrier from another city centre location (namely Liverpool) for discussion with a view to identifying a mutually agreeable solution. The example forwarded depicts a trief kerb atop which a pedestrian guardrail can be installed. The Council favours this design solution in principle, and has identified an example of a higher specification but not bespoke guardrail design (see appendix A, image 2) which, subject to agreement, and confirmation of

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
		<p>been in seeking to address the design of the barrier and what evidence is there that a mutually satisfactory design can be achieved?</p>	<p>colour and finish, it would support along the centre line of the raised and kerbed central island, in combination with a high containment (trief) kerb, as appropriate to the location and context of the improvement scheme.</p> <p>A subsequent design meeting with Highways England held on the 27th July was positive and constructive in affording a more informed understanding of both parties imperatives and concerns, and in exploring and in some cases discounting potential barrier solutions. As reported at Deadline 4 and Issue Specific Hearing 5, further assessment and analysis information to be provided by the Applicant is still awaited.</p> <p>The Applicant has suggested that the trief kerb and guardrail combination described could be limited to the extent of the improvement scheme which abuts the Old Town Conservation Area, with a concrete barrier employed elsewhere, and at Issue Specific Hearing 5, it was suggested that HCC has been inconsistent regarding the physical extent along the improvement scheme to which its concerns over the impact of the proposed concrete barrier relate. HCC would draw the ExA's attention to the content of its submissions in the draft SoCG (Draft DCO Schedule 2 Part 1 Article 12) at Deadline 1, LIR (pages 18, 21, 59), ExQ1 (response to 1.4.1.), Post Issue Specific Hearing at Deadline 3 (para. 1.1), and Written Submission at deadline 4 (page 13).</p> <p>Whilst HCC has appropriately emphasised the sensitivity of the Conservation Area within its submissions and at earlier issue specific hearings, it has also been consistent in expressing concern over</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>the potential impact of the proposed concrete barrier on the settings of listed and locally listed heritage assets, which extend beyond the Old Town Conservation Area, indeed virtually from the western extent of the improvement scheme within the city's boundary to the eastern extent.</p> <p>Similarly, the Council has from the outset, expressed concern over the impact of the same on visual amenity within the city centre, and the built environment generally, and its effect on the enhanced connectivity and severance reduction objective of the scheme, from both visual and psychological perspectives.</p> <p>This is particularly concerning from a socio-economic perspective with regard to the Thornton Estate, to the west of Mytongate, and outside of the Old Town Conservation Area. The prospect of the improvement scheme delivering a perceived increase in visual severance through the introduction of a solid, and utilitarian central reserve, of patently inferior material and design quality to that used elsewhere along the corridor, interfacing with one of the most deprived residential areas within the city, would seem wholly inappropriate to HCC. Such a move would fail to ensure that the benefits set to accrue from the scheme would be delivered, and perceived to be delivered, in an inclusive and progressive manner, but would risk reinforcing, or being seen to reinforce, the exclusion and marginalisation of more disadvantaged communities, disconnecting the neighbourhood from existing economic activities to the south of the A63, including the future redevelopment and regeneration potential of the proposed compound site at Waverley</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>Street.</p> <p>The Applicant, at the design meeting referred to, identified a need to protect a central pier, located in the underpass, and required to support the proposed Mytongate overbridge. HCC have requested that justification for this measure be provided, along with a reasoned explanation of the minimum effective length of linear protection to either side of the pier, in order for the townscape and visual impacts of any such structure to be minimised, both within but particularly beyond the limits of the Mytongate overbridge, and awaits receipt of that information.</p> <p>In advance of such receipt, and from its own desktop review and reference to multiple locations elsewhere on the Strategic Road Network, HCC find it difficult to envisage that such a barrier would need to extend beyond a relatively short distance from the central pier referred to.</p> <p>HCC hope that the outstanding information referred to is provided by the Applicant as soon as possible, and in advance of Deadline 6, to enable due consideration and response, given that concern over the barrier has been long held, and that those concerns were first raised formally, as part of this process, at Deadline 1.</p>

ExQ2

Question to:

Question:

HCC response

The Applicant's Response 2.7.1

The Applicant notes the importance of the choice of central reserve barrier to HCC. It is worth noting that the Applicant changed the Scheme several times before the submission of DCO and indeed during the Examination period to accommodate specific issues noted by HCC. The Applicant has always adopted an attitude of working together to resolve issues if it was possible to do so.

Some examples of significant changes to the scheme due to HCC raising concern are listed below:

- The choice of compound between Staples and Arco;
- The removal of several vehicle recovery compounds (Tower Street and Williamson Street);
- Early delivery of PQB;
- Inclusion of CCTV into the PQB scheme;
- Provision of a revised step layout on the NW corner of the PQB;
- Change from uncontrolled to controlled crossings at Market Place and Queen Street;
- Provision of High Street visualisations.

