

Annex B:

**Full report of responses
received from the consultation of the
City Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options report.**

January 2009

How this report is set out

This summary sets out the list of consultees below and then tables the comments made to the Issues and Options report. The table of responses commencing with general comments and then follows the format of the Issues and Options report including the context and vision, 3 key themes, the 5 opportunity areas, monitoring and delivery, and the boundary, concluding with comments received on the accompanying Sustainability Statement (July 2008).

CCAAP Consultation Response Register 2008

No.	Date	Name	LDF ID Number
1	29/07/2008	Shaun Walton	2595
2	29/07/2008	Richard Pollitt - Mansion House	2596
3	29/07/2008	David Quarrie	293
4	30/07/2008	Mike Stone England & Lyle	322
5	31/07/2008	John Reeves, Helmsley Group	198
6	31/07/2008	M Tooby	789
7	01/08/2008	Timothy Kirkhope	360
8	04/08/2008	Barry Otley	200
9	05/08/2008	K Dean, Denison Till Solicitors	2597
10	06/08/2008	Equality and Human Rights Com	381
11	07/08/2008	Robert David Greaves	945
12	08/08/2008	Paul Howden	1100
13	08/08/2008	David Randon	549
14	12/08/2008	Prue Pitcher-Cumming	681
15	14/08/2008	Sarah Anderson	1144
16	18/08/2008	Lesley V Pratt	1601
17	18/08/2008	The Archdeacon of York	2601
18	20/08/2008	Mrs A Sweeting	1237
19	20/08/2008	John H Hoare	2239
20	18/08/2008	The Venerable Alan Dean	1299
21	21/08/2008	Yorkshire Tourist Board	2317
22	28/08/2008	CABE	217
23	28/08/2008	W Derbyshire	447
24	29/08/2008	Claire Brockway	975
25	29/08/2008	Kexby Parish Council	76

York LDF City Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options – Summary of Responses

November 2008

26	31/08/2008 Ruth Karn	2570
27	01/09/2008 Dr David Sellick	2161
28	01/09/2008 Michael Abbott	1486
29	02/09/2008 David & Lynda Timms	2028
30	03/09/2008 Mrs S M Jackson	1817
31	03/09/2008 Andrew Hutton	1533
32	03/09/2008 William Gambold	68
33	03/09/2008 Company of Merchant Adventurers	2210
34	03/09/2008 CTC	2611
35	05/09/2008 Peter Fisher	2367
36	08/09/2008 Foss Internal Drainage Board	199
37	09/09/2008 R D Fletcher	2614
38	09/09/2008 Anna Semlyen	1301
39	09/09/2008 Roger Armistead	2613
40	10/09/2008 Natural England	4
41	11/09/2008 Keith Chapman	2467
42	11/09/2008 T Booth	2612
43	12/09/2008 Alan Gillott	503
44	12/09/2008 North Yorkshire County Council	18
45	15/09/2008 York Cycle Campaign	111
46	15/09/2008 Brian Houghton	1659
47	15/09/2008 Bob Sydes	2153
48	16/09/2008 Sport England	398
49	08/09/2008 Howard Dickenson	2615
50	17/09/2008 Joanna Finlay	2617
51	17/09/2008 Royal Mail Group	327
52	17/09/2008 Felicity Iredale	2618
53	17/09/2008 Paul Turner	2620
54	18/09/2008 Jacqueline Warren (CYC)	2607
55	18/09/2008 Environment Agency	5
56	18/09/2008 Philip E Crowder	2616
57	18/09/2008 Wendy A Pycock	1885
58	17/09/2008 Silke Goebel	1443
59	19/09/2008 Keith Daggett	526
60	19/09/2008 Visit York	373
61	19/09/2008 Rosalind A Maggs	1791

York LDF City Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options – Summary of Responses

November 2008

62	19/09/2008 Paul Bray Menezes	1325
63	19/09/2008 River Foss Society	103
64	19/09/2008 Bettys Café Tea Rooms	2622
65	19/09/2008 Peter Marsden	2621
66	19/09/2008 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	49
67	19/09/2008 Rose Freeman	324
68	19/09/2008 The Coal Authority	397
69	21/09/2008 York ans District Trade Union Council	456
70	21/09/2008 Cllr Dave Taylor	2461
71	22/09/2008 Mulberry Hall	254
72	22/09/2008 York Green Party	458
73	22/09/2008 Monica Nelson	2469
74	22/09/2008 Richard Lane	511
75	22/09/2008 Ramblers' Association York Area	102
76	22/09/2008 The Castle Area Campaign Group	535
77	22/09/2008 Network Rail & National Museum	621 & 214
78	22/09/2008 Northminster Properties Ltd	532
79	22/09/2008 Gov Office for Yorkshire & Humber	1
80	22/09/2008 Rushbond	611
81	23/09/2008 K Richmond	2413
82	23/09/2008 English Heritage	242
83	23/09/2008 Highways Agency	2434
84	23/09/2008 Yorkshire Forward	479
85	23/09/2008 Osbaldwick Parish Council	43
86	23/09/2008 Edward Alan Courtney	1525
87	19/09/2008 Persimmon Homes Yorkshire Ltd	2623
88	22/09/2008 Strutt and Parker	2624
89	22/09/2008 Michael J Pulman	2625
90	22/09/2008 Larry Hotchkiss	2626
91	22/09/2009 Tony Kitchen	2627
92	22/09/2008 Steve Watson	2628
93	23/09/2008 Sainbury's Supermarket Ltd	2629
94	22/09/2008 Jen Williams	2630
95	22/09/2008 The Dataquest Partnership	2631
96	23/09/2008 Bryony Wilford	2632
97	22/09/2008 Centros (King Sturge)	2633

York LDF City Centre Area Action Plan Issues and Options – Summary of Responses

November 2008

98 23/09/2008 World Heritage Working Group	2635
99 23/09/2008 Dean of York	2636
100 24/09/2008 Thomas Feeney	2634
101 25/09/2008 Philip Crowe	580
102 25/09/2008 Janet Keenan	2637
103 25/09/2008 York Civic Trust	110
104 25/09/2008 Mary Ann Dearlove	1007
105 24/09/2008 Chris Newsome CYC	2638
106 05/09/2008 The River Foss Society (J Millett)	2639
107 26/09/2008 John Lacy (Licensing)	2610
108 29/09/2008 O'Neill Associates	2644
109 29/09/2008 Conservation Area Advisory Panel	441
110 29/09/2008 Miss Marion A Maw	2643
111 01/10/2008 Janet Hopton	203
112 03/10/2008 Murton Parish Council	77
113 03/10/2008 Dunnington Parish Council	67
114 01/10/2008 Bishop of Selby	
115 02/10/2008 Gillygate Surgery	2196
116 03/10/2008 Yorkshire & Humber Regional Assembly	2
117 05/10/2008 Kentmere House Gallery	
118 06/10/2008 York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	
119 06/10/2008 Graeme G Thomas	2552
120 06/10/2008 Christopher John Cullwick	
121 06/10/2008 Christian Schumacher	2498
122 06/10/2008 Ben Arnup	
123 06/10/2008 Colin Wood	1185
124 09/10/2008 York Environmental Forum	52
125 09/10/2008 York Archaeological Forum	107
126 20/10/2008 Douglas A Heald	2654
127 29/10/2008 Charlie Croft CYC (Lifelong Learning & Culture)	2605

General

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	<p>To be sound, important to consider how issues and options will be developed, through further consultation and supported by a robust evidence base and sustainability appraisal, to the publication. Although Preferred Options is no longer a milestone, further consultation is likely to be needed before publication.</p> <p>Policies and designations should be those considered necessary to help deliver the spatial vision, objectives and policies of emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>AAP should contain its own locally distinctive, realistic and inclusive vision of what the City Centre will be like at the end of the plan period. Should be developed from the vision in the Sustainable Community Strategy, the emerging spatial vision in the Core Strategy and the specific issues identified through consultation and from other strategies and the evidence base.</p> <p>At publication, need to set out information regarding assessment of options and alternatives and their selection and rejection. LDF system requires the generation and evaluation of options and alternatives. Need to ensure that documents are genuinely front-loaded by involving communities in the development of issues and alternative options and encourage a meaningful response based on a genuine choice of options. Options could focus on implementation, as well as being strategic.</p> <p>Preferred approach should be progressed in comparison with the alternatives and with commitment growing at each stage.</p> <p>Need to show why selected options perform better and why they were selected. If scope and choices seem limited, need to make clear why e.g. because of higher-level policies or other circumstances. Government policy should be at least met and variations from national or regional guidance need to be justified through the evidence base.</p> <p>Need to develop clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring. Publication document should propose deliverable options that are credible.</p> <p>Need to establish targets and milestones and be clearer about how these are to be measured. Where possible, there should be evidence of buy-in of the policies by other stakeholders or authority departments. At publication, the DPD will need to demonstrate sufficient flexibility to accommodate known and unexpected changes.</p> <p>It should also conform generally to but not repeat RSS published in May 2008.</p> <p>Spatial Portrait should come before Spatial Vision, which should follow on from issues identified in the completed portrait. Should include clear links between York City Centre and the regional economy, other AAPs, the fringes of York, Leeds City Region.</p> <p>Some elements of the three 'Key Visions' appear to be not locally specific. Addition of more detail regarding the scale and mix of development expected would help.</p>	<p>1/5190</p>

General Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	<p>Would also benefit from clearer links to Core Strategy’s strategic policies, thus setting limits of AAP. Spatial Vision should flow from Core Strategy but still be locally specific. In Key Themes, the lists of questions after each option offer very limited responses. The LDF system requires the evaluation of options and alternatives, with the assessment information set out alongside the options and the grounds for rejecting or selecting them. Communities should be encouraged to respond to consultation based on a genuine choice of options. As the document evolves it would be desirable to demonstrate where options are restricted because of higher-level policies or other factors.</p> <p>Need to establish more detail in strategy and site allocations, e.g. number of houses, scale and mix of commercial development expected to achieve so that AAP can be incorporated into emerging core strategy.</p> <p>Not apparent that flexibility is built in to allow for unexpected events or a dearth of development. Contingency plans should be considered. Some assessment of risk would also add to the robustness of the document.</p>	1/5190 continued
	<p>Overall, consultation papers provide a comprehensive review of detailed issues facing allocation of land within City of York and how they might be tackled.</p> <p>Also satisfied addresses those critical issues necessary to help deliver RSS policies. Not clear from the document how issues raised in Councils Strategic Housing Market Assessment are being dealt with. Would have expected a stronger steer on different options for housing mix or clear links to where this is addressed in other DPDs.</p>	2/5195
	<p>A number of options include a spatial element where policies may be developed designating areas where a particular use would be acceptable. If these are in areas of flood risk then a sequential test would need to be undertaken to ensure that these are the best areas for such development and there are no alternatives in areas of lower flood risk.</p>	5/5212
	<p>Major issue is sustainable transport particularly public transport. Frequent and reliable public transport is only alternative to the car. Recent cuts in bus services not a promising indicator of commitment.</p> <p>Need to transform poor infrastructure i.e. Marble Arch Bridge at Leeman Road and parking zone at Castle, but never allow development to obscure historic landmarks. Proposals and vision are good but confused and not prioritised. Some aspirations not compatible e.g. thriving commerce and a reduction in the use of the private car. Area is too small to do everything. One world-class building (Minster) and others aspiring for serious recognition, therefore need to prioritise.</p>	67/5302
	<p>Pleased to note work that has been done. Implementation will require quality leadership and management. Need to recruit best possible candidate.</p>	68/5303

General Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	<p>Do not get the impression of a strong vision behind this Report and seems to be a series of tactics but no clear overall strategy.</p> <p>Seems to have been constructed with little attention to the personality of York. Rather, it makes prescriptions for individual issues without first attempting to comprehend the overall personality of the city. Strongly recommend that Conservation Area appraisal is completed with all speed so that the results may be incorporated into the decisions made in the final Action Plan.</p> <p>Action Plan should take account of the proposed changes to heritage legislation specifically proposal to abolish Areas of Archaeological Importance designated in the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act. This seems not to have been addressed. Should be clearly identified within the CCAAP.</p> <p>Contains much that is good and clearly a high degree of detailed work has been done. The three key themes seem well chosen, although decision to place Economic Vitality first, tends to suggest that the other two themes are secondary to it. There are aspects of each that might more appropriately have been considered in another section.</p> <p>Maps that accompany the Report require more detailed editing before a final Action Plan is adopted. Mapping of listed buildings is inadequate. The economic drivers map seems incomplete. (Many eating and drinking establishments in High Petergate and Gillygate seem to be missing). The decision to draw the extent of the proposed shopping extension in the Castle area right up to the base of Clifford's Tower is worrying.</p>	<p>110/6805</p>
	<p>Unless plans are economically viable or Government funded they are a waste of time. Should concentrate on big picture, putting infrastructure in place for cars/bikes and pedestrians to live together make public spaces nice and attractive/encourage innovative exhibitions ideas etc then let professionals implement the detail.</p>	<p>198/6810</p>
	<p>Robust design policies should be included in all documents.</p> <p>Officers and members should champion good design.</p> <p>Design should be treated as a crosscutting issue.</p> <p>Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations.</p> <p>Should include adequate wording or "hooks" with policies to enable development and use of other design tools.</p> <p>Use of plans, graphics and illustrations are encouraged to help understanding of area, context and spatial vision proposed.</p>	<p>217/5413</p>

General Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	<p>Pleased to note recognition of importance of City’s historic assets to its character, future economic well being, and to the quality of life of its communities.</p> <p>Although makes a number of references to need to ensure that the strategy safeguards the “special character”, nowhere does it set out which aspects of York are considered to contribute to this. Without this, concerned that the strategy of the LDF may not actually fulfil that part of its stated vision and objectives relating to the safeguarding of the “special historic character or setting of the City”.</p>	242/5414
	<p>Appears as though all the necessary headings are there. However, difficult to comment when do not know exactly what is in mind for the city. Hate change for changes sake and so much is alright now.</p>	293/5450
	<p>Felt that tourism issues cut right through the themes in the text, and relate to many of the features under the three Key Themes as well as all the Opportunity Areas.</p> <p>Seeking a bold approach to change. City Centre has absorbed and benefited from many changes in last twenty years. Where questions suggest a “do nothing” option, feel can do better than that, for visitors and residents.</p> <p>The change outlined above would not have been achieved without detailed consideration of the operational and practical needs of city centre. Plan will stand or fall on how practical consequences of desired change are managed.</p>	373/5458
	<p>Welcomes inclusion of: - Inclusion of a separate section for accessibility of City Centre and public spaces, footstreets and rivers; Clear identification of the proposed opportunity areas; Linkages with LTP2; Production of Open Space, Sport and Recreational Strategy.</p>	398/5484
	<p>Deplore unfinished state of Conservation Area Appraisal. Hope can be completed well before Preferred Options.</p>	441/5494
	<p>No explicit consideration of how AAP would support delivery of various regional, sub-regional and local economic strategies. Would be helpful to consider links to those strategies that have particular importance to delivery of AAP, e.g. RSS and Future York Group Report.</p>	479/5594
	<p>Action Plan is something of a disappointment. It is as staid, backward looking and unimaginative as the 'Future York' report. Dominated by concerns for retail, with no qualification as to nature of retail. Better served if discriminated in favour of independent and/or locally owned establishments, rather than blindly promoting retail generically. Promotion of retail is in direct odds to the promotion of York as a unique and historical centre with its own identity. Competition with Leeds should not be an aim. More important considerations are being entirely omitted. No aspiration to build a more sustainable or healthy city.</p>	511/5616

General Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	Support concept of AAP.	611/5760
	Appreciate how much York has to offer and how much must be preserved. Access to City must be cheap; parking can then be limited to disabled, deliveries etc. Centre must be clean, small businesses supported and existing buildings used as opposed to creating new ones that are not in keeping with heritage. Don't ruin what is a beautiful and international heritage site, for modernisation, consumerism and commercialism.	681/5786
	Information gained from website does not really state any tangible objectives, just a collection of ideas.	789/5787
	Best and most comprehensive survey done for a long time. Market should be advertised more.	945/5788
	Recurring theme is that of need for more 'growth'. Do we really need to create more and more of this, that and the other? Proper sense of balance and harmony is as important.	1299/5920
	20 mph should be default speed limit maximum on residential roads. Need to prepare for economy with less fuel. Should aim for an energy descent plan and build local generation of power with renewable energy. Other elements would include promotion of local food production and also energy saving measures. Stop all road building or road widening.	1301/5921
	Cut or abolish car-parking fees. Attract manufacturing. Get control of business rates. Retain niche shops to make York different to Meadowhall etc. Need to be more radical.	1486/5992
	Area including War memorial should be improved - names difficult to read. Area outside railway station badly laid out, gives visitors a bad impression.	1601/6093
	A very comprehensive study. Key to successful outcome will be how well eventual plan balances and reconciles conflicting demands of how best to maintain and enhance a historic urban environment while at same time allowing reasonable modern retail, office and housing development, all combined with better facilities for pedestrian movement, cycling and essential vehicle access.	2028/6147
	Royal Mail does not make best use of Leeman Road site. Constant flow of large vehicles is considerable addition to traffic congestion. Forecourt is pretty unsightly, particularly with amount of litter. Not a pleasing approach to NRM.	2161/6825
	Applaud wide level of public consultation on City Centre Action Plan	2552/6405
	Council's Executive agreed that Public consultation on whether a Big Screen should be established in York take place as part of LDF process and a Big Screen Option be added to CCAAP. (See representation for further information)	2605/6814

General Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
	Whole document could be stronger on Climate Change and environmental protection. Suggest adding at vision stage (and related areas throughout CCAAP) something relating to creating a City Centre that lives within its environmental limits i.e. adapting and mitigating to climate change (including addressing and reducing GHG emissions), sustainable design and construction (including improved energy generation, energy efficiency and low/zero carbon technology & IPS) and enhancing and protecting wildlife and biodiversity. Some of these aspects are mentioned in bulk of document but not at beginning, thus this dulls down their importance, especially climate change.	2607/6465
	Plan is conservative, specifics too narrowly drawn and inwardly focused and pursues short-term initiatives that are in vogue e.g. low-cost housing, eco-friendliness and carbon foot-printing, rather than concentrating upon a long term plan. Need to maintain York's reputation as a heritage centre. No need to consider affordable housing within City Walls. Plenty of estates outside City area where affordable housing can be provided. Traffic situation always over-stated. Compared to most other city centres, joy to negotiate. One aspect to address is access to City after trading hours. For evening economy to thrive need to relax parking restrictions and prohibitions on an evening. These should only be contemplated in interests of public safety. Planning constipation is a major issue due to time taken, questions of focus and resourcing and unjustified political interference. Opportunity areas are properly identified, but not enough emphasis placed on transport links. Badly needs proper bus station and interchange. -Should be catalyst for 'cultural quarter' linking the NRM to Art Gallery via Museum Gardens. Victorian emphasis is not exploited enough. Should trumpet enterprise of George Hudson, link it to emergence of York's Philosophical Society as Yorkshire Museum and relate it to Victorian concern to introduce culture into City Centre through exhibiting of fine art.	2631/6680
	Encouraged by direction of CCAAP particularly retail led development of castle Piccadilly. Crucial City Centre is expanded to accommodate new modern retail floor space. This should take priority over other aspirations in AAP.	2633/6701
	Report well written and accessible, giving "room" for people to enter into it and feel can comment and be involved. Puts over options and facts clearly and with empathy. Support overall approach.	2638/6773
	Concerned consultation is taking place before completion of Conservation Area Appraisal.	2651/6798

The Vision for the City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Key visions too extensive and detailed. Could be replaced by shorter vision statement. Details can be listed separately, but fundamental, over-riding vision should be considered.	373/5459
	First of three key themes should be called "Economic Prosperity ", rather than vitality, would be more aspirational. Re visions: - Accessibility by public transport is more a community than economic issue; Economic Prosperity should include establishing York as a major Conference venue and having at least one 5 star internationally renowned hotel; Historic Environment should include having achieved World Heritage status by 2029; City will have "improved" (rather than merely retained) its character - adding to the statement "by developing an emphasis on the Victorian aspects of the City in the cultural quarter"; Community Life should include specific reference to swimming facilities and cycle ways as part of "healthier lifestyle" statement.	2631/6570
Question 1	Vision should set out meaningful, locally relevant and achievable outlook for City Centre that provides realistically ambitious targets for improvement and tie in with aspirations for adjacent areas such as York Northwest. Should also reflect Community Strategy vision. It should combine views and ideas from other sources addressing York's environmental, economic and social needs. Welcome and support inclusion of issues that help to support delivery of Natural England's outcomes.	4/5196
	Section is about a vision for City Centre but is soon broken down into three separate visions. No vision combining all themes as one for the City Centre. E.g. "...a successful retail and commercial offer... serviced by readily accessible public transport, by foot and by cycle with pedestrian and cyclist friendly initiatives which reduce congestion... in a unique historic but contemporary setting ... offering facilities that meet the needs of people of all ages and cultures... and meeting the social and community needs of all sections of older, younger, single and /or disabled people and families in York." Holistic vision and Key Themes should be reflected and cross-referenced with each other.	43/5226
	Welcome aspiration in "Vision for Economic Vitality" that in 2029 York city centre will be a successful shopping destination and have strong links with York Northwest and the NRM. Suggest that York Central will have a part to play. Consider that first two bullet points of "Vision for Economic Vitality" should be merged to reflect part that York Central can play in achieving the overall aim set out in the City of York Retail Study 2008. Re aspiration for the city centre to accommodate a range of quality office accommodation, note there is a shortage of high quality office space in the city centre, and therefore questions whether the constrained city centre alone can accommodate space to meet identified need.	214/5371 & 621/5392

The Vision for the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 1 continued	Propose that the sixth bullet point of the “Vision for Economic Vitality” be amended to include reference to the fact that the city centre, together with York Central, will have a range of office accommodation that meets market needs.	214/5371 & 621/5392 continued
	Broadly endorse Visions. Certain elements of “Vision for Economic Vitality” (e.g. encouragement of better links between City Centre and York Northwest) could conflict with “Vision for Historic Environment”. Would have been useful, in Sustainability Appraisal, to have undertaken similar assessment to that in Appendix 10 of ODPM guidance “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents” to test consistency, identify potential tensions and indicate areas where component parts of visions should be amended. In Vision for Historic Environment, several aspects seem only to have a tenuous link with the management/promotion of the City’s historic assets. E.g. a “dedicated outdoor performance area”, and “a public realm which can be used for a wide range of activities and events” appear to be social aspirations (or economic) rather than associated with the historic environment. A larger pedestrian zone is more to do with movement around the City although removing traffic may have benefits for setting of the City’s historic assets. Specific observations for the “Vision for Historic Environment”: - Suggest first bullet-point is amended to read, “will have retained and, where appropriate, enhanced its unique and special historic character”. Suggest second bullet-point is amended to read, “will showcase the highest standards of contemporary, contextual design”.	242/5415
	Economic Vitality - Do not accept need for more shops to be added to City Centre or that new shops should be located on Castle car park. First bullet point should be amended to read "will be a successful shopping destination for local people and visitors alike". Historic Environment - As City Centre is largely designated as the Central Historic Core Conservation Area, first bullet point should read, "will retain its unique and special character and appearance which will have been preserved and enhanced". Suggest additional bullet point, "will be exemplary of good conservation practice". Eighth bullet point should be amended to omit word "historic" relating to the market place.	441/5495
	Welcome Vision for Economic Vitality. Would be helpful to consider how City Centre and its communities would be connected to key elements of City’s economy, particularly Science City York and the Universities. Suggest amending criterion 2 to: ‘will have strong links with York Northwest’s retail and office offer, the National Railway Museum, Science City York and the City’s universities;’	479/5595

The Vision for the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 1 continued	Vision for Historic Environment – would be helpful to consider how development within City Centre would support delivery of RES target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20-25% by 2016. Suggest vision should encourage sustainable development by promoting new development where it would mitigate and adapt to impacts of climate change. To improve consistency with national and regional planning policy an additional criterion should be included, which promotes the use of appropriate sustainable construction and design measures in City Centre.	479/5595 continued
	Economic Vitality: 1. Suggest delete 'at Castle Piccadilly' and replace with, 'with an expanded shopping offer'. 2. Suggest 'York Northwest' rather than 'York Northwest's retail and office offer. 7. Already has a 'thriving early evening economy' for food and drink, so it would be helpful to identify shops here. Community Life 4. Add 'local and regional' to 'from across the world'.	526/5656
	Bullet Point 1 under Vision for Economic Vitality should be expunged. Would be failure to support economic vitality of local businesses and traders and lead to a loss of identity of York. Should adhere to Planning Inspector's comments relating to Castle Piccadilly.	535/5723
	Support vision for City Centre generally but in particular: - Making the city more attractive to inward investors and businesses; Refreshing the tourism offer; Having a more diverse and inclusive evening experience; Showcasing the highest quality of contemporary design; Having a high quality public realm; Having a wide range of homes.	611/5761
	Excellent. Old streets could be used for film locations.	945/5789
	Development should be sustainable as possible and include green technology. Access to York Northwest by sustainable means e.g. train/tram with park and ride at Poppleton.	1325/5922
	Provide extensive vision for next 20 years.	1525/5993
	Ambitious.	1601/6048
	Under Historic Environment first bullet point should read: "will have retained and enhanced its unique and special character".	2153/6152
	Desire to create a 'major addition to York's shopping offer at Castle Piccadilly' is misguided. Not only is this one of most important heritage locations in City, would have detrimental effect on economic vitality of rest of City Centre. York should play to its strengths in offering a distinct and different shopping experience. Strongly oppose any proposal to build shops near Clifford's Tower. Rest of 'visions' acceptable and welcomed, although phrase 'refreshed tourism offer' is too vague to have any meaning. An additional 'vision' should be to see York become a World Heritage Site.	2461/6285

