

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
----------------------	----------------	--	----------------------------

Annex 4 – Analysis of Consultation Responses

<p>1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road</p>	<p>64</p>	<p>(likes): <u>(ref L13)</u> changing trees to give more usable space <u>(ref L18)</u> moved trees option <u>(ref R4)</u> The seating under the two ground trees on the Square is filthy and unhygienic due to the natural pigeon perches provided by this variety of tree. We are regularly called upon to provide paper napkins for pigeon victims. Locals, who are aware of the problem, just don't use the seats. We like the idea of removing these two ground trees and re-planting further outwards to increase the size of the central area. New trees need to be of a variety which discourage pigeons, in order that new seating can be positioned underneath. <u>(ref R6)</u> Kings Square Development – York Street Performers’ Perspective. Widening the square and moving trees – we think this is a great idea. It will make the square bigger and more open. The pigeons are a major problem, so changing the type of tree and any other measures such as anti-pigeon spikes on branches would be welcomed. Removal of the Mulberry tree will create more needed space. <u>(ref R11)</u> remove <u>(ref R14)</u> Although always reluctant to remove mature trees, i can see the benefit of doing so to open up the Square area, with new trees planted at the periphery <u>(ref R16)</u> The trees in Kings square do need spacing further out, three trees should be used, preferably fruit trees to highlight gods providence <u>(ref R20)</u> remove <u>(ref R36)</u> I do like the very tall tree at the top of the Shambles, but can see that the other trees could be superseded by ones which discourage pigeons, and stand further towards what is currently the street <u>(ref R38)</u> replace trees so there are still two <u>(ref R42)</u> is happy to see replacements</p> <p>(Conditional): <u>(ref R43)</u> It does seem a pity to fell the long established trees but I think it could make the area feel lighter and more spacious. My only comment would be to position any replacement trees so that the risk of BPS people walking into them is minimised</p>	
<p>1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are</p>	<p>73</p>	<p>(likes): <u>(ref L4)</u> loves the trees <u>(ref L64)</u> Newly planted tree would probably get vandalised. It is probably all a case of swings and roundabouts <u>(ref R10)</u> leave them positioned where they are <u>(ref R15)</u> Trees should be left <u>(ref R24)</u> English Heritage- recommends working around the retention of the trees and seeking the views of the donor of the Paper Mulberry tree <u>(ref L28)</u> the trees as existing enhance the appearance and atmosphere. No need to move/remove at great cost for no achievement <u>(ref R37)</u> the current trees and seating along the road side should remain to provide screening and a barrier between the road and the space</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p><u>(r39)</u> Leave them as they are</p> <p>(dislikes): <u>(ref C1)</u> removing mature trees <u>(ref L30)</u> I do not want any trees cutting down - they are precious for shade and give the square a mature look <u>(ref L34)</u> Removal of any trees <u>(ref L38)</u> The removal of the mulberry tree. This should be replanted somewhere in the square (properly protected) <u>(ref R19)</u> do not fell 75/100 year old trees in the square. How grey and not green it will be <u>(ref R40)</u> If there is remaining life in the trees, the ground level ones should not be moved at this stage</p>	
<p>1c Trees: Do not support either option (1a or 1b)</p>	<p>18</p>	<p><u>(ref L8)</u> Proposes only keeping two trees (current options are minimum of three) <u>(ref L2)</u> only have two trees <u>(ref L8)</u> would like removal of trees with no replacement <u>(ref L12)</u> consider removal of all trees <u>(ref L58)</u> no trees <u>(ref R3)</u> Regarding the trees. I would prefer the removal all current trees and replace with two smaller slow growing varieties. I would advocate these trees being placed near to #5 and street trader b. I would advocate full removal and non replacement of the tree near to the Shambles as I believe this would open this aspect up fully. For the regeneration of the square it would be advantageous to install trees which prevent pigeons resting/roosting <u>(ref R8)</u> There was also concern with regard to the removal of the mature trees <u>(ref R13)</u> If trees are to be removed... then remove the mulberry and one of the lime trees, whilst retaining 2 limes and crown lift one of these – see the attached annotated image <u>(ref R19)</u> Option 1- remove Mulberry & replace with one large tree nearer roadway. Option 2 Take out Mulberry & two mature trees near road & replant with three large trees</p>	
<p>1d Trees: No opinion</p>	<p>12</p>		
<p>2a Raised Area: remove the raised burial area and two raised trees in order to return the space to ground level</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>(likes): <u>(ref C16)</u> removal of raised area <u>(ref L7)</u> Removal of passageway next to Tullivers(raised area removal) <u>(ref R3)</u> For full year use of the square and increased capacity for the square I would prefer that the raised (burial) area is removed. The removal of this as well as the tree adjacent will create a new dynamic of how people move around the space. People wont be funneled in to the Shambles from so far away and my view is that people walking away from the Shambles will naturally be drawn into a wider space which is being created <u>(ref R3)</u> Seating in general is a must and I would suggest that back to back seating is provided near to the boundary of shops (Tullivers, To Let and Barnfarthers). This will put back some of the lost seating from the removal of the plinth <u>(ref R6)</u> We would support the idea of flattening the raised area, but only if the square was widened (trees moved)</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>(ref R9) Go for removing the raised area - keep it all level and hence more usable</p> <p>(ref R11) remove</p>	
<p>2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area</p>	<p>91</p>	<p>(likes):</p> <p>(ref C4) retained raised area option. removal of raised area would clog up route to Shambles when a performance is on</p> <p>(ref C18) built in seating (burial area)</p> <p>(ref C29) The raised area itself provides extensive seating which it would be difficult to replace with benches.</p> <p>(ref C34) The raised area is a natural stage for performance and the removal of it would be to the detriment of future street performance, it needs to be retained</p> <p>(ref C32) The raised burial area should be retained and not tampered with</p> <p>(ref C65) One of the major assets of the square is the raised area and the burials that it covers. The area gives the square its sense of history, which is an essential attraction, standing as it does at the top of the Shambles. To remove the raised area and any burials would be desecration. On the contrary its graveyard nature should be emphasised with, as a minimum, refurbishment of the existing grave stones.</p> <p>(ref L20) don't remove raised burial area</p> <p>(ref L28) Enhance the existing raised area with improved seating and rubbish bins</p> <p>(ref L35) Keep raised area</p> <p>(ref L36) must keep raised area</p> <p>(ref L36) Historic nature of the raised area and general character of the square</p> <p>(ref L52) Performers, even the Morrismen rehearsing like the 'stage' & it gives everyone a good view. Keep It.</p> <p>(ref L56) leave raised area - focal point, and preserve gravestones.</p> <p>(ref R10) retain but refurbish the raised area (in particular, retain the trees on it)</p> <p>(ref R24) English Heritage- advocates the retention of the raised area to maintain an important link with the former church and to protect gravestones</p> <p>(ref R37) The current raised area should remain. it provides screening and the existing footpath alongside of Tullivers allow foot traffic to move around the square so that people do not feel they are becoming involved or are interrupting a performance</p> <p>(ref R38) keep the raised area and use as a stage so refurbish it to this end</p> <p>(ref R40) Because the raised area connects with the former church it should remain</p> <p>(dislikes):</p> <p>(ref C1) removing the raised area</p> <p>(ref C11) removing raised area</p> <p>(ref C18) removing burial area</p> <p>(ref C29) dislike alternative 2 - the raised area in my opinion gives the square its unique character, and should be retained</p> <p>(ref C37) dislike the idea of the raised area being levelled. Apart from the reminder that a church once stood here, it makes an ideal stage for the performers</p> <p>(ref C58) dislike the removal of the burial area, which takes away the history of the square, and is disrespectful of the people buried there</p> <p>(ref C56) not sure about the raised part</p> <p>(ref C64) I am not in favour of returning the raised area to ground level. The path behind the raised area is</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>one of the distinctive features of the square and is well used as a pedestrian through route. I would be concerned that if the whole area were to be flattened some of the square's charm would be lost <u>(ref C67)</u> Removal of burial ground <u>(ref L3)</u> interference with raised burial area <u>(ref L26)</u> Burial sites should not be interfered with <u>(ref L27)</u> The removal of the raised area. It is extensively used people sit on the wall to eat. The paved area contains gravestones and should be restored</p> <p>(conditional): <u>(ref R42)</u> it forms a perfect stage for street performers raised above the level of the square. ...Neither of the trees here should be removed.</p>	
