

## **York Central - Seeking Your Views to Guide Development Summary Analysis of Consultation Responses**

The following table summarises the consultation feedback for each of the 31 questions asked as part of the consultation process. Qualitative comments from online surveys, written responses and comments made at dedicated meetings are also summarised. The council's response to the consultation is set out in the third column. Further detailed analysis can be found in the ARUP Consultation Report which can be viewed online

[https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11126/york\\_central\\_seeking\\_your\\_views\\_to\\_guide\\_new\\_development\\_consultation\\_report](https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11126/york_central_seeking_your_views_to_guide_new_development_consultation_report)

<b>Question</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>CYC response</b>
<b>Redevelopment</b> Question 1. Do you support redevelopment of the York Central site?	<p>74% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There was significant support for the proposed redevelopment of the York Central site (79% supported; 13% did not support).</p> <p>i) Whilst supportive of the principle of regeneration, a number of respondents were concerned about the deliverability of the site. Particular issues were around the uncertainty of delivery timescales and process, phasing and release of land for development, site capacity/density of development, and financial viability and funding.</p> <p>ii) A number of respondents also noted the importance of developing brownfield land and need for quick delivery of the scheme</p>	<p>The council note and welcome support for the principle of redevelopment at York Central.</p> <p>i) Work to support the delivery of the site is ongoing and significant progress has been made to address the concerns raised. The YC Planning Framework will establish key delivery parameters. Further more detailed appraisal to substantiate the deliverability of the site will be publicly available as evidence base to support the Local Plan process.</p> <p>ii) The council note the comments made.</p>
<b>Vision</b> Question 2. Do you support the proposed vision for York Central?	<p>73% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There was overall support for the Vision (59% supported; 24% did not support).</p> <p>Key points raised included:</p> <p>i) A number of qualitative comments related to the need to strengthen the Vision in terms of the identity, role and relationship of York Central with the existing historic city, and</p>	<p>The Vision will be taken forward into the YC Planning Framework.</p> <p>i) The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken on the city setting which will inform preparation of the Planning Framework.</p>

	<p>opportunity for exemplar (particularly sustainable) development on the site.</p> <p>ii) The need to set out how the quality of development will be delivered was also raised.</p>	<p>ii) The Planning Framework will articulate quality expectations and these will be used to assess planning applications.</p>
<p><b>Objectives</b></p> <p>Question 3.</p> <p>Do you agree with the following proposed objectives for York Central?</p>	<p>69% of the total number of respondents answered this question</p> <p>There was significant agreement with the objectives. The objective 'Heritage as an Asset' has the strongest agreement followed by 'Green Infrastructure', 'Sustainable Development' and 'the National Railway Museum as a Cultural Epicentre'.</p>	<p>The council note and welcome support for the objectives. The objectives will be taken forward into the Planning Framework.</p>
a) Heritage as an Asset	(91% agreed; 3% disagreed)	
b) Green Infrastructure	(84% agreed; 6% disagreed)	
c) Catalyst for Economic Development	(69% agreed; 11% disagreed)	
d) A Vibrant New Community	(66% agreed; 13% disagreed)	
e) Movement and Access	(74% agreed; 13% disagreed)	
f) A Gateway	(62% agreed; 15% disagreed)	
g) Creating and Connecting Communities	(67% agreed; 11% disagreed)	
h) National Railway Museum as Cultural Epicentre	(78% agreed; 11% disagreed)	
i) Sustainable Development	(81% agreed; 7% disagreed)	
<p>Question 4.</p> <p>Are there any objectives missing or do you have any other comments?</p>	<p>A large number of qualitative comments were received. Key points raised included:</p> <p>i) Many respondents requested further clarity and specific detail to be reflected within individual objectives.</p> <p>ii) A number of respondents raised significant concerns about the potential impact of tall buildings and high density development on the historic character of the city and key</p>	<p>i) The objectives within the Planning Framework will be further expanded.</p> <p>ii) Further work will be undertaken to model the impact of height and density to understand the implications and inform preparation of the</p>