The Vision for the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 1 continued	Bullet point 6 can be achieved between Clifford's Tower and Foss. Grass with benches by Foss desirable for shoppers, would draw them to revitalised market, which would be a feature here. Play space for children by Eye of York would bring more visitors to Castle Museum. New shops, just over footbridge, in Piccadilly, where development would thrive.	2469/6338
	Agree with detailed visions for economic vitality and historic environment. Community Life - Statement 4 in vision should be amended by adding at the end 'whilst retaining a strong element of the York and Yorkshire culture and tradition.'	2552/6367
	Think Visions are exactly right and three key themes are right ones.	2628/6617
	Economic Vitality - add 'to support local businesses and local production, including food'. Historic Environment - amend last bullet point to include 'for residents and visitors' after historic market place. Community Life – add at end of last bullet point 'as home and homecoming, where feel can belong'.	2638/6774

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Should take more account of increasing student presence in city. Although University of York is committed to housing most of its students within its Heslington campus, York St John University is providing new accommodation behind Walmgate, within the area of CCAAP. Implications for a changed demographic seem not to be considered. Another similar major change is development of York Central and Northwest AAP. Seems little in CCAAP to connect up the two Action Plans and understand one in the light of the other.	110/6806
	Main thrust must be to make offering of York as a City good value to both locals and tourists and hopefully residents who may wish to live in the centre. Need pavement culture, but have to stop little issues, such as fire engine access complaints from a few residents, stopping this taking place. Tourism is likely to be lifeblood of city, must encourage tourist growth to be a vibrant city. This means events in public spaces both temporary and permanent. Pictures around York are a great idea, not publicised enough. Suggest the same with modern art, music playing or even a York quiz contest. Also suggest special 'Visit York' trains with entertainment based on York at station and the future cultural quarter.	198/6811
	Visit to the Walks in Chester may give an idea. Many streets in York Centre where this could be copied. Stop selling out to large multiples. Reduce rent and rates to a level attractive to small businesses.	2626/6615
Introduction Paragraph 6.02	Reference to policy suggestions made by Future York Group inappropriate. Report not adopted by Council and reference should be deleted.	580/6820
Spatial Portrait - Offices Paragraph 6.07	Should not be seeking more offices in City Centre. Out-of-town office accommodation should not be seen as 'the enemy' but as offering easier commuting/parking etc.	1299/5914
Spatial Portrait: Retail Paragraph 6.08	Retail performance is affected by other factors, e.g. how attractive the City Centre is and how easy to get around.	2628/6618
Spatial Portrait: Tourism Paragraph 6.09	Tourism is starved of investment both in private and public sectors. Marketing is abysmal.	2628/6619
Spatial Portrait: Evening Economy Paragraph 6.10	Concern about York's attraction of hen and stag nights. Not nice at midday for people with young children. Good for pubs but not for City Centre as it puts families and tourists off.	1237/5882
	Evening Economy is really important but has taken York a long time to adjust.	2628/6620
Spatial Portrait: Universities Paragraph 6.11	At start of term large groups of students walk into town with sole purpose of getting drunk.	1237/5883
Map 1: Economic Drivers	St Leonard's Place & Museum Street shown as "office premises". Whilst this is current use, building has potential to be re-used for a mix of uses including hotel, residential, offices, retail and food and drink. Suggest that "office premises" notation is deleted or the plan amended to make clear that these notations refer to current economic drivers.	611/5762

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Question 1</p>	<p>Needs to be overlap between Central and Northwest. City Centre has limited space for any sizeable development without undermining historic environment. Largest vacant land around station should be in this area as long as transport is sorted.</p>	<p>67/5276</p>
	<p>Supports proactive options for tackling issues raised. Does not support “do nothing” options. Theme has an accurate description.</p>	<p>203/5326</p>
	<p>Note bullet points in paragraph 6.7 do not refer to the important conclusion that there is a shortage of high quality office accommodation within the city centre. Should be reported within AAP. Could most appropriately be included within fifth bullet point of paragraph 6.7, which requires amending so that its meaning is clear. Should be revised to read: “The ELR concludes that occupiers often choose out-of-centre premises as a ‘second choice’ because of the lack of availability of high quality city centre office accommodation.” Paragraph 6.8 should refer to constrained physical environment of city centre. Welcome acknowledgement in paragraph 6.12 that “The York Northwest area, especially the York Central site, has huge potential to complement the city centre.” Paragraph 6.13, contributions towards success of York’s economy, to meeting residents’ needs, and to York’s success as a tourist and leisure destination, relies on shops and facilities within York as a whole and not confined to simply city centre locations.</p>	<p>214/5372 & 621/5393</p>
	<p>Generally agree. Agree in particular with identification in Paragraph 6.2, of critical role played by its historic environment. However, should also note that the historic environment contributes to attractiveness of the City as a place to invest, for a skilled workforce to live, a place to study, and a place to visit – all of which contribute to the economy of the city.</p>	<p>242/5416</p>
	<p>Under paragraph 6.8 unsure if percentages quoted are for City Centre or for whole area. Unable to comment without undertaking a survey.</p>	<p>456/5536</p>
	<p>Following should be added to description of City Centre: “Vision for economic vitality: In 2029, York City Centre will have a strong local business base with a balanced mix helping to protect the local economy from the vagaries of world markets.”</p>	<p>458/5559</p>
	<p>Tourism section could be expanded to give an approximate percentage split of the origin of visitors from abroad. Likewise region British tourists come from. Hotels deserve more analysis. Lack of a major conference and exhibition facility should be mentioned. Status as a Gateway to a region should be emphasised. Should be mentioned that economic vitality of City Centre is boosted by events held outside it; race meetings etc.</p>	<p>526/5657</p>
	<p>Accurate but too many cafes.</p>	<p>945/5790</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>1525/5994</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 1 continued	Yes.	1601/6049
	Yes. Decline in retail activity a serious issue.	1791/6095
	Find statistics unhelpful in understanding economic drivers. Some work needs to be done to summarise data more effectively in order to fully understand economic picture. Text gives no feel for relationship between roles of specialist shops and national chain stores and other branded retailers.	2153/6153
	Could add something about thriving residential community in City, well supported by local services e.g. City Centre general practices, YDH, local schools.	2196/6189
	Yes.	2239/6205
	Accurate description apart from references to ongoing growth. May have to be revised in light of current economic trends. Note that Council has not adopted 'Future York' report. Suggest little weight is attached to it in deliberations with regard to LDF.	2461/6286
	Increase in late night drinking causes concern. Problems with air quality caused by vehicle exhausts when congestion occurs. Set to increase because of housing schemes in pipeline. Increase in retail, housing and employment should not be pursued as cannot cope with congestion levels at present.	2469/6339
	Disagree with comment in Paragraph 6.12 that 'there is a well established route network'. Contains hundreds of bits that are too short. Best route that existed (old industrial railway) has recently been cut in two when James Street was connected to Layerthorpe Street. This should be restored.	2498/6364
	Yes.	2614/6487
	Generally accurate but analysis of traffic problem not sufficiently robust. Gives impression City Centre is a pedestrian paradise when in fact blighted by traffic and parked cars, particularly Goodramgate.	2628/6621
Yes.	2633/6702	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Shopping uses, in particular on car park area at Castle Piccadilly have been resisted in past and will continue to be in future. This is on three grounds: first, is an area with a concentration of Grade I listed buildings; Secondly, part of economic success of York's retail lies in its compactness in medieval core. To extend southwards would compromise delicate balance that exists; Thirdly, Public Realm Map (6) shows how little green space there is at this end of City and demonstrates potential for creating a really popular and well-used public open space leading down to a newly landscaped bank of Foss.	110/6815
	York Northwest boundary has been identified on a number of maps within CCAAP, however, these should stipulate that it is 'indicative' and will not be confirmed until the adoption of the York Northwest AAP.	479/5598
	Concern about proposed extension close to Clifford's Tower. Should be a green park space with Foss flowing through it.	549/5752
	Encourage small shops to open in City Centre.	1007/5842
	Wish main shopping areas were brought back into City. Non-car owners find out of town shopping difficult to get to. Should encourage major retail businesses to locate back in City so all residents can have equal access to them.	1100/5851
	Do everything possible to support small independent traders. Don't allow a city centre of cloned uniformity.	2610/6842
	Any plan must first recognise why York attracts people. Surveys suggest that one factor is small individual shops. Opposed to major retail development on Castle Piccadilly. Clifford's Tower is unique and of historical significance and setting must be maintained and improved. National retailers would be likely to dominate major retail development. This would draw footfall from other parts of City, which provide York's unique character. Retail development on this site has twice been rejected at public inquiries. Promotion of major shopping centres is incompatible with sustainability as developments become out-dated within 30-40 years and are then demolished. However, wish to see regeneration of Piccadilly.	2651/6799
Paragraph 6.14	Coney Street looks run down in places. Some shop fronts could look better.	1237/5884
	Retail balance is wrong. Too many corporate brands, not enough small local businesses. Distinctiveness is constantly threatened.	2628/6622
Paragraph 6.17	Designer Outlet, Naburn, should generate more shops here.	1237/5885
	Out of town retail parks are convenient, reduce congestion in the City and are a valuable part of economy of area as a whole.	1299/5916
Paragraph 6.18	55% said no to more shops in the City Centre. This should be respected and suggestion to provide more retail space and larger stores resisted.	2612/6468

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Paragraph 6.17 and 6.18</p>	<p>Important to maintain high quality of existing retail. Unwise to insist on maintaining a certain percentage of market share as size of market increases as cities develop. Expanding retail area to keep up would dilute the quality.</p>	<p>203/5330</p>
	<p>Do not accept implication that York should compete with Leeds and Hull for regional retail share. York competes on basis of being different. Note that paragraph 6.18 indicates that 55% of responses to shopping questionnaire cited "said no to more shops in the City Centre". This is inconsistent with first sentence in paragraph.</p>	<p>441/5496</p>
<p>Protecting the Existing Shopping Environment Paragraph 6.20</p>	<p>Micklegate needs more promoting.</p>	<p>1237/5886</p>
<p>Protecting the Existing Shopping Environment Question 2</p>	<p>No preference to location of Central Shopping Boundary provided sequential test (ST) and exception test (ET) has been carried out for the allocation of sites. Castle Piccadilly is identified as a major development site in the Core Strategy; therefore ST and ET should be undertaken at that level. If sites that are not identified in the Core Strategy are to be allocated in CCAAP, then the ST and ET will need to be carried out in the AAP.</p>	<p>5/5213</p>
	<p>Option 2.</p>	<p>43/5227</p>
	<p>Option 3 – need good feeder facilities i.e. bus terminals and parking.</p>	<p>67/5277</p>
	<p>Option 3 – to include Stonebow area on Map 3 and Piccadilly side of the Foss. Castle side should not be included.</p>	<p>203/5329</p>
	<p>The boundary of Central Shopping Area should be formulated once the overall approach to retail provision in York has been understood and agreed through the overarching Core Strategy. Therefore it may be premature to identify a specific Central Shopping Area boundary in advance of the completion of this work. The 2008 Retail Study confirms that existing city centre is deficient in space to support the full extent of capacity identified in the LDF plan period to 2029, and notes that the Central Shopping Area Boundary within the Draft Local Plan is “now considerably out of date”. Advise taking the opportunity to redraw the boundary in line with the emerging retail strategy being developed as part of the Core Strategy. Welcome reference in paragraph 6.27 that ‘York Central’ site is considered to be preferable to out-of-centre locations for additional retail. York Central should be included on Map 4, shaded purple as a “Major Development Opportunity Site.”</p>	<p>214/5373 & 621/5394</p>
	<p>Option 1 – Object. Option 2 – See Option 3. Option 3. Map 3 is acceptable with following modifications: - Castle car park should be excluded; Shopping should not be extended along Piccadilly beyond Merchantgate - preferable existing largely office use in Piccadilly should be retained;</p>	<p>441/5497</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Protecting the Existing Shopping Environment Question 2 continued</p>	<p>Following designated 'Gateway Streets' should also be added, since their inclusion in Central Shopping Area will help safeguard their viability: Gillygate; whole of Goodramgate; Fossgate and Walmgate; Bridge Street and Micklegate.</p>	<p>441/5497 continued</p>
	<p>Option 2. Centre dominated by clothes shops and not easy to shop for diverse range of goods. Take issue with paragraph 6.14 re good range of multiple retailers. Centre has suffered from competition from Out-of-Town Shopping Centres. Paragraph 6.14 is in direct conflict with paragraph 6.17 e.g. very few retailers selling “white goods” in City Centre.</p>	<p>456/5537</p>
	<p>Vitality of City Centre is best enhanced by concentrating on existing primary shopping streets and by reinvigorating secondary areas such as Micklegate, Walmgate and Gillygate. Obsession with new large scale shopping developments such as that proposed around Clifford's Tower could lead to a lack of trade and gradual loss of shops in existing streets. Do not believe any expansion in the main shopping area is desirable.</p>	<p>458/5560</p>
	<p>Central Shopping area should be redrawn to include areas to West of Ouse, and exclude area to West of Foss adjacent to Clifford's Tower. Improved connectivity across Ouse created by the proposed new bridge, and possible pedestrianisation of Ouse Bridge should be seized upon to revitalise Micklegate/George Hudson Street/Rougier Street/Tanner Row areas.</p>	<p>511/5617</p>
	<p>Option 1. With exception of Micklegate, 2007 retail study does not address status of shopping south west of Ouse, and eventual relationship to York Northwest. An extension of primary shopping along Piccadilly is unlikely to succeed without much rebuilding of south side of street's North West end. Although this is identified as a primary shopping street it is dispiriting. Improvements to this part of street should take precedence over new build beyond Piccadilly Bridge. Ideal solution would involve refreshing much of south side of Piccadilly, retaining Coppergate front of White Swan, replacing car park with a store or offices, having new CYC HQ beyond bridge, and a new car park further beyond that. Market cross toilet block could be opened up as a roofed shelter/performance area/utility area/covered cycle store. Stonebow site has several advantages: - Nearer to epicentres of York's shopping; It is at end of three gateway streets and not one; Can be approached via more shopping streets and tourist routes; Would upgrade Colliergate and Whipmawhopmagate; Would 'hand on' routes to new Hungate area; Would upgrade environment through to Fossgate; It could extend and improve the character of Pavement. Option 2. Out of date.</p>	<p>526/5658</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Protecting the Existing Shopping Environment Question 2 continued	Option 3. Bridge Street, Lower Micklegate, George Hudson Street and Rougier Street do not seem to figure in planning as even secondary shopping streets. Rougier Street presents a large area, not quite a square. It should serve Toft Green's nighttime activity area or office area. It is likely to have renewed importance as a route to York Northwest. Should be addressed by recasting area into a better quality space with NE side of Rougier Street rebuilt, eliminating former garage/offices and rebuilding the side back to the former Tanner Street.	526/5658 continued
	Option 3. Support need to maintain retail role, but also acknowledge is linked to role as a key tourist destination. Means that leisure and tourist related uses are also important for City Centre. Not appropriate for Piccadilly area to be included as part of central shopping area. River Foss should form boundary adjacent to Coppergate Centre. Piccadilly is distant from core of City Centre and other complementary uses may be more appropriate e.g. hotels, restaurants, cafes and possibly offices. Opportunity to enhance Piccadilly to provide important and much needed tourist facilities.	532/5702
	Options 1 and 2. No. Option 3. 'Little shops' are what makes York interesting for shopping.	535/5724
	Options 1 and 2. Disagree. Option 3. Addition of Castle Piccadilly not acceptable. Recognition of Stonebow site welcome and should be included.	580/5753
	St Leonard's Place, Gillygate, Bootham and High Petergate are all shown as outside central shopping area. St Leonard's Place currently has limited shopping offer relating to cultural attractions, but with re-development this could change. Should consider identifying street as a potential secondary shopping street.	611/5763
	Option 2. Will secure future of existing businesses.	945/5791
	Option 3. Omit retail from Castle area and concentrate on Piccadilly and York Northwest.	1325/5923
	Options 1 and 2.	1525/5995
	Option 2.	1601/6050
	Option 2. Not as much retail around Clifford's Tower. Restrict shops to waterfront and retain rest as green open space/cultural area.	1791/6096
	Option 1.	2153/6154
	Option 2.	2161/6868
	Option 3 to include Micklegate and greater use of pedestrianised riverside areas for retail/leisure. Greater development of riverside locations could place river at centre of City. Larger and more variety of department stores would attract more local shoppers and tourists. Would be a shame to lose smaller independent retailers. Would not like to see vast indoor shopping malls but prefer an open-air version.	2196/6190

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Protecting the Existing Shopping Environment Question 2 continued	Options 1 and 2. Could form sound basis to be worked upon.	2239/6206
	Options 1 and 2 should be dismissed. Favour Option 3 to include a stronger focus on Secondary Shopping Streets such as Goodramgate, Gillygate, Micklegate, Fossgate, etc.	2461/6287
	Option 3. Concentrate in Piccadilly and leave area between Clifford's Tower and Foss as an amenity area.	2469/6340
	Option 3. Addition of Fossgate and northern Walmgate would enhance central shopping area and provide inclusivity to this area.	2552/6368
	Option 2.	2614/6488
	Option 3. Only Piccadilly side of Foss should have built retail development. 'Castle side' should remain open for other uses e.g. markets; events or car parking.	2617/6525
	Option 2. Extending to Castle Piccadilly would take away from compactness of City and affect its vitality. Stonebow could do with development and would benefit from being part of central shopping area.	2622/6587
	Central shopping area should be redrawn to include Micklegate, Gillygate and more of Walmgate.	2628/6623
	Option 1.	2633/6703
	Option 1.	2636/6728
Managing Retail Uses Question 3	Option 2.	43/5228
	Option 2.	67/5278
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5331
	Option 1. Especially those streets identified in Paragraph 6.22. Consideration should be given to an additional Option, which seeks to restrict the amalgamation of neighbouring small shop units to form larger retail premises. Consideration should also be given to the inclusion of a Policy, which seeks to safeguard the "hidden" spaces behind street frontages. These are part of the "grain" of the city and contribute to its special character.	242/5417
	Responses relate to the altered Central Shopping Area identified in Question 2. Option 1. Primary Shopping Frontages to include all primary shopping streets listed in Appendix H in the DCLP. Option 2. To include 'Gateway Streets' listed in Question 2, Option 3. Option 3. Policy S4 in the Development Control Local Plan, relating to 'Protected Primary Shopping Streets' should be extended to apply to: - High and Low Petergate, Parliament Street, Coney Street, Market Street, High and Low Ousegate, Colliergate and all of Goodramgate.	441/5498
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	456/5538

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Managing Retail Uses Question 3 continued	Options 1 and 2. Effort should be made to protect retail frontages in secondary as well as primary streets. To increase footfall, ways could be investigated of creating more convenient pedestrian links from and across City Centre, may mean reallocating road space from vehicles. Castle Piccadilly should be promoted as a mixed-use development with a significant residential element and open space around Clifford’s Tower. Some existing buildings on Piccadilly, such as the Banana Warehouse, could be incorporated into any new development. Historic shop frontages should be protected from unsuitable alterations.	458/5561
	Three options are all "yes", which seems a little perverse. Fail to see threat from non-retail uses opening up. Don’t understand what is meant by "undesirable uses". Cannot see any justification for policy to require buildings to be used for retail. Better to allow premises to be used for whatever uses they will most benefit from and maintain high footfall.	511/5618
	Options 1 and 2. May be useful. Option 2. Any formula should not preclude punctuating secondary retail streets with return of some properties to domestic use. Option 3. Sensible. A policy could encourage expansion of retail units into adjacent properties, with appropriate retention of character of each.	526/5659
	Option 1. Appropriate to protect Primary Frontages. Other areas may be appropriate for a greater mix. Should not be too prescriptive. Not appropriate to include Piccadilly as a secondary shopping frontage.	532/5703
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Especially ‘Little Shops’ in secondary shopping areas.	535/5725
	Option 3. Not have so much on shop windows.	945/5792
	Option 1.	1237/5887
	Option 1.	1325/5924
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Consider incentives - rents/business rates to encourage more shops.	1525/5996
	Option 1.	1601/6051
	Option 1.	1791/6097
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Don’t need to compete with other city centres. What is so attractive about York is survival of many small independent shops and retention of some of its character. Coney Street as dominant location for ‘branded’ national chains is quite distinct from other parts of York. Distinction needs protecting. As well as protecting street frontages should also protect mix of shops and encourage diversity.	2153/6155

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Managing Retail Uses Question 3 continued	Need to find a mechanism that will encourage more food-based shops to open in Centre. Protecting street frontages also needs to be looked at in relation to Newgate Market and various markets held in Parliament Street.	2153/6155 continued
	Option 2.	2161/6869
	Options 1 and 2 should be adopted with some reservations on Option 3 with regard to loss of job opportunities	2239/6207
	Option 3.	2413/6826
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Particularly Option 2.	2461/6288
	Option 1.	2552/6369
	Options 1 and 2.	2614/6489
	Loath to support too many restrictions as can strangle development.	2617/6526
	Option 3.	2622/6588
	Option 1.	2628/6624
	Options 1 and 2.	2636/6729
New Retail Development General	Would want to see mixed use activity on Castle Piccadilly – it could be retail led but should not be exclusively retail. Would look for “complementary retail” on York Central (i.e. not competing with the shopping offer of the traditional city centre) but again mixed use preferred.	373/5461
	Retail development of current car park area near Clifford's Tower is inappropriate. A green space in this area would be preferable.	2630/6677
New Retail Development Paragraph 6.23 and 6.25	Disagree. City Centre has attracted numerous fashion and homeware brands since 2004. Shopping offer has improved. Retailers and shoppers are attracted because it's different. Piccadilly would be better dedicated to an eclectic mix of uses: - offices, five star hotel, council offices and some retail tightly knit to the existing shopping area.	254/5449
New Retail Development Paragraph 6.24	To ensure future viability, sustainability and accessibility, York needs to remain a compact and circular pedestrianised shopping location. Oppose extension of shopping provision in a linear form down Piccadilly. Any additional shopping should either hug top of Piccadilly or be located within existing shopping area.	254/5448
New Retail Development Map 4	Highlight opportunity for new retail development at York Central in Map 4.	479/5597
New Retail Development Question 4	Allocations that take place in this AAP as oppose to the allocations DPD need to ensure that ST and ET have been undertaken.	5/5214
	Combination of Options 2 and 3.	43/5229
	Option 3.	67/5279
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. Only Piccadilly not Castle side of Foss.	203/5332

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Retail Development Question 4 continued	Recognise retail development should be directed to town centres first, and acknowledge Castle Piccadilly is a key retail site within city centre. However, strongly supports Option 3.	214/5374 & 621/5395
	<p>Concur with Paragraph 6.23 that, because of character of historic core, there is a lack of suitable space to accommodate large retail units. Would not oppose Option 1, provided that redevelopment of area is undertaken in line with principles set out in recent Development Brief.</p> <p>Option 2. Telephone Exchange/Stonebow House sites could offer potential for additional retailing. Given character of Goodramgate, concerns about impact redevelopment might have upon grain of streets in this part of City Centre.</p> <p>Concern extends to not simply effect, which redevelopment might have upon plot sizes, but also what impact loss of “hidden” spaces behind street frontages might have.</p> <p>Parts of riverside within AAP, particularly on western bank, are uninspiring. Would greatly benefit from investment. In principle, welcome opportunity to enliven this area and potential to create a walkway along river’s eastern bank.</p> <p>Option 3. However, whilst favour improvement of linkages between City Centre and area to northwest of station, support is conditional upon such linkages having no adverse impact upon historic character of City.</p>	242/5418
	<p>Do not agree with basic premise that more retail space is needed in City Centre.</p> <p>Option 1. Object.</p> <p>Option 2. Exclude Goodramgate.</p> <p>Option 3.</p>	441/5499
	<p>Options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Agree City Centre retail development is preferable to “Out of Town” shopping. Agree with sentiments expressed in paragraph 6.23 re lack of new modern retail space. Would like to see freeze on any further expansion of number of retail units at the Out of Town centres.</p> <p>Agree that ‘Castle Area’ should be a priority.</p> <p>York Central has limited potential for retail, not clear how linkages to city would be achieved. Large shops may find themselves isolated. Ideally retail areas should flow into each other so one feeds off another.</p> <p>Development of Stonebow and Telephone Exchange areas would be ideal for extension of shopping area.</p> <p>Any retail development should not be at the detriment of other shopping areas in City, particularly small shops.</p>	456/5539
	<p>Option 1. Oppose. Unusual and specialist retailing should be protected and encouraged.</p> <p>Large chain stores simply duplicate provision available elsewhere and erode City’s unique attraction.</p>	458/5562

