
MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	3 JUNE 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS STEVE GALLOWAY (CHAIR), POTTER (VICE-CHAIR), AYRE, D'AGORNE, MERRETT, REID, SIMPSON-LAING, R WATSON, WATT AND I WAUDBY (SUBSTITUTE)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR MOORE

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the LDF Working Group held on 13 May 2008 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

4. CITY OF YORK RETAIL STUDY 2008

Members considered a report which summarised the key findings and recommendations of the Retail Study for York commissioned by the Council in June 2007 from consultants GVA Grimley. The purpose of the study had been to provide a context for retail policies and proposals within the forthcoming Local Development Framework (LDF) for York, with particular reference to the amount of floor space to be allocated for future retail development.

The headline findings from the study were that York City Centre was essentially healthy and performing well but with a number of weaknesses that needed to be addressed. These included: lack of convenience offer in the city centre, lack of new and refurbished department store offer, and small format units not suited to modern retailing requirements. York city centre was also drawing a declining share of overall retail spending within its catchment area, with the prospect of further decline if nothing was done. The study forecast that there was capacity for significant additional retail

floor space in York in the period up to 2029 and went on to consider the best locations for meeting this extra demand.

Members received a presentation from a representative of GVA Grimley, outlining the methodology and sub-regional context of the study and providing details of the qualitative and quantitative assessments carried out and of the resulting recommendations regarding Convenience outlets and Strategy. During the discussion that followed, Members stressed the need to understand the wishes of York residents, with a view to ensuring that their custom was not lost to other retail centres, such as Leeds. Officers agreed to carry out further analysis to determine the shopping patterns of York residents. It was noted that a number of local shopping parades had been omitted from the study; however, these would be covered by an analysis of neighbourhood shopping provision currently being carried out by Officers.

Members enquired about internet shopping and it was noted that an allowance had been made for this in the projections. Members asked about the basis on which the projections had been made and it was confirmed that they had been based on long term economic trends of the past 20 years but took no account of the recent dramatic rise in oil prices, 'credit crunch' or developing world recession.

RESOLVED: (i) That the publication of the City of York Retail Study as part of the LDF Evidence Base be endorsed, on the understanding that additional information requested by the Working Group may be published at a later stage and that the results of the analysis of neighbourhood shopping provision will be brought to the Working Group prior to publication of the preferred options.¹

REASON: To inform decisions on the policy options for retail for York as part of the LDF.

(ii) That it be agreed that authority be delegated to the Director of City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive and Shadow Executive Members for City Strategy, to make any necessary changes to the Retail Study arising from the resolutions of the Working Group, prior to its publication.²

REASON: So that any recommended changes can be incorporated into the Retail Study prior to its publication.

Action Required

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Publish the Retail Study | JB |
| 2. Make any incidental changes required. | JB |

5. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: YORK CITY CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Members considered a report which invited them to comment upon the draft Issues and Options document for the York City Area Action Plan (AAP) and to recommend that the Executive approve publication of the document for consultation in July.

The draft document, entitled '*City Centre Area Action Plan – Issues and Options*', was attached as Annex A to the report, with a summary of the issues and options attached as Annex B. The AAP revolved around the three 'key themes' of economic vitality, historic environment and community life. A vision for each key theme was set out at the start of the document, followed by a more detailed explanation of the issues and a series of questions posed along with options to deal with these issues. Also included was a section outlining five proposed 'Opportunity Areas' that could help deliver key elements of the city centre vision; namely, Castle Piccadilly, The Cultural Quarter, Gateway Streets, City Spaces and Riversides.

A presentation was received from the City Development Officer outlining the content and main issues in the AAP and progress made since consideration of the scoping report in December 2007, and detailing the key themes and their relationship to the 5 proposed 'Opportunity Areas' in the City. In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that the information in Appendix A to the draft AAP (brief descriptive summaries of Character Areas) was similar to that expected to be included in the Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal, to be presented to the Planning Committee at a later stage.

Members recommended the following amendments to the draft AAP at Annex A:

- a) Section 2 – Vision for the City Centre:
 - Under 'Vision for Community Life', include reference to disabled people
- b) Section 6 – Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality
 - Amend Map 1 to include hotels and offices on Stonegate and Piccadilly
 - In 6.2, 3rd sentence, make it clear that the Future York Group report has not been adopted by the Council
 - At the end of 6.8, remove the words '*for certain goods*'
 - At the end of 6.26, remove the last phrase (from *although to capacity*) and replace with '*although these could be more challenging to deliver*'
 - In Question 7, Option 1a), remove reference to the 5-7 pm period
 - In 6.50, 2nd sentence, amend to read '*Toft Green / Blossom St area*'
 - In Question 8, Option 2, add reference to Blossom Street area
 - Re-phrase 3rd sentence of 6.64 ('*cross city journeys around the city*')
 - Expand on 6.80 to clarify
 - Re-phrase 2nd sentence of 6.83 to clarify areas for improvement
- c) Section 7 – Key Theme 2: Historic Environment
 - Amend Map 5 to extend area and include more features
 - In 7.15, change the picture illustrating 'badly designed areas beside river'
- d) Section 8 – Key Theme 3: Community Life

- In 8.10, re-phrase 3rd bullet point to clarify that the Archbishop does not live in the City Centre
 - Include reference to indoor sports and leisure facilities
 - In 8.37, include reference to keeping walking routes safe at night
 - Under 'Issue: Housing types', include families living in City Centre
 - In 8.52, expand on reference to the 'living above the shop' scheme
- e) Section 9 – The Opportunity Areas
- In 9.6, remove reference to individual properties
 - Amend Gateway Streets so that they extend to key bus stops. In particular, Micklegate should be amended to include Blossom Street as far as the Odeon and Piccadilly to encompass part of Fishergate (Map 11 to be amended accordingly)
 - In 9.23, Table 3, amend entry for Stonebow / Peaseholme Green to include more buildings of interest in Peaseholme Green
 - In 9.27, Table 5, include separate entries for St Sampson's Square and Parliament Street
 - In 9.27, include the same text under the illustration of King's Square as appears under the Exhibition Square illustration
- d) Sections 6, 7 and 8 – Question boxes
- Insert the words '*or mutually exclusive*' after '*exhaustive*' in the italic text at the end in each box, where appropriate
- e) Appendix A – Character Areas
- Include a question asking whether character areas reflect the current situation
 - Remove typographical errors from the map.

RESOLVED: That the Executive be recommended to:

- (i) Approve the draft Issues and Options document at Annex A and the Summary of Issues and Options at Annex B for public consultation, subject to the recommended changes as recorded above;¹

REASON: So that the City Centre Area Action Plan DPS can be progressed to its next stage of development, as highlighted in the Council's Local Development Scheme.

- (ii) Delegate authority to the Director of City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive Member and Shadow Executive Member for City Strategy, to make any incidental changes to the draft document and the Summary of Issues and Options document that are necessary as a result of the Working Group's recommendations.

REASON: So that the changes recommended as a result of discussions at this meeting can be made and the report progressed.

- (iii) Delegate authority to the Director of City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive Member and Shadow Executive Member for City Strategy, to approve the Sustainability Statement to accompany the Issues and

Options document consultation, after the Statement has been circulated to Members.

REASON: So that the report and accompanying document can be progressed.

(iv) Delegate authority to the Director of City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive Member and Shadow Executive Member for City Strategy, to approve a Consultation Strategy and promotional material.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed methods of consultation are satisfactory to Members.

Action Required

1. Refer draft AAP, and minutes of LDFWG, to Executive. JB

S F Galloway, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 6.05 pm].