These changes have clearly added value to the scheme, and sought to address the concerns raised by an important stakeholder. They have however each expended significant funds to deliver, all of which have been funded by the Applicant and also risked the delivery programme in some cases. This indicates that the Applicant has taken these queries seriously to address any concerns raised.

In terms of the Concrete Central Reserve Barrier (CCRB), The Applicant has been aware for some time that HCC do not endorse this proposal. It is worth noting that the first time an alternative option was proposed was at the Historic Environment hearing and in the form of a guidance note from California.

The Applicant has therefore spent significant time assessing the viable options to replace a CCRB, held a collaborative session to discuss options and has now completed a report assessing the options.

The report has been submitted for Deadline 6 to allow the ExA and HCC to consider. The summary of the report is that following the workshop, detailed assessment, consultation with Highways England's Safety, Engineering and Standards team the CCRB will remain as the preferred solution within the entire central reserve. The option HCC preferred (trief kerbs) has not been tested on trunk roads for HGV impact therefore cannot be used on the A63 as it remains an asset of Highways England, and therefore is classified as a trunk road.

This is not a decision taken lightly, it has been challenged through the Examination process by the Applicant in continued discussions with the designer, however the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 need to be considered when assessing changes to

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>design. If the designer appointed by The Applicant recommends a solution, the Applicant cannot amend this as they would be seen to interfere with the Principal Designer process.</p> <p>The assessment and further investigation still highlights that that the CCRB outperforms the other two options on all criteria, except aesthetics and deterring pedestrians (although this is clearly subjective). The road layout on this section of the A63 will change significantly in the future when open for traffic; the number of vehicles performing stopping and starting manoeuvres will dramatically reduce as all crossings are to be removed, therefore the speed of vehicles will therefore increase compared to the current measurements.</p> <p>Changing the barrier will introduce unnecessary risk to road users and operatives in the future. Therefore, the CCRB is still the preferred barrier option for the A63 Castle Street Improvement Scheme and will be used throughout the full extents of the scheme.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
2.7	Transportation and Traffic		
2.7.2	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p>Myton underpass design</p> <p>The Council's suggested additional requirement, which would require details of the design of the Myton Bridge underpass, is noted (HCC's Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215]). Have any design principles or details yet been agreed? If not, what evidence is there that a mutually satisfactory design can be achieved?</p>	<p>HCC wishes to reiterate that this element of the scheme remains a distinct and fundamental concern. Given the removal of at grade NMU crossings over the A63 at the eastern end of the city centre, this route is set to become critical in connecting the city centre to its waterfront and associated regeneration areas, and providing an accessible alternative for all users, both during construction and operation.</p> <p>HCC consider that an environmental upgrade of the underpass is justified and necessary for the scheme to deliver truly on its objective to enhance connectivity, and mitigate for extended travel distances for NMUs, and comply fully with the DfT's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, the Applicant's Accessibility and Cycling Strategy, paras.3.16 and 3.17 of the NN NPS, and Policy 25 of the Local Plan.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>In the continued absence of sufficient design details for the proposed base scheme, and reliance on frozen designated funds for uplift, notwithstanding constructive consultation around the issue with the both council officers and representatives from HAIG, including a beneficial walk through held on 2nd July, and discussion around broad design principles at a subsequent landscaping design meeting, HCC consider that it is essential that the additional requirement features within the DCO.</p> <p>The Council and its partners in the 'Living with Water' project have identified the underpass as a location suitable to benefit from secured public art funding associated with flood risk and water management. Adjacent to the River Hull and near to its confluence with the Humber estuary, in the shadow of the River Hull tidal surge barrier, and on one of the main pedestrian approaches to the Deep aquarium, the site is considered to have great potential, and the Council is very keen to work with the Applicant to pool ideas and resources towards maximising the quality of experience for route users.</p>
<p>The Applicant's Response 2.7.2</p> <p>The Applicant notes the importance of the High Street underpass to HCC as the proposed route around Market Place crossing closure. The Applicant has worked very closely with HCC highways officers, access officers, HAIG, designers and developers adjacent to this route during the scheme development. Workshops have been held, a walk with HAIG was held and visualisations for the route have been prepared and shared. They have been appended to The Applicants D6 submission for the ExA to consider.</p>			