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Retail Development	Combination of Options 1 and 3.	479/5596
Question 4 continued	<p>Sceptical about prescriptions of Retail Study. Better to develop cautiously. Piccadilly should be redeveloped urgently, and agree that Ouse riverfront and Stonebow are challenges and opportunities to be seized.</p> <p>Castle Area should not be developed for any significant retail use. York Central may provide another excellent opportunity. Great deal of opportunity for infill development to tidy up areas such as Ogleforth, Tanner Row and the West side of Gillygate.</p>	511/5619
	<p>Option 1. Strongly disagree. Stonebow would be better.</p> <p>Option 2. Curious to identify Goodramgate for infill projects. Virtually every building is listed. It owes its character to its small plots. Goodramgate may lose its charity shop image with growth of University, as it provides shortest route to retail centre. Better promotion of street, e.g. as part of the newly announced Minster Quarter, should help.</p> <p>Option 3. Whatever character York Central or York Northwest take, linkages with City Centre will be crucial. Shown as no more than notional on Map 4. Routes proposed in Cultural Quarter scheme do not address problem of linking retail areas.</p> <p>Recasting Rougier Street may be part of solution. See response to Question 3 Option 3.</p> <p>Another part of solution may be use, which could be made of route behind Station Rise War Memorial and through arch at Queen Street.</p> <p>The proposed elimination of section of Leeman Road, which runs between Memorial and Festival Gardens, may be premature and should be resisted. A reserved route might be suggested through Sorting Office site.</p>	526/5660
	<p>Castle Piccadilly provides opportunity to enhance retail provision but not only option for retail. May be opportunity to provide infill retail in other parts of City Centre. Detailed assessments of Castle Piccadilly need to be undertaken to identify level of retail that could be provided along with leisure and other uses. May not be appropriate to provide retail uses along its entire length and a range of town centre uses may be appropriate.</p>	532/5704
	<p>Option 1. No.</p> <p>Option 3. Focus should not be drawn away from City Centre and ‘little shops’.</p>	535/5726
	<p>Any new retail site must be carefully considered as to traffic management, parking, whether it is compatible with the historic heart of York, and any green issues. New retail sites should be at Monks Cross, Clifton Moor or McArthur Glen.</p>	681/5777
	<p>Option 1. Piccadilly could be used for small cottage type industries.</p>	945/5793
	<p>Option 1. No. Enough retail outlets in City Centre. Should be building on historic character of City, not trying to compete with Leeds. Castle Piccadilly needs improvement, green spaces could be provided here.</p>	975/5834

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Retail Development Question 4 continued	Option 1. Not without better access and parking. Option 3.	1144/5852
	Prefer Castle Piccadilly to be a green space not retail.	1185/5870
	Option 1.	1237/5888
	Option 3.	1325/5925
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1525/5997
	Option 2.	1601/6052
	Option 2. Castle Piccadilly desperately needs retail development but not exclusively at castle site. Eye of York great cultural potential. Holy Trinity Church behind Goodramgate needs protection.	1791/6098
	Not sure what section is setting out to achieve. Need for more retail within core central area but not more mainstream 'branded' shops. What would be useful is a food store. Option 1 has advantages but would not like to see development at expense of historic environment and would wish to see substantive gain in open space and public amenity. Options 2 and 3 have benefits. Mix of all three options would be appropriate way forward.	2153/6156
	Option 1. Lower Piccadilly and Walmgate have potential for expansion of retail but Castlegate should not be residential or retail. Should concentrate on cafes, hotels and restaurants with plenty of green space, young children's play area and quality gardens.	2161/6177
	Option 2.	2196/6191
	Options 1, 2 and 3. With following comments: - Option 1. Attractive for supplementary retail site, unsure if should be a key one. Large new modern unit(s) could discount distinctive historic character of area particularly if sited West of River Foss. Piccadilly would be a preferred site also affording better access for re-stocking traffic. Whatever is done West should be in keeping with historic setting. Option 2. Fine in regard to riversides upstream of Ouse Bridge where redevelopment could enhance appearance; provide new retail space to face a continuous pedestrian way on East bank. Access is envisaged as a cantilever construction in places. To West less opportunity for redevelopment or infill, already occupied. Re Goodramgate seems hard to identify specific sites among range of present shops some of which are of a heritage kind. Option 3. Worth pursuing.	2239/6208
	Redevelopment of Castle/Piccadilly area should not adversely impinge on Clifford's Tower / other historic buildings making up Eye of York. Potential for incorporating complementary retail development into York Central but necessary to improve links with City Centre.	2367/6257
	Option 3.	2413/6827

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Shopping in the City Centre continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Retail Development Question 4 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Improved linkages should be by sustainable transport modes (walking/cycling and public transport).	2434/6278
	Option 1. Strongly oppose. Option 2. Stonegate/Hungate offers some opportunities, George Hudson Street and opposite riverside is a possibility, but Goodramgate is heavily built-up already where green and public open space would be valued. Option 3 welcome.	2461/6289
	Option 3.	2552/6370
	Option 1. Would complement York Central particularly if river was developed (including a pedestrian walkway alongside river and with access to shops). If Barbican reinstated as a swimming pool/leisure complex would benefit local people as well as tourists.	2570/6406
	Option 2. Majority of 'Castle Piccadilly' area should be kept free of retail. Immediate area surrounding Cliffords Tower and river more suitable for park or recreational green area. Area along Piccadilly Road in dire need of renovation.	2595/6430
	Option 1. Development needs to respect necessary separation from Clifford's Tower but could compensate for this by its height to create retail square footage needed. Bold modern design would be desirable albeit controversial. Option 2. Option 3. Not convinced that linkages could be achieved. Inclusion would risk impacting on City Centre and jeopardise progress on Castle Piccadilly.	2614/6490
	Option 3. York Central should be a contrasting retail role to City Centre.	2617/6527
	Option 1. Oppose large-scale development. Area needs to be preserved as open space. Piccadilly needs improving. Not opposed to some retail along river.	2618/6555
	Option 1. No.	2620/6575
	Option 2. Need to make it more appealing for visitors.	2622/6589
	Options 1 and 4.	2628/6625
	Option 1. Should be promoted as an area for small businesses not more national chains. Remove castle car park and turn whole large area into an open market, for weekly Saturday farmers' markets and other events.	2632/6681
	Option 1.	2633/6704
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Exciting concept. Complements and takes some of larger scale pressures off immediate historic City and creates sense of place in new area.	2636/6730 2638/6775

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Tourism

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Welcomes acknowledgement of economic importance of tourism. Also welcomes focus on: - Events, festivals and the evening economy; Improving visitor experience; Attracting overnight visitors, and protecting the provision of visitor accommodation in the city centre.	373/5460
	Encourage people to come. Provide multi-storey car park (on racecourse maybe) and free bus in to City.	1007/5844
	Efforts must be focussed on maximising value of York's unique assets.	2651/6800
Improving York's Visitor Experience and Exceeding Expectations - General	Need to look at quality of services available to ensure top quality events.	373/5462
	Display of Art Works around City should be made an annual event with different themes e.g. York History, food and drink etc.	2625/6614
Improving York's Visitor Experience and Exceeding Expectations Question 5	Option 1	43/5230
	Option 2.	67/5280
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5333
	Option 3.	214/5375 & 621/5396
	Option 1. Community Strategy highlights need to improve the public realm of the City. Welcome intention to invest in improvement of the public realm of the City. Whilst endorse intention to enable better and greater usage of York's public places, essential achieved in a manner which does not result in additional clutter and signage within the City. As historic core is characterised by a series of relatively small, intimate, public spaces, it may be difficult to provide a facility for a large-scale public event within the City Centre. Option 2. Given amount of signage, already, it is essential that additional signs to promote key events do not add to the clutter in the streetscape. If intended to pursue this Option, need to develop, as part of public realm strategy, a comprehensive review (and possibly rationalisation) of the existing signage across the city. Option 3. Has to be based upon an assessment of what impact additional visitors would be likely to have upon continued viability of existing tourist attractions and effects even greater numbers of people in the City Centre might have upon its special character. The capacity to accommodate such developments needs to be ascertained in order to provide the necessary evidence to underpin the strategy for the City Centre.	242/5419
	Castle Car Park could be an opportunity for a new area of open space that could benefit the attractiveness of the city.	458/5563
	Combination of Options 1 and 3. Option 4 not viable, as not consistent with regional economic and planning policy, or York's regionally important tourism role.	479/5599
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Council could provide an invaluable service by maintaining a "what's on" board of events. There is a dire need of more public space.	511/5620

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Tourism Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Improving York's Visitor Experience and Exceeding Expectations Question 5 continued	If cross-Ouse linkages and riverfront could be improved, could be benefit from improved, green public spaces at Clifford's Tower and park on Wellington Row. A well-designed public open space at Clifford's Tower could provide excellent setting for number of tourist attractions. Could be designed flexibly for performance, exhibition or leisure.	511/5620 continued
	Option 1. A no-cost step, which could be immediately effected, would be to ensure that commercial waste bins do not remain in view all day. Council does not do enough to encourage property owners to maintain their properties. Solution may be to have more enforcement officers. Needs a property-by-property analysis of what looks dirty and tawdry. Public Toilets remain a notorious issue. Option 2. Temporary signage preferred. Use of 1 Museum Street as a main Information Centre should transform things. Permanent signage of sort proposed by J.C.Decaux should be avoided in the city centre and beyond. Bus and taxi shelters should be entirely transparent in sensitive locations. Option 3. Best way forward is through enhancement of current offer. But it needs good promotion. Seldom advertise events widely enough or far enough in advance.	526/5661
	Option 1. Also needs to be an emphasis on enhancing visitor experience and leisure and tourism facilities. Castle Piccadilly could play an important role. This needs to be explored.	532/5705
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	611/5764
	Option 4. Well signposted enough.	945/5794
	Option 1. Not a priority, quality more important.	1144/5853
	Option 1. Greater number and variety of events.	1185/5871
	Option 2.	1237/5889
	Options 1 and 2. Increase pedestrian areas, limit vehicles into City Centre at set times, all traffic by park and ride only, at these times.	1325/5926
	Option 1.	1443/5972
	Option 3.	1525/5998
	Option 1.	1601/6053
	Options 1 and 3. De-clutter street furniture.	1791/6099
	Options 1 and 2. Redesign of public spaces requires a more comprehensive evidence base than exists. Conservation Area Character appraisal will need to be completed. Need to examine signage as too much and intrusive. Recommend similar approach to 'Legible Cities' initiative (Bristol). Could link outlying areas e.g. Dringhouses and Clifton more positively with Centre. Should integrate with cycling and other public access strategies. Option 3 should be covered through Options 1 and 2. Option 4 is not an option.	2153/6157

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Tourism Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Improving York's Visitor Experience and Exceeding Expectations Question 5 continued	Option 4.	2161/6178
	Option 1. Essential and clean place up. Also action required re public consumption of alcohol on streets.	2196/6192
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. No	2239/6209
	Option 1. Urge consideration of policy of providing highest level of public space in defined "tourist footprint". Include new spaces for events, e.g. in Museum Gardens as part of Cultural quarter, a city screen (either on Parliament street or Clifford's Tower), and new public square as part of York Central site (at NRM, York Station area with transport interchange underneath). Option 2. Signage needs improving, especially road signage. Option 3. Continued investment in tourist attractions needed to meet visitor expectations. Quality of attractions needs to be matched by quality of public space, service, catering, transport, etc. City walls and buildings where lighting is important could be an attraction. Option 4. Not an option. World Heritage Status is an option that should be pursued.	2317/6255
	No objection to increasing variety of events, but whole tourist experience needs to be elevated and given greater historic/ architectural/cultural emphasis.	2367/6258
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Several places (e.g. west of Gillygate on pedestrian route between coach park and Bootham Bar area) where pavement should be widened.	2413/6828
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Depends on detail of changes proposed and how might affect historic environment, congestion and citizens' experience of City Centre.	2461/6290
	Option 1. Green space with benches by Foss	2469/6341
	Option 2.	2552/6371
	Option 1.	2570/6407
	Option 4.	2595/6431
	Option 4.	2612/6469
	Provide covered seating at Clarence Street Coach Park; provide covered area in Parliament Street; Better public toilets at Bootham Bar and Parliament Street.	2613/6476
	Option 1. Only if necessary and sufficient funding available.	2614/6491
	Options 1 and 2. Not keen. Prefer Option 2 but smaller events that need more support. New major ones not required. St Nicholas Fair could do with improvement.	2617/6528
	Outdoor performance areas enhance attraction of York.	2618/6556
Option 1.	2620/6576	
Option 1. Needs to be located centrally not on fringe.	2622/6590	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Tourism Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Improving York's Visitor Experience and Exceeding Expectations Question 5 continued</p>	Option 1. Considerable investment is required to lift City Centre from present deteriorating appearance and would mean extending footstreets.	2628/6626
	Option 1. Particularly in autumn/winter/early spring.	2632/6682
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Worth considering. Preferred Option should be to create concentration of large modern shop units able to offer something new to visitors over and above that already available. Castle Piccadilly provides only location where this could be achieved in a way that would integrate with rest of Centre.	2633/6705
	Options 1 and 2.	2636/6731
	Design quality is single most important factor. It is for example architecture as much as art/activity that draws people.	2638/6776
	Option 1. Some spaces e.g. King's Square reveal their history through layout so should be preserved. Improvements can be made here without removing the graveyard. Others e.g. Exhibition Square not as sensitive to change and can be developed.	2649/6790
<p>Attracting Overnight Higher Value Visitors Question 6</p>	Option 1.	43/5231
	Option 3. Enough hotels already with insufficient parking.	
	Option 3.	67/5281
	Options 1 and 2. Accessibility should be on offer across the range of accommodation for those with disabilities. Not necessarily for all accommodation on offer but to allow choice.	203/5334
	Mixture of Options 1 and 3. Welcome and support explicit recognition in paragraph 6.66 that York Northwest has potential to enhance business tourism and conference facilities in York. Support aspiration within York Northwest AAP to provide a site for a hotel within York Central, although star rating will depend on demand.	214/5376 & 621/5397
	Efforts should be made to ensure that City Centre has a sufficient stock of good quality overnight accommodation to discourage use of residential properties as holiday flats etc. Would like to see a wide variety of hotels including a good range of traditional Bed and Breakfast establishments.	458/5564
	Visit York, working with key stakeholders, will look to identify sites and opportunities for development that meets accommodation requirements of high spend, long stay target visitor market. It is important that AAP reflects this work, which is likely to directly impact on all options identified.	479/5601
	Option 1. Location, as in 6.34, should be included in this option. Option 2 b). Most appropriate.	526/5662
Policy encouraging hotel development within secondary areas of City Centre should be provided. Piccadilly area could accommodate good quality hotels. Accessible, close to visitor attractions and could accommodate larger hotels with a full range of facilities.	532/5706	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Tourism Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Attracting Overnight Higher Value Visitors Question 6 continued	Hotels deemed to be city centre use under national planning policy. Need to make clear that City Centre boundary (Draft Local Plan), not central shopping area, should be used as the boundary for that purpose.	611/5765
	Option 3.	945/5795
	Option 1.	1325/5927
	Options 1 and 2a). Option 3. Do not support.	1525/5999
	Option 2b).	1601/6054
	Option 1.	1791/6100
	Option 2b).	2161/6870
	Option 1.	2196/6193
	Options 1 and 3. Higher grade of accommodation needs more space. For 4-star or above, York Northwest more choice. Old hotel at south corner of Pavement could suit 3-star. Option 2. Doubtful, could be restrictive for best use of premises.	2239/6210
	Option 1. Scope for continued growth. Some key sites, such as White Swan, and possible new sites such as any development at St Mary's Car Park. Option 2. Any protection policy needs to be thought through carefully. Key issue is to have quality, range, and volume to meet demand.	2317/6256
	Option 2.	2413/6829
	Option 1. Need 5 star hotel in near future. Development of budget hotels is not likely to benefit York. Sufficient supply of rooms must be maintained in hotels/guesthouses.	2461/6291
	Option 3.	2469/6342
	Option 1.	2552/6372
	Option 1. Hotels in 3 to 5 star range. Option 2a). If regardless of quality and facilities, would be worthless.	2614/6492
	Great need for quality hotels. Try attracting small specialist 4 and 5 star. Somehow discourage the Hen & Stag parties. Definitely no more 1 and 2 star hotels. Concerted effort needed to improve lower end of guesthouse & B & B trade.	2617/6529
	Option 1. Need a 5 star offering.	2622/6591
	Option 1. Overseas and higher spending tourists prefer small and "boutique" type hotels which exude quality and distinctiveness. B & B and Guesthouses are not generally of sufficient high quality.	2628/6627
Castle Piccadilly has potential to accommodate a small high quality 'boutique' style hotel. This would complement range of overnight accommodation on offer.	2633/6706	
Option 3.	2636/6732	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Evening Economy

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General</p>	<p>Endorses positive moves on developing the evening economy, particularly the early evening period (5-7pm). Believes that activity is needed as well as encouraging shops to open longer. It will need to appeal to parents and children, and to residents as well as visitors. Also needs a critical mass of retailers to open later. A number of questions arise: - Have other cities successfully opened up in the evening and how did they pull this off? Can anything be learnt from the performance of the pre-Christmas late night Thursdays? Could a pilot scheme be considered?</p>	<p>373/5463</p>
	<p>Support outside eating and drinking areas. Should be relaxation in street café rules allowing opening after 8pm. Restriction on umbrellas should be lifted to give City some colour especially on riverfront. City should be zoned for late night entertainment e.g. The Square. Making it clear to new residents moving into City nature of areas. Support more open space entertainment areas. Castlegate / Fossgate should be fully paved, encouraging pavement cafes. In summer identify nighttime Pedestrian Streets for al fresco dining e.g. Petergate/Goodramgate.</p>	<p>2610/6466</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.40</p>	<p>An outdoor events area is a crucial necessity.</p>	<p>2628/6628</p>
<p>5 - 7 PM Lull - General</p>	<p>Fossgate - Pedestrianisation would benefit some traders, particularly those associated with hospitality trade. Reduction or restriction of traffic and ‘smartening up’ of street surface and architecture would attract more footfall. However, until proposals are known impossible to comment on effect of such a move. If decided to close Fossgate to all vehicular access from 10.00am -11.00pm, it might mean Merchant Adventurers Hall would be unable to operate as a venue for weddings and other private hire events. Concerned at effect on local residents who currently benefit from vehicle access and off street parking. Would they be denied vehicle access to their own properties? Proposal to turn Fossgate into gateway street may have merit and help to address 5-7pm lull issue. Until there are specific proposals of how much of street is to be closed to vehicles and for how long, impossible to comment further.</p>	<p>2210/6198</p>
	<p>Physical improvements to pedestrian environment are definitely required. Footstreets zone needs to be extended, not just in evenings.</p>	<p>2628/6629</p>
<p>5 - 7 PM Lull Question 7</p>	<p>Option 1a). Option 2. Late opening has been tried and does not work. Economic downturn will make this worse.</p>	<p>43/5232</p>
	<p>Agree in principle to idea of extending opening hours of shops, cafés and to creating new pedestrian zones. Best done in line with Option 2. Traders could be invited to source their goods from sustainable sources such as Fairtrade</p>	<p>52/5270</p>
	<p>Option 2.</p>	<p>67/5282</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Evening Economy Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
5 - 7 PM Lull Question 7 continued	Option 1b). Options 1a) and 1c) would require consultation with retailers and owners before progressing or not.	203/5335
	Option 1.	242/5420
	Option 1.	458/5565
	New, or improved, public spaces would have potential to support development of evening economy in York.	479/5600
	Agree with extending footstreet hours, but improvement to many parts of pedestrian environment is vital.	511/5621
	Option 1a). Ending at 4pm for safety of children leaving school remains valid. 11am is too late, 10.30am would be better. Option 1b). Should include more seating everywhere, with restoration of seats where they used to be. A particular need is for grouped seats for parties to rest and be briefed. Very few seats in York have shelter. Option 1c). Bad idea in streets such as Micklegate and Fossgate. Evening activity is more appropriate in squares. Evening footstreets raise the issue of who York is for. After footstreet hours answer should be residents. Option 2. Local shops run by family enterprise may be disadvantaged by an increased evening economy.	526/5663
	Option 1. May be advantage in extending pedestrian friendly environments to Piccadilly.	532/5707
	Option 1.	535/5727
	Introducing pavement dining will enhance holiday feel of central York. However shelter, parking and a much cleaner centre are paramount. Weather is an important factor. Make Petergate, Stonegate, the Shambles, etc. into covered streets/arcades and stop traffic.	681/5778
	Option 1c).	945/5796
	Option 1a).	975/5835
	Option 1a). Only if accessible by public transport and cycling is improved to City Centre. Option 1c). As long as still access to City Centre for visitors and residents, especially those with poor mobility.	1144/5854
	Option 1a).	1185/5872
	Option 2.	1237/5890
	Option 1.	1325/5928
	Option 1. Plus bookshops and cafes open in evening.	1443/5973
	Options 1 a), b) and c). Should be degree of flexibility for opening hours.	1525/6000
Option 1a).	1601/6055	
Option 1.	1791/6101	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Evening Economy Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
5 - 7 PM Lull Question 7 continued	Option 1. Needs to be every day to be effective and in place for at least a year to monitor impacts. 11am vehicle exclusion time is too late; 10am start more appropriate.	2153/6158
	Option 1.	2161/6871
	Option 1.	2196/6194
	Option 1 with Option 2 happening as a result. However, success rests with weather.	2239/6211
	Many footstreets already completely closed to traffic except for servicing. However, no objection to extending hours of operation or to creating new footstreets, as long as adequate provision is made for essential traffic to access the area.	2367/6259
	Options 1 a), b) and c). Care needs to be taken with designating streets as footstreets to ensure access by service vehicles.	2461/6292
	Option 2. No evening footstreets.	2469/6343
	Option 1a).	2570/6408
	Any extension of foot-street hours, which would stop deliveries to local businesses, would cause more hardship. Easing parking restrictions and car park prices in City Centre would revive 5 – 7pm economy.	2595/6432
	Remove prejudice against A3 food uses in City Centre. Livelier than shops they replace.	2613/6477
	Options 1a) and c).	2614/6493
	Not sure of difference between 'footstreets' & pedestrian zones. More 'evening footstreets' seems like a recipe for more rubbish. Idea of Fossgate not having evening access is a non-starter. York does not have a regular warm & sunny climate conducive to Café life at night. Unless some way can be found to reduce the drunkenness & litter spreading, suggest no further 'evening footstreets' are developed.	2617/6530
	Options 1a) and c). Also like to see shared footpaths/cycle lanes along Clifford Street and over Skeldergate Bridge.	2618/6557
	Option 1c).	2620/6577
	Options 1a) and b). Option 1c). Not in favour of evening footstreets, should be 'full time' in Goodramgate, Micklegate, Gillygate and Fossgate.	2628/6630
	Options 1a) and c). Other more café, restaurant and club dominated streets (e.g. George Hudson Street).	2632/6683
	Option 1.	2636/6733
Good concept of activities relating to residential areas in City Centre - "urban villages".	2638/6777	
Option 1. If 'vibrant' means letting people drink more, could make York less attractive and increase costs of policing etc. However extending the day into the evening is desirable and to be promoted.	2649/6791	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Need to think carefully about use of area around station (George Hudson Street and Toft Green). A more eclectic use of area should be carefully considered. This is a key area for regeneration in York, which has the advantage of its location and the disadvantage of the overbearing nature of its architecture to consider. The Piccadilly area might also be considered carefully in thinking about location of new office-based employment.	110/6816
Paragraph 6.45	Should not be seeking more offices in City Centre. Out-of-town office accommodation should not be seen as 'the enemy' but as offering easier commuting/parking etc.	1299/5915
Existing Office Space in the City Centre Question 8	Option 2.	43/5233
	Option 1. Reduction in use of existing buildings due to job losses.	
	Option 4.	67/5283
	Options 1, 2 and 4.	203/5336
	Option 4. Consider important for second phase of ELR to feed into LDF process, to provide necessary evidence base to support preferred options.	214/5377 & 621/5398
	Option 1. Option 2. Existing concentration of offices in area, although particular care needed to ensure that any intensification of activities do not detract from nearby historic assets, especially the adjacent City Walls and high-grade Listed Buildings.	242/5421
	Strongly object to 'zoning' in City Centre, which is now an outdated practice. Options 1 and 4. Options 2 and 3. Object.	441/5500
	Option 4. Agree large numbers of office staff benefit the wider city economy. Not clear what land is available for office development in Blossom Street/Toft Green/Rougier Street. Designating areas to be office quarters does not serve any useful purpose. Restricting use of current office buildings to office use would restrict the availability of sites for retail.	456/5540
	Options 2 and 3. Oppose. May be some scope for flexibility in use of existing office space within City. Do not see any advantages in trying to concentrate office development exclusively in certain parts of centre.	458/5566
	Option 2. See no reason to justify an office quarter. Better approach would be to aim for pockets of offices throughout City. Would spread benefits of office workers shopping for lunches; dilute transport problems of everyone arriving to the same area at the same time.	479/5602 511/5622
Option 2. Designation follows present use. New offices should respect scale of Bar Walls and Micklegate. New build may be along The Crescent through to Station. Here, for once, a higher build may emphasise the characteristics of railway sheds.	526/5664	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Existing Office Space in the City Centre Question 8 continued	Much depends on gateway routes into York Northwest from Blossom and Queen Streets. Option 3. Teardrop site is one of few places in York where a cluster of high-rise offices might be appropriate. Should not interfere with deep vista across Station site between Queen Street Bridge and Holgate Road Bridge.	526/5664 continued
	Piccadilly area has potential to provide good quality office space, offering choice and a mix of redevelopment options as part of Castle Piccadilly proposals.	532/5708
	Option 1. Options 2 and 3. No. Not unreasonable to build some offices on Piccadilly as part of a mixed-use development.	535/5728
	Option 3. Develop Piccadilly east of Foss to reinforce office space already in area (possible site for Council HQ). More sense than mixed-use proposals for Castle Piccadilly.	580/5755
	Flexible approach needs to be adopted. Attempts to control change of use of buildings from offices would constrain ability of City to respond to new and exciting opportunities.	611/5766
	Option 4.	945/5797
	Option 4.	1237/5891
	Options 2 and Option 4. For offices outside of Option 2 area. Option 2 could also include York Northwest near station. All developments to be in easy reach of park and ride/sustainable transport hub.	1325/5929
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 3. Hungate area not designated for housing.	1525/6001
	Option 2.	1601/6056
	Options 1, 2 and 4.	1791/6102
	Option 2.	2161/6872
	Options 2 and 4.	2196/6195
	Options 1 and 4. Option 2. Valid if part of Northwest Area comes within easy reach on foot of railway station and any transport interchange. Option 3. Hard to visualise because of spread of such space in central areas.	2239/6212
	Option 1. Options 2 and 3. No. Does not want sections of City, which are 'dead' at night when offices are closed. Wishes to see some offices clustered near station both at Toft Green/Rougier Street/Blossom Street, and as part of York Central. Area close to station should comprise offices, civic uses, public open space, retail, cafés, and other leisure uses, as well as a transport interchange. Any residential development should be targeted to British Sugar site. Option 4. Will happen in any case without any intervention.	2461/6293
Options 3 and 4. Option 3 preferred.	2552/6373	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Existing Office Space in the City Centre Question 8 continued	Option 4.	2595/6433
	Option 4.	2614/6494
	Opposed to development of 'Quarters'. York is a very small city and as such benefits from a well-mixed use of space.	2617/6531
	Option 2.	2622/6592
	Pleased to see that Paragraph 6.51 now recognises that limited marketability of certain premises needs to be seriously considered. Option 4. Strongly support further development, which would involve creation of a new policy to allow change of use of poorer quality office stock subject to certain criteria.	2624/6613
	Option 1.	2628/6631
	Option 4.	2633/6707
	Options 1 and 4.	2636/6734
	Policy approach must be flexible because of number of listed buildings and the costs of refurbishment, which can act as a disincentive to potential developers. To safeguard City's historic environment a balanced policy approach needs to be adopted. May be times when office developments will prove to be unviable but other uses appropriate to City Centre, such as hotel, leisure and retail, will be attractive to developers. These will still have considerable benefits for City.	2644/6786
	Option 2. No. Development areas should not be strictly designated.	2649/6792
New Office Development in the City Centre - General	General preference for a mixture of land uses – a pure office area can have little character in the evening so some flexibility with other uses will work better.	373/5464
New Office Development in the City Centre Question 9	If sites for new office development are to be allocated in AAP, ST and ET will need to be undertaken.	5/5215
	Option 2.	43/5234
	Option 2.	67/5284
	Options 2 and 3.	203/5337
	Welcome reference in paragraph 6.54 that there is an opportunity to meet demand for office space as part of York Northwest. Development of a new Central Business District on York Central provides an excellent opportunity to accommodate larger floorplates, with more open and flexible office space, and therefore new office development in the city centre should complement the CBD element of York Central scheme.	214/5378 & 621/5399
Given character of the part of York likely to be covered by AAP, difficult to identify possible sites for new large-floorplate office developments, which would not be likely to detract from its historic character.	242/5422	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Office Development in the City Centre Question 9 continued	Support comment in paragraph 6.54 that sensible to seek such sites within York Northwest area (Option 3). Area around Toft Green may provide potential. Essential that “the more efficient use of land” referred to in paragraph 6.52 is not achieved to the detriment of historic character of the City. This area abuts the City Walls and contains a number of high-grade Listed Buildings associated with its railway heritage.	242/5422 continued
	Options 1 and 2. Object. Option 3. Especially utilising space above shops.	441/5501
	Options 1 and 3. Assume Old Station and NER HQ buildings are listed. These are not highlighted on Map 5. Concentration of new office development on Toft Green has limited potential as it is within the Bar Walls.	456/5541
	Option 3.	458/5567
	Option 2.	479/5603
	See no reason to justify an office quarter. Better approach would be to aim for pockets of offices throughout City. Would spread benefits of office workers shopping for lunches; dilute transport problems of everyone arriving to the same area at the same time.	511/5623
	Option 2. Old Station and garden would make a fine centrepiece. There is a potential entrance to Station via underpass of Queen Street Bridge. From gates to garden is an opportunity for an extended 'railway experience' route to NRM. Option 3. Assume by redevelopment of existing office property. Piccadilly from its bridge through Ryedale House would make a fine site for new Council HQ.	526/5665
	Should promote a range and choice of locations and type of office space. Need to be flexible to respond to changing market needs and demand. May be more appropriate to give an emphasis to small and medium sized office opportunities. Larger proposals may be accommodated in edge of centre locations with good accessibility to City Centre.	532/5709
	Options 1 and 3. Piccadilly acceptable. Option 2. No.	535/5729
	Use existing but redundant office space and provide much cheaper public transport to it.	681/5779
	Option 2.	945/5798
	Option 2.	1185/5873
	Option 1.	1237/5892
	Option 2. Could also include York Northwest near station. All developments to be in easy reach of park and ride/sustainable transport hub.	1325/5930
	Options 1 and 2. Option 2 likely to be constrained by existing occupation. Opportunities should be sought in Hungate area.	1525/6002
	Option 2.	1601/6057