	<p>views.  <i>See also Question 25.</i></p> <p>iii) Respondents noted the need to undertake appropriate heritage assessment work and archaeological investigation. Other comments noted the need for robust and up-to-date information on ecology.</p> <p>iv) A number of respondents highlighted the importance of a comprehensive approach to green infrastructure/open space, biodiversity and sustainable networks (eg. SUD's/district heating/transport). The importance of interaction with areas outside the York Central boundary was also noted. <i>See also Questions 8 and 9.</i></p> <p>v) A large number of respondents emphasised the importance of community cohesion and connection with existing local communities inside and outside the boundary of York Central. In particular, comments were made about the provision of leisure and cultural facilities (such as the existing York Railway Institute) as a driver for community establishment and sustainability. <i>See also Question 6i)</i></p> <p>vi) Comments supported the NRM as a local and national asset and major attraction for the city. Opportunities to enhance the rail investment/engineering /education offer and to improve the route to the NRM from the city and other social attractions were noted. <i>See also questions 14, 15 and 16.</i></p> <p>vii) Respondents suggested that a new objective relating to quality of place should be included.</p>	<p>Planning Framework.</p> <p>iii) The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework.</p> <p>iv) The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the Planning Framework.</p> <p>v) The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the Planning Framework. A York Central Community Forum will be established to engage with and represent the views of the local community as the site progresses.</p> <p>vi) The council note the comments made.</p> <p>vii) The council note the comments made. Further work to inform preparation of the Planning Framework will be undertaken.</p>
<p><b>Heritage</b>  Question 5. Do you agree with the proposed classification of</p>	<p>63% of the total number of respondents answered this question There was overall support for the proposed classification of buildings (47% agreed; 18% disagreed).</p>	<p>Further heritage assessment work to inform preparation of the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to the proposed classification of buildings will be</p>

buildings?	However, just over a quarter of respondents (26%) did not know. This was reflected in qualitative comments where several respondents also noted that they were unclear about what they were being asked.	undertaken.
Question 6. Are there any buildings which should be retained?  Question 7. Are there any buildings which should be removed?	A large number of qualitative comments were received including: i) Almost a third (403) of the total number of respondents to Question 6 called for the retention of York Railway Institute and associated buildings. Respondents highlighted the value of York RI as a social hub for community sport, leisure and cultural activities (some of which are unique in York) in the heart of York.  ii) A number of other buildings were also identified which respondents felt should be either be retained or could be removed.	The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the Planning Framework.  Consultation and engagement with York RI will continue to inform both the Planning Framework and development plans for the site.
<b>Landscape &amp; Public Realm</b> Question 8. Do you support the proposal to create a linear park through York Central?	64% of the total number of respondents answered this question There is a high level of support to create a linear park at York Central (67% supported; 11% did not support).	The principle to create a linear park at York Central will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.
Question 9. Do you have any comments on the landscape principles?	A large number of qualitative comments were received including:  i) A number of comments were made that the landscape principles should be expanded to include, for example, spaces for biodiversity (including design to support wildlife) and biodiversity enhancement features; advance, temporary and permanent landscaping; maximising tree planting; communal gardens; food production; and play.  ii) Some respondents also commented that Holgate Beck should be de-culverted. <i>See also Question 4v)</i>	Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the Planning Framework.  i) The council note the comments made. The landscape principles within the Planning Framework will be expanded.  ii) The council note the comments made. Further work to understand the implications of de-culverting Holgate Beck will be undertaken.
<b>York Railway</b>	63% of the total number of	The principle to create a new

<p><b>Station</b> Question 10. Do you support the creation of a new public square on the west side (the rear) of the station?</p>	<p>respondents answered this question. There is a high level of support to create a new public square on the west side (the rear) of the station (68% supported; 14% did not support) Qualitative comments included the potential for the square to be a major public space for the city and pedestrian/cycle gateway.</p>	<p>public square on the west side (the rear) of the station will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.  The council note the comments made.</p>
<p>Question 11. Do you support the creation of a new public square on the east side (the front) of the station by re-organising buses and taxis?</p>	<p>63% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There is a high level of support to create a new public square on the east side (the front) of the station (67 % supported; 16% did not support).  The extent to which the station environment can be improved and a public space created is potentially influenced by whether Queen street Bridge is retained or removed. Whilst the principle of creating a new public square on the east side of the station was strongly supported, there was no clear majority agreement whether Queen Street Bridge should be retained or removed. <i>See also Question 12 and Question 13.</i></p>	<p>The principle to create a new public square on the east side (the front) of the station will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.  Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework will be undertaken.</p>
<p>Question 12. Do you agree with either of the following options to reorganise Queen Street?</p> <p>Option1. Keep Queen Street Bridge</p> <p>Option 2. Remove Queen Street Bridge</p>	<p>63% of the total number of respondents answered this question. Option 2, to remove Queen Street Bridge, was marginally the most popular option. However, for each option a similar number of respondents either disagreed or did not know.</p> <p>(39% agreed; 23% disagreed; 22% did not know).</p> <p>(44% agreed; 22% disagreed; 19% did not know).</p>	<p>Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to improve the station environment will be undertaken.</p>
<p>Question 13. Do you have any comments on the proposals for the station or thoughts on how the front of the station could be</p>	<p>A high number of qualitative comments were received including: i) A significant number of respondents supported reorganising the station frontage, and improving the station environment by altering current arrangements for vehicle and taxi</p>	<p>The council note the comments made. Further work to inform the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to improve the station environment will be undertaken.</p>