<p>2c Raised Area: Do not support either option (2a or 2b)</p>	<p>19</p>	<p><u>(ref C66)</u> The raised burial ground is there for a reason, removing it would be disrespectful and wrong just for the sake of pure greed <u>(ref L70)</u> Why not flatten the raised area but replaced it with a circular (band stand type) area, in the centre of the square <u>(ref R4)</u> We are ambivalent towards the removal of the raised area. In its favour no other square has such a feature, and it does provide a very good stage area - summer evening plays etc. perhaps? If it stays would it be feasible to widen the path that goes across the back of it by a couple of metres? Currently this area is dingy and not easy to negotiate when busy. As previously mentioned, the plinth also has the function of seating 50 or 60 people during busy periods. On the other hand, dismantling it would create more space and improve the flow of people over the Square. There's also the argument that "if it didn't exist, would you create it?". It's a difficult one to call... <u>(ref R6)</u> If the area does not get flattened, we would suggest removing the Mulberry tree and replacing with public seating. We would suggest not putting benches all the way round the back of the raised section as this will create bottlenecks and obstructions if there is not adequate spacing in between benches for people to move through or stand <u>(ref R39)</u> Definitely retain, don't refurbish the platform itself as this will remove the character and quirkiness</p>	
<p>2d Raised Area: No opinion</p>	<p>11</p>	<p><u>(ref R14)</u> I have no strong views either way regarding the future of the raised area <u>(ref R20)</u> No opinion <u>(ref R36)</u> I have no strong feelings either way on this</p>	
<p>3a (Do you support) Cafe Seating: Yes, in the location shown on the plan</p>	<p>70</p>	<p>(likes): <u>(ref L2)</u> cafe seating not next to one cafe <u>(ref L11)</u> ensure enough public seating to balance cafe seating <u>(ref L16)</u> cafe seating (likes) <u>(ref R11)</u> & likes extra bench seats <u>(ref R42)</u> I support the inclusion of limited cafe seating <u>(ref L50)</u> I support cafe seating but the location is NOT shown on the plan</p> <p>(conditional likes): <u>(ref L34)</u> please keep cafe seating to a minimum and in location shown. Choc story is an expensive visitor</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>attraction and should not be allowed to take over/dominate kings sq <u>(ref R6)</u> If the Square was extended as per Variation 1a we would accept café seating in the proposed areas. We would appreciate reassurances from the council that this would not then lead to more and more café seating that could lead to the demise of street performances making it unviable <u>(ref R16)</u> I believe limited cafe seating should be allowed <u>(ref R25)</u> English Heritage. This is a conditional yes- would like to see controls over the cafe screening (& other associated clutter) so as not to detract from the square <u>(ref R37)</u> Cafe seating, whilst providing some benefits for the general feel of the space, should be kept to a minimum <u>(ref L52)</u> If you put seats at the back of the 'stage' people would use them <u>(ref L68)</u> How is cafe seating to be operated/ maintained? - which shops to have responsibility or benefit of these arrangements?</p>	
<p>3b (Do you support) Cafe Seating: Yes, but in another location</p>	<p>2</p>	<p><u>(ref L12)</u> Would prefer just one cafe location - either would do <u>(ref C60)</u> More central. Move street performers to Parliament Street where there is more space and make King's Square a place to linger and rest. Continued use of the square as a performance space will inevitably restrict access to public seating and impede pedestrian progress through the square.</p>	
<p>3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No</p>	<p>82</p>	<p><u>(ref C1)</u> Any organised cafe (dislikes): <u>(ref C2)</u> the obstacle cafe seating creates to movement (dislikes): <u>(ref C10)</u> Please can we retain Kings Square without ANY cafe seating? There are enough areas (eg St Sampson's, Piccadilly) that have such seating that add nothing to the atmosphere and obstruct the free flow of pedestrians <u>(ref C24)</u> This is a small picturesque area good for sitting and watching street performers. Why should a commercial outlet "own" part of the square? There is ample room in parliament street and St Sampson's Square for cafe seating. <u>(ref C27)</u> There are too many seated areas in the city centre, given the regular markets and the high number of tourists. The seating makes it even harder to move around the city on foot <u>(ref C28)</u> I don't want the Chocolate Museum to have any cafe space in the square. <u>(ref C31)</u> Dislike the idea of a cafe seating area <u>(ref C34)</u> The area is too small an area to accommodate any cafe seating if it is also used to be used effectively for street performance <u>(ref C36)</u> If cafe-style seating is added, it should be free for everyone to use e.g. to eat picnic/food bought from kiosks, not limited to a specific company e.g. the chocolate museum. <u>(ref C45)</u> Cafe seating will just lead to more litter and will be taken over by smokers. <u>(ref C66)</u> If the whole point is to reclaim the area for pedestrians, cluttering it with cafe seating is the worst possible thing to do. <u>(ref C71)</u> While I've ticked c), my real concern is that cafe seating should be available to ALL cafes operating on the Square, and not just the Chocolate Experience people. I have been a customer of Harlequin cafe since it opened, and as a much-loved local business, I am concerned that nothing should be done which undermines its position (there are already too many chain cafes in York) <u>(ref C76)</u> The seating must be shared among the cafes on the square. If this cannot be done fairly - and let turnover NOT be the measure of a cafe's qualification - then it is better to have no tables at all. Litter is an</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>unacceptable problem in the square. Hygiene hazards are also undesirable. No York resident wants paper cups blowing about, or an addition to the presence of pigeons in the square, which might arise from food debris being scattered on a windy day</p> <p><u>(ref L5)</u> cafe seating (dislikes):</p> <p><u>(ref L6)</u> Every introduction of cafe seating seems to mean a reduction in public seating. Inclusivity means space for everyone not just those with money to buy coffee</p> <p><u>(ref L13)</u> The beauty of Kings Square is that it is unstructured space for casual and informal use. Cafe seating would add formality and restrict the preferred casual use. I do not want to see cafe seating at all.</p> <p><u>(ref L24)</u> Would prefer open seating available to all.</p> <p><u>(ref L28)</u> This would be an excuse for the 'chocolate experience' to extend its operations. There is already enough cafe seating around the area</p> <p><u>(ref L42)</u> Too much in city streets already</p> <p><u>(ref L44)</u> There is quite a lot of outside cafe seating in other city centre locations. If there is space not needed for public performance etc it would be much better to put in additional trees and shrubs.