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
New Office Development in the City Centre Question 9 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1791/6103
	Option 2.	2161/6873
	Options 2 and 3.	2196/6196
	Options 1 and 3 preferred. Option 2. Less attractive to businesses/developers as saturation is reached with time.	2239/6213
	Not a great deal of scope for office development in Toft Green area. Development should not adversely affect important historic buildings in area. Might be more opportunities in Hungate, provided any development is in scale with area and nearby historic buildings.	2367/6260
	Agree with approach in paragraph 6.53. All new developments should be supported by transport assessments and travel plans.	2434/6279
	Options 1 and 3. Piccadilly should be targeted alongside York Central, close to station. Option 2. No.	2461/6294
	Option 2.	2552/6374
	Should be on previously derelict or unsightly land/buildings (i.e. Stonebow) to improve those areas. Also be in York (as opposed to the outskirts) to attract trade within the City.	2570/6409
	Option 3.	2595/6434
	Should be on edge of City Centre.	2613/6478
	Option 3. Also see response to question 8.	2617/6532
	Office development to be kept away from historic core of City. Ryedale House is an eyesore and should be pulled down.	2618/6558
	Option 3.	2620/6578
	Option 2.	2622/6593
	Option 1.	2628/6632
	Should not be concentrated in one area. New retail and other mixed-use buildings should be part of any new developments.	2632/6684
	Option 2. Good starting point. Option 3. Also appropriate where does not conflict with other more critical objectives.	2633/6708
	Option 3.	2636/6735
	Policy approach must be flexible because of number of listed buildings and the costs of refurbishment, which can act as a disincentive to potential developers. To safeguard City's historic environment a balanced policy approach needs to be adopted. May be times when office developments will prove to be unviable but other uses appropriate to City Centre, such as hotel, leisure and retail, will be attractive to developers. These will still have considerable benefits for City.	2644/6787

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Universities

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Supporting Universities in the City Centre Question 10	Option 2.	43/5235
	Option 2.	67/5285
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5338
	Routes to and from St John's restricted by Bar Walls. Without constructing new routes the only other means of highlighting the presence of the university is by better sign posting.	456/5542
	Options 1 and 2.	458/5568
	Don't believe this is a priority for Council action.	511/5624
	Option 1. Cycle contra flow lane along St Maurice's Road and then along Foss Islands Road is worth early consideration. Suggested Option. Consider old prefabs site behind art gallery as an extension of University of York at King's Manor. Option 2. Further dedicated performance space is unnecessary and would not be viable unless in use most weeks of year.	526/5666
	Option 2.	945/5799
	Option 2.	1237/5893
	Option 2.	1325/5931
	Option 2.	1443/5974
	Options 1 and 2.	1525/6003
	Option 1.	1601/6058
	Options 1 and 2.	1791/6104
	Option 2. Develop St Leonard's Place as studios, teaching facilities and venues for smaller performances. Façade of St Leonard's should be maintained.	2161/6179
	Options 1 and 2. Invalid or of low priority.	2239/6214
	Option 1.	2413/6830
	Option 1. Unsure what suggesting. If involves closing Gillygate to private cars this would be acceptable to reduce air pollution. Option 2. No. Doesn't see need for additional facilities which are not available within either of two universities or via private sector.	2461/6295
Option 2. Vital that student population retains a good balance of domestic and international students. Also promote establishment of a scheme which bonds international students to locality throughout their study period and then attempts to establish them as ambassadors for it when they return home.	2552/6375	
Support expansion of University, however believe should be offset by University providing accommodation to majority of students, along with additional public transport to alleviate inevitable over use that would arise from a large influx of students.	2595/6435	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Universities Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Supporting Universities in the City Centre Question 10 continued	Leave them alone things work well now.	2617/6533
	Option 2.	2622/6594
	Options 1 and 2.	2628/6633
	Option 1.	2636/6736
	Option 1. Would also help major pedestrian route into Centre along Gillygate corridor.	2638/6778

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General</p>	<p>Public transport needs to be improved and traffic flows rethought. Park and Ride buses should circulate the town centre. School buses should be run to bus children in from Park and Ride sites to private schools.</p>	<p>76/5310</p>
	<p>Transport and traffic congestion must be planned properly.</p>	<p>77/5311</p>
	<p>Must accept that the privately owned car is here to stay. Firmly believe that too much time and attention is given to "Green" issues. Would love to see in York the transport (free of charge) system for all registered visitors to region, as practiced in Germany.</p>	<p>293/5451</p>
	<p>Welcomes promotion of cycling, walking and public transport, which helps to support the RES greenhouse gas reduction target. Has potential to improve legibility and permeability of City Centre for visitors. However, this should recognise need for developments to be commercially viable, as well as support a vibrant city centre, which will require good accessibility by a range of different modes of transport. Major new retail and office development in and around City Centre will still require access by private car.</p>	<p>479/5606</p>
	<p>Would like to be consulted about any new park and ride sites being proposed.</p>	<p>2434/6280</p>
<p>Congested Road Network - General</p>	<p>Welcomes continued measures to reduce traffic congestion in City Centre. Strong interest in reducing congestion and increasing pedestrianisation. One issue worth exploring is flexible working hours to reduce peak period traffic. Again practical issues like the servicing requirements of city centre businesses need to be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>373/5465</p>
	<p>Should be twenty mile an hour speed limit on inner ring road and on all streets inside it. Would be better than closing streets and bridges, apart from footstreets. Footstreets could be extended both in time and number.</p>	<p>2630/6679</p>
	<p>Freeing up roads gives space for wider pavements e.g. Piccadilly.</p>	<p>2638/6779</p>
<p>Congested Road Network Paragraph 6.68</p>	<p>To get cars and people off the roads reduce bus fares.</p>	<p>1237/5894</p>
<p>Congested Road Network Question 11</p>	<p>Option 3.</p>	<p>43/5236</p>
	<p>Option 1. Should liaise with Cycling Bid to ensure cycling facilities are harmonised and prioritised.</p>	<p>52/5271</p>
	<p>Option 2. Parking around railway station / Leeman Road is not central, free bus shuttle service should be considered.</p>	<p>67/5286</p>
	<p>Consider underground or ground level parking for new development.</p>	<p>203/5339</p>
	<p>Support aspirations to encourage use of public transport and desire to site a multi-modal transport interchange close to Station. Essential for operation of station and NRM that adequate car parking is provided for station users and visitors to NRM. Re York Central, any options to reduce congestion must be considered in context of commercial viability of scheme and attracting occupiers to site.</p>	<p>214/5379 & 621/5400</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Congested Road Network Question 11 continued	Should not simply be seeking to reduce traffic “congestion” but attempting to reduce the physical and environmental “impact” of traffic. Should set out a framework for reducing both the number and the types of vehicles using the City Centre. Options 1 and 2. Strong support. Option 3. Providing no off-street car parking in new residential developments does not necessarily mean occupants of new dwellings will not have cars. Could result in large numbers of cars seeking a limited number of on-street parking spaces, which may detract from character of area.	242/5423
	Options 1 and 3.	398/5485
	Unrealistic to propose new residential development without parking. Seems unfair to expect residents to use public transport to go out into the countryside, visit relatives and for those working from home making site visits to inaccessible places. Car clubs may help, but parking spaces (not necessarily immediately within the development) would be desirable to encourage people to live in the town centre.	447/5535
	Option 3. No. Suggestion under paragraph 6.70 is unreasonable. A change in mobility culture is required. Whilst cars are stationary in drives they do not increase congestion. Many people, living in outlying areas, rely on their cars to get to their place of work in the city, due to inadequate public transport. Options 1 and 2. For these to work public transport would have to be dramatically improved and the price differential would have to be in its favour.	456/5543
	Options 1 and 3. Also support a 20mph zone in City Centre. Could improve environment for walking and cycling. Road pricing should be given consideration.	458/5569
	Note that a number of options have been presented However, it is unclear whether the viability of all options has been considered.	479/5604
	Options 1 and 2. Absolutely key issue. Congestion is self-limiting and will tend towards same maximum. Trick is to manage this safely and put resulting mess where it will do as little harm as possible. Happy to see Ouse Bridge pedestrianised. Coppergate should be made one-way, allowing a widening of the pavements.	511/5625
	Option 1. Comprehensive assessment should be on going. Closure of Lendal Bridge to through traffic has support. Some of suggestions impact on cross-city route of Micklegate - Coppergate - Stonebow - Peasholme Green. Option 2. Would have deleterious effect on evening activities of local people, and many evening tourists. Option 3. Underground parking may conflict with archaeology, but more ground floor and podium parking could be physically accommodated.	526/5667

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Congested Road Network Question 11 continued	Comprehensive solutions need to be identified with robust policies to reduce the reliance on private car and enhance public transport usage. Investment in public transport enhancements needs to be implemented as a matter of urgency, alongside restricting vehicular access and reducing parking numbers. Advantage in closing Castle Car Park to enable its early redevelopment, especially for enhanced public realm.	532/5710
	Option 1. More footstreets can make City Centre more appealing and reduce pollution.	535/5730
	May be opportunities to restrict access to certain streets. Whereas policies could seek to reduce level of car parking provision generally, will still be requirement for an appropriate number of spaces to support development. A blanket ban would be counter-productive.	611/5767
	Charge a flat rate of £1 for all buses, anywhere within the city limits.	681/5780
	Option 3. Use public transport as much as possible.	945/5800
	Option 1. To cars, not to cyclists, buses or motorised wheelchairs.	1144/5855
	Option 1. Won't work because it would block the A64. Need to look at widening roads and better parking systems.	1237/5895
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Encourage no car use inside ring road during peak daytimes.	1325/5932
	Options 1 and 2.	1443/5975
	Option 1.	1525/6004
	Moves to discourage cars useful provided alternative transport available.	1533/6044
	Option 1.	1601/6059
	Options 1 and 3.	1791/6105
	Options 1, 2 and 3. More streets should be restricted access, more one-way systems. City Centre car parks should charge more to encourage people not to use them.	2153/6159
	Option 1. Should be multi-story car park in York Central with shuttle bus links to Castle Museum making clear that Coppergate shopping area is accessible from that direction.	2161/6180
	Option 2. Strongly oppose. Essential to ensure appropriate access to medical practices, hospitals etc is maintained at adequate levels. Seems an unattractive proposition for a new company relocating to new offices to be denied any parking at all.	2196/6197
	Unrealistic to consider three Options, will be an amalgam of all three or more.	2210/6200
	Options 1 and 2. Option 3 could be counter productive.	2239/6215
	Not possible to close bridges as either part of Inner Ring Road or important bus routes. Congestion applies mainly during working day and so relaxation of car parking charges for residents in evening is welcomed, but why does this only apply to off street car parks?	2367/6261
	Options 1 and 3.	2413/6831

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Congested Road Network Question 11 continued	<p>Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. The following statement should be included in this section. “All new developments should be supported by Travel Plans and Transport Assessments which will help to determine what transport improvements are necessary. Travel Plans are an integral part of the planning process and an essential measure to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by new development. A Travel Plan will be used as the foundation for a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the Department for Communities and Local Government / Department for Transport guidance and it should be in conformity with prevailing guidance. Travel Plans should demonstrate a firm commitment by developers and occupiers to reduce the number of single occupancy car trips generated by, or attracted to, their site. They should set out mode options available to travellers, identify interventions to enhance the availability and capacity of sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport, set mode share targets based on those modes, identify a system for monitoring the effectiveness of the plan and a programme for reviewing and modifying it to ensure agreed outcomes are achieved. Interventions could include making a contribution to transport facilities planned by the Council or other agencies. Agreed measures and targets will be secured through planning obligations or conditions. Working with the Council the Highways Agency will advise developers how to prepare, implement, monitor, review and update Travel Plans to support their development and will consider tri-partite agreements with the Council and developers where appropriate.” Council should try to develop a Travel Planning Guidance SPD to assist developers and ensure that travel plans are consistent.</p>	2434/6281
	<p>Answer lies with road pricing and should be an option to be considered. Support Option 1. Closing Fossgate could be done without impact of congestion, traffic would divert to Piccadilly. Consider closing St. Leonard’s Place and Gillygate to private vehicles. Not convinced by Option 2, without other measures. Option 3 is acceptable.</p>	2461/6296
	<p>Improve cycle route network. Reopen bus Enquiry Office. Need proper bus station.</p>	2469/6344
	<p>Need a new ‘Middle Ring Road’.</p>	2498/6365
	<p>Option 1.</p>	2552/6376
	<p>Beneficial to have various large car parks just outside York within easy walking distance of City and allow business vehicles, disabled drivers and local residents access only.</p>	2570/6410
	<p>None of Options appropriate. Focus should be on greater accessibility of public transport.</p>	2595/6436
	<p>Option 3. Concern about any proposal to reduce short stay car parking as would impact on retail.</p>	2614/6495

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Congested Road Network Question 11 continued</p>	<p>Abolish all signing for Inner Ring Road. More traffic might then go to Outer Ring Road. Make Lendal, St Leonard’s and Exhibition Square one way (towards Bootham) and Bus and Taxis only. Car parks are a necessity unless great improvement in alternatives. Get alternatives right and then restrict cars if necessary.</p>	<p>2617/6534</p>
	<p>No need to close bridges. More pedestrian areas and cycle tracks. Reduce number of parking places. Encourage use of public transport. Extend hours of park and ride.</p>	<p>2618/6559</p>
	<p>Option 2.</p>	<p>2620/6579</p>
	<p>Need to make York more accessible and not put visitors off who wish to visit by car.</p>	<p>2622/6595</p>
	<p>Options 1 and 2.</p>	<p>2628/6634</p>
	<p>Traffic should be discouraged from all areas inside City Walls, by reduction in car parking provision, increase in cycle parking provision, introduction of a congestion charge anywhere on or within inner ring-road and by provision of an efficient and frequent bus service. In advance of teardrop site being available as bus terminal, castle car park could be used, to avoid confusion of having to catch different buses from different locations.</p>	<p>2632/6685</p>
	<p>Option 1.</p>	<p>2636/6737</p>
	<p>Option 1. Extend footstreets; close Ousebridge to ordinary traffic in daytime, helping buses to keep on schedule. Suggest approaches to station be increased for pedestrians. Could be a route through Cambridge Street or from The Crescent off Blossom Street.</p>	<p>2649/6793</p>
<p>Pedestrian and Cycle Routes into the City Centre General</p>	<p>Should be a consistent and connecting network of cycle lanes (preferably on pavements) rather than a few located in a piecemeal way.</p>	<p>2570/6426</p>
	<p>Welcome positive measures e.g. new river bridges. Also intention to liaise with LTP2. Suggest, as advised by Cycling England, where motor vehicles are banned from a street, an experimental period of 24/7 cycling be permitted, with a view to this being made permanent if successful e.g. Fossgate. Examine options for delineation of cycle routes, plus surface and edging treatments to minimise risk to pedestrians especially those with mobility restrictions. Key daytime cross-city cycle routes, particularly those enabling cyclists to avoid detours along busy routes e.g. High Petergate between Bootham Bar and Minster and Colliergate between St. Andrewgate and St. Saviourgate should be restored. Suggest blanket 20 mph limit in City Centre. Seek legal powers to deal with drivers who flout 10 mph limit during core hours. Suggest extension of secure public cycle parking, in conjunction with Safer York Partnership’s Cycle Theft Reduction Team. Encourage employers to create on-site employee parking, to reduce on-street demand.</p>	<p>2611/6467</p>
	<p>If want to encourage people to cycle, more places needed to safely park and lock bikes, instead of locking them to railings etc.</p>	<p>2654/6804</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Pedestrian and Cycle Routes into the City Centre Question 12	<p>Option 1. A policy lead approach is important to ensure that new developments take into account need to make provision for sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Option 2. Creating suitable and safe linkages for cycling and walking with other parts of the city should be pursued as part of the creation of a strategic cycle network. Also like to see in reference to cycling, the development of options for the interface between walking and cycling (i.e. appropriate cycle parking where areas are pedestrianised, and next to key green spaces) and the examples of the measures that will support cycling in the street environment.</p>	4/5197
	Options 1 and 2.	43/5237
	Option 1.	67/5287
	<p>Options 1, 2 and 3. Fully support improved pedestrian and cycle flow around the city centre. Footstreets should be accessible to cycles.</p> <p>As a Cycle Demonstration Town, obliged to introduce more radical measures to increase cycling than previously. Following measures should be modelled and considered : -</p> <p>Make Gillygate one-way to vehicular traffic, maintaining two way cycle access at all times;</p> <p>Introduce a one lane, alternate traffic light system on Lendal Bridge for vehicles, while maintaining two ways cycle access;</p> <p>Cyclists' needs should be considered as part of the design of all signalised junctions.</p> <p>Introduce a 10 second advance for cycles at all traffic lights;</p> <p>Allocate space for cyclists on the Fishergate gyratory. Model the effects of removing a lane in the dual carriageway section of Fawcett Street and Tower Street;</p> <p>Introduce two-way cycling on all one-way streets;</p> <p>Introduce a 20 mph speed limit throughout city centre and inner ring road. Reduced traffic speed leads to an increase in cycling, as residents feel more confident to get on a bike.</p>	111/5322
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5340
	Recognise importance of providing dedicated pedestrian and cycling facilities with strong links from York Central to surrounding network, particularly city centre. Connectivity within and between areas adjacent to city centre should be an aspiration of the AAP.	214/5380 & 621/5401
	<p>Question is not mutually exclusive of Question 11 as both options considered could have implications on pedestrian and cycle linkages with York Northwest and through the City. To enable non-car dependent movement to be properly encouraged AAP must give priority to pedestrian and cycling linkages.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3. Also supports an expansion to strategic cycle network.</p>	398/5486
	<p>Option 1. Appears to embrace Options 2 and 3.</p> <p>Would like to know route of proposed access from Queens Street to York Northwest (paragraph 6.76) given its close location to station.</p>	456/5544

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Pedestrian and Cycle Routes into the City Centre Question 12 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3.	458/5570
	Cycling should be embraced. A North-South cycle route is an excellent aspiration and Hungate development may go some way towards this, linking Walmgate with Aldwark. Inner Ring Road needs to be tamed in places. Would welcome a narrowing of four-lane sections at Castle Mills Bridge/Fishergate, and three-lane sections at Paragon Street and St Leonard's Place, to improve cycling and pedestrian environment.	511/5626
	Option 1. Funds could be more firmly tied to immediate neighbourhoods than at present. Option 2. Need cycle route linking Bootham Bar to Walmgate Bar. Exists in north-south direction out of footstreet hours and in south-north direction either with departures from the direct route or by using inner ring road. Problem of providing it during footstreet hours could be eased by reversing recent ban on cyclists passing through Bootham Bar, and by allowing cycling in Colliergate. Option 3. Provision along inner ring road has improved significantly over last year. Contra flow lane along St. Maurice's Road would be worthwhile. Gillygate is problematical. A lane from Bootham to Lord Mayor's Walk would be desirable. Signage indicating Bootham Park as a way to St. John's is needed, as is a sign to identify Bootham Row as a route. Traffic lights need to be phased to give cyclists more time.	526/5668
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	535/5731
	Option 1.	945/5801
	Option 1. Also need more parking for bikes.	1237/5896
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Make cycle and bus users priority road users. All other traffic to use park and ride/tram/trains.	1325/5933
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1443/5976
	Options 1 and 2.	1525/6005
	Option 1.	1601/6060
	Desirable access North Street to Coney Street.	1659/6094
	Options 1 and 2.	1791/6106
	Yes to all three options, particularly Option 2. Cyclists should always have priority on city roads. Should be greater physical separation between cycles and vehicles. Should be mandatory 20mph limit within City. Support new bridge across Ouse.	2153/6160
	Option 1. Option 2 of less priority. Option 3 appears unfeasible unless vehicular traffic volume can be limited to allow priority to cycles.	2239/6216
	Should be a pedestrian/cycle route to link existing east-west Acomb - Millennium Bridge - University route to City Centre via Hamilton Drive and east side of ECML from Holgate Bridge to Station.	2367/6262