<p>improved?</p>	<p>movement. The issue of conflict between various modes of transport was also raised at various stakeholder events and workshops.</p> <p>ii) It was noted that the current arrangement makes it difficult for pedestrians to navigate and legibility, safety and accessibility should be improved.</p> <p>iii) Some respondents noted that the removal of Queen Street Bridge could be an important step in re-ordering the highway network in order to allow for the reorganisation of the station frontage.</p> <p>iv) A number of respondents suggested that public realm improvements should be pursued, particularly where additional space could be created for pedestrians.</p>	
<p><b>National Railway Museum</b> Question 14. Do you support the creation of a new public square and events space outside the National Railway Museum?</p>	<p>63% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There is a high level of support to create a new public square and events space outside the National Railway Museum (74% supported; 12% did not support). <i>See also Question 16</i></p>	<p>The principle to create a new public square and events space outside the National Railway Museum will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.</p>
<p>Question 15. Do you support the re-routing of Leeman Road to allow the expansion of the National Railway Museum?</p>	<p>63% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There was overall support to re-route Leeman Road to allow the expansion of the National Railway Museum (59% supported; 21% did not support). However, this is contrary to the findings of Question 20, Option 1. <i>See also Questions 16, 20 and 21</i></p>	<p>Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to highway management of Leeman Road will be undertaken.</p>
<p>Question 16. Do you have any comments regarding how the National Railway Museum is incorporated into York Central?</p>	<p>A high number of qualitative comments were received including:</p> <p>i) A large number of respondents suggested that the NRM should be the focal point of York Central and that quality public spaces with good pedestrian and cycle access were needed to incorporate the NRM into York Central.</p>	<p>The council note the comments made. Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to the proposed highway management of Leeman Road will be undertaken.</p>

	<p>ii) A number of respondents had conflicting views about whether Leeman Road should be retained or re-routed to incorporate the NRM into York Central.</p> <p><i>See also Questions 4 and 21</i></p>	
<p><b>Access and Movement</b> Question 17. Do you support the proposed approach to sustainable travel?</p>	<p>61% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There is a high level of support for the proposed approach to sustainable travel (68% supported; 10% did not support).</p>	<p>The principle of the proposed approach to sustainable travel will be taken forward into the Planning Framework</p>
<p>Question 18. Have the right pedestrian and cycle routes been identified?</p>	<p>61% of the total number of respondents answered this question. 35% agreed that the right pedestrian and cycle routes had been identified. (10% disagreed; 43% did not know).</p>	<p>The council note the comments made. The approach to pedestrian and cycle routes in the Planning Framework will be further expanded.</p>
<p>Question 19. Do you have any comments on the pedestrian and cycle routes identified?</p>	<p>A high number of qualitative comments were received including:</p> <p>i) A large number of respondents suggested that dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes should be included separate to highway infrastructure. Provision of high quality pedestrian and cycling infrastructure was noted as essential.</p> <p>ii) Other comments included the need to consider flood defences/accessibility of routes and the needs of disabled users.</p>	
<p>Question 20. Do you agree with any of the highway management options on the west (the rear) side of the station?</p>	<p>61% of the total number of respondents answered this question. Option 1 was marginally the most popular option. However, this option would constrain the delivery of NRM expansion and contradicts the findings of Question 15.</p> <p>There was no clear support for any of the Options.</p>	<p>Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework and clarify the approach to the proposed highway management of Leeman Road will be undertaken.</p>
<p>Option 1 Leeman Road open for all traffic; No bus gate</p>	<p>(38% agreed; 31% disagreed; 20% did not know).</p>	
<p>Option 2 Bus gate in place on Leeman Road Underpass; Leeman Road through the NRM</p>	<p>(35% agreed; 34% disagreed; 20% did not know).</p>	

site open for pedestrians only		
Option 3 Bus gate in place on Leeman Road Underpass; Leeman Road though the NRM site fully closed	(29% agreed; 35% disagreed; 23% did not know).	
Option 4 Leeman Road diverted around NRM, NRM expanded, diverted Leeman Road and Underpass remains open for all traffic (no bus gates)	(17% agreed; 44% disagreed; 25% did not know).	
Question 21 Do you have any comments on the highway options presented?	<p>There were a high number of qualitative comments received including:</p> <p>i) Concerns were raised regarding the impact on the Holgate area and in particular Wilton Rise/Cleveland Street/St Paul's Square resulting from the proposed new access bridge into the site from Holgate Road and from the closure of Leeman Road.</p> <p>ii) Many concerns were raised by residents living in the area around Leeman Road, Garfield Terrace/Livingstone Terrace and Salisbury Road about the negative impact on residents' ability to access the city centre caused by the volume of traffic passing through the area.</p> <p>iii) Concerns were raised about the impact closure may have on bus routes and in particular the impact on the Park and Ride service.</p> <p>iv) A large number of respondents raised concerns about the proposals leading to increased levels of traffic congestion throughout the city as well as locally to the site. Some respondents were also concerned about the impact this may have on air</p>	<p>The council note the comments made. Further work to inform the preparation of the Planning Framework will be undertaken.</p> <p>i) Detailed consultation will be undertaken with residents close to the proposed access road.</p>