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
		<p>The base scheme proposals, therefore entirely funded by the Scheme, indicate that the route between Market Place and Queen Street will be upgraded to:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve accessibility in line with guidance (dropped crossings and smoother ramp gradient); - Provide enhanced street lighting and urban lighting (up / down lighters for the bridge piers) on the route; - Improve the footways and align this with material used following the significant public realm work completed by HCC; - Provide CCTV infrastructure; - Cut back the levels of overgrown vegetation and provide a new low maintenance planting proposal for the route.
		<p>The visualisations provided by The Applicant show that this area is to be significantly improved compared to current levels. The Applicant, by agreeing to uplift the footway material and provide additional up/down lighters under the structure is going above and beyond of the minimal provision that would be expected. This has been agreed between The Applicant and HCC as it will become the only way for people to cross between the north and the south of Castle Street in this vicinity.</p>	
		<p>HCC note the following <i>'in the continued absence of sufficient design details for the proposed base scheme, and reliance on frozen designated funds for uplift, notwithstanding constructive consultation around the issue with the both council officers and representatives from HAIG, including a beneficial walk through held on 2nd July, and discussion around broad design principles at a subsequent landscaping design meeting, HCC consider that it is essential that the additional requirement features within the DCO'</i>. It should be noted that preliminary design (of which the DCO is based on) has been shared with all parties, including HCC and HAIG. Meetings have been held in a workshop format and on site and the feedback on the proposals was overwhelmingly positive. Detailed visualisation were also presented to all parties which again were well received. The comments from the group centred around the step detail on the corner Blackfriargate and High Street which will be picked up at detailed design stage.</p>	
		<p>The comment regarding The Applicant's use of Designated Funds (DF) needs further clarification. DF is used to enhance projects but it cannot be used to mitigate an issue within a project. For example, the A63 team have been very successful, and obtained over £10m to assist local projects such as Hull Minster regeneration, Holderness Drain flood alleviation, Electric Vehicle Charging Points in Hull, Spurn Lightship design assessment and South Blockhouse archaeological dig. All these examples are outside the scheme red line boundary.</p>	
		<p>The Applicant has just received an DF application for the High Street area, but this seeks to extend the area to be upgraded, not amend the current proposals for the High Street Underpass. The Applicant is supportive of this application, but HCC cannot rely on this funding being approved. The area they seek to upgrade is outside the current scheme red line boundary, is on their network and would therefore have to be funded by HCC capital monies if it is an important aspiration for them and DF was not approved.</p>	
		<p>HCC mention the 'Living with Water' project, and The Applicant would be supportive of integrating such a proposal into the scheme, however this would be for HCC to organise and coordinate.</p>	

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
2.8	Transportation and Traffic		
2.8.1	Applicant	<p>Cycle routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide details of how the proposed cycle routes will link in with the cycle network in the immediate area surrounding the NSIP site. Please ensure that all illustrative material is consistent with the project plans. • At Deadline 3 the Applicant advised that it wishes to review the shared cycleway/footpath provision along the A63 [see document REP3-007]. Has that review now taken place and, if so, when will any revised details be submitted? 	<p>Although this question is directed to the Applicant only, HCC wish to provide written comment on the matter. This issue has become of increasing concern to the Council, due to the absence of clarification and further information to address points raised by HCC in previous submissions, and inconsistencies apparent within the applicant's submission.</p> <p>In terms of the latter, HCC draws the ExA's attention to the submitted Environmental Statement at:</p> <p>Para. 2.6.50 which describes how a 'combined footway and cycleway along the length of both sides of the A63 would be provided where possible as shown on Volume 2, Figure 2.5 Sheets 2, 3 and 5 The Scheme proposals. The shared facility would generally be 3m wide, however there are some locations where space is restricted and the width would be reduced to a minimum of 2m as follows:</p> <p>.....</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in front of Humber Dock Marina, Holiday Inn and Trinity Burial Ground on the south side of the A63 for approximately 400m • adjacent to Kingston Retail Park and in front of Arco on the south side of the A63 for approximately 450m; <p>Para. 2.6.52 which describes cycle and pedestrians would ‘..re-join the A63 either via Queen Street or by continuing along Blanket Row and Humber Dock Street...’;</p> <p>Table 14.10 which describes upgrades from footway to combined footway and cycle path at locations 3 and 19 along the A63;</p> <p>Para. 15.7.6 which states that ‘A combined footway and cycleway would be provided on both sides of the A63, along its length..’;</p> <p>Table 15.11 which describes upgrades along the A63 to provide a continuous combined footway cycleway in the context of access to the Holiday Inn;</p> <p>Table 15.13 which describes combined footway and cycleway in the context of locations 17 and 19;</p> <p>Para 15.9 and table 16.8 which state that ‘adverse effects would be partially offset through the provision of upgraded facilities such as the combined footway and cycleway on either side of the A63’.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			HCC consider that it is essential that the scheme delivers credible improvements to enable and encourage journeys to be made both on foot and by cycle, not least given that one of the scheme's stated objectives
<p>The Applicant's Response 2.8.1</p> <p>The Applicant notes HCC's comments on this question, however in the Applicant's response to the ExA's question, the Applicant confirmed that a review had been undertaken of the NMU provision on the A63 with the following clarification (REP5-004).</p> <p><i>"A review has been undertaken and the Applicant wishes to clarify that a combined footway and cycleway would be provided to the north of the A63 and along Blackfriargate, whilst the footway to the south of the A63 would be improved.</i></p> <p><i>These clarifications have been made to the ES (APP-023), Planning Statement (APP-070), Transport Assessment Report (APP-073), ES Volume 2 Figures 2.5.4 and 2.5.6 The Scheme Proposals and ES Volume 2 Figure 15.2 Proposed NMU facilities and closures for the scheme (APP-025) via the DCO Documents Errata version 3 to be submitted for DCO Deadline 5 on 5 August 2019 (REP5-005). In addition, NMU Route Plans (TR010016/APP/2.8 (DB) Sheet 3 of 6 and TR010016/APP/2.8 (F) Sheet 5 of 6) will be re-issued on this date (REP5-018).</i></p> <p><i>The proposed cycle routes will link into the existing cycle network as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To the north of the A63, the proposed combined footpath / cycleway will link into the existing shared footpath / cycleway to the west of the Scheme and continue all the way along the A63 eastwards until joining the ramp down to High Street to go under the A63.</i> <p><i>On the south side of the A63, pedestrians and cyclists would be routed along Blackfriargate. Pedestrian users would re-join the A63 either via the retained Queen Street signalised crossing. Cyclists would travel along the existing Blanket Row and Humber Dock Street or could travel further west by taking a route along the existing High Street, Queen Street, Wellington Street (existing cycle route) and Manor House Street.</i></p>			