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Pedestrian and Cycle Routes into the City Centre Question 12 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3. Cycle/pedestrian bridge next to Scarborough bridge with direct access into railway station should be built as soon as possible. Also link along back of hospital to join Sustrans route 66. Similar direct route into station from south, from Cambridge Street, should be constructed to improve access to station for people coming from Holgate/Acomb direction. Needs to be more safe storage for cycles.	2413/6832
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. Travel plans are an effective way to achieve this. Suggest should include following statement. "Transport improvements identified from transport assessments and travel plans could include making a contribution to pedestrian or cycling facilities planned by the Council or other agencies. Agreed measures and targets will be secured through planning obligations or conditions."	2434/6282
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2461/6297
	Options 2 and 3.	2469/6345
	New cycle bridge between Navigation Road and Hungate a good idea. There is a need for small cycling bridges over Foss especially between Huntington Road and Heworth Green/ Dodsworth Avenue. Bishopthorpe also needs a new road bridge. Option 2. Time restrictions on Goodramgate should be avoided. Cyclists and pedestrians should not be put on same ways. Many of cycle paths in York are actually pedestrian pavements, which is dangerous. Cycling should be a priority on both sides of river. Where possible continue to build cycle paths along Ouse. Improvement needed on Terry Avenue to Bishopthorpe Road link. Also suggest extending cycle route through Nunn Ings and Middlethorpe Ings and a possible connection to designer Outlet.	2498/6366
	Cycle path network needs to be extended outside City to surrounding villages, preferably using off-road cycle paths through available and suitable countryside and public rights of way. On-road cycle routes are of no use and are frequently cause of problems between motorists and cyclists. Should only be used as a last resort. Allowing cyclists to use pedestrian areas without a clearly marked cycleway is incredibly dangerous.	2595/6437
	Improve cycle access to City Centre; Provide more cycle parking including covered and secure; Allow mixed pedestrian and cycle access; Provide cycle access to station from Scarborough Bridge and improve bridge access.	2613/6479
	Support improvements to pedestrian routes through and in to City Centre. Concern re conflict between pedestrian and cycle use. Opposed to provision of excessive signage and road/pavement markings to differentiate these uses as visually intrusive. Opposed to any proposal seeking to allow cycle use in existing or future pedestrianised areas.	2614/6496

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Pedestrian and Cycle Routes into the City Centre Question 12 continued</p>	<p>Although statistics show walking more popular than cycling, nearly all suggested improvements are for walking/cycling or cycling. Walking /cycling provision is not nice for pedestrian as have to be constantly alert for silent fast machines. Also true in so called pedestrian areas. Should be concerted long-term drive against law breaking cyclists. Pedestrian areas mean push your bike or keep out. Option 2. If means keeping cyclists out of City Centre.</p>	<p>2617/6535</p>
	<p>Options 1, 2 and 3.</p>	<p>2628/6635</p>
	<p>Option 1.</p>	<p>2633/6709</p>
	<p>Options 1 and 2.</p>	<p>2636/6738</p>
	<p>City Centre riverside route would be expensive and impractical. Suggest cycle lanes be permitted to cross City Centre e.g. Blake Street, Davygate, Parliament and Piccadilly as two way daytime cycle routes. Cycles should have a speed limit and be required to consider pedestrians.</p>	<p>2649/6794</p>
<p>Buses General</p>	<p>Focus is mainly on location of bus stops, other aspects should be considered. Link to LTP could be included. Are bus operating companies signed up to support any or all of the possible options? How do economic, social and environmental factors influence the demand for certain bus routes and bus frequencies in the city centre?</p>	<p>1/5192</p>
	<p>Issue could be explored. Strong preference for small vehicles and electric powered.</p>	<p>373/5466</p>
	<p>One essential element should be central bus terminus. Must include: - integrated Central Bus Station; dedicated parking areas for tour coaches; good information office; good system to advise of service connections; refreshments area alongside comfortable passenger waiting lounges. Should implement these measures sooner rather than later.</p>	<p>789/5653</p>
<p>Buses Paragraph 6.81</p>	<p>Strongly support. Major cause of congestion is large buses.</p>	<p>203/5342</p>
<p>Buses Question 13</p>	<p>Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.</p>	<p>43/5238</p>
	<p>Option 3.</p>	<p>67/5288</p>
	<p>Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 3. Strongly support.</p>	<p>203/5341</p>
	<p>Option 3. Would complement station's location as gateway to York, and provide additional public transport connectivity link to City Centre and beyond for future employees and residents of York Central.</p>	<p>214/5381 & 621/5402</p>
	<p>Options 1, 2 and 3. Options 1 and 3 need to be weighed against impact buses, bus stops and signage might have upon character and setting of City's historic assets. Option 4. Provided could be delivered in a manner, which safeguards special character and setting of City.</p>	<p>242/5424</p>
	<p>Options 3 and 4. Interchange point should be located in Piccadilly area. Ideally bus shelters should be located at kerb edge so as not to impede pedestrian flows.</p>	<p>456/5545</p>

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Buses Question 13 continued	Support Options 1, 2 and 3.	458/5571
	Construction of a bus interchange would be an excellent project. It would make Council a more equal partner in Bus Quality Partnership and improve integrated transport possibilities. Should be at walking distance from station, likewise from new Hub Station cycle hire/secure parking facility. Only reasonable site might be as part of York Central.	511/5627
	Option 1. Location of bus stops and routes should be under constant review. Option 2. Wherever possible all bus signage should share streetlight or other utility poles. Modern covered bus shelters present less transparency. Option 3. Service from Station to Hospital could benefit University. A second NRM 'train' to Castle would be useful.	526/5669
	Options 1, 2, and 3.	535/5732
	Option 2.	611/5768
	Option 3. Could be either shuttle bus or road train.	945/5802
	Option 3. No, short distance to walk to City Centre.	975/5836
	Definite need for a purpose built bus terminal within area of railway station.	1100/5849
	Option 3. Free bus would be good. York needs a bus station or central point, railway station or Rougier Street an obvious solution.	1144/5856
	Option 3. No, probably not enough demand. Existing buses need more publicity. Option 4.	1185/5874
	Option 1.	1237/5897
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Private coaches should be excluded from bus priority lanes and given spaces at park and ride sites to stop and keep them out of City Centre.	1325/5934
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.	1525/6006
	Buses should run later in evening (not just park and ride). Buses to improve links to rural areas and tourist attractions e.g. Benningborough House (liaise with National Trust and local villages).	1533/6045
	Option 1. Move bus stops outside Library as causes severe problems.	1601/6061
	Option 3. Option 4. If transport interchange located in teardrop site, second interchange desirable.	1659/6823
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Shuttle bus long overdue. Bus Station could be on teardrop site.	1791/6107
	Options 3 and 4.	2161/6874
	Option 2. Full support but answer will be amalgam of all four options and more.	2210/6201
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. A bus interchange point at Castle Piccadilly, perhaps East side.	2239/6217
Use of small electric vehicles, perhaps operating on a circular route and possibly being allowed to use certain footstreets, seems sensible. Might even replace sightseeing buses.	2367/6263	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Buses Question 13 continued</p>	Options 2, 3 and 4. Companies operating bus tours around City should be required/encouraged to reduce emissions/use less polluting types of engine.	2413/6833
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. No.	2461/6298
	Options 3 and 4.	2469/6346
	Option 3. Whatever is adopted "bendy buses," are just not right for City.	2552/6377
	Option 3.	2570/6411
	Current trend for large buses inappropriate. Focus should be on improving quality of service and reducing congestion by using smaller buses, which do not block up streets. Bus routes need to be frequent, cost-effective and accessible to all York residents, not just ones on high volume (high profit) routes.	2595/6438
	Identify proper interchange for buses, taxis etc.	2610/6480
	Short of having Bus only streets, don't know how can solve this one. York's streets are too narrow for traffic, bus stops and pedestrians. Wider pavements, bus station close to railway station and smaller buses might help.	2617/6536
	Option 3.	2618/6560
	Option 3.	2620/6580
	Option 3. With clear key destinations for shopping.	2622/6596
	Options 2 and 3.	2628/6636
	Option 3. Free buses might encourage more commuters to come by train rather than car.	2632/6686
	Options 1, 3 and 4.	2636/6739
Option 3. City Centre to Hospital bus would be welcomed.	2650/6796	
<p>River Transport General</p>	If it is decided to pursue a policy to promote commercial river transport then must be consistent with emerging LDF Core Strategy that provides for the "protection and enhancement of water course corridors". Both rivers are a huge asset, an important resource and ecologically important, supporting a wide variety of flora and fauna. Therefore, any intensification of use should not result in unacceptable impacts.	4/5198
	Potential is recognised, but tinged with realism. Issues in past about speed limits, reliability (with rivers so often in flood) and concerns about likely commercial viability. Could be an attractive proposition for certain types of customer at certain times of year.	373/5467
	Ouse and Foss should be made into working rivers. Ouse could be used for waterbuses, linking with a car park in Clifton Moor area. Could have stops at various bridges and continue as far as Fulford.	1885/6146
	River transport must be something for the future.	2467/6337

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
River Transport Paragraph 6.88	Good suggestion where feasible but still need to convey materials from river to site if not on the river. (Small vehicles?)	203/5344
River Transport Question 14	Sustainability Statement refers to keeping access out of Flood Zone 3, however we would suggest that this would be very difficult given the access is necessarily in close proximity to watercourses. Also if access is proving a problem, this means the river is in flood and using the river for transport will be very difficult due to high levels and flows in the watercourse. If river transport is pursued issues such as impacts on river banks and erosion and bankside vegetation must be assessed on sections where an increase over 50% boat passes is likely. The need for dredging should also be considered if deeper draft craft are to be used. This would include waste regulation issues with regard to disposal of the material displaced. Impacts on fisheries, protected species and other wildlife must also be considered.	5/5216
	Option 1.	43/5239
	Strongly agree with increasing approaches to York via river transport. A main terminal could be constructed adjacent to shopping centre at Coney Street. Studies should be undertaken to examine pick-up points at several places along the river.	52/5272
	Option 2.	67/5289
	Option 1. Passengers only. Could double as a tourist attraction.	203/5343
	Option 1. If linked to peripheral park-and-ride sites and out-of-town coach parks, could encourage visitors to leave their cars/coaches on the edge of city, and the boat-ride would form part of the visitor experience of York.	242/5425
	Option 2. Use of river for freight seems attractive, but has limited potential. Use of river for passengers is not feasible. Major outlying population is situated to west of city, Boroughbridge Road area and Poppleton, and river is narrow and would not allow boats to turn. The river could be widened but too expensive.	456/5546
	Option 1. Considerable potential for freight transport but consideration needs to be given to suitable locations for unloading. Passenger travel will continue to be a significant part of the leisure/ tourism offer, though for non-leisure travel likely to be too slow to attract significant modal shift.	458/5572
	Option 1. To promote commercial transport.	511/5628
	Option 1. Useful to encourage use of river for freight. Passenger service could not compete with other modes. Service mooted for Clifton Moor Park and Ride impracticable.	526/5670
	Not long enough river route to be of any value.	681/6821
	Option 1.	945/5803

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
River Transport Question 14 continued	Option 1. Would add to visitor experience.	975/5837
	Option 1. Likely for visitors only e.g. Knavesmire to Centre, ' Park and Float' would be visitor attraction and anti congestion if priced right.	1144/5857
	Option 1. Potential from Bishopthorpe and Naburn areas.	1185/5875
	Option 1. Keep transport costs affordable.	1237/5898
	Option 1. Park and Ride adjacent to river at Rawcliffe could be adapted to allow access.	1325/5935
	Option 2.	1443/5977
	Option 1.	1525/6007
	Option 1.	1533/6046
	Option 2. Not feasible.	1601/6062
	Option 1.	1791/6108
	Option 1.	2153/6161
	Option 1.	2161/6875
	Ouse and Foss are underused assets, which could be used to ease congestion. Consider using River in conjunction with low emission vehicles for freight. If Transshipment Centre sited close to A64/River Ouse and freight transhipped to low emission vehicles, which could be shipped into City Centre on purpose built barges, would be considerable reduction in congestion both within City Centre and on routes to it. Might be potential to use river taxis on both rivers if suitable out of town parking and bus exchanges provided.	2210/6202
	Option 1. More relevant for passenger use. Some use for freight using suitable craft particularly for construction. Use for trade replenishment does not seem of benefit because of extra handling from landing to premises. In view of comment in paragraph 6.8, Option 1 is worth retaining with measured support until ruled out on local limitations.	2239/6218
	Ouse could be used for transport of construction materials and possibly as a relaxing (if rather slow) way to commute from Poppleton and Naburn.	2367/6264
	Option 1. Option 2. No.	2434/6283
	Option 1. Investigate further.	2461/6299
	Option 2.	2469/6347
	Option 2.	2552/6378
	Option 1. If riverside developed. Needs connecting pedestrian walkway along riverside.	2570/6412
Option 1. Route along river from nearby Park and Ride site would be a tourist attraction.	2595/6439	
River is an excellent sports facility for rowing and canoeing. These should be encouraged and facilities and regattas given maximum publicity. It could be used to the south for transshipment to low emission vehicles at that side of City.	2617/6537	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
River Transport Question 14 continued	Option 1.	2618/6561
	Option 1.	2620/6581
	Option 1.	2622/6597
	Option 1.	2628/6637
	Potential from at least Fulford up to Ouse (when not in flood). Link could be made with park and ride at Designer Outlet or similar. Would need relatively small and fast boats. Should also be ferries across river between Skeldergate Bridge and Millennium Bridge.	2632/6687
	Option 1. Policy should provide clear incentives and reflect an understanding that in most circumstances transport of freight by river will not be viable.	2633/6710
	Option 2. Rise and fall of river so acute would be unreliable.	2636/6740
Commercial Traffic Question 15	Option 2.	43/5240
	Option 1. Have areas cleared by 09.30, no return till 17.30.	67/5290
	Option 2.	203/5345
	Option 1. Not necessary if Option 2 works, but if not, times before 10.30 and after 4.30.	
	Note impact of commercial traffic in city centre may be reduced through development of a transshipment centre. Should consider appropriate locations for this through Allocations DPD, and ensure an appropriate funding method is proposed, that is proportionate to its role as a citywide facility.	214/5382 & 621/5403
	Options 1 and 2. Further Option would be to attach conditions and/or legal agreements to permissions for large-scale retail developments within City Centre restricting the sizes/types of vehicles used for deliveries and the hours during which deliveries are allowed to take place.	242/5426
	Option 2. Would affect volume of traffic using outer ring road depending on where sited.	456/5547
	Extending operation of footstreets could significantly change the “feel” of the City Centre and encourage growth of the “café culture”. Time extensions might be staggered, so end of operation would be at different times in different areas.	458/5573
	Option 2. Impact of commercial traffic in City Centre would be reduced. Currently being explored through York Northwest and has potential to deliver benefits for City Centre.	479/5605
	Council's Freight Strategy 2003 included proposal to license a fleet of freight bikes. Transshipment centre followed by this would be an excellent idea.	511/5629
	Options 1 and 2. Should be clear of footstreets area by 10.30am.	526/5671
	Options 1 and 2.	535/5733
	Option 2.	945/5804
Option 1. Cars and vans etc. not allowed between 8.30am and 4.00pm.	1237/5899	
Spearhead nationwide campaign to confine city-centre deliveries to 12.00am to 08.00am.	1299/5917	

Key Theme 1: Economic Vitality Issues and Options – Accessing the City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Commercial Traffic Question 15 continued	Option 1. 06.00 to 07.30am and 18.00 to 19.30pm.	1325/5936
	Option 2.	1525/6008
	Option 1. 6am to 9am.	1601/6063
	Option 2. Must not become a warehouse, requires constant movement.	1791/6109
	Options 1 and 2. 11am vehicle exclusion time is too late; 10am start more appropriate. Commercial vehicles should be restricted to very early morning.	2153/6162
	Option 2. Expand industry on Northminster Estate.	2161/6876
	Option 1. If deliveries were restricted further and no workable and financially viable alternative provided, might well have effect of making City Centre an increasingly unattractive place to trade. Option 2. But consider using River in conjunction with low emission vehicles. If sited close to A64/River Ouse and freight was transhipped to low emission vehicles which could be shipped into City Centre on purpose built barges would be considerable reduction in congestion both within City Centre and on routes to it.	2210/6203
	Option 1. Before 10am and after 4pm seems reasonable. Option 2. Electric vehicles might be included for less bulky deliveries.	2239/6219
	Option 2. Should be consulted about any proposals at an early stage.	2434/6284
	Option 1. Could have different times for each, may help reduce congestion. Option 2. Final delivery vehicle should be less polluting. Cycle couriers should be encouraged wherever possible.	2461/6300
	Option 2. No. Don't make it even more difficult for delivery lorries.	2469/6348
	Option 2.	2552/6379
	Option 1. Will not help small local businesses. Option 2. Would need to be enforced and supported by Council and all businesses.	2595/6440
	Option 2. Seems to envisage a smaller number of larger vehicles delivering in Centre. Larger vehicles are last thing needed. Suggest transhipment to river (in South) and smaller vehicles in City.	2617/6538
	Already restricted for commercial use, don't make it too hard to trade.	2622/6598
	Option 2.	2628/6638
Option 2. However may not be suitable for all businesses and retailers. Should be explored as one of a number of solutions.	2633/6711	
Option 2.	2636/6741	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General</p>	<p>There is much to be commended in this section. In considering design should consider impact of large buildings on key views. The recent additions to York St John could be used as examples of 'how not to' rather than as templates for good practice.</p>	<p>110/6807</p>
	<p>Welcomes: - Acknowledgement in paragraph 7.1 that “world class heritage will continue to be centre piece of cultural offer” and highlighting of the built environment, public realm and rivers; Clear messages on managing archaeological resources and building design; Proposed improvements to pedestrian routes; Seeking to increase opportunities for “greening” and managing flood risks.</p>	<p>373/5468</p>
	<p>Welcomes general approach to historic environment and in particular paragraph 7.17. Approach should be a central theme of CCAAP and adopt position that historic environment within and immediately outside City Walls forms a place that is a world heritage site in all but name. Should set out policies and approaches compatible with preservation and enhancement of significance of site. World Heritage Working Group’s draft statement of significance could be used alongside emerging Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal to give strong understanding of significance of historic core. Policy options to guide future development must be structured so can be used to protect and enhance significance of City Centre. One of principle policy objectives should be that future development will preserve or enhance significance of site. Other key policy areas include: - views into and out of City Centre e.g. to and from Minster and Clifford’s Tower and towers and steeples of City Centre churches; scale massing and height of new developments; townscape quality; use of natural materials in buildings and public realm.</p>	<p>2635/6727</p>
	<p>Historic Environment also equals quality of life for residents.</p>	<p>2638/6780</p>
<p>Spatial Portrait Paragraph 7.04</p>	<p>The City Centre represents more than 2000 years of development since the area was settled before the Romans arrived.</p>	<p>441/5502</p>
<p>Spatial Portrait Paragraph 7.06</p>	<p>Amend 'Yorkshire Museum Gardens' to 'Museum Gardens'. Never been known as the Yorkshire Museum Gardens. If Rowntree Park is considered to have any impact on City Centre, it also is a registered Park.</p>	<p>441/5503</p>
<p>Spatial Portrait: Character Appraisal Paragraph 7.08</p>	<p>Pleased that Council is undertaking a Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). Also wish to promote the role of townscape and landscape character assessment, which will help inform this AAP as well as the planned LDF Site Allocations DPD.</p>	<p>4/5199</p>
<p>Spatial Portrait: Character Appraisal Paragraph 7.08 and 7.10</p>	<p>Cannot emphasise too strongly how fundamentally important the Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal is to formulating a relevant Action Plan. Its findings should not simply be incorporated into the Issues and Options document but should be the foundation of its recommendations.</p>	<p>441/5504</p>

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Spatial Portrait: Public Realm and Rivers Paragraph 7.14	Amend 'Yorkshire Museum Gardens' to 'Museum Gardens'. Add Tower Gardens.	441/5505
Spatial Portrait: Public Realm and Rivers Paragraph 7.15	Essential to keep access for pedestrians along edge of river.	102/5313
Spatial Portrait: World Heritage Site Paragraph 7.17	Strongly approve.	203/5346
	Re bid for World Heritage Status needs to be major changes in thinking and strategy. Apart from giving best presentation of historical heritage, need enhanced cultural and leisure facilities together with current and additional retailing and servicing outlets compatible with that status.	549/5751
Spatial Portrait: Public Realm Map 6	Include Deans Park, Memorial Gardens in Duncombe Place, Bowling Green behind Art Gallery and small park in North Street opposite Guildhall, possibly as a sub-category. All are valuable landscape resources, even if privately owned.	580/5654
Spatial Portrait Question 16	Yes.	43/5241
	Yes.	67/5291
	Yes. Support proactive options for tackling issues. Does not support "do nothing" options.	203/5327
	Paints a reasonably accurate description of historic environment of the City Centre. However, also needs to set out, explicitly, which elements of the City Centre contribute to York's "special historic character". Whilst the Conservation Area Appraisal may well provide a greater analysis, it will not provide the holistic analysis necessary. The summary Character Statements fail to capture the essence of the historic core or truly characterise the areas they describe.	242/5427
	Probably inadequate but will have to be revised in light of Conservation Area Appraisal. However, Appraisal may include too much material to incorporate fully into document.	441/5506
	Suggested "Vision for Historic Environment: York will be designated as a UN World Heritage Site with secure funding to maintain and enhance our historic heritage for the enjoyment of future generations."	458/5574
	Yes.	526/5672
	Conservation Area Appraisal should have been done before consultation. Believe making York a World Heritage Site would be a positive thing. May change patterns of tourism attracting higher spending tourists. May be negative to describe this as a 'pressure'.	535/5734
	Yes.	945/5805
	Yes.	1325/5937

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Spatial Portrait Question 16 continued	Yes.	1525/6009
	Yes.	1601/6064
	Yes.	1791/6110
	Yes.	2153/6163
	Scarborough Rail and Foot Bridge is in poor condition. Even if rail section not touched a new, safe and aesthetically pleasing pedestrian section could replace present one. If a metre wider would allow bicycles being pushed across to pass more easily.	2161/6181
	Yes, but surprised that CAA for Central Historic Conservation Area not completed before CCAAP released for consultation. Urge that this is completed as soon as practical.	2210/6204
	Yes.	2239/6220
	Yes. Galling that Conservation Area Appraisal remains incomplete at this stage.	2461/6301
	Map 6 is misleading, should be redrawn with few areas available to the public, which are grassed and usable. This leaves Museum Gardens, Deans Park, Tower Gardens and Memorial Gardens, which is woefully inadequate. White space on map, presently covered with cars, has potential for grassed open space. This historic area should be set aside for people to relax in.	2469/6349
	Yes. Fully agree with paragraph 7.15.	2552/6380
	Yes.	2614/6497
	Yes.	2628/6639
	Yes.	2636/6742

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General</p>	<p>City Centre redevelopment should be maintained in keeping with the history of the area and not be overly modern in design.</p>	<p>76/5308</p>
	<p>Areas such as those around the Castle (Goodramgate, old shops and church) should be developed to ensure the integrity of these historic areas.</p>	<p>77/5312</p>
	<p>While options have been presented for ‘greening’ the city, no options are presented for integrating sustainable construction and design principles into historically sensitive locations and buildings within City Centre. Suggest AAP outline a policy that promotes sustainable construction and design, including guidance on those technologies that are likely to be appropriate for historically sensitive locations and buildings, in City Centre.</p>	<p>479/5608</p>
	<p>New build should be in keeping with feel of an ancient city.</p>	<p>1007/5843</p>
	<p>Agree should preserve heritage but should also be forward thinking and promote good design. Iconic new buildings should be promoted and encouraged as these encourage visitors too. New can sit with old quite happily and doesn’t need to be in “traditional” style.</p>	<p>2597/6461</p>
<p>Managing the Archaeological Resource General</p>	<p>Welcomes robust approach but emphasises that archaeological resource is not restricted to below ground deposits. Includes ancient monuments, listed buildings and other remains both above and below ground.</p>	<p>107/5320</p>
<p>Managing the Archaeological Resource Question 17</p>	<p>Options 4 and 5. Contributions should be dependent on the extent of the site and archaeological interest. Option 3. Guided visits, open days and press reports.</p>	<p>43/5242</p>
	<p>Options 1 and 2. Essential. Option 3. Access for public at sites, proper archaeological reports in accessible format and available locally and internet. Option 4. Level of contribution to be calculated when new Heritage Bill is passed. Option 5.</p>	<p>67/5292</p>
	<p>Option 1. No. Option 2. Option 3. Response will be different on each site. The reasoning behind archaeological intervention and the results should be made public. Option 4. Concerned that level of contribution requested would affect likelihood of developers agreeing to pay. Option 5. Requirement is not legally binding but agrees owners should be encouraged. Also results from significant sites should be published in a formal manner.</p>	<p>107/5321</p>
	<p>Option 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Under Option 3 where feasible “hands on” and visits to sites.</p>	<p>203/5348</p>

