

## ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

Below are responses to the questions raised from a number of different sources regarding the community stadium business case, to be considered at Executive ion 6<sup>th</sup> July.

### **A) Questions from Conservative Group**

*1) The Council 'Pump-Priming' contribution of £4,000k is based on the sale of Huntingdon Stadium at Monks Cross. If the site selected is Monk Cross where does the £4m come from? Can you confirm the valuations given to Bootham Crescent and Ryedale and tell us when were the sites were last valued?*

This allocation was made in the Council's capital programme in 2009. Funds for approved capital projects in the programme are not linked to the disposal of assets. The £4M would be funded from the Council's Capital Programme. The replacement of an athletics facility / stadium would be a planning requirement whether redeveloped as a new stadium or for other uses. This would need to be completed before development started, thus some of the council's capital could be used to pump prime the delivery of the replacement facilities.

As the stadium project has progressed, it has been suggested that if the new stadium were to be provided elsewhere in the city, Huntingdon Stadium (Ryedale) could be disposed of. No formal decision has been taken on this matter.

Huntington Stadium is used as a stadium for rugby and athletics. It is in public (CYC) ownership and if redeveloped, planning restrictions would require replacement facilities (as described above). A restrictive covenant, with complex buy-back clause restricts the use of the land for sport and recreation. Thus, commercial redevelopment is not a simple option. Commercial valuations and development appraisal work has suggested that if redeveloped in isolation the site may struggle to achieve a good market value. This strengthens the case for the use of Huntington stadium, as it is likely that (even if possible to dispose commercially) the resultant value may be below £4M.

There may be scope to see the use of the Council's £4M as a loan, if Huntingdon Stadium cannot be disposed of (based on the fact that CYC is donating the land). This would require the repayment of funds over a long-term period from any surpluses made by the stadium management company (or other body set up to run the facility). If this option is to be considered, it must be noted that sufficient commercial activity needs to be included in the wider stadium package, to ensure that a surplus (not a deficit) can be made. There may be many calls on any surpluses made, particularly from the sports clubs who see the new stadium as an opportunity to generate additional funds. The more commercial activity included, the greater the capital cost of the scheme. There is a risk that this may put more pressure on the on-going revenue position of the clubs and stadium management company.

Valuations for all sites considered have been undertaken by the council's property service and supported by external specialist. These were last updated in April 2010. In the

## ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

current market it is difficult to provide accurate indications, thus all figures have risk associated with them. Due this and other commercial sensitivities they are not provided in this report. Bootham Crescent and Huntington stadium have authorised uses for sport and recreation. If to be redeveloped for any other use this would require planning permission and should not be considered as a given. Any application for an alternative use would need to demonstrate the adequate re-provision of existing facilities.

*2) Is a Developer contribution of £4,158k to £9,486k from the Monk Cross site to close the funding Gap realistic in the current economic climate?*

The scope to close the funding gap through developer contributions is considered achievable. However, there are considerable risks associated with any commercial dependencies in the current economic climate. Success is entirely dependent on the site agreed and the type / quantum of development to be proposed. Experiences from across the UK and development appraisal work undertaken in relation to the short-listed sites identified in the report, demonstrate there is potential to achieve the necessary uplift in value to deliver a contribution of up to c. £15M. Schemes at St Helen's, Chesterfield, Grimsby, Southend, Wakefield and Warrington are examples of how enabling development has been used to deliver similar stadium projects.

It is impossible to predict what will happen to the economy of the country / region in the current climate. The delivery of this project will be reliant on market forces. Thus, there are significant risks that relate to this. However, in the absence of any other significant funding stream, it is the only realistic option. Scope does exist to close some of the gap through other means, including costs reduction, value engineering, specification reduction etc. Thus if developer contributions are less than anticipated there is scope to deliver the project, although the specification / wider benefits may be reduced.

*3. What would be the consequence for YCFC, Knights RL and Athletics if the earliest completion date of Q3, 2014 isn't achieved?*

All partners are aware of the risks related to the timescale for delivery. These are clearly set out in the report and have been discussed at the Partnership Board. Dependent on the option chosen the delivery date will differ. There are variables which may be out of the control of the council and the partner bodies in the delivery of this project. It is therefore prudent to consider the chance of the project delivery being later than Q3 2014.