	<p>quality.</p> <p>v) Concerns were raised about the adverse effect of road closure/re-routing Leeman Road on businesses along Leeman Road.</p>	
<p><b>Development parameters</b> Question 22. Do you agree with the proposed uses for York Central?</p>	<p>59% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There was overall support for the proposed land uses at York Central (56% agreed; 22% disagreed). <i>See also Question 26</i></p>	<p>The proposed land uses at York Central will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.</p>
<p>Question 23. Are there any other uses that should be considered for York Central?</p> <p>Question 24. Are there any uses which you feel should not be considered for York Central?</p>	<p>A high number of qualitative comments were received including:</p> <p>i) There were split views on comments providing residential uses, commercial/ office/employment/industrial uses, hotels and restaurants/cafes, car parks.</p> <p>ii) Specific uses that could be considered for York Central included providing low cost/social housing, educational, community and health facilities, local shops, a concert venue, bus interchange and transport associated facilities.</p> <p>iii) A number of respondents suggested that consideration should be given to leisure uses, including sports facilities. Several comments suggested the importance of leisure uses to stimulate activity outside traditional working hours.</p> <p>iv) Specific uses that should not be considered for York Central included large supermarkets, budget hotels, night clubs/evening entertainment venues, casinos, student accommodation, luxury homes/apartments, and a petrol station.</p> <p>v) A number of respondents commented about the demand and viability of proposed office space.</p>	<p>The council note the comments made. Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the Planning Framework.</p>
<p>Question 25. Do you support the</p>	<p>59% of the total number of respondents answered this question.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the</p>

proposed approach to maximum building heights?	There was overall support for the proposed approach to maximum building heights (56% agreed; 22% disagreed). However, views were divided about what is an acceptable building height. Respondents also noted the need to clarify the proportion of different building heights. <i>See also Question 4iii) and Question 27</i>	Planning Framework and clarify the approach to building heights.
Question 26. Do you agree with any of the following development options?	58% of the total number of respondents answered this question. Respondents did not support any of the four development options put forward. The differences between the options were small.	Further work will be undertaken to understand the implications of different options and inform preparation of the Planning Framework.
Option 1 120,000m <sup>2</sup> commercial development + 1,000 homes	(15% agreed; 31% disagreed; 21% did not know)	
Option 2 100,000m <sup>2</sup> commercial development + 1,500 homes	(16% agreed; 35% disagreed; 23% did not know)	
Option 3 80,000m <sup>2</sup> commercial development + 2,000 homes	(16% agreed; 38% disagreed; 22% did not know)	
Option 4 60,000m <sup>2</sup> commercial development + 2,500 homes	(16% agreed; 37% disagreed; 21% did not know)	
Question 27. Are there any other issues that you feel should be considered when setting development parameters for York Central?	A large number of qualitative comments were received. These predominantly related to topics covered by the other qualitative questions. <i>See also Questions 4, 21, 24 and 31</i>	
<b>Phasing and Temporary Uses</b> Question 28. Do you agree with the proposed temporary uses for	58% of the total number of respondents answered this question. There was overall agreement with the proposed temporary uses for York Central (44% agreed; 9% disagreed)	The proposed temporary uses will be taken forward in the Planning Framework.

York Central?		
<p>Question 29. Are there any other temporary uses that should be considered for York Central?</p> <p>Question 30. Are there any temporary uses that should not be considered for York Central?</p>	<p>i) Other suggested temporary uses included: leisure uses (eg. theatres/ skating rink); community uses; temporary housing/homeless shelter; heritage open days; education/research development; and car parking.</p> <p>ii) Suggested temporary uses that should not be considered included: late night noise generating uses/drinking establishments; music venues/music festivals; car parking; and outdoor festivals/markets/catering.</p>	<p>The council note the comments made.</p>
<p><b>Other comments</b> Question 31. Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding the proposed development at York Central?</p>	<p>There were a high number of qualitative comments made, the majority of which are reflected in qualitative comments relating to previous questions. Other specific points raised included:</p> <p>i) The need to monitor the impacts on nearby communities through the construction period (eg. air quality/noise levels).</p> <p>ii) The need for open and sustainable communications throughout consultation and development of the scheme.</p>	<p>i) &amp; ii) The council note the comments made and will make due provision as required.</p> <p>The council has committed to undertaking additional consultation with residents living in the vicinity of the proposed new access bridge off Holgate Road.</p>