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Managing the Archaeological Resource Question 17 continued	Need to evaluate how successful past management strategy for archaeological resource has been. Only then is it possible to ascertain whether Option 1 or 2 be adopted. Favour an alternative Option which seeks, firstly, to evaluate how successful past management strategy for archaeological resource has been, and as part of this, goes on to consider Options 1 and 2. Option 3. Methods will depend upon individual circumstances. Option 4. Option 5. Excavated material needs to be deposited at a registered Museum. It would seem appropriate that any materials are deposited at the Yorkshire Museum.	242/5428
	Historic environment as manifested in the built fabric of City Centre is part of archaeological resource. Some reference should be made to this in this section.	441/5507
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. For archaeology.	535/5735
	Option 5.	945/5806
	Option 1. What's the ARUP Report? Options 2 and 4. Part of Planning already. Option 3. No. Option 5. Why not in planning already? Universities archaeology dept could help with this.	1237/5900
	Option 5.	1325/5938
	Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.	1443/5978
	Option 5.	1525/6010
	Option 3.	1601/6065
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Public should have access to all sites, reports should be produced outlining results and in a coherent accessible form. Should be available locally and internet used in imaginative and dramatic ways. Option 4. Contribution to be worked out when new Heritage Bill is passed. Option 5. Materials belong to landowners but should be encouraged to deposit materials.	1791/6111
	Option 1. Evidence should be incorporated into interactive GIS linked to CYCHER and Conservation Area Appraisal. Option 2. Should form part of evidence base. GIS will go a long way to satisfying this. Option 3. Could be further enhanced through better access to results of archaeological investigations. Dissemination should be a priority. Needs to be shared vision that includes schools, businesses, tourists and residents. Option 4. Could be assessed against developing CYCHER to meet needs of Options 1 and 3 so charge will be proportion of running and development costs. Option 5. Will Yorkshire Museum be able to store an increasing quantity of material?	2153/6164

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.	
Managing the Archaeological Resource Question 17 continued	Option 2.	2161/6877	
	Options 1, 2 and 4. Option 3. Selection of deposits needed to achieve right balance. Option 5. To extent enough room in Yorkshire Museum.	2239/6221	
	Options 1 and 2. Option 3. Methods should vary with scale and importance of investigation. Suggest visits, talks, display boards with text and photographs on site and internet. Option 4. No thoughts on appropriate contribution. Option 5. More of an ambition than something, which could, or should be enforced.	2461/6302	
	Option 1.	2552/6381	
	Options 3, 4 and 5.	2595/6441	
	Option 5.	2620/6582	
	Options 3, 4 and 5. Option 3, depends on type of intervention. Suggest open days and volunteer options. Where possible community should be involved in management of these	2628/6640	
	Options 1 and 3. No comment on rate proposed. Option 2. Probably. Option 5. Does not sound manageable.	2636/6743	
	Designing in the City Centre General	Hungate development does not comply; too tall buildings and Council HQ plan inappropriate. Barbican development - 5-storey hotel not in keeping with area.	43/5243
		Strong support for proposed Conservation Area Appraisal.	373/5469
Not aware of anywhere where a design code has proved effective. Often unexpected which produces magic. Vital process does not filter out inspiration. Verbal briefs can provide no more than a starting point. Height limits useful but has to be room for exceptions. Archaeology important factor, but good architectural quality should have equal weight. “Safe” solutions will result in bland streets and weak buildings. Icons are necessary, not everywhere, but at right points, which can be derived from Conservation Area Character Assessment. Plan is a great opportunity to slam door shut on indifferent architecture and to create a climate where only best is good enough. Development control staff and Planning Committee members, in the main not trained in design. Opportunity for in-service training to raise design awareness and a serious need to resource adequately assessment process. Architectural quality should be assessed as rigorously as archaeological issues and enforced just as robustly.		2615/6524	
Agree paragraph 7.36.		2638/6781	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Designing in the City Centre Findings of the Character Appraisal Paragraph 7.30	Pleased that Council is undertaking a Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). Also wish to promote the role of townscape and landscape character assessment, which will help inform this AAP as well as the planned LDF Site Allocations DPD.	4/5200
Designing in the City Centre Question 18	Option 2. Should be based on current evidence, including the current CAA and other appropriate landscape/townscape assessments. Option 3. Approach set out in paragraph 7.33 sets out sensible parameters for a code including a mix of general design principles and more specific aspects of design. Option 4. Tall Buildings need to take into account the CAA and any landscape and townscape character and setting including the historic environment.	4/5201
	Options 3, 4 and 5. Option 5. New contemporary landmarks should be discouraged.	43/5244
	City Centre is a pinch point for wildlife, which is situated on two important river corridors. There is very little green space within the city centre. Provision of green roofs within City Centre on new developments could provide undisturbed habitat for animals such as insects and birds and could greatly increase biodiversity of City.	49/5268
	Selection of Architects, Planners and Contractors who design and build within the CC should be on basis of other credentials rather than cost and name. A register should be made of approved organisations that meet set credentials and have a record of sensitivity in these matters. In this regard a development of a design code would be appropriate.	52/5273
	Option 2.	67/5293
	Options 2, 3, 4 and 5. All move Option 1 forward.	203/5349
	Option 2. Subject to concerns regarding emerging Conservation Area Appraisal. Option 3. To provide degree of guidance necessary would need to be a comprehensive document, probably sub-divided in a similar manner and containing much the same information as City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal. This may be little different to approach proposed in Option 1. Option 4. However, strategy for identifying and protecting key views and visas has to encompass whole of City and not just be restricted to City Centre. Option 5. May well be potential for creation of new landmark buildings. However they would have to be based upon a thorough understanding of impact they might have upon character and setting of historic City and, especially of key views across York.	242/5429
	Combination of Options 1 and 3, informed by Option 2, but not over prescriptive. Option 4. Long-standing but unwritten convention that no building should be higher than eaves of Minster aisles should be reiterated. Audit of internal City views is needed. Option 5. Disagree. Issue is better dealt with as appropriate in Design or Planning Briefs.	441/5508
	Agree with paragraph 7.27.	456/5548

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Designing in the City Centre Question 18 continued	Options 3 and 4. New buildings in historic area should respect and blend in with existing structures, both in scale and overall design and appearance.	458/5575
	Pleased to see inclusion of requirement of uniqueness. Do not support introduction of a Design Code for entire City Centre. Support idea of creating a policy on views and tall buildings. Do not think Council should make priority of creating 'new contemporary landmarks in City Centre, though could be desirable in redevelopment of some areas.	511/5630
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. Planning permission is granted too early in the process causing problems when applicants come back and ask for more. Option 5. York does not lack landmarks.	526/5673
	Option 1. Design is key issue. Important new buildings are sensitive to and sympathetic with surrounding historic environment. Also important to ensure that new developments do not replicate old. Current policy approach supports this. Option 5. New landmark zones could be identified within AAP. Could include Piccadilly.	532/5711
	Options 2 and 4. Conservation Area Appraisal should have been done first. Option 5. No.	535/5736
	Care should be taken with design codes so particular styles and approaches are not prescribed. Opportunity should be taken to encourage use of new landmarks and contemporary buildings that reflect present period.	611/5769
	Should already have stringent architecture and design policies in place.	681/5781
	Option 4. Thought had one on tall buildings i.e. Minster height or below. Nothing too prescriptive as it stops innovation, rules to avoid price above aesthetic design and to be in keeping with historic nature are necessary.	1144/5858
	Option 3. What about World Heritage Site proposals?	1185/5876
	Should take English Heritage out of equation and start using some common sense.	1237/5901
	Option 2.	1325/5939
	Options 4 and 5.	1443/5979
	Option 4.	1525/6011
	Option 4.	1601/6066
	Option 2. But not overly prescriptive. Option 5. Using top quality architects and materials.	1791/6112
	Option 1. Not an Option. Option 2. Useful in allowing gifted architects with experience of design in sensitive locations to develop innovative approaches but they are not that common.	2153/6165

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Designing in the City Centre Question 18 continued	Other challenge lies in quality and quantity of Council staff time that can be invested in working with architects and developers to achieve an appropriate result. Option 3. More reliable. Design principles should include materials, architectural features such as windows and doors in certain locations. It should also include a set of clear principles around the use of contemporary design. Should allow for introduction of exciting contemporary developments that complement and enhance character of York. Code should be worked up in partnership with CABE, English Heritage and involve urban designers as well as conservation architects. Options 4 and 5.	2153/6165 continued
	Option 4.	2161/6878
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Could provide flexible guidelines giving effect to Options 1 and 2. Options 4 and 5. Could be taken together to achieve a harmonious result.	2239/6222
	More tall buildings are neither necessary nor appropriate. A Design Code might be useful. Should be based on the Conservation Area Appraisal.	2367/6265
	All Options possible but should allow some scope for improving energy-capturing roof types (e.g. photovoltaics and solar heating systems).	2413/6834
	Option 2. Option 3. May be too prescriptive but if adopted should have some reference to quality, competition of design, respect for historic environment, an aspiration for low-energy building, sympathetic materials to adjacent and other significant buildings, etc. Option 4. No. Option 5. With possible exception of York Central.	2461/6303
	Option 4.	2469/6350
	Option 3. Principle should be that prevailing architectural style or building materials, which provide a specific locality with its distinctive flavour, must be strongly borne in mind.	2552/6382
	Options 3 and 4.	2570/6413
	Options 2 and 4. Option 5. Totally inappropriate.	2595/6442
	Options 2 and 4. Option 5. No.	2612/6470
	Promote conservation and urban design policies for City Centre.	2613/6481
	Option 2. A more flexible for individual sites. Option 3. Would lead to blander and less exciting options being proposed.	
	Option 5. Must not be afraid of height. Criteria should be quality.	2614/6498

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Designing in the City Centre Question 18 continued	Could be very restrictive. Need high standard of design built with high quality materials. Option 4. Remaining views of Minster should be safeguarded.	2617/6539
	Options 3 and 4. Tall buildings should be limited.	2618/6562
	Option 4.	2620/6583
	Option 4. Option 3. Based on uniqueness.	2628/6641
	Options 3 and 4. Areas suitable for modern-looking offices and those where only traditional looking buildings can be constructed can be designated.	2632/6688
	Elements of all Options appropriate, however policy should remain open to new ideas. Option 5. Should become preferred Option.	2633/6712
	Options 2 and 4.	2636/6744
Design Decisions General	Agree paragraphs 7.40 to 7.42. Design Panels should root back into community, e.g. York Design Awards stimulating interest. Visioning and 3D thinking, and raised expectations, urban design studies to be at core of strategies and planning briefs.	2638/6782
Design Decisions Design Champion Paragraph 7.41	Pleased to see recognition of potential of York Design Awards and support for them. Agree with emphasis on need for ensuring quality design.	203/5347
Design Decisions Question 19	Combination of Options 2 and 4. Should be a Local Design Panel. Option 3. No. Too much for one person.	43/5245
	Option 4.	52/5274
	No view.	67/5294
	Options 2, 3 and 4.	203/5350
	Options 2, 3 and 4.	242/5430
	Option 3.	373/5470
	Option 1. But with greater emphasis on an integrated approach by all departments within Council. Design Champion not necessary to ensure this, just properly developed and integrated policies, which are comprehensively and consistently applied. Option 2. For major development schemes only. Option 3 and 4. Object.	441/5509
	How would Design Champions be appointed and who selects the Design Committee? Design Competitions are a good idea for major or sensitive schemes.	456/5549
	Options 2 and 4.	458/5576
	Support an approach that promotes new high quality contemporary design in City Centre. Work currently being undertaken may also give an indication of how AAP could help to improve approach to considering design issues in decision making process.	479/5607

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Design Decisions Question 19 continued	Support proposal to create a Design Panel for significant developments. Design competitions would exist purely within professional architectural world. Challenge is to bridge that world.	511/5631
	Option 1. Existing procedures are proving less effective. Need augmenting with a range of new safeguards. Option 2. Providing that initial stage is an open competition. Option 3. Could usefully supplement a fully staffed dedicated conservation team. Could help co-ordinate work of departments. Option 4. Should be in addition to, not a replacement for, other bodies, statutory and non-statutory consultees.	526/5674
	Options 2 and 4.	535/5737
	Option 4.	611/5770
	Option 3. No.	681/5782
	Option 4.	945/5807
	Option 3. No a waste of money.	975/5838
	Options 2 and 3.	1144/5859
	Option 3.	1185/5877
	What's the point of having a national planning policy? Normally architects and designers are knocked back by English Heritage and we have a backward view of design in general. Until that changes CABE will fail.	1237/5902
	Option 4. Urge that Panel membership be not limited to 'experts'. Should include ordinary members of public.	1299/5918
	Option 4.	1325/5940
	Option 4.	1525/6012
	Option 2.	1601/6067
	Option 2.	1791/6113
	Option 1. No. Option 2. Can be successful but Council needs adequate historic environment and urban design resource. Option 3. Suggest that heritage champion also pick up on design portfolio. The two are too firmly linked. Option 4. Could also be very useful for large-scale developments.	2153/6166
Option 2. Important to ensure a balance of expertise and "ordinary citizens" and business community. Also crucial to actively solicit views of young people in the 15 to 25 age range.	2161/6182	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options - Conservation and Design Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Design Decisions Question 19 continued	Option 1. No. Option 2. Could be beneficial for larger projects. Option 3. Presence of a Councillor in role of Heritage Champion is a step forward. If this works well, should have first Design Champion ready available. Option 4. Could be formed for some projects.	2239/6223
	Option 2. Would help to concentrate minds of developers and architects and give more opportunity for public involvement. Option 3. Not certain of benefits. Option 4. Should be based on existing Conservation Area Advisory Committee. What is most needed is a fully staffed Conservation Team in Planning Department.	2367/6266
	Options 1 and 3. No. Option 2. Option 4. Could already exist in form of Conservation Areas Advisory Panel.	2461/6304
	Allow public to see preliminary drawings of major new buildings from three architects to judge, which is suitable for its historic surroundings. Preferred design could be worked up.	2469/6351
	Option 4.	2552/6383
	Options 2 and 3.	2570/6414
	Option 4. Must be linked to architectural conservation and historical experts to advise on designs. Option 3. No.	2595/6443
	Educate decision makers on design issues. Employ Chief Planning Officer with power over design.	2613/6482
	Options 1 and 3. No. Option 2. Of use in only a limited number of cases, expensive and of varying benefit. Option 4. Care needs to be taken to ensure not over balanced in favour of preservation and a too conservative approach.	2614/6499
	Option 2. Provided judge is from outside York and not blinkered by familiarity, would also need to be of high calibre. Option 3. No.	2617/6540
	Option 2. As long as full public consultation on designs chosen.	2618/6563
	Option 1.	2620/6584
	Option 4.	2628/6642
	Option 2. Option 3. Uncertain.	2632/6689
	Option 1.	2633/6713
Option 4. This can combine with Option 2.	2636/6745	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	To enable greater movement by non-car modes, the connection of attractive and functional public and green spaces through safe and attractive linkages is required. Critical that AAP reflects a decision to enable primary modes of transport to be non-car dependent and provide public and green spaces that enhance the quality of City's environment for residents and visitors.	398/5490
	Opening up and linking is a brilliant idea. Once completed "walking tour" guides could be produced for various length walks around City, highlighting tourist attractions/notable buildings etc that are walked past. Quarters/Designated Areas are a good idea as at moment whole City merges into one. Would make it easier to navigate. Each area could be given a common "theme" so that visitors can easily identify them. Squares. Suggest competitions for people to design them. Should be well designed and use modern materials and plants and not make features out of street furniture.	2597/6462
Paragraph 7.44	Welcome the approach.	4/5202
Improving Pedestrian Routes around the City Centre	Disagree with statement.	441/5510
	Footstreets should be extended throughout City including Micklegate, Goodramgate and also to Gillygate. Fossgate and Walmgate should be considered.	2628/6644
Paragraph 7.47		
Improving Pedestrian Routes around the City Centre Question 20	Option 3.	43/5246
	No view.	67/5295
	Option 1 and 2. Particular attention to snickleways, ancient links between areas of city – ensure clean and well lit, attractive to use.	203/5351
	Option 1.	242/5431
	Do nothing approach unacceptable. Development of a robust strategy is needed to manage movement conflicts within public realm and prioritise non-car mode movement.	398/5487
	Option 1. Option 3. No.	441/5511
	Option 1.	458/5577
	Would prefer improvements of worst areas, where conflict occurs, to construction of dedicated routes, which would be more for tourists. City should be walkable for everyone. Also reinforce point about railings that where there is conflict this should be resolved without imprisoning pedestrians behind railings.	511/5632
	Option 1. Option 2. 'Songlines' are currently fashionable. Name should not figure in final product. Concept is useful. Signage of routes can create urban clutter, and, owing to York's many attractions, confusion. Coloured laser beams can mark a route very effectively at night.	526/5675

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Improving Pedestrian Routes around the City Centre Question 20 continued	Option 3.	945/5808
	Option 3.	1237/5903
	Option 2.	1325/5941
	Options 1 and 2.	1443/5980
	Options 1 and 2.	1525/6013
	Option 2.	1601/6068
	Options 1 and 2.	1791/6114
	Options 1 and 2. Option 2. Suggest examining Bristol's legible cities project.	2153/6167
	Option 3. No.	
	Option 3.	2161/6879
	Options 1 and 2. Option 3. No.	2239/6224
	Options 1 and 2. Several places where pavements should be widened.	2413/6835
	Option 1. Options 2 and 3. No.	2461/6305
	Option 1.	2469/6352
	Option 2.	2552/6384
	Option 3.	2595/6444
	Option 2.	2617/6541
Options 1 and 2. Shift presumption in favour of cyclists and walkers / pedestrians.	2628/6643	
Options 1 and 2. Also redevelopment of Castle Piccadilly will provide opportunity to connect green spaces around Clifford's Tower to public spaces in City Centre.	2633/6714	
Option 2.	2636/6746	
Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces General	Yes to de-cluttering, though appropriate signage is still needed. No objection to consideration of moving market stalls but needs handling sensitively. Market is a valuable asset from a tourism perspective, but economic difficulties with markets are understood.	373/5471
	Litter and graffiti should be targeted with more enforcement procedures. This leaves a very bad impression. Should be more trained wardens to complement police and deal with things like litter offences and anti-social behaviour.	2570/6427
Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Paragraph 7.52	Issue is Newgate Market. Is shabby with empty stalls and needs an urgent revamp particularly as it is next to The Shambles. Suggest covering with a glass roof, and café seating and areas of market split into different sections with each stall having its own site.	2627/6616
Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Question 21	Options 2 and 4b). Option 3. To Parliament Street.	43/5247
	Option 1.	67/5296

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Question 21 continued	Options 1 and 2. Market a great attraction for residents and visitors, needs investment. Option 4. Not clear what type of performance referred to – short or longer. Option 5. Within limits.	203/5352
	Options 1 and 3. Option 3. Not clear where current market might be relocated or what would happen to current space if vacated. Option 5. Appropriateness of new public art should be based upon a thorough understanding of character of area and designed so that it does not add to clutter within City's public spaces.	242/5432
	Intention should be to enrich experience for all, making spaces that are flexible and multifunctional. Additionally, spaces should be set aside for cycle storage facilities in prominent locations and designed into the setting.	398/5488
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Relocate market to Parliament Street and designate Newgate Market as a performance space. Options 4a), b) and c) but not d). Option 5. Encourage best artists and craftsmen to design for public spaces through site design briefs.	441/5512
	Potential site for public performance space would be on Castle Car Park adjacent to Clifford's Tower. If market relocated, should be done in full consultation with market traders, but move to Parliament Street could be positive, with cycle parking switched to covered secure racks on Newgate site. Children's area could be in Parliament Street.	458/5578
	Support enhancement of public space. Foliage and permeable surfaces should be promoted. Support efforts to improve Newgate Market in current location. Open space at Clifford's Tower would be an excellent location for a dedicated outdoor performance area.	511/5633
	Option 1. Distinction between routes and public spaces is not necessarily meaningful. Map of public spaces has omissions: - Bootham Abbey Wall Garden - lacks context; is a memorial; plaque is needed to explain it. It needs seats. Use will probably increase with a supermarket on the 'Charlie Brown' site. Central Library Garden - used to be a rose garden. Junction of Market St, Peter Lane and Feasegate - an incipient space to which Costa's has given a much better character. The circular setts are only metres from only unmarked Roman corner tower; a plaque could stretch a point. All Saints Pavement Churchyard and alley through to Coppergate Centre – popular area but garden is unused. New grass, and trimming of trees needed. Whipmawhopmagate - could easily be made into a significant space with St. Crux as a focus, by removing low concrete barrier at end of Stonebow House.	526/5676

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Question 21 continued</p>	<p>Public Spaces could be transformed by modest enhancement. Decluttering has not yet had much effect. Too many new highway signs. Maintenance is equally important. Street furniture does not respond to its location. Traditional unpainted wooden benches are best type of seating.</p> <p>Option 2. Newgate Market present location is best. Recent suggestion that stalls should be extended along Silver Street is sound.</p> <p>Late opening establishments along the market's west could discourage crime.</p> <p>Option 3. Market would not survive if relocated to a less central location. A return to Parliament Street is impracticable. The north-west end of Piccadilly to the bridge might be a possibility, as part of a radical package, which would see relocation of multi-storey car park etc. A canopy over this part of Piccadilly could be innovative.</p> <p>Option 4. The size of an outdoor performance area depends on size of event. Parliament Street, King's Square, St Helen's Square already function well as performance areas. Principle reason for having another space would be for large spectacle.</p> <p>Option 4b). Land between Clifford's Tower and Foss lends itself to large events.</p> <p>Option 5. In so congested an environment, small pieces of artwork mounted at vandal proof level at first storey and above, would be sensible.</p>	<p>526/5676 continued</p>
	<p>Option 4b). Area to the east of existing Cliffords Tower (Castle car park) would make an ideal performance area, given its setting and location.</p>	<p>532/5712</p>
	<p>Options 1, 3 and 4. Market into Parliament Street. Performance space in Castle area.</p>	<p>535/5738</p>
	<p>Option 1 incorporating best in contemporary design not pseudo-historic.</p> <p>Option 2.</p> <p>Option 4. Castle car park area as part of redevelopment as open space.</p>	<p>580/5756</p>
	<p>Leave Newgate Market alone.</p>	<p>681/5783</p>
	<p>Option 2.</p>	<p>945/5809</p>
	<p>Option 3. Parliament Street.</p>	<p>1007/5847</p>
	<p>Option 3. Practical to relocate market. Old Market in Parliament Street was popular.</p>	<p>1100/5850</p>
	<p>Option 1. Continental type spaces would be nice for visitors.</p> <p>Option 3. No.</p>	<p>1144/5860</p>
	<p>Should be up to spec already. If not why?</p> <p>Options 2, 3 and 4. No.</p>	<p>1237/5904</p>
	<p>Options 1, 2 and 4. Parliament Street on Public Toilet site.</p>	<p>1325/5942</p>
	<p>Options 1, 2, 4 and 5. Especially outdoor performance area somewhere without risk of flooding.</p>	<p>1443/5981</p>
	<p>Options 1 and 2.</p>	<p>1525/6014</p>

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Question 21 continued</p>	Option 1.	1601/6069
	Options 1, 2 and 4. Remove car park from Clifford’s Tower and grass area for performance arena. Single row of shops along riverside.	1791/6115
	<p>Option 1. All public spaces should be enhanced and de-cluttered. Not helpful to separate out key green spaces from key public spaces as shown in Map 12, which excludes all green spaces. Map 6 is more appropriate and de-cluttering and enhancement should be designed more holistically.</p> <p>Option 2. Will not really address challenges faced by Newgate Market.</p> <p>Option 3. Move to Parliament Street to provide core of a daily market. Stalls should be more mixed and effort should be put into attracting specialist sellers on a regular basis. Newgate Market could be transformed into a space with seating, outdoor café culture, performing arts and occasional formal presentations.</p> <p>Option 4. No.</p>	2153/6168
	<p>Beware of over-organising! Some confusion and clutter is part of natural charm of York.</p> <p>Option 5. “Tear Drop” area will need care because of historic Victorian station complex, including south side of NRM buildings and old station within City Walls.</p>	2161/6183
	<p>Option 1. Least signage should be aim. Concentrate on City Spaces Opportunity Area.</p> <p>Option 2. Present situation is not good.</p> <p>Option 3. Suggest Castle Piccadilly.</p> <p>Option 4. At Newgate area, instead of market.</p> <p>Option 5. Only on occasional display sponsored by artist community.</p>	2239/6225
	<p>Option 1. Should be 'de-cluttered' and simplified. Large variety of paving materials should be rationalised and natural/traditional materials used. The need for additional signposting should be carefully considered in this context.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3. No objection to present location, but returning it to original location in Parliament Street would allow it to expand and provide a rationale for this very wide street. In any relocation, opportunity should be taken to redesign public toilets.</p>	2367/6267
	<p>Options 1, 2 and 3. Stronger support for Option 3 to Parliament Street.</p> <p>Option 4. a) Possible if move market, b) Castle Car Park would be perfect, c) might not be suitable, d) might be suitable under certain circumstances and e) York Central, somewhere close to NRM.</p>	2461/6306
	<p>Option 3. Relocate to Clifford’s Tower area.</p> <p>Option 4. In Newgate or by Castle Museum.</p>	2469/6353
	Options 1 and 2.	2552/6385
	Option 3. No.	2570/6415