Temporary ground share arrangements will need to be put in place whilst development is underway. This will have an impact on all of the clubs. Contingencies will need to be considered if there are delays, thus a contingency plan will need to be developed and agreed with the partner organisations to ensure any impact can be effectively managed.

The Football Stadia Improvement Fund (FSIF) provided York City Football Club (YCFC) with a loan of £2M. An agreement has been reached stating that if YCFC make an application for a grant (subject to compliance with funding requirements), the loan will be converted to a grant, providing it is made by May 2012. The interest payments

## ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

will be rolled-up but need to be repaid at this date. If no application is made (or it is unsuccessful) the loan and interest must be repaid. FSIF rules require full planning permission for the grant to be approved. If the project is delayed, there is a chance this milestone will not be met, which may threaten the award of the grant. Steps to manage / mitigate this issue are in place and regular discussions / updates are taking place with the FSIF.

The risks associated in slippage with the replacement athletics and other outdoor sports facilities if moved to the Hull Road Sports Village would be less. Outline Planning Permission already exists. Providing the council capital identified in the capital programme was used the is limited risk regarding the delivery, procurement and planning. The athletics club favour this approach.

### **B) Labour Shadow Executive requested more information regarding transport issues relating to the stadium**

A detailed transport assessment was undertaken by Halcrow. The summary of the findings relating to the 4 short-listed sites are as follows:

#### **Huntington Stadium**

- Within the zone of high bus accessibility: there is a number of high frequency direct bus services from the city centre prior to match start times. However frequency following matches is poor especially on weekday evenings – this would need to be addressed.
- Limited walking access (30 min journey)
- Cycle access relatively good
- It may result in the generation of a greater number of cars: A1036 Malton Road is deemed to have a capacity of over 1,000 trips at weekday evening match times however no capacity for Saturday lunch times. Thus some mitigation measures will be required.
- The Vanguard Site has an extant outline planning permission for 500,000 sq m of business uses. If this site is developed as part of the stadium development, the traffic impact of this permission must be considered.
- Advantage can be taken of the Park and Ride facilities though this will be limited on weekends
- Visiting fans can use the relatively uncontested A64 providing access to the stadium itself if necessary parking can be accommodated.
- There is scope for other ancillary business uses, particularly those with non-weekend peaks (health care / education / office etc).

#### **Mille Crux**

- Within the zone of bus accessibility site at principal match times on both weekdays and weekends
- Limited space for parking provision
- Exhibits some of the highest proportions of the demand market located within an acceptable walking and cycling distance of the stadium, thereby maximising sustainable accessibility and minimising resulting car journeys.

## ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

- The more distant location of Mille Crux away from the city centre may not capitalize on the viability of using P&R sites.
- If dedicated shuttle services to the stadium were provided across more than one P&R site it would be expected to disperse any highway impacts and reduce increases in demand at any particular site. Though the provision of more than one shuttle service increases associated costs and may prove problematic in signing.
- Significant additional commercial development would cause traffic problems that may require considerable mitigation.

### **Bootham Crescent**

- The site is well within the zone of high bus accessibility to and from the site at principal match times on both weekdays and weekends.
- As the site is within walking distance of the city centre it can capitalise on all surrounding P&R sites, dispersing stadium demand across available capacity around the city.
- It exhibits some of the highest proportions of the demand market located within an acceptable walking and cycling distance of the stadium, thereby maximising sustainable accessibility and minimising resulting car journeys.
- Limited space for parking provision: Trips to York City FC matches at the current stadium are adequately accommodated on the existing transport network but any increase in attendances aspired to through the community stadium project would necessitate exclusive use of sustainable travel choices due to limited available highway and parking capacity in the city centre.
- Limited scope for additional commercial development that requires vehicular access.

### **Heslington East University Campus**

- Could accommodate a large car park though it's location may constrain feasible capacity.
- Following both weekend and weekday matches, direct high frequency bus services are available however late evening return services into the city centre following weekday evening matches are less frequent in nature.
- Heslington East campus in particular will benefit from the proposed public transport interchange to be developed on-site as part of the university development.
- Could attain higher mode splits for walking and cycling modes than in other parts of the city from the greater presence of dedicated walking and cycling infrastructure, combined with a series of additional socio-demographic factors.
- Any significant volumes of away fans traveling by car from the west could potentially bypass the city centre via the comparatively uncongested A64; assuming parking requirements could be accommodated at their destination.
- Congestion possibilities to A64 junction, requiring significant mitigation if large scale commercial development proposed on site.