</p> <p><u>(ref L49)</u> Plenty of cafe outside provision - elsewhere. & very hard to identify: tiny numbers on 'higher' (?) ground</p> <p><u>(ref L53)</u> Dislike Cafe seating for benefit of scroungers and their offspring. This would limit the seating area for general public and reduces access + requires removal of trees</p> <p><u>(ref L56)</u> You are already leaving far too much clutter - cafe seating would just add to this</p> <p><u>(ref L58)</u> Enough cafe's already</p> <p><u>(ref L59)</u> The trees in their current location provide better screening from the road. The raised area adds character, historical reference and provides impromptu seating and staging</p> <p><u>(ref L62)</u> This is a public space. There are already ample opportunities available for commercial interests</p> <p><u>(ref L70)</u> If there are tables outside York Chocolate Story the other cafes may want the same</p> <p><u>(ref R6)</u> As discussed, limiting the space available on the current Kings Square would potentially kill off street performing. This was explained last summer during the Save Kings Square Campaign which was widely supported by the public and local businesses in response to proposed tables and chairs on the square. Therefore we are very much against café seating on the square in the current size.</p> <p><u>(ref R10)</u> no</p> <p><u>(ref R15)</u> strongly oppose cafe seating</p> <p><u>(ref R17)</u> strongly opposes cafe seating and thinks it undermines other local businesses with cafes</p> <p><u>(ref R20)</u> no</p> <p><u>(ref R28)</u> fears a more commercial venture would be detrimental to the feel of the square</p> <p><u>(ref R31)</u> I am opposed to the Chocolate Factory having tables outside for their own benefit.</p> <p><u>(ref R36)</u> A street café can be enlivening, but there are already lots of those around York and only one performing Square of the calibre of Kings Sq...</p> <p><u>(ref R38)</u> No</p> <p><u>(ref R39)</u> Cafe seating. No, definitely not. There isn't room</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> No- the space is too small</p>	
3d (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No opinion	12		

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
<p>4 Are there aspects of the design you particularly like</p>		<p>Paving Materials (likes): (ref C1) Improving the surface for pedestrians and performers. Improving the look of the Square (ref C3) new paving emphasising pedestrian use (ref C4) natural materials replacing tarmac (ref C6) type of paving(likes) (ref C11) stone paving & setts (ref C17) York stone and traditional materials (ref C18) paving demarcation (ref C29) Re-paving of the whole square - the surface badly needs re-paving (ref C41) The level surface and proposed materials for both the road and pedestrian areas (ref C58) Improving the road and pavement surfaces (ref C62) Refurbishment of surfaces, removal of street furniture (ref L4) natural materials (ref L7) repaving (ref L10) the different types of setts (ref L18) resurfacing (ref L25) Improved pedestrian area (ref L31) Yes the use of natural materials for the new paved area/road, avoiding uneven cobbles (a problem in my home town of Chesterfield) (ref L35) Paving the square (ref L38) The pedestrianisation, the stone paving, the setts, the expansion and levelling of the square (ref L46) The level surfacing in different 'textures' (ref L51) Small sets (2b) to match paving (ref L56) High quality materials (ref L63) The surface definitely needs improving - it is an unsightly mess at present. I walkthrough Kings square regularly, two to three times a week. It will be good to have a more even surface (ref R3) I like the use of mixed floor material to demark spaces (ref R10) Improving the paving surface</p>	
		<p>Level surface (likes): (ref C4) levelling the road & path (ref C6) level space- no kerbs to open up the space (ref C7) even surface (ref C18) flat surfaces (ref C35) Levelling off the existing road/pavement areas (ref C40) paving/level access will join up the area and make it feel bigger and be more accessible (ref C42) paving/level access will join up the area and make it feel bigger and be more accessible (ref L2) making it all one level (ref L10) creating a level space (ref L60) Level surfacing throughout</p>	
		<p>Public Seating (likes): (ref C1) more public seating</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>(ref C4) improved seating (ref C25) Inclusion of seating (ref C45) Including more benches (put in as many as possible, there will never be enough) (ref L16) extra public seating (ref L18) seating (ref L30) more seating (ref L46) More performing space and seating (ref L61) Street furniture to prevent vehicular encroachment (ref L69) Seating in the square will be improved (ref R35) I am in favour of more public sitting places. I think the spacious feeling of the Square, and space for the performers are both very important</p>	
		<p>Vehicles (likes): (ref C2) reduction in the number of cars parked along the side (ref C3) restriction of disabled parking to specific bays (ref C17) removal of unregulated parking (ref C24) Reduction of parking especially on the Square itself by delivery vehicles (it happens) (ref C32) like the ideas re the junctions (ref C45) Making it more pedestrian friendly, slowing down vehicles passing through (ref L2) The raised table junction (ref L3) eliminated car parking on street (ref L10) two disabled spaces- no more than this (ref L15) keeping areas for disabled parking (ref L20) not enough disabled parking spaces- at lease four preferred (ref L49) Better controls of parking. Better pedestrian facility (ref L55) Removal of parking spaces (ref L57) Dissuade parking + traffic from the area</p>	
		<p>Design intent (likes): (ref C66) No, Kings Square is fine as it is, it just needs a little TLC, a few benches and not to be so cluttered with stalls so that it's easier to walk through. If there's a demand for a larger performance area that can easily be included in the Parliament Street makeover (ref L42) Ask Barnitts (ref L48) It seems a good scheme of benefit to residents and visitors alike (ref R43) It was most encouraging to note that you had given considerable thought to the needs of blind and partially sighted (BPS) people. The most important factors are to make sure that there are safe crossings places provided for the roads, that there is clear demarcation between the 'road' and the pedestrianised area and that street furniture is suitably positioned</p>	
		<p>Street Performers (likes): (ref C10) street performers (are good) (ref C27) It is nice to have an area for performers that has a defined area plus a raised 'stage' (ref C29) Maintenance of existing kiosks, entertainers and raised area (ref C32) would like to retain the current feel of the square with area for street entertainment</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p><u>(ref C58)</u> This square is a busy square, it has street traders and buskers who add to the popularity of the area, without these the square and the city would lose its appeal. I hope these people will not be lost.</p> <p><u>(ref C72)</u> This could be a lovely, sheltered, very attractive performance space and I like the idea of improving it by night. Coloured (solar powered) lights in the trees would enhance that; also seating. Will bands be able to perform there?</p> <p><u>(ref C82)</u> Natural performance area</p> <p><u>(ref L27)</u> the quality of street performers should be monitored. There should be a lot more variety. I sit at the last drop (Inn) and time again the same performers are there. Should be more diverse</p> <p><u>(ref L62)</u> Retention of space for performers</p> <p><u>(ref L67)</u> That pedestrians and street activities are a priority inc street performances and stalls</p> <p><u>(ref L68)</u> Desires to maintain performance space, pedestrian enhancements & nocturnal use</p>	
		<p>Space (likes):</p> <p><u>(ref C3)</u> opening up the space</p> <p><u>(ref C6)</u> open & inviting space</p> <p><u>(ref C7)</u> increased usable space</p> <p><u>(ref C56)</u> The better placement of the trees and opening up the space</p> <p><u>(ref C72)</u> Like the concept of making the entire space, including the road, a shared public space, with priority for pedestrians and limits on parking</p> <p><u>(ref C75)</u> Paving the junction and expanding the square, reducing the road width and smartening up the area</p> <p><u>(ref L9)</u> encouraging use of an important public space</p> <p><u>(ref L10)</u> enlargement of the flat open space</p> <p><u>(ref L16)</u> more usable open space</p> <p><u>(ref L34)</u> Creating more space for people and improving area as a whole for pedestrians</p> <p><u>(ref L57)</u> Better use of available space/level surfacing</p> <p><u>(ref L65)</u> Wider pavements: easier for wheelchairs. More pedestrian space</p> <p><u>(ref L68)</u> Desires to maintain performance space, pedestrian enhancements & nocturnal use</p> <p><u>(ref R3)</u> I like the widening of the square</p>	