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Improving the Appearance of and De-cluttering Public Spaces Question 21 continued	Option 3. Parliament Street. Option 4c). More green spaces should be created (e.g. Castle Piccadilly).	2595/6445
	Option 3. Parliament Street. Option 4. Newgate Market space could be used.	2596/6460
	Remove road element at St Sampson Square and fully pave. Identify space for outside entertainment. Market must change, encourage outside café facilities and fresh food stalls	2610/6843
	Option 3. Parliament Street. Option 5. No.	2612/6471
	More could be improved e.g. Whipmawhopmagate, Station Rise, Stonebow/ Aldwark Junction and Duncombe Place.	2613/6483
	Option 1. Concerned over spreading resources too thinly. Might be better to focus on one space and redesign to a high standard as an example. Option 2. Unconvinced that much can be done. Option 3. No. Option 4. Only viable sites are b) and c). In interim not feasible. Option 5.	2614/6500
	If market is moved, new site must be relatively wind protected, within 200 metres of shopping centre, have substantial stalls, lighting and be in one area with services.	2616/6848
	Option 1. If 'enhance' means de-cluttering etc. Concerned about additional enhancement. Option 2. Improve stalls and reduce number. Should be set up and vehicles removed by 0830 and kept open until 1730 with no vehicles allowed in before then. Something also needs to be done about litter. Not all stallholders clear up after themselves. Option 3. Make Newgate a 'Food' market & remove other stalls to Cliffords Tower/Castle area instead of having Retail there. If there were some way of removing stalls in evening then a car park would be available which would benefit evening economy.	2617/6542
	Public spaces need to be kept clutter free. Market okay where it is.	2618/6564
	Options 1 and 4. Option 4. Within central shopping area and Museum gardens	2622/6599
	Extend Newgate Market into Piccadilly.	2626/6569
	Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Must use quality public art and distinctive street furniture. Option 4. Suggest back of Minster and eventually Exhibition Square.	2628/6645
	Option 1. Current public spaces not too cluttered. Should be more trees and other green space (grass or flower gardens instead of unappealing and impermeable concrete). Option 2. Location good but too small. Suggest one row of stalls be removed from entrance, and market could extend into Parliament Street on a Friday and Saturday. Option 3. No.	2632/6690
	Options 1 and 2.	2636/6747

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Footstreets General	Supported in principle – it meets demands from many traders.	373/5472
Footstreets Question 22	Option 7. Too many disabled drivers (blue badge holding vehicles) in pedestrian areas during restricted times.	43/5248
	No view.	67/5297
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5353
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.	242/5433
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. Piccadilly between Pavement and Merchantgate. Option 6. Possibly Gillygate and St Leonard's Place.	441/5513
	Would like to see consultation on extension of footstreets, with possibility that some secondary locations such as Micklegate and Fossgate might be included. Goodramgate and Gillygate could also be potential options. In the latter case with traffic restricted to buses, taxis and cycles and pavement widening.	458/5579
	Fossgate and Duncombe Place should be included within Footstreets zone. Ouse Bridge and first section of Micklegate could be part of Footstreets zone, if riversides improved.	511/5634
	Option 1. Existing footstreets form a well-defined shopping area; Fossgate is unsupported by it. Would be viable as a footstreet as part of a more extensive scheme including Merchantgate and Piccadilly. But it would sever yet another cross-city route and make the provision of a City Centre N-S cycle route more difficult. Option 2. Poor idea. Micklegate in both directions is part of the W-E cross-city traffic route. Option 3. Giving the north end and Blake Street an extended use should be a priority. Option 4. Recasting Piccadilly as the "tree-lined boulevard" could be made to work if central area traffic were completely re planned. It would make better sense if whole of northwest side were rebuilt, eliminating car park.	526/5677
	Option 4.	532/5713
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	535/5739
	Option 7.	945/5810
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Extension should still allow access to cyclists and public transport to allow access to non-pedestrians	1144/5861
	Options 2, 3 and 4.	1185/5878
	Options 1, 2, 4 – Coppergate and Option 7.	1325/5943
	Option 1.	1443/5982
	Options 1, 2 and 7.	1525/6015
	Option 2.	1601/6070

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Footstreets Question 22 continued	Options 1, 2, 3 and 7.	1791/6116
	In principle more streets that are turned into pedestrian streets the better although would like to see more spaces made available for cyclists to share with foot traffic.	2153/6169
	Options 2, 3 and 4.	2161/6880
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 5. Both Petergates down through Colliergate. Would mean an examination of Option 7.	2239/6226
	Fossgate and Goodramgate might be pedestrianised. Duncombe Place not appropriate.	2367/6268
	Options 2 and 4.	2413/6836
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. No. Option 5. St. Leonard's Place, Gillygate. Option 7. No but would like to see all taxis licensed only if run on more environmentally-friendly fuels within ten years time. Cycles should be permitted in all footstreets, sharing space responsibly with pedestrians.	2461/6307
	Option 1. Fossgate to Foss Bridge.	2469/6354
	Options 1, 2 and 5. Option 5 to include Micklegate in evenings.	2552/6386
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2570/6416
	Options 6 and 7.	2595/6446
	St Sampson Square full of disabled badge drivers; need to be made traffic free. Centre needs to be fully pedestrianised. Park and ride buses with rise and fall facilities for disabled and drop kerbs are provided. Suggest full barrier restrict to cars/van 11am–7pm.	2610/6844
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 4. No	2614/6501
	Option 2. Option 7. If this means keeping coaches out, or limiting their access to Coach Parks only, by nearest/direct route from Outer Ring Road. Options 1, 4 and 6. No.	2617/6543
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Support pavement cafes but not use of outdoor heating.	2618/6565
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 5. Walmgate, St. Leonard's/Exhibition Square, Fossgate, Micklegate and Gillygate. Yes, extend to all within City Walls, apart from designated major roads for access only.	2628/6646
	Option 4. Together with redevelopment of Castle Piccadilly offers opportunity to connect Clifford's Tower and Eye of York with rest of City Centre.	2632/6691
	Option 1.	2633/6715
	2636/6748	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Green Spaces and the Riversides General	Riverside area could be further developed subject to flood defences being improved.	76/5307
	Improvements to Memorial Gardens need to take place in context. This is the most important area for coach drop offs. Priority should be to improve facilities for coach passengers here. Access improvements from Gardens to City Centre would be welcomed Interest in using City Walls for recreation, e.g. proposals for a walk between Monk Bar and the proposed gardens at St Anthony's Hall at ground level next to the Walls, or opportunities for innovative illumination of the Walls.	373/5473
	Improve passageway from Leeman Road Bridge along side Post Office to riverside walk at Marygate. Consider access to NRM from riverside walk.	2621/6586
	Too many spaces in York feel as though they are for "other people" rather than "us".	2638/6783
Green Spaces and the Riversides Paragraph 7.58	Riverside green spaces could provide flood storage, as well as assisting with surface water run-off.	5/5217
Green Spaces and the Riversides Paragraph 7.59	Existing green spaces should be protected i.e. Museum Gardens/North Street Garden etc. New ones should be provided e.g. part of Castlegate plans around Tower.	2612/6472
Green Spaces and the Riversides Question 23	Welcomes emphasis on green spaces and need to create connections. All the options need to be considered. Green infrastructure should be incorporated into the city centre where possible and linked to surrounding areas to form continuous networks/corridors to the rest of York. This should be looked at as a whole not in isolation or just in one area. Any proposals for the city centre must be consistent with the Green Space Strategy.	4/5203
	Option 1. However, sensitive areas for wildlife should be identified and protected. Protected species such as otter have been discovered breeding close to the City centre.	5/5218
	Option 1.	67/5298
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.	203/5354
	Support a review of and improvements to the connectivity of the City's green spaces. Option 1. Museum Gardens is on Register of Historic Parks and Gardens is a Scheduled Monument, and railings along its southwestern boundary are Listed. Will need to consider impact, which it might have upon integrity of Registered Landscape, the monument, and character of Listed railings. Further consideration is impact on security at night and any likely increase in vandalism. Option 2. Option 3. Green spaces around City Walls are a key element of the green infrastructure of the City. Contrary to the statement in Paragraph 7.61, they are, actually, part of the Scheduled Monument itself. Concerned about concept that these green spaces are perceived as being "underused" and that they ought, somehow, to be exploited more fully.	242/5434

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Green Spaces and the Riversides Question 23 continued	Intention should be to ensure that the character and setting of this aspect of York's green infrastructure is appropriately managed and that development proposals take full account of the impact that it might have upon their character. AAP might explore possibility of using commuted sums or management agreements to secure improvements to the City Walls as part of development in the vicinity of the Walls.	242/5434 continued
	Important to include expansion of, and improved accessibility to green infrastructure. Exploring viability for creating a new children's play area should be included, where location, as indicated within Open Space, Sport and Recreational Study, should be integrated within existing green infrastructure, possibly at Museum Gardens.	398/5489
	Options 1 and 2. No. For practical reasons, and because Museum Gardens railings are listed and already incorporate a pair of double gates to the riverside. Option 3. No. Is a "green corridor" and should be left alone. Option 4. Locate in an extension to Coppergate Centre at edge of Castle car park, or in present Newgate Market space.	441/5514
	Support introduction (or improvement) of entrances to Museum and Memorial Gardens from riverside. Creation of one large green space between Royal York Hotel and riverside would be a huge challenge, and one only worth mounting if City Centre activity could be successfully spread across Ouse. Not convinced is need for any additional spaces specifically for children. A well-designed green space would be beneficial to all. Option 3 is too vaguely worded to be able to comment.	511/5635
	Option 1. Access to riverside can be improved without wholesale 'opening up'. Paragraph 7.60 is incorrect; the Memorial Garden now has along its north edge an improved path to the river. A third access from part of Leeman Road closest to City Walls was proposed a few years ago, between Boat Club and Walls. Should not remove railings along Memorial Garden's riverfront. The Museum Gardens as a historic park continues to need a secure perimeter. Riverside railings are listed. They define both Esplanade and serpentine White Rose Walk. Option 2. To combine Festival and Memorial Gardens would result in loss of character of both. Memorial Gates are important. Part of Leeman Road, which separates them, may be needed to facilitate access to York Northwest and a redeveloped Sorting Office site. Option 3. Presumably incorporates moat or ditch around the walls. They are a green space looking area. Character should not be further compromised. Parts of moat have retained an earlier character as recreational areas. Other stretches need modest enhancement. Option 4. Could be provided behind Marygate Tower.	526/5678

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Green Spaces and the Riversides Question 23 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Green space and floral displays around city walls and maintaining a green corridor along River Foss.	535/5740
	Should be extending and celebrating the green space in and around York. Museum Gardens, Rowntree's Park, etc. must be preserved and maintained.	681/5784
	Option 2. Hungate, Foss Islands lost opportunities. Teardrop area could be a public park.	945/5811
	Option 2. Cycle route to avoid road to railway station if possible. Option 3.	1144/5862
	Option 1. More access gates to river and St. Mary's Road. Option 2. Coach parking at park and ride, so road not required as coach drop off place. Option 4. Museum Gardens or adjacent to Skeldergate Bridge.	1325/5944
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1443/5983
	Options 1 and 3.	1525/6016
	Option 2.	1601/6071
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 4. Car park off St. John's Road not listed as a car park, would be ideal location for children's play area.	1791/6117
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 4. Key priority. Castle Piccadilly is one obvious site for a children's play area and part of car park should be given up now in advance of any proposed development. One should be designed into Hungate development.	2153/6170
	Options 1 and 4. Tear Drop development (covered space as well as full open sensible).	2161/6185
	Options 1 and 2. Option 3. Less likely to yield benefits. Option 4. Bootham Hospital field off Bootham may serve layout as in Rowntree Park.	2239/6227
	Memorial Gardens could play an important role in context of linking City Centre and York Central. Already public access to City Walls. Cannot see what needs to be done, apart from allowing access through bars without having to descend to street level.	2367/6269
	Options 1 and 3.	2413/6837
	Options 1, 2 and 4. Option 4. Possibly Newgate Square if market relocated. Option 3. Green corridor already exists around City Walls.	2461/6308
	Option 3.	2469/6355
	Options 1 and 3.	2552/6387
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Memorial Gardens should have a Café and discreet police presence (or specially trained wardens) to avoid anti-social behaviour.	2570/6417
Options 1 and 3.	2595/6447	
Maintain cycle ways and develop new extensions for better off road access to City Centre.	2613/6484	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Green Spaces and the Riversides Question 23 continued	Option 1. No. Opening up would lead to loss of distinction between stillness of green spaces and general movement of the City, Option 2. Beneficial but would be enhanced if enclosed like current Memorial Garden rather than become a busy pedestrian thoroughfare. Option 3. No. Would jeopardise unique character. Option 4. Dependant on sites and designs.	2614/6502
	Option 4. No.	2617/6544
	Memorial Gardens could be improved with seating, lighting and artwork. Option 3. Cannot see how ramparts could be used for recreation. Need to be properly maintained. Historic trail along Walls a good idea.	2618/6566
	Option 2.	2620/6585
	Option 1.	2622/6600
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.	2628/6647
	All green space should be improved, with more tree-lined roads to improve visual appeal, provide shade and help absorb water hence prevent flooding. Option 3. Should be seeded with native wild plants and managed suitably so become a valuable habitat rather than just sanitised/sterile mown grass.	2632/6692
	Option 1.	2636/6749
	Map doesn't much acknowledge radial forms of rivers and commons.	2649/6795
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre General	Idea is supported but planting needs to be right. Some existing trees (especially in Parliament Street) are the wrong variety for the location. Need to open up the city and look critically at certain tree cover/canopies, which obscure views rather than enhance them (e.g. Museum Gardens).	373/5474
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Paragraph 7.63	Welcomes the recognition, that enhancement opportunities for biodiversity are an important consideration.	4/5204
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Paragraph 7.64	Welcomes the recognition of role that street trees can play in both adapting to climate change and improving air quality. While recognising that street trees are a fundamental part of the public realm, would also highlight the role that trees play in reducing storm water runoff and cooling urban areas in a changing climate.	4/5205
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Question 24	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. As well as additional tree planting, important to ensure that existing trees are properly managed, maintained and retained. Urban tree loss has reached new levels of deterioration. A proactive approach is required and a positive approach to trees in the AAP should be part of that approach.	4/5206
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Could also make reference to SuDS.	5/5219
	Combination of Options 1, 2 and 3.	43/5249

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Question 24 continued	Options 1, 2 and 3. Further options could include: - Exploring the management of green spaces within the city to enhance biodiversity. Enhancing smaller areas in City Centre e.g. road verges and graveyards for wildlife and to give some extra connection to nature for city dwellers through sympathetic management. Potential for making buildings more wildlife friendly e.g. features such as swallow and swift boxes and bat boxes within the city centre could increase roosting and nesting opportunities for wildlife.	49/5269
	A mix of Options 1, 2 and 3. In addition the context of York in its full environmental setting should be considered. The greening of York through spaces should be seen as a continuum of the wider context and not just as a bubble of greenness.	52/5275
	Option 1.	67/5299
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5355
	Options 1, 2 and 3. 'Green roofs' should be introduced only where acceptable as will not always be compatible with built conservation principles.	441/5515
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	458/5580
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Stress need for permeable surfaces where possible.	511/5636
	Option 1. Many opportunities as possible should be pursued. Ask public for suggestions. Option 2. Key is 'where appropriate'. Option 3.	526/5679
	Opportunity to redevelop Castle Car Park as a new City Centre park. Would help to green City Centre, provide important additional recreational space and help enhance setting of Coppergate area and Cliffords Tower.	532/5714
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. Explore means of creating green and open space between Clifford's Tower and River Foss.	535/5741
	Castle precinct should be designated as green space with relocation of car park to include performance space. Option 3. Better link between Castle precinct and Tower Gardens to exploit potential of continuous green space between Foss and Ouse with Clifford's Tower as its centre.	580/5757
	Plant trees wherever you can, encourage and support retailers to plant window boxes, pay for flower baskets and definitely take responsibility for their rubbish.	681/5785
	Option 3. Also include nesting boxes on buildings to encourage wildlife.	945/5812
	Option 1. Castle Piccadilly.	1185/5879
	Options 1 and 2. Option 3. Query cost to go green.	1237/5905

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Question 24 continued	Options 1 and 3.	1325/5945
	Options 1 and 2.	1443/5984
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1525/6017
	Option 1.	1601/6072
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1 with emphasis on appropriate bushes rather than trees.	1791/6118
	Option 1. Newgate Market and perhaps locations along city walls and river are possible locations for new planting. Option 2. No. Option 3. This should be a priority both in terms of addressing biodiversity and in expanding pedestrian and cycle routes through City.	2153/6171
	Option 1.	2161/6881
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 2. For minor buildings. Green roofs may bring problems, suggest proceed warily.	2239/6228
	Option 1. No obvious opportunities. Option 2. 'Green' roofs could present a rather 'rustic' appearance, even on new buildings, which would look out of place in an historic city.	2367/6270
	Options 1,2 and 3. Suggest new 'Central Park' on Castle Car Park between Clifford's Tower and River Foss.	2461/6309
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Clifford's Tower has potential for grassed open space. This historic area should be set aside for people to relax in.	2469/6356
	Option 3.	2552/6388
	Option 2. Should be offered on as many buildings as possible but with priority being given to more unsightly buildings to try and improve their appearance.	2570/6418
	Option 1.	2595/6448
	Option 1.	2612/6473
	Improve and maintain cycle/ walking off road routes to City Centre.	2613/6485
	Options 1 and 3. Option 2. Highly questionable in City Centre.	2614/6503
	Option 1. Care needed before planting more trees especially by roads. Okay if accepted they and other established trees can be removed when necessary. Agree with ongoing plan for gradual replacement of trees now too big for their location. Option 2. Could be a good idea.	2617/6545
	Option 2. Castle area car park should be converted to green space.	2618/6567

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Increasing Opportunities for Greening the City Centre Question 24 continued	Option 1. Need to be maintained.	2622/6601
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2628/6648
	Option 1. Parliament Street. Area outside of and around Minster, outside art gallery and Nunnery Lane area. Option 2. Green roofs should be encouraged on all new buildings and rainwater collection for use in toilets etc. to help prevent flooding and reduce heat absorption.	2632/6693
	Option 1.	2633/6716
	Options 1 and 3.	2636/6750
Managing Flood Risk General	Seems increasingly likely to become a major annual issue in York. Recommend obtaining the English Heritage guidance notes on 'Flooding and the Historic Environment' and 'Climate Change and the Historic Environment'.	110/6808
	Important to carefully consider sites for both housing and retail in view of damage caused recently by flooding.	2630/6676
	To reduce flash flooding problems: - Highest environmental sustainability and flood protection criteria should be built into requirements for all new buildings, including rainwater harvesting; Permeable surfaces should be investigated for pedestrian areas e.g. gravel, astro-turf type materials to help increase absorption of rainwater.	2632/6849
Managing Flood Risk Paragraph 7.67	Should include reference to decisions being made in accordance with PPS25 and specifically the Sequential Test and Exception Test.	5/5220
Managing Flood Risk Question 25	Agrees that flooding is a serious issue for York City Centre. Recently published guidance advocates a risk-based approach to development in areas of flood risk. On this basis support proposed options 1-3, in terms of trying to reduce impact of flooding for developments that have to be located in areas of high risk. Suggest following wording for a policy that would encompassing this: - “All new development proposed within the City Centre Area Action Plan boundary must include the following flood mitigation measures where feasible: 1. SuDS such as green roofs, rainwater reuse and porous surfaces. 2. Recognised flood resilience and resistance principles, if located in flood zones 2 and 3. 3. A 30% reduction in existing runoff rates for brownfield sites.”	5/5221
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	43/5250
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	67/5300
	City Centre redevelopment does not directly affect Foss and Marston Moor Drainage Boards. However, keen to promote awareness of issues of surface water control from both new development and redevelopment.	199/5325
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5356

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Managing Flood Risk Question 25 continued	In representations submitted to Core Strategy Issues and Options 2, confirmed support for prioritising sustainable locations and seeking to mitigate potential flood risk through technical solutions. Maintain support for this approach.	214/5383 & 621/5404
	Mitigation measures to address the effects of climate change and, potentially, increased episodes and severity of flooding need to be undertaken in a manner which takes full account of the impact which they might have upon York’s special character and setting.	242/5435
	Options 1, 2, and 3. Should be pursued across entire City, not just in Centre. Appropriate storm drains must be provided for all new developments, rather than automatically assuming that connection to existing infrastructure can be sustained.	458/5581
	Options 2 and 3. Including use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). Important AAP outlines an approach of adapting to climate change impacts whilst maintaining a vibrant City Centre. This should also consider relevant links to the emerging Regional Climate Change Adaptation Study.	479/5609
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Stress need for permeable surfaces where possible.	511/5637
	Option 4.	526/5680
	Option 1. Build a huge reservoir under Clifton Ings/Common to collect and save water.	945/5813
	Option 1.	1007/5848
	Option 4.	1237/5906
	Option 1.	1325/5946
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1443/5985
	Options 2 and 3.	1525/6018
	Option 2.	1601/6073
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1791/6119
	Not convinced that any measures taken within City apart from improving drainage system will work. Policy must be to work more closely with Environment Agency and others to deliver ‘soft’ flood prevention projects such as Moorland grip sealing and flood plain tree planting. Option 3. No.	2153/6172
	Option 1.	2161/6882
	Combination of Options 1, 2 and 3.	2239/6229
Options 1,2 and 3. This cannot be dealt with solely by adoption of these, other policies and strategies must also be employed, e.g. upland planting outside boundaries of City. Measures should be citywide. Option 4. No.	2461/6310	
Option 4.	2469/6357	

Key Theme 2: Historic Environment Issues and Options – Public Spaces, Footstreets and Rivers Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Managing Flood Risk Question 25 continued	Options 1 and 2.	2552/6389
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Alongside reduction of green-space and over development of areas in and around City.	2595/6449
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Should mention soakaways, which ease load on drains and return water to ground.	2617/6546
	Options 1 and 2.	2622/6602
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2628/6649
	Should be a range of solutions including Options 1, 2 and 3.	2633/6717
	Option 4. Not clear that flooding to which York is prone has much to do with York itself compared with rainfall in Pennines.	2636/6751

Key Theme 3: Community Life

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Recognises City Centre's cultural and community role. Reference to evening activity is welcomed. Endorses proposals to create improvements to ambience – lighting, outdoor seating etc and need to look at more flexible midnight-time transport.	373/5475
	Need to take account of possible location of new football stadium. Will have to be near edge of City Centre e.g. York Central/British Sugar site, near public transport hub.	2413/6273
	Need to recognise other activities offered by churches. More is offered to tourists, pilgrims, residents, workforce, etc than simple acknowledgement of the Minster and other historic buildings would suggest. In taking AAP forward churches and organisations (see list in representation) should be involved and enabled to contribute to what is needed.	2652/6801
	Falls short of recognising full contribution which churches make to life of City e.g. Tourism; Social cohesion and community; Third Sector/Voluntary Agencies; Festival Programmes and venues; Employment (in Church related activities and enterprise in City Centre).	2653/6803
Spatial Portrait Question 26	Yes.	67/5301
	Supports proactive options for tackling issues raised. Does not support “do nothing” options. Theme has an accurate description.	203/5328
	Difficult to answer without independent verification.	456/5550
	Yes.	526/5681
	Yes.	945/5814
	Yes.	1325/5947
	Yes.	1525/6019
	Yes.	1601/6074
	Yes.	1791/6120
	If go back to living in City Centre, will be brighter and safer. With good public transport, shopping (including groceries etc) and healthcare in City Centre and services such as Police HQ and Fire Station, York would regain its heart.	1817/6143
	Yes.	2153/6173
	Yes.	2239/6230
	Yes, but no mention of recent surge in Polish and other Eastern European migrants which have swelled ranks of Catholic community, growth of Chinese population, deficiency in provision of publicly available swimming facilities and challenge to disabled people presented by many buildings in historic centre.	2461/6311
	Yes.	2628/6650
	Paragraph 8.10 should be rewritten. Describes place of the Christian religion in terms of buildings, while other religious groups are described in terms of their human communities.	2636/6752
	Yes.	2643/6850

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Community Services and Facilities