A summary table for all the long-listed sites considered is set out below.

### **C) Summary of responses received on Council website / e-mail address to Business Case Report**

## ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

As part of the press conference held on Friday 25th June 2010 a consultation process was launched which asked members of the public to feed back their opinions on the York Community Stadium Business Case Report.

To date (Monday 5th July 2010, 11am) there have been 95 email responses. The emails received have been sent by people who live locally, regionally, nationally and even abroad (Finland, Czech Republic and Australia). The main themes of the emails are similar and are as follows:

- All but one email supports a community stadium development in York
- Ask Members to back and actively support the plans for a community stadium in York
- Emphasise that the community stadium will be a valuable asset to the community, showcasing what the clubs and city have to offer.
- Should be a community and sporting venue the York can be proud of
- The development is an opportunity that should be seized to provide first class community facilities
- The need for a new stadium for professional clubs to survive
- Importance of Athletics provision
- Declining attendance/accessibility concerns if the stadium is out of the city centre
- Travel plan/reduced travel costs for football supporters if at an out of town site
- City centre spend/ economic impact/pre and post match experience will suffer if stadium is out of town.
- Traffic volume / movement and parking issues if the stadium is at Bootham Crescent
- General traffic/vehicle volume concerns
- The stadium should not be at the expense of the tax payer
- Timely delivery

### *Site Preference:*

	<b>Preferred Site</b>	<b>Not preferred site</b>
Bootham Crescent	III III I	III
Hull Rd	III	II
Mille Crux	II	I
Monks Cross	III	III

*Please note that not all of the emails have stated a site preference or non-preference, yet some have detailed both.*

### **Attachments:**

1. Summary table for long-list sites:

Site 1: Hull Road Sports Village  
 Site 2: Mille Crux / Nestle North  
 Site 4: Bootham Crescent  
 Site 5: Huntington Stadium

ANNEX 15 – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED

Table 6.1 Summary of Transport Benefits Influencing Site Selection

THEME	PARAMETER	A			B	C		D		E		F			G		H	
		1	10	16	17	3	5	12	2	4	6	7	11	14	15	8	13	9
SUSTAINABILITY	Stadium site located within zone of high public transport bus accessibility	✓	✓		✗		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓		✓
	High proportion of stadium demand located within 30 minute walking catchment	✗		✗		✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗		✓		✗
	High proportion of stadium demand located within 15 minute cycle catchment			✗		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓		✗
	High proportion of stadium demand within direct bus access	✓	✓	✓	✗				✓	✓						✓	✓	✗
	Resulting proportion of car trips to core stadium likely to be minimised				✗		✓	✓		✓	✓			✗				✗
HIGHWAYS	No major highway network capacity issues in immediate vicinity of the site	✓	✓			✗	✓	✓				✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	
	Ability to mitigate increased vehicular demand on surrounding highway network			✓		✓						✗	✓		✓	✗		
	Highway network mitigation measures likely to be 'affordable'					✓							✗		✗			
ENABLING USES	Connectivity with local community facilitates 'community' land uses (healthcare and education)	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗		✗	✓			✗
	Potential to accommodate office land uses			✓						✓		✓	✗	✗	✗	✗		✗
	Potential to accommodate large food retail store up to 7,000sqm				✗	✗			✗	✗	✗	✗	✗		✗	✗		
	Potential to accommodate small food retail store up to 2,000sqm		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✗		✗			✓	
FUTURE PROVISION	Potential to accommodate non-food retail store up to 7,000sqm		✓			✓	✓		✗			✗		✗	✗	✓	✓	
	Site likely to benefit from future tram-train provision	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓		✓				✗
	Potential for dedicated or shared use car parking provision on-site	✓	✗		✓	✓	✓		✗	✗			✓	✓	✓	✗		
	Opportunities to exploit P&R in accessing the facility								✓	✓								✓
	Stadium provision unlikely to impact on spatial strategy preferred options		✗	✗	✗	✗			✓	✓			✗		✗	✓	✓	✓
<b>Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>-3</b>

✓ Parameter TRUE at site location (+1)  
 ✗ Parameter FALSE at site location (-1)

Blank cells observe no significant benefit or disbenefit