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
2.8	Transportation and Traffic		
2.8.2	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p>Pedestrian crossings at Market Place and Queen Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any reason not to amend the scheme to introduce/retain signalised crossings at these slip roads as the Council suggests? • What are the safety implications of providing or not providing signalised crossings at these points and what information is that view based on? 	<p>HCC understand that the Applicant has concerns about the potential for vehicular traffic to back up on the off-slip roads, possibly affecting the main A63 carriageway.</p> <p>Should controlled crossings be retained/provided, the situation described above may have the potential to compromise highway safety in terms of shunt accidents.</p> <p>Should controlled crossings not be retained/provided in these locations, as identified the safety audit, there is a significant risk to the safety of NMUs seeking to cross Market Place or Queen Street in an east-west direction. The scheme removes the at grade crossing between Market Place and Queen Street, thereby placing greater emphasis on E-W NMU movements in order to access alternative crossing points at Princes Quay Bridge and the High Street underpass. In addition, the proposed upgrade of the carriageway footpath along the northern side of the A63, (and notwithstanding a lack of consistency within the Applicant's submission in this respect, HCC hopes and expects along the southern side of the A63 also) to shared user standard for cyclists and mobility scooter users, will also see the latter two categories of travellers</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:	HCC response
			<p>approaching the crossings at higher speeds, with the lack of control compromising connectivity, and disincentivising usage when vehicular traffic flows are heavy, and removing the certainty which a controlled crossing provides in directing cyclists and mobility scooter users to proceed or stop, thereby increasing the likelihood of collisions with oncoming vehicles.</p> <p>Loss of controlled crossings would also put at risk more vulnerable users, including those with mobility issues, and visual and hearing impairments, already subject to further travel distances as a consequence of the scheme, removing confidence over when it is safe to cross, and certainty over time available to do so.</p> <p>HCC's concerns in this regard are compounded by related concerns over speed limit demarcation discussed in response to ExQ2 2.8.3. below, and the absence of progress on this issue, despite it having been raised in the SoCG at Deadline 1.</p>
<p>The Applicant's Response 2.8.2</p> <p>The Applicant has now concluded assessments to understand the impact of reintroducing controlled crossing across Market Place and Queen Street. The conclusion is that these crossings can be included in the submitted Scheme. NMU plans and associated DCO documents will be updated to reflect this amendment. This will be subject to agreeing the new location with Historic England due to the proximity of the King Billy</p>			

ExQ2

Question to:

Question:

HCC response

statue.

The Applicant responded to question 2.8.3 at Deadline 5 with regards to the placement of the 30 / 40mph speed limit terminals with a preferred solution to address HCC's concerns. Clearly it would be beneficial to provide the terminals in advance of the crossings, however due to the road geometry this is not possible in some locations. It is also worth the ExA noting that the current layout on the northern side of the road has the same layout as will be provided in the proposed scheme, with the speed limit terminals located north of the crossing point.