		<p>Historic interpretation (likes):</p> <p><u>(ref C64)</u> The historical interpretation which will ensure that Kings Court and more importantly, the Roman fortress line, will be marked in the paved surface (though the plan does not give information about the material to be used to mark the fortress line and does not label it)</p> <p><u>(ref C67)</u> historical interpretation aspect</p> <p><u>(ref C76)</u> Refurbishing the raised burial area is welcome. Could there be a discreet memorial to those buried there</p> <p><u>(ref L28)</u> Like the idea to mark the fortress line. How about a story board on a wall, showing the original church and other historical points of interest?</p> <p><u>(ref L33)</u> To mark Roman fortress line and kings court</p> <p><u>(ref L50)</u> Historical interpretation, but also please include an information board on the history of the square. Very helpful are the ones in King's Lynn. Please go and look!</p> <p><u>(ref L53)</u> Making Roman Fortress Line</p> <p><u>(ref L61)</u> Demarcation of the Roman wall and gatehouse is proposed but not shown in the plans</p> <p><u>(ref R42)</u> I would be pleased to see the line of the Roman fortress wall marked</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>De-Clutter (likes): <u>(ref C3)</u> removing clutter <u>(ref C17)</u> removal of clutter <u>(ref C23)</u> I like the proposed de-cluttering of Kings Square, seeing this a great improvement <u>(ref C37)</u> Removal of the phone boxes, etc <u>(ref C40)</u> paving/level access will join up the area and make it feel bigger and be more accessible like the removal of clutter <u>(ref C45)</u> Opening up the space, getting rid of clutter <u>(ref C62)</u> Refurbishment of surfaces, removal of street furniture <u>(ref L16)</u> de-cluttering <u>(ref L31)</u> Removing Clutter <u>(ref L51)</u> Reduction/relocation of phone boxes <u>(ref R14)</u> I am very supportive of the projects aim's and suggested solutions. A thorough de-cluttering of excess street-furniture and signs etc would be welcome. <u>(ref R11)</u> Keen on reducing street signage & clutter <u>(ref R42)</u> I would also be pleased to see some of the clutter removed</p> <p>Pedestrian Priority (likes): <u>(ref C14)</u> The priority given to pedestrians <u>(ref C25)</u> Prioritisation of pedestrians <u>(ref C45)</u> Making it more pedestrian friendly, slowing down vehicles passing through <u>(ref C77)</u> Improved pedestrian access and better control of traffic <u>(ref L1)</u> the priority to pedestrians <u>(ref L7)</u> clever design that defines pedestrian space <u>(ref L12)</u> the whole design- as long as it remains pedestrian for long periods <u>(ref L14)</u> all of it <u>(ref L19)</u> making pedestrians the priority in this design <u>(ref L24)</u> less intrusive traffic with pedestrian priority <u>(ref R11)</u> Keen on encouraging pedestrians over traffic <u>(ref R39)</u> Like the idea of a change in paving on the road areas to emphasise the pedestrian-friendliness and make vehicles slow down</p> <p>Lighting (likes): <u>(ref C13)</u> improved lighting welcomed <u>(ref C67)</u> Improvements to lighting <u>(ref L7)</u> Improved lighting <u>(ref L31)</u> The new lighting</p>	
<p>5 Are there aspects of the design you particularly dislike</p>		<p>Street Performers (dislikes): <u>(ref C64)</u> I would hate Kings Square to become a performance area for loud music or speech through microphones and am wary about the proposed pop up power. The area is small enough for performers to be heard without amplification. It would become somewhere to avoid if it got taken over by loud public performances <u>(ref L5)</u> (There should be) no amplified noise. Remove street performers <u>(ref L9)</u> Remove the street performers</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>(ref L11) reduce amount of street performers (ref L19) too much emphasis on street performers (ref L49) (There should be) no amplified music or other performance</p>	
		<p>Public Seating (dislikes): (ref L19) perhaps too much public seating shown (ref R3) The two seats identified on the plans immediately in front of the entrance to Chocolate will create a barrier and again will serve the function of channelling people through a narrow space. We would prefer that people can spread out in the square</p>	
		<p>Vehicles (dislikes): (ref C4) parking spaces should not be provided- it will never feel like a pedestrian space with these (ref C7) worried about effective controls on parking (ref C28) We need to ensure that there are sufficient accessible car parking spaces. These are being reduced all over town and I am very concerned that disabled drivers will have very reduced access to town and will therefore have no option but to drive to out of town shopping centres. Not a good plan (ref C40) how well traffic/parking will be controlled (ref C63) Inclusion of disabled bays - can't they be provided close to but outside the square. Is it not possible to route traffic away from the square entirely? (ref C67) Restrictions to vehicular access/parking (ref L2) don't like inclusion of parking bays (ref L23) under provision of disabled parking (ref L28) The psychological approach to traffic management! (ref L55) 'Shared spaces' where the road is levelled with pavements is trendy, but dangerous to pedestrians and should not be used. Such a design of a shared space with no clear roadway should only be used if motor vehicles are banned completely during busy times (e.g. 8.00-18.00) (ref R14) A bit of uncertain caution by drivers / pedestrians etc is not such a bad thing sometimes in my view and tends to keep users alert</p>	
		<p>Design Intent (dislikes): (ref C4) design of swept arc of Kings court joining main road (ref C24) Have the people who thought up this scheme ever sat in King's Square? I have sat on the raised area many times but it is described as 'underused' (ref C66) Claiming the idea is to make it better for pedestrians, but leaving stalls near the main Shambles/Market artery is stupid, put the stalls under the trees near the road (which wouldn't matter if it's pedestrianised) and you open up the main part of the square, instead of creating a bottleneck as you head to/from the Shambles (ref C76) Please don't make the roadways and footpaths undistinguishable. Look at Coney Street in a rain storm to see how confused pedestrians are when the street is awash, and a vehicle comes by. The Shambles is a great example of how to remind pedestrians that it is a working street (ref C82) Need to enclose the viewing & performing areas to allow pedestrians to walk by, e.g. more peripheral seating / fencing to create clear corridors. Also, remove steps to rear of raised areas, and turn into a ramp - nightmare for pushchairs, wheelchairs, etc (ref L56) Demarcation between 'road' and 'pavement' - this is historically illiterate</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p><u>(ref L61)</u> The attachments of lighting equipment to the wired buildings throughout the square</p>	
		<p>Clutter (dislikes): <u>(ref C4)</u> retention of cash machine & electrical box & phone box <u>(ref C13)</u> All stalls & A boards must go in order to create enough open space <u>(ref C14)</u> phone box & cash machine <u>(ref C16)</u> phone box & cash machine- suggests putting in St Andrewgate entrance <u>(ref C16)</u> the kiosks are too gaudy & out of keeping <u>(ref C45)</u> Why retain the cash machine when the idea is to get rid of clutter? There are plenty of banks and ATMs in York <u>(ref C76)</u> Please dispense with one of the telephone boxes. Remove the (unnecessary) cash machine - there are more than half a dozen of them within 50 metres: Lloyds, Halifax, HSBC, banks, for example <u>(ref C82)</u> Relocate or remove the telephone booth - most people have Mobiles and its an obstruction <u>(ref L2)</u> phone box & cash machine <u>(ref L31)</u> I would have suggested replacing the phone boxes with traditional type or removing them altogether. Suggest repainting post box (Royal Mail) <u>(ref L39)</u> Remove the street trader stalls, except for 'a' <u>(ref L49)</u> No need for cash machine <u>(ref L56)</u> Far too much clutter left in, should move street traders out - add to clutter</p>	
		<p>Materials (dislikes): <u>(ref C23)</u> The loss of the black basalt pieces of roadway, a feature of many of the historic core streets, is a loss, as they act as a reminder of old York <u>(ref L50)</u> Concrete setts and paving. This heeds care - light colours look awful after a few months when covered with dirt and gum <u>(ref L52)</u> Don't smooth it all out too much or you will lose the Yorkiness! Keep old paving slabs for example</p>	
		<p>Trees (dislikes): <u>(ref C24)</u> The removal of any trees. They take a long time to grow. Without them and the raised area the Square will look bare and uninteresting. They supply welcome shade in summer and would not serve any purpose close to the carriageway. <u>(ref C34)</u> Extremely worried about the proposed removal of several mature trees, this is not acceptable in my mind. <u>(ref C41)</u> Moving the trees <u>(ref C42)</u> Hoping if trees are moved, they can replant them - it needs trees <u>(ref C45)</u> Although moving the trees is a good idea, if the raised area is flattened then those trees will go. Put in as many trees as possible (4?) to separate the pedestrian area from the traffic <u>(ref C63)</u> Retention of trees. In a relatively small urban area natural vegetation is more of a hindrance than a help <u>(ref C67)</u> Removal of trees <u>(ref C72)</u> I object in the strongest possible terms to the removal of the trees, in particular the three large trees that have been there for many years. The tree canopy is extremely important to provide shade, shelter and a cooling effect, and it helps to remove air pollution. Trees, and Green Infrastructure in general, tend to undervalued as part of the city's resources, yet they are fundamental to enhancing the quality of the built environment, and they are also a part of the city's historic features. It will not be possible to remove/relocate the three mature trees with trees that provide similar canopy cover. I am less worried about the Paper Mulberry tree, as it is smaller and the canopy doesn't extend far. However, I would like to see greenery in its place - planters, perhaps?</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p><u>(ref C75)</u> Loss of any of the trees, other than the young 'paper mulberry' tree. The one on the raised area is a significant landscape feature for the whole square and the vista entering it from the shambles and market. Removing the raised area would impact on the survival of this tree and not serve any really useful purpose. The bench and other clutter could be removed while retaining the tree.</p> <p><u>(ref L46)</u> Sorry that some trees need to be removed - Though its for the greater good... Hoping the NEW TREES will be suitable and already grown somewhere</p> <p><u>(ref L52)</u> Replanting trees nearer the road could cause hazard if drivers could not see pedestrians till the last minute.</p> <p><u>(ref L63)</u> Can't see much to be gained by moving trees a few feet. If you do plant new trees, they must be well guarded against vandalism.</p> <p><u>(ref L68)</u> Removal of any mature trees, though 'necessary'</p> <p><u>(ref L69)</u> A tree planted at the apex of the square would obscure the view of Petergate</p> <p><u>(ref R10)</u> losing any trees</p>	
<p>6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered</p>		<p>Historic Interpretation/Character (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C1)</u> inclusion of an information point</p> <p><u>(ref C6)</u> there should be something like a plaque to help explain the historical significance</p> <p><u>(ref C37)</u> It is important that the historic atmosphere is retained. It is a special little area and will not benefit from being "tarted up". A tidy-up is acceptable, though</p> <p><u>(ref C56)</u> How about a tourist board at the entrance area to The Shambles big enough to direct tourists but small enough as to not block any sight</p> <p><u>(ref L1)</u> more info on the history of the site</p> <p><u>(ref L6)</u> gravestones add character</p> <p><u>(ref L6)</u> would like to see cart tracks retained</p> <p><u>(ref L7)</u> Viking Royal Hall not mentioned</p> <p><u>(ref L16)</u> more info on the history of the site on site</p> <p><u>(ref L24)</u> can gravestones be relocated/retained</p> <p><u>(ref L24)</u> more info on the history of the site on site</p> <p><u>(ref L26)</u> restoring the church would be nice</p> <p><u>(ref L30)</u> plaque with info about the Roman & Viking archaeology. Also info about demolished church</p> <p><u>(ref L53)</u> Mark line of old church</p> <p><u>(ref L65)</u> The gravestones are a historic feature worth retaining if possible <u>(ref R8)</u> The panel were generally pleased to see improvements made to the square however concern was raised about that the removal of the raised burial ground as this would remove the last vestiges of the church that had been demolished in 1937. The panel would like to see that marked in some way, perhaps by reusing the memorial slabs if their condition allowed.</p> <p><u>(ref R8)</u> There was concern that the surfacing from the Shambles would stop too abruptly and not have the flow as at present.</p> <p><u>(ref R11)</u> Is there interpretative material in the scheme about the history of the square?</p> <p><u>(Ref R23)</u>- English Heritage. Advocates the retention of the present York stone paving and stone cobbled surfaces, along with granite wheel tracks and kerbstones</p> <p><u>(ref R42)</u> existing materials, York stone paving and granite setts marking Kings Court should be retained</p> <p><u>(ref R42)</u> burials and the remains of the church formerly standing in Kings Square will be quite close to the surface 7 will need adequate consideration</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>Disabilities (not currently considered): <u>(ref C17)</u> disabled parking gets abused- better enforcement needed <u>(ref L18)</u> prohibit parking rather than discourage it <u>(ref C12)</u> Put disabled parking on St Andrewgate <u>(ref L14)</u> consider 3 disabled spaces (not 2) <u>(ref L15)</u> disabled drivers(consider more spaces?) <u>(ref L69)</u> Disabled access into the square <u>(ref R12)</u> disabled parking bays could be located on St Andrewgate <u>(ref R22)</u> Abbreviated issues from press article 01.02.2013: York Independent councillor Lynn Jeffries, who is herself disabled, claimed the plans for King's Square seem to fit into a pattern of a gradual tightening of restrictions on disabled motorists in the city centre. She said City of York Council had already scrapped some disabled parking bays outside the main library, and decided to restrict access to Davygate, and she wondered if there more such proposals now in the pipeline. She said she fully understood the desire to reduce the number of vehicles in the city centre to make it safer for pedestrians, but claimed there did not seem to be an understanding that more severely disabled motorists needed to be able to park right in the centre if they were to be able to go shopping... extra space will partly be achieved through a narrowing of the road at one end of the square, which it is believed will result in a reduction of three or four disabled parking spaces <u>(ref R34)</u> As a York resident and regular user of the area I believe that removing the existing double yellow lines and replacing them with two disabled parking bays is a major reduction in disabled parking availability in York... <u>(ref R35)</u> ...I am very concerned about the proposed alterations to the road and parking at Kings Square which will mean the removal of the on-road disabled parking. Replacing these with just 2 allocated bays is definitely not sufficient. <u>(ref R43)</u> Does not want to see an increase in vehicular traffic from the shambles- which would be hazardous to blind & Partially Sighted (BPS) people. Also doesn't want to see more bollards which are a hazard to BPS people <u>(ref R43)</u> would prefer to see the tactile crossing near St Andrewgate rather than Tullivers</p>	
		<p>Vehicular Management & Use (not currently considered): <u>(ref C1)</u> How will you police the parking on the square in the evening <u>(ref L38)</u> the police must be vigilant to protect motorists driving through as they already do in Coney Street, Davygate etc despite there being pedestrians in these areas. <u>(ref C4)</u> reduce the number of cars passing thro' <u>(ref C8)</u> emergency access as it currently is should be maintained & any fire hydrants <u>(ref C12)</u> Kings Sq should be free of traffic during footstreets (& Goodramgate) <u>(ref C35)</u> Maintaining through access for vehicles from both Goodramgate and High Petergate, which are used by Churchgoers at the Minster, St Michael le Belfrey and St Wilfreds on a Sunday morning, and whose services finish early enough for egress to be completed before footstreet restrictions apply <u>(ref C42)</u> Control of cars needed, and ensuring no bad parking takes place <u>(ref L31)</u> It should be pedestrian friendly and not overrun by badly parked vehicles. Marked bays and relocating the trees will improve this aspect <u>(ref L42)</u> Multiple drop deliveries <u>(ref L45)</u> Consideration needs to be given to deliveries in that area, both during works and after completion (see letter R32) <u>(ref L56)</u> Be Bolder 0 Get cars out entirely! <u>(ref L62)</u> Traffic calming, reduction schemes <u>(ref L64)</u> Road outside Barnitts should be resurfaced first before kings square is started <u>(ref R2)</u> Currently it is possible to park outside our shop (Barnfathers) before 11am and after 4pm - will this still be possible?</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p><u>(ref R3)</u> One of the most interesting pieces of information to come out on Friday was that there were approx 1300 vehicles entering Kings Square and travelling down Colliergate. Whilst I advocate the proposed changes to look and feel of the road surface and the portrayed pedestrianisation of the Square I would be interested to understand how the Council will educate drivers further and prevent drivers using it as a short cut through the city. I regularly walk up Foss Gate and Colliergate and am always amazed at the number of vehicles and speed that they are travelling.</p> <p><u>(ref R5)</u> The turn into King's Sq from Church St and Goodramgate looks to be very tight for a large vehicle, has this been autotracked? The carriageway looks to be very narrow outside boots. How will loading take place whilst still allowing through traffic? Boots does have deliveries by a large articulated vehicle. 2 bollards shown, what are they for? Is the intention to formally regulate the 2 disabled bays, hence the need for signs?</p> <p><u>(ref R10)</u> Its relation to Colliergate. I'm in favour of the road surface between Boots and Barnitts being made to look as if that piece of road is part of the square, rather than a route for traffic. The whole area is usually heaving with trucks when I walk through at 10:00 am, which is unpleasant and unnecessary.</p> <p><u>(ref R11)</u> We fail to understand why vehicles need to pass through the city centre, apart from deliveries within certain times and those bringing people with disabilities. Yet there seem to be ordinary vehicles frequently using the city centre.</p> <p><u>(ref R12)</u> Currently there is no clear right of way for single lane traffic from Goodramgate meeting with two-way traffic on Church St. This was exacerbated by the change from a Stop order at the end of Petergate, when it became a 'GiveWay'. The end of Goodramgate ought to also be a GiveWay.</p> <p><u>(ref R12)</u> The northern end of the square gets very congested. Making the road narrower here will make congestion worse.</p> <p><u>(ref R9)</u> If you remove the raised area have you considered re-routing the vehicular link through to the markets across the south side of the square - it would then be shorter, leaving more space for pedestrian-priority surfaces.</p> <p><u>(ref R44)</u> No mention is made of cycling in the documents I have seen. A good long-term plan would ensure good cycling links across-town in lines parallel to Coney Street. As a step towards this, I suggest that cycle routes should be allowed for along Colliergate (in both directions if possible) up to St Andrewsgate, and possibly up to Petergate also. Cyclists should give way to pedestrians but should not be excluded completely.</p>	
		<p>Pedestrian Management & Use (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C7)</u> how to improve evening use</p> <p><u>(ref C7)</u> allow one business to use their toilets</p> <p><u>(ref L4)</u> no smoking zone in the square</p> <p><u>(ref L13)</u> promote unstructured activity (not in set places)</p> <p><u>(ref L16)</u> is the space big enough for one off events? Viking week etc</p> <p><u>(ref L39)</u> let the piano player remain. Have a yearly Christmas tree. Include some raised flower beds</p> <p><u>(ref L67)</u> Adapt raised area in such away as to open up the shops behind (which at present are hemmed in)</p> <p><u>(ref R37)</u> Protocols should exist to remove vendors and seating from the Square when performances take place</p>	
		<p>Litter (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C29)</u> Benches under trees get fouled very quickly and can become unusable</p> <p><u>(ref C39)</u> Pigeons need to be reduced as much as possible</p> <p><u>(ref C45)</u> Make sure there are some big rubbish/recycling bins and they get emptied often enough</p> <p><u>(ref C67)</u> The square would really benefit from an increase in litter bins</p> <p><u>(ref C76)</u> Please clean the working parts of the litter bins daily. They are a disgrace</p> <p><u>(ref C82)</u> More litter bins - it's a favourite spot for eating, but only 1 litter bin...</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>(ref L4) daily removal of chewing gum (ref L8) don't reduce amount of street sweeping (ref L24) Are 2 bins sufficient if people are encouraged to picnic? (ref L61) Provision of LOTS of litter bins to avoid its current often filthy state - which includes pigeon droppings (ref L64) the pigeons need to be dealt with. Notices put up asking people not to feed them. This is done in other places. (ref L67) Discourage Pigeons</p>	
		<p>Kiosks (not currently considered): (ref C19) It is an important meeting and entertainment space but it is scruffy and dirty now. The stalls in the space clutter it up and should be moved into the disabled parking areas (ref L3) too many Kiosks (ref L12) move candle kiosk to the market (ref R40) Kiosk design should be controlled & of open sided design (ref R4) Thanks for the further meeting on Friday about Kings Square. The project heralds a new era in Kings Square, and it is great to see everyone cooperating and contributing so positively towards this... (various comments were made on the need to reconsider the locations of kiosks)... (ref R20) Performers add a lot of life in the square & we need to keep them...Choc Storey must not take over. (ref R38) How do the various traders get to use the space? (the comments asks for more variation over the year. Also want edible plants)</p>	
		<p>Cyclists (not currently considered): (ref L2) ban cyclists during footstreet hours (ref L8) stop cyclists going the wrong way up Colliergate (ref L8) stop cycles during footstreet hours - especially going the "wrong way" (ref R7) I note the proposal for a raised crossroads at Church St/Colliergate junction...The ramps for the table should be sufficiently far from junction mouths so that cyclists do not encounter them when turning. Build outs, bollards and parking restrictions, as appropriate, may be needed to prevent parking around the junction</p>	
		<p>Design (not currently considered): (ref C31) Kings Square needs to be retained as an area which all the public can enjoy. I think a cleanup is needed but the area should continue to be used by the buskers to entertain the crowds. I don't think the idea of cafe seating is a good one as it would ruin the area. (ref C40) how the area will become more lively in the evenings. What about a screen for film shows? (ref L41) this may not apply particularly to Kings square BUT York is desperately short of toilets in city centre/shops part. Especially since removal of ones in parliament street - I'm surprised M&S hasn't objected to at sometimes resembling public toilets queue. Please could council consider providing more central toilet facilities somewhere urgently (ref L47) I am particularly concerned at the Pavement junction of Stonebow & St Saviourgate, this area is a disgrace has been neglected for years. If it cannot be maintained then remove the raised beds & replace with tubs & much needed seating (ref L51) It is the natural area to sit and eat takeaway food from the many nearby shops. This is a valued provision and should not be compromised by formal pavement cafe. In general, the extensions to the core proposal denature the space, e.g. the very photogenic snicket behind the raised area would disappear. The rear edge of the raised area is well used as seating. The raised platform is a versatile performing area: artists and audiences self configure. Built-in seating at the front of the raised area would limit the possibilities. Grave slabs and information slab should be retained. The proposed treatment of Kings Court</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>paving is poor. The present surface with cart tracks should be retained: it was chosen to match contiguous streets. To remove the tracks from part of Kings Court (but not all) would not assist legibility or interpretation of 'an important historic street'. It is also against specific EH advice: see Streets for All: Yorkshire & Humberside, where they are illustrated.</p> <p><u>(ref R14)</u> "ramp-ups' to the junction(s) are ideally done using sinusoidal profile blocks which tend to give a smoother transition for vehicles and cyclists</p> <p><u>(ref R16)</u> The whole of the central business district should be a level surface</p> <p><u>(ref R16)</u> York should be twinned with Rome</p> <p><u>(ref R16)</u> As for the raised cemetery area a water feature would be a good addition, one incorporating a steady flow of water down a naturally looking rocky surface and an arch that pedestrians can walk under to depict the washing away of any sins. The problem York has is the weather, a glass canopy to allow greater use of the space even during the cooler months may make this space more attractive.</p> <p><u>(ref R35)</u> If the raised area remains they should be alongside it in an east/west alignment, rather than projecting across the foot flow and visual link with the Minster.</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> The sinuous way the layout of surface materials flow through from Newgate and the Shambles and into Kings Square is particularly pleasing (& should be retained)</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> The tabled crossing seems to undermine the historic importance of the road by marking the area in setts as a place in its own right. The large scale flags should be continued around the corners of the buildings as a threshold space. The raised table should only be introduced if the whole area is being raised to be level, otherwise it interrupts pedestrian.</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> ...Suggests also that Colliergate running thro' kings sq is more centred in the space rather than towards one edge</p>	
		<p>Street Furniture/ clutter (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C14)</u> would like to see less clutter</p> <p><u>(ref C17)</u> Change the telephone kiosk for traditional red one (or complete removal)</p> <p><u>(ref C50)</u> Although there will be 2 phone boxes retained, I do not think they should be used as general advertising hoardings. Does that not require planning permission? I am surprised this is permitted in what must surely be a conservation area. The products advertised cheapen the look of the square, and will certainly not be in keeping with the newly revamped square. I am pretty certain I would not be allowed to sell advertising space on the side of my building. If the raised area is kept, then it would make more sense to align the 2 boxes with the edge of the raised area than sticking out at right angles to it. The boxes should be maintained so they are not scruffy.</p> <p><u>(ref C62)</u> If the raised area is removed can the retained cash machine/post box/telephone booth be relocated so that they are against one of the buildings, rather than been left in the middle of the more open space?</p> <p><u>(ref L2)</u> suggests inclusion of removable flower tubs</p> <p><u>(ref L68)</u> Install smaller postbox, move ATM and phone box away from kings square. Don't put seating below trees</p> <p><u>(ref R14)</u> Can't the phone box & cash machine go somewhere else? If not ensure there is no advertising, and/or replace with red phone box type.</p> <p><u>(ref R14)</u> Increase the extent of the design into St Andrewgate. Include some replacement cycle racks</p> <p><u>(ref R15)</u> York Chocolate Story currently uses a bicycle as advertising. This should not be allowed.</p> <p><u>(ref R32)</u> There is a large traffic control sign situated outside our Thomas the Baker shop on the Church Street junction. Would it be possible to re-position this sign within the scheme, as it currently obscures our shop frontage?</p> <p><u>(ref R35)</u> doesn't want kiosks used as advertising hoarding</p>	
		<p>Seating (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C5)</u> retain seating- especially good for mobility issues</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>(ref C14) would like to see high quality designed street furniture</p> <p>(ref C14) CYC needs to carefully regulate/review cafe seating</p> <p>(ref C24) This is a small intimate environment not suitable for large "pedestrian activities" More seating would certainly be welcome since most of that in Parliament St has been removed. You seem to think that pedestrians do not need to sit down and look at the scenery which York provides (and have a rest) Not all of us are in the prime of life !</p> <p>(ref C25) Its public performance role is of major importance; to allow cafe seating would conflict with this and should not be contemplated</p> <p>(ref C39) More seating required - the walls of raised area act as seating areas at the moment but are not enough</p> <p>(ref C59) The cafe seating should be given to a locally owned cafe and not a coffee shop chain</p> <p>(ref C63) Provision of more seating in either granite or stainless steel so that people can rest and watch the world go by. Existing seating is always full during main visitor times which suggest that there is insufficient provided.</p> <p>(ref C69) The loss of seats prevented my wife and I from visiting the centre</p> <p>(ref L4) outdoor seating next to shops acceptable if no smoking policy imposed</p> <p>(ref L12) add seating at Tullivers end (if you remove burial area)</p> <p>(ref L48) The cafe' seating needs fair and moderation in its regulation.</p> <p>(ref L58) Seating for OAPS. Nice Planters</p> <p>(ref R3) I would suggest the seating provision is designed to be flexible and movable</p> <p>(ref R3) Re the Potential café seating location. I would be interested to gain an understanding as to how this space will be allocated to a business. Process, priority. Naturally there is only the opportunity for one operator to be here however several will be interested</p> <p>(ref R3) Will any power be provided at the location for the Café Seating? Is there space for a small catering unit to serve from?</p> <p>(ref R3) Whilst no seating is currently scheduled/ proposed immediately adjacent to our facility I would encourage CYC to retain an open mind on this moving forward. The proposed changes to the square and the way people may move around the space may create a whole new dynamic. We clearly understand that this is a public space but that shouldn't stand in the way of providing the public a great overall experience within the square other than eating fish and chips and Cornish pasties leaving their litter behind them and encouraging more pigeon activity. Continuum would be happy comply with any restrictions with the vehicular use of Kings Court and would be happy to support the council in its overall management of the Square.</p> <p>(ref R3) It would be useful to understand what and where any 'pop up' power may be provided. Naturally we would be interested to hold events at key points during the year</p> <p>(ref R4) On the draft plan the two seats adjacent to Chocolate would need to be re-sited because of the position of the Lemonade stall</p> <p>(ref R4) What is the feasibility of a back-to-back seat at the head of the square opposite Millie's/St Paul's boundary wall? It would a good view of the Minster and would prevent large trucks from encroaching onto the square.</p> <p>(ref R4) The raised area provides seating for probably 50 or 60 people at the moment. On busy days this is used to full capacity by people eating their sandwiches, ice cream etc and watching the entertainment. If it is levelled this seating capacity would need to be replaced in the new seating plan.</p> <p>(ref R6) If the area does not get flattened, we would suggest removing the Mulberry tree and replacing with public seating. We would suggest not putting benches all the way round the back of the raised section as this will create bottlenecks and obstructions if there is not adequate spacing in between benches for people to move through or stand.</p> <p>(ref R6) ...The proposed plans to have benches next to the crepe stall for example could be disastrous... we welcome public seating but would ask that common sense prevail and they not cause bottle necks or obstructions which would adversely affect our ability to entertain the public as best as possible.</p> <p>(ref R6) ... We suggest a small tiered seating area. This could be placed where the Mulberry tree currently stands if the raised</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>area was flattened. It could have its back to the electric housing unit and post box which cannot be moved so there would be no extra obstruction. (an example with photos is given of Quebec City)</p> <p><u>(ref R8)</u> The panel felt that it would be important for CYC to control any out door seating in order for it to achieve the outcomes required</p> <p><u>(ref R9)</u> Include more seating around the outside - it's what makes a public place. Make sure it's flexible so it can be used from both sides - could just be raised pads rather than formal benches.</p> <p><u>(ref R24)</u> English Heritage- observes low quality of existing street furniture and advocates much better standards</p> <p><u>(ref R28)</u> suggested an idea for an amphitheatre of public seating</p>	
		<p>Materials (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C4)</u> consider using one material for roadway- either granite or yorkstone setts all way down from raised table thro' square</p> <p><u>(ref L4)</u> don't use any concrete</p> <p><u>(ref L50)</u> Huge improvements (and savings) could be made by just relaying and cleaning the existing paving, with additional natural stone paving pairs. There will be many burials close beneath the slabs <u>(ref R38)</u> ..No concrete, manufactured reconstituted stone, olde worlde bins etc. Should be more imaginative...</p> <p><u>(ref R39)</u> I really like the present line of worn and characterful cobbles in front of Chocolate Story etc, really think they should be retained.</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> the margin adjacent to the road on the NE side (shown as setts) should be a continuation of the large scale stone flags to signal that it is part of the space rather than the route</p> <p><u>(ref R41)</u> Granite is difficult to walk on & slippery</p> <p><u>(ref R42)</u> sub-base construction needs to be adequate</p>	
		<p>Public Art (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C7)</u> consider including public art</p>	
		<p>Trees (not currently considered):</p> <p><u>(ref C14)</u> new trees should not be allowed to damage pavement/road (roots)</p> <p><u>(ref C50)</u> If the raised area is kept, I would be in favour of keeping the tall lime tree to give some height to the planting.</p> <p><u>(ref C75)</u> While the two trees alongside Colliergate are perhaps only 30-40 years old and may not be ideally placed for the new design they are significant features and with time will grow to replace the older mature tree on the raised area when it dies. We can't keep removing semi mature trees that have a valuable landscape, shade and pollution cleansing role in our city centre.</p> <p><u>(ref C76)</u> Please leave the trees. York is far too ready to fell trees. Just take a look at the Darlington to Thirsk road to see how mature trees can look</p> <p><u>(ref L3)</u> suggests using plane trees</p> <p><u>(ref L52)</u> There is a good view down Petergate towards the minster which should not be lost by blocking it with a tree</p> <p><u>(ref L54)</u> Trees are important in urban areas. All effort made to replace</p> <p><u>(ref L56)</u> New trees would be archaeologically damaging - lots of archaeology under here</p> <p><u>(ref R11)</u> hope any new trees are as mature as possible</p> <p><u>(ref R40)</u> The raised planter with the Mulberry tree is odd....Is it possible to replant this in the square</p> <p><u>(ref R44)</u> The image captioned "Tree positions extent the effective size ..." shows two big red barriers. They are not mentioned in the text. I hope they are a printing error!</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>Lighting (not currently considered): <u>(ref C16)</u> no mention of street lighting- welcomes lights on buildings (not poles) <u>(ref L16)</u> make sure lighting is not boring <u>(ref R3)</u> I would be interested to understand further how the lighting will improve. The square at night is quite a forbidding space and can only benefit from an improved lighting scheme. <u>(ref R9)</u> The sheet doesn't say much about lighting - it'll need to be interesting to make the space work well after dark</p>	
		<p>Priority/cost (not currently considered): <u>(ref C13)</u> there are worse areas that need improved paving- e.g. Stonegate, Low Petergate <u>(ref C13)</u> This offers little in return for the outlay. <u>(ref C49)</u> Do we really have Money for this? <u>(ref C51)</u> The roadway is narrow as it is, stop wasting money leave it alone. <u>(ref C73)</u> This project involves totally unnecessary expenditure by CoYC in this time of cuts to budgets and core services. The money would be better spent on services for the citizens of York rather than esoteric designs for visitors <u>(ref C74)</u> I think it is worthy but unjustifiable expense at this time and should be suspended until there is a better financial climate. <u>(ref C76)</u> I think you should instead spend the money set aside for the rejuvenation of the square on sorting out the Tea Room Square traffic/pedestrians/taxis/police/hire cars tangle. I would be very happy to advise you on solutions to this problem <u>(ref C77)</u> This project is largely for visitors and tourists, not residents. In a time of severe cash shortage, I think the money that would be spent here, and presumably financed by York residents, would be better spent helping the York residents. <u>(ref C81)</u> it seems to work as it is - just enforce the parking and traffic regulations. Spend the money on something worthwhile for the residents like keeping the green bin collection <u>(ref L8)</u> the cost a concern but worth it <u>(ref L17)</u> difficult to give comments if you don't know how much it will cost- value for money issue <u>(ref L21)</u> don't do this project at all <u>(ref L23)</u> Square is ok as it is <u>(ref L32)</u> Leave it alone, it does not need changing. Save the money and put it towards a much-needed facility - a bus station for York. <u>(ref R18)</u> Generally supportive of the design but thinks it should not go ahead: Scarce council resources should be spent elsewhere <u>(ref R31)</u> I would like to add that some money could go on improving the pavement on Colliergate on Tulliver's side. It slopes badly and too near the road to be safe, especially for the handicapped. One foot is uphill and the other downhill.</p>	
		<p>Timing of construction works (not currently considered): <u>(ref C58)</u> I also think disruption to other shops and businesses in the square should be thought about, as they had to put up with a lot of mess while the Chocolate story was refurbished. <u>(ref C67)</u> The work will be very disruptive for local business, who have already put up with months of noise and dust during the work on "Chocolate" <u>(ref L64)</u> Road outside Barnitts should be resurfaced first before Kings Square is started. <u>(ref R2)</u> If the proposals go ahead when would work begin and how long would it take? <u>(ref R3)</u> Timing – Naturally this is my greatest concern as is the case with the Street Traders and the Performers. Our business relies upon footfall during the Peak season (April – Sept). Commencing the work in April may have a serious detrimental effect on our performance as a new tourist attraction. Whilst Street Traders and Performers can be moved to other locations we</p>	

Structured questions	No. who agreed	Summary of written comments grouped under themes	Overall officer conclusion
		<p>unfortunately can't. I understand that the dates may not be able to be moved due to many reasons however we need to ensure that the square and our business remain welcoming and clearly advertised. We would like further discussion on how the council intend to do this.</p> <p>(ref R3) Should the works over run from the April – Early July program, what plans will be in place to offset the disruption over the critical months of July & August.</p> <p>(ref R32) As identified in the questionnaire, we would like consideration to be given to deliveries during and after the works. We are dependent, more than many other retail trades, upon the frequency of delivery.</p>	
		<p>Archaeology/Consecrated Ground (not currently considered): (ref C23/R33)The raised area of Kings Square is, of course, the site of Holy Trinity Church and is, as such, consecrated ground. The lowering of the raised area, which I support, will have to be done sensitively with regard to the archaeology of the site and the reverent disposal of any human remains that are found. Set in the raised paved area are about 12 ledgerstones that were presumably part of the floor of the church. These survive in more or less legible condition and are of importance. Consideration must be given to their future. Discarding them or destroying them is really not a possibility...I would assume that the whole of the paved 'island' of Kings Square is historically consecrated ground which may or may not have been formally deconsecrated.</p>	<p>We will consider this- yes a very sensitive area. We are aware that the graveyard extended beyond the raised area and that the former church footprint could also include graves (we currently think the raised area is likely to be a construction of the church demolition process). Normally we have referred to this raised area as a "burial area" for simplicity of description (where as it is more likely to be a charnel pit- but we don't know for sure), but don't normally refer to it as the "burial ground" This would have been a grammatical mistake. Apologies if this has been in any way misleading. We need to do lots more investigation- this public consultation is to gauge public opinion on a range of design directions and dependent on the outcome we will do more technical work.</p>
7a Are you: a York resident	142		
7b a visitor	2		
7c a business owner	4		
7d employed in York	10		
8a Do you have mobility impairments: yes	10		
8b no	129		
8c prefer not to say	4		