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General</p>	<p>While tourism is important should not neglect local people. Could be permanent skating, bowling, dancing and swimming facilities, which would benefit tourists and local people.</p>	<p>76/5305</p>
	<p>Accessibility issues are important to all members of the community, so need to be addressed for all needs.</p>	<p>373/5476</p>
	<p>Should identify through Open Space and Sports Study the most appropriate facilities to provide and deliver specific facilities within the closest (walking) distance from the associated communities in the City. Should enable co-locational options that would allow complementary activities to share facilities, or the clustering of facilities that would serve a wide range of communities of interest. In all cases, need to identify how current and future needs are best met through new or rationalised provision and improvements in quality. Should take full advantage of planning obligations. Seeking inclusion of policies that: - Seek to maintain quality of environment in which leisure takes place; Support provision of facilities which are accessible by public transport, bicycle and on foot; Minimise impact on environment by reducing impact of 'footprint' of the building, and promoting biodiversity opportunities where possible; Encourage wise use of non-renewable resources; Advocate facilities which use sustainable construction techniques and materials; Support development of facilities which will improve quality of life of local residents and participants and create job opportunities; Seek to maximise accessibility for all sections of the community; Help to create awareness of, and appreciation for, the environment through promotion of opportunities for sport. An example is the provision of green infrastructure in both existing urban areas and the planned growth areas.</p>	<p>398/5491</p>
	<p>Should reinstate Barbican, as swimming pool/leisure complex is needed.</p>	<p>2570/6428</p>
<p>Community Services and Facilities Question 27</p>	<p>Option 1.</p>	<p>4/5207</p>
	<p>Option 2.</p>	<p>43/5251</p>
	<p>Option 1.</p>	<p>203/5357</p>
	<p>Option 1.</p> <p>Consider any emerging policy re provision of services and facilities within city centre should not include a blanket requirement for on-site provision as part of all new developments, but should incorporate an element of flexibility for off-site contributions, having regard to local needs.</p>	<p>214/5384 & 621/5405</p>
	<p>Option 1.</p> <p>Land within AAP boundary at a premium and only so much development land is available. Leisure/sports facilities can be accessed outside City. Most important facility for those living in City Centre would be local food stores. At present very few of these.</p>	<p>456/5551</p>

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Community Services and Facilities Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Community Services and Facilities Question 27 continued	Provision of food and convenience stores in City Centre should be promoted, as well as other useful “general” services, such as post offices. Already some facilities available for recreational use (such as church halls) and every effort should be made to protect these from redevelopment for flats or commercial use.	458/5582
	Agree with statement that there should be more community services and facilities in City Centre. Loss of Barbican is keenly felt. Community spaces for performance and social events are at a premium. Would benefit massively from an establishment such as the former Arts Centre on Micklegate.	511/5638
	Option 1.	526/5682
	Option 1.	945/5815
	Community Centre in Fishergate, possibly enhancing Melbourne Street.	1144/5863
	Option 1. Make sure children and teenagers have a place.	1237/5907
	Option 1.	1325/5948
	Option 1.	1443/5986
	Option 1.	1525/6020
	Option 1.	1601/6075
	Option 1.	1791/6121
	Option 2.	2161/6883
	Option 1.	2239/6231
	Option 2. May be counterproductive without identification of needs.	
	Need more food stores, to provide further competition.	2367/6271
	Option 1.	2461/6312
	Option 1. Local food stores needed. No central children’s play area. Suggest River Foss near Castle Museum.	2469/6358
	Option 1.	2552/6390
	Option 1. Tang Hall/Foxwood need more green spaces and community centres to deter boredom and vandalism.	2570/6419
	Lack of sporting and leisure facilities which must be addressed by opening new venues in all areas of City, not just favoured west side.	2595/6450
	Secure bike storage with sales/repair centre and café in City Centre.	2613/6486
	Option 1.	2614/6504
	Option 2. No.	
Option 1. Local food stores and markets. Suggest two Farmers markets a month.	2617/6547	
Option 1.	2628/6651	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Community Services and Facilities Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Community Services and Facilities Question 27 continued	Option 1. Inner city allotment/ community garden areas and youth clubs in as many areas as possible, with safe bicycle access.	2632/6694
	Option 1.	2633/6718
	Option 1.	2636/6753
	Option 2.	2643/6851
Community Services and Facilities Question 28	Option 2. Residential homes targeted to ethnic minorities.	43/5252
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5358
	Do not believe that there is any single section of community that should be targeted.	511/5639
	Option 1.	526/5683
	Option 1.	945/5816
	Option 2. Multiuse is fine, if facilities are flexible enough.	1144/5864
	Option 1. Stop giving priority to university infrastructures. Support local residents.	1237/5908
	Option 1.	1325/5949
	Option 1.	1525/6021
	Option 1.	1601/6076
	Options 1 and 2. Budget restraints need to be considered.	1791/6122
	Option 2. Consulting with teenagers is essential. Lacking attractive but undemanding places for kids to “chill out”.	2161/6184
	Option 1.	2239/6232
	Option 2. May be counterproductive without identification of needs.	
	Cannot see a need to target facilities towards any particular groups.	2367/6272
	Option 1.	2461/6313
	Option 2. Should be more recreational activities for teenagers as well as elderly residents (with transport provided for latter if they are housebound or disabled) both within York as well as in outlying areas.	2570/6420
	Option 1.	2614/6505
	Option 1.	2617/6548
	Option 2. Elderly.	2618/6568
	Option 2. Teenagers.	2622/6603
	Option 1.	2628/6652
	Option 2. Youth clubs for teenagers and community gardens for those with little garden space of their own.	2632/6695
	Option 1.	2636/6754
Option 1.	2643/6852	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Community Services and Facilities Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Community Services and Facilities Question 29	Combination of Options 1 and 2. Welcome focus on funding opportunities and suggest combination of funding and service provision will be important.	4/5208
	Option 2.	43/5253
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5359
	Emerging policy re provision of services and facilities within City Centre should not include a blanket requirement for on-site provision as part of all new developments, but should incorporate an element of flexibility for off-site contributions, having regard to local needs. Re distribution of community and social facilities across York Northwest in particular, account should be taken of existing provision of education and health facilities in vicinity of area covered by York Northwest AAP, as well as to needs arising from development of York Central and British Sugar. A comprehensive locational strategy should be developed for provision of education, health and community facilities across the site, taking account of intended phasing and quantum of development.	214/5385 & 621/5406
	Option 1.	458/5583
	Sceptical of value of Section 106 agreements.	511/5640
	Option 1 Impracticable. Option 2. 106 Agreements or equivalent could be weighted to improving area adjacent to a development, rather than out of town.	526/5684
	Option 1.	945/5817
	Community Centre in Fishergate, possibly enhancing Melbourne Street.	1144/5865
	Option 2.	1325/5950
	Option 2.	1525/6022
	Option 2.	1601/6077
	Option 2.	1791/6123
	Option 2.	2161/6884
	Option 1. Option 2. May be counterproductive without identification of needs.	2239/6233
	Option 1.	2461/6314
	Tang Hall/Foxwood need more green spaces and community centres to deter boredom and vandalism.	2570/6421
	Option 1. In addition to off site facilities.	2595/6451
	Option 1. No. Option 2.	2614/6506
	Option 1. Should be firmly limited by need. Option 2. No.	2617/6549

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Community Services and Facilities Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Community Services and Facilities	Options 1 and 2.	2628/6653
Question 29 continued	Option 1. Space for community gardens should be built into requirement for new homes (where little or no individual garden space) in City.	2632/6696
	Option 1.	2636/6755
	Option 1.	2643/6853

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Cultural Activity

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	<p>Not all redundant buildings have to be maintained for cultural and community use – other, more commercial, operations may well be fine as the main concern is if historic buildings are lying empty rather than being put into use.</p> <p>Other issues: - Closer consideration of appropriateness of fairground, bouncy castle and similar offers in City Centre (concern about quality) – while acknowledging that it is important to consider the location of children’s activities; Events signage – need for high quality temporary signage which is planned for, not ad hoc.</p>	373/5477
Cultural Activity Paragraph 8.21	Support.	203/5360
Cultural Activity Question 30	Option 2. Modify by adding “using redundant places of worship as bases” at beginning. Option 3.	43/5254
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5361
	<p>Option 2. Performing arts are an important community element providing social, cultural, environmental and economic benefits. Theatres can be a major tourist attraction, and policies to promote tourist facilities and the growth of a tourist industry should support the inclusion of theatre use. A festival or summer season may be a crucial draw but this will only be possible if suitable venues are available. A policy to promote theatre use as part of a relatively small local cultural attraction may make a strong contribution to the character that locality and enhance the experience of visiting the town as a tourist.</p> <p>Option 3.</p>	324/5453
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Stained Glass Museum in Micklegate is an example of this.	458/5584
	St Mary's is an excellent space reused for culture. Startling number of churches in York. Support proposal that these be retained for community use.	511/5641
	<p>Option 1. Historic buildings provide a wide range of venues, difficult to find. A better central register would help. What needs to be provided is a large outdoor multifunctional space, which can accommodate large-scale performances and large venues for indoor recreation e.g. a compendium of games Fun Palace site. The Focal Building perhaps to be built in the Hungate development could be given over to this type of thing.</p> <p>Option 3. Not many redundant churches and chapels remain in the central area.</p>	526/5685
	Option 1. A parade of floats depicting York through the ages.	945/5818
	What cultural activities can we plan for the 2012 Olympics?	975/5839
	Options 1 and 3. Option 3. If economic.	1144/5866
	Option 2.	1325/5951
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1443/5987
	Options 2 and 3.	1525/6023

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Cultural Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Cultural Activity Question 30 continued	Option 3.	1601/6078
	Options 2 and 3.	1791/6124
	Options 1 and 2. Option 1. Would like to see the creation of places that would be attractive to teenagers in the City Centre – coffee shops, drop in centres, games centres. Option 3. No. May be suitable for small businesses as well as community use.	2153/6174
	Option 3. Worth encouraging. May need some financial contribution towards adapting for modern use.	2161/6186
	Combination of Options 1, 2 and 3. Measures should be sympathetic to and enhance local character. Option 3. Need for sensitive regard to former role.	2239/6234
	Option 1. Visual art scene is underdeveloped and limited opportunities for visual artists to obtain studio accommodation. York Festival should be revived. Option 3. Should be retained for cultural use, not allowed to be turned into nightclubs	2367/6274
	Options 1,2 and 3. Council should support project to create a new Stained Glass Museum at St. Martin cum Gregory at bottom of Micklegate.	2461/6315
	Option 1. New building for Historic Archives. If new Council Offices are not going to be built on site of Peasholme Centre, should be considered as location for City Archives.	2469/6359
	Options 1 and 3. An artists' quarter (not just galleries but workshops).	2552/6391
	Option 3. Should be retained and restored for original purpose or for community projects.	2570/6422
	Option 3.	2595/6452
	If an Anglican parish church is to be declared redundant, there are formal procedures to follow. It would not be possible for Council to retain such redundant places of worship without wider discussions, which have to be followed as a matter of statutory course. Also, it may not be possible for Council to retain such places for cultural community uses if there is a stronger and more viable alternative recommendation. (See representation for more information on process)	2601/6463
	Option 3.	2612/6474
	Let things evolve. Option 3. Can City afford number of Listed building, which might be offered? If answer to cost of maintenance is yes, use them but make sure use is acceptable to those faiths from which they come both on acceptance and in future.	2617/6550
	Option 1. Open Air Concerts. Option 3.	2618/6571
	Option 1. Venues to hold bigger events.	2622/6604
Options 1, 2 and 3. Exhibition Square should be made traffic free and used for cultural activity, festivals and performance.	2628/6654	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Cultural Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Cultural Activity Question 30 continued	Option 2. Youth and adult education clubs promoting arts, crafts, and local skills valuable.	2632/6697
	Option 3. Should be on a case-by-case basis depending on need for community facilities.	
	Option 1.	2633/6719
	Options 2 and 3.	2636/6756
	Option 3.	2643/6854
	Option 3. Welcome careful consideration. Should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	2653/6802

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Evening Activity

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Little in way of evening attractions for families and older people. Needs to be addressed. Could be permanent skating, bowling, dancing and swimming facilities, which would benefit tourists and local people.	76/5304
Evening Activity Paragraph 8.27	Support research findings.	203/5363
Encouraging a Diversity of Things to Do Question 31	Combination of Options 1, 2 and 3.	43/5255
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5362
	Option 1. Allowing restaurants and cafes in open plan settings around suitable venues would enhance their use, give an area a sense of local identity and pride, and would entertain and stimulate local residents and businesses. AAP should ensure that access to theatres is not impeded by other proposals such as those, which could prevent disabled access and drop off, parking of trucks and vans for stage get-ins, broadcasting and other uses of theatre spaces. A theatre's economic sustainability relies upon it being able to have unrestricted physical access for users. Option 3. Food and drink venues can be systemised to cater for over 25s; families; sited next to cinemas and theatres; less emphasis on teenager/early 20s fun pubs with loud music; music venues which support local bands or more and better choice in restaurants.	324/5454
	Not helped by unexplained use of term A4 drinking establishment. Lacking venues for musical performance. Would benefit from more spaces being available to the community. Also support late opening for museums, galleries and libraries. Illuminating York has been a success.	511/5642
	Option 1. Extended hours for these buildings would be welcome. Option 2. See Fun Palace response to Question 30 and a Temperance Hall. Option 3. Overdue.	526/5686
	Option 2. Castle Car Park could provide outdoor performance space that could enhance evening economy. Opportunity to stimulate evening economy further through provision of riverside activity in Coppergate and Piccadilly areas.	532/5715
	Option 1.	945/5819
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1237/5909
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 3. Street entertainment, café/bar culture, on street dining.	1325/5952
	Options 1 and 2. City Centre Cinema, Cafes.	1443/5988
	Options 1 and 2.	1525/6024
	Option 3.	1601/6079
	Options 1 and 2. A good performance venue needed. Children's entertainment in school holidays. A planetarium would be a great additional facility.	1791/6125

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Evening Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>Encouraging a Diversity of Things to Do Question 31 continued</p>	Options 1 and 3.	2161/6885
	Options 1 and 3. Option 3, could be scope for performing arts to be fostered.	2239/6235
	Options 2 and especially 3.	2413/6838
	Options 1 and 3.	2461/6316
	Option 1. Longer opening hours for Library.	2469/6360
	Option 1.	2552/6392
	Option 1. Restrict growth of nightclubs / “super” bars and support small public houses that York is famed for.	2595/6453
	Options 1 and 3. (Strongly supports Option 1)	2614/6507
	Options 1 and 2. Development that attracts more families.	2622/6605
	Option 1.	2628/6655
	Option 1.	2636/6757
<p>Ambience and Perceptions General</p>	Options 1, 2 and 3. Barbican Centre was a lost opportunity. Need a venue on this scale. Extensions to outdoor seating and lighting schemes both welcomed. Lighting needs consideration in terms of scale. Is it for pedestrians or motorists? Major distinctions regarding intensity, location of equipment etc.	373/5478
<p>Ambience and Perceptions Question 32</p>	Options 2 and 3.	43/5256
	Options 1 and 2.	203/5364
	Option 1. Greater seating for bars and cafes could help to promote “café culture”, though may need to restrict traffic to achieve this. Would like to see an alcohol-free venue for young people in City Centre and more family-friendly venues.	458/5585
	Does not support Options 1, 2 and 3. Brighter lights not solution, and outside seating is not useful for most venues for most of the year. Very few places don’t feel safe in City Centre after dark. Newgate Market site should be used after dark. Spot for outdoor cinema in summer - better idea than a permanent TV screen.	511/5643
	Option 1. City Centre offers choice of an unusual number of establishments with quality outdoor spaces. Gardens behind or to side offer a far better evening experience than areas in front. Outdoor seating in front of establishments should be confined to locations where it can coexist with existing functions of public realm. Option 2. The level, quality and disposition seem appropriate supplemented by ongoing York Light Project. A third type of lighting significant to evening economy is lighting of premises by their owners or operators. Restrictions arising from 'cafe culture', 'city centre living' or whatever beyond these hours would be unwelcome.	526/5687

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Evening Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Ambience and Perceptions Question 32 continued	Option 2. Lighting schemes should be extended to areas such as Piccadilly.	532/5716
	Option 1.	611/5771
	Option 2. Toft Green, Micklegate and Piccadilly.	945/5820
	Allow City Centre free parking in evenings. Don't build new shops when so many empty.	1007/5845
	Option 1. But not just for smokers. Should be restrictions on smoking and noise created.	1144/5867
	Option 1.	1185/5880
	Option for policy to drive out drunks and get tough with establishments that cause trouble.	1237/5910
	Option 1.	1325/5953
	Options 1 and 2.	1443/5989
	Option 2. Suggest Micklegate, Fossgate, Skeldergate etc.	1525/6025
	Option 2.	1601/6080
	Option 1. Good weather would help. Option 2. Riverside walks.	1791/6126
	Option 1. Option 2. No. Too much light pollution in City already.	2153/6175
	Option 1. Link to Question 28 Option 2.	2161/6886
	Options 1 and 2. Scope for user-friendly seating in popular areas like King's Square.	2239/6236
	Option 1. Inappropriate because of climate. Café Culture may have contributed to take-over of much of central York in evenings by drunks and hen parties. Option 2. No particular views except that should have regard to historic environment.	2367/6275
	Option 1.	2413/6839
	Option 1. Options 2 and 3. No.	2461/6317
	Options 1 and 2.	2552/6393
	Options 1 and 2.	2570/6423
	Option 1. Along with increased and improved public disorder enforcement.	2595/6454
	Option 1. Problem in differentiation between bars and restaurants. Could risk spread of noisiest of pub culture into public open space. Need for as much discrimination as possible within Planning Use Classes. Option 2. Not sure if a real problem. Strong environmental argument against. Option 3. No.	2614/6508
	First step is to cut drunkenness. No tolerance over a reasonably long period might help. Removal of licences from establishments where drunks are seen to exit regularly for serving drink to those under the influence might help.	2617/6551

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Evening Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Ambience and Perceptions Question 32 continued	Option 1. Only reservation is use of outdoor heating as not environmentally sound. Option 2.	2618/6572
	Option 1. Needs to be properly managed. Potential to just bring drinking on to streets. Option 2. Along riverside is a key area underdeveloped. Lighting and more activity in evenings would make it more vibrant.	2622/6606
	Option 1.	2628/6656
	Option 1. Within weather limitations: patio heaters should not be allowed. Option 2. Be updated across City to energy saving type and levels dimmed slightly.	2632/6698
	Option 2. Should be sensitively designed. Excessive light not the answer. Must be taken in conjunction with development of walkways through and round City in general.	2636/6758
	Option 1.	2643/6856
Night-time Transport General	Improvements to night-time transport would be welcomed by City Centre hospitality industry. Need to have appropriate vehicles given that there's likely to be fewer passengers than is normal in day/evenings.	373/5479
Night-time Transport Question 33	Combination of Options 1, 2 and 3.	43/5257
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	203/5365
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	458/5586
	Option 2. At night taxi ranks need managing just as pubs do.	526/5688
	Option 2.	945/5821
	Option 1.	975/5840
	Option 1.	1144/5868
	Option 2. Park and Ride and other key buses should operate until 11.30pm (except where overlap). Also work with rail for later Harrogate and Scarborough (hopefully eventually Haxby) trains.	1185/5881
	Option 2.	1237/5911
	Options 1 and 2.	1325/5954
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	1525/6026
	Buses should run later in evening (not just park and ride). Buses to improve links to rural areas and tourist attractions e.g. Benningborough House (liaise with National Trust and local villages).	1533/6047
	Option 2.	1601/6081
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. Less frequent between 7-10pm, more frequent 10-11.30pm.	1791/6127
Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 2. Encourage People Carrier sized taxis to get young people back home after events in the City with a Young Person's travel card.	2161/6187	
Options 1, 2 and 3.	2239/6237	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Evening Activity Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Night-time Transport Question 33 continued	Extending park and ride later into evening would benefit those who have come from elsewhere by car, but would not serve those who live in York itself, for which a limited night bus service might be more appropriate.	2367/6276
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2461/6318
	Option 2.	2469/6361
	Option 1. If there is a demand.	2570/6424
	Options 1 and 2. Alongside additional provisions for Taxi ranks in controlled areas.	2595/6455
	In summer extend park and ride until 1130hrs.	2610/6847
	Options 1 and 3.	2617/6552
	Option 1.	2618/6573
	Option 1. Essential if trying to get businesses/attraction to open later. More ability to park on street after 6.00pm.	2622/6607
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2628/6657
	Park and ride should operate until much later in evening. Reasonable for buses to run regularly until 11.30pm, with services hourly after that until 3.30am, to allow everyone to get home safely and cheaply.	2632/6699
	Option 1.	2636/6759
	Options 1, 2 and 3.	2643/6857

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Housing

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Housing Types General	While tourism is important should not neglect local people. They also need affordable homes.	76/5306
Housing Types Question 34	Option 1.	43/5258
	Options 1 and 2. To ensure a mixed and balanced society in the City Centre area.	203/5366
	Recognise importance of delivering a mix of dwelling types and sizes but must be balanced with need to make efficient use of land within and adjacent to city centre, particularly sites with excellent public transport accessibility such as land at York Central.	214/5386 & 621/5407
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. The right mix of all options, family housing and older people. Land availability might be a problem. Provision for older people is likely to be a priority in future. Option 4. Should be met by Housing Association and new council housing. The SHMA identified that proportion of flats to housing was incorrect and should have been 70:30 in favour of housing. Housing should be determined by local need rather than what developers want. There is concern about reduction in room sizes mentioned in paragraph 8.46. Could lead to social tensions and create future slums.	456/5552
	Option 1. Options 3 and 4. No.	458/5587
	There is a shortage of family housing in central areas of York (not just within city walls). Do not believe that City Centre should be treated vastly different from any other area in terms of housing need. Needs to be enough neighbourhood centres to provide essential facilities away from City Centre.	511/5644
	Options 2 and 4. Option 3. Modern city living will change its present nature considerably as people choose or are obliged to modify their lifestyle.	526/5689
	Option 1. Accepted that city centre locations are normally more appropriate for high-density development, which may suit certain sections of community more than others.	532/5717
	City Centre has ability to provide housing for a variety of different people. Should facilitate opportunities for this to happen rather than prescribing particular forms of housing to cater for specific group types.	611/5772
	Option 4.	945/5822
	Should be providing more affordable housing for people on low incomes and more social housing for elderly. Question is where. Against building on green field sites.	975/5841
	Option 1.	1007/5846
	Option 1, 2 and 4.	1144/5869
Options 1, 2, 3 and 4.	1237/5912	
Option 1.	1325/5955	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Housing Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Housing Types Question 34 continued	Options 1, 3 and 4.	1443/5990
	Option 4.	1525/6027
	Option 1.	1601/6082
	Options 1 and 3.	1791/6128
	Option 4.	2161/6887
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Could be implemented on a phased basis. Option 1 long term, Option 2 short term and Option 4 as opportunities arise. Option 3 valid throughout.	2239/6238
	No need to target particular age or income groups, other than to require a proportion of affordable housing as with any other housing scheme.	2367/6277
	Option 1. Options 3 and 4. No.	2461/6319
	Option 1.	2469/6362
	Option 1.	2552/6394
	Options 2 and 4. No.	2570/6425
	Option 1. All new developments must be restricted to brownfield sites.	2595/6456
	Option 1. Should be broad objective. Need for immediate future should be in context of existing provision and seek to reflect demand from groups currently under provided.	2614/6509
	Option 1. Option 4. No.	2617/6553
	Already lots of flats, no room for any more. Housing should be of best quality.	2618/6574
	Option 1. Preferred. Variety of accommodation has to be a vital element of York's housing provision. CCAAP should encourage continuation of this to ensure wide mix of provision aimed at meeting wide mix of need, offering greater flexibility for changing needs over time. More specialised form of new housing the less flexible it is to meet future needs. Option 2. City Centre should provide new housing for families and older people but do not consider priority should be given to these groups. Option 3. Modern 'city living' appeals to a limited household type. It has brought new life to city centres but it has also created an over supply of a particular type of housing. Empty or underused apartments bring no benefit to a city centre. Option 4. Should be provision of new housing in City Centre for people on low incomes, in interests of maintaining a mixed community, but this should not be prioritised. Should be greater provision of family housing across City including centre.	2623/6612
	Option 1.	2628/6658

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Housing Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Housing Types Question 34 continued	More new homes should be built for smaller families and the retired. Developments should be low-rise or have large balconies or a vegetable garden space usable by all apartment block residents to cater for desire for garden space, drying/washing space etc. More homes for people on low incomes would help.	2632/6700
	Option 3.	2633/6720
	Option 1.	2636/6760
	Options 1 and 4.	2643/6858
Equality and Access to Housing General	Economic vitality and activity within historic environment is crucial. Already a lively evening economy in places and plans for additional housing (including occupancy mix) need to take account of this and not dissuade investment in improvements in lighting, performance space etc that will bring additional visitors and residents in the evening.	373/5480
Equality and Access to Housing Question 35	Combination of Options 1 and 2. Option 4.	43/5259
	Option 3 and 4. Option 2. Consider feasibility and effect.	203/5367
	Note overall approach will be determined through Core Strategy. Any variation from threshold adopted must be fully justified and based on robust evidence should a reduction in affordable housing threshold in city centre be preferred policy approach.	214/5387 & 621/5408
	Options 2 and 4. Living accommodation over shops is not ideal for families unless of course the family owns the shop. The Council should dictate affordable housing based on anticipated demand. If the developers are reluctant to provide affordable housing then Council or Housing Associations should.	456/5553
	Options 2 and 1. Perhaps with a gradation system.	458/5588
	Support affordable housing quota, currently adopted policy in York. Do support measures to bring empty housing back into use, especially if it could provide affordable housing.	511/5645
	Option 4. Need more terrace housing.	526/5690
	Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Option 2. More living over shop. Option 4. Some housing as part of mixed-use development on Piccadilly acceptable.	535/5742
	Reduction of affordable housing threshold would constrain ability of market to respond to development opportunities.	611/5773
	Option 2.	945/5823
	Option 4.	1237/5913
	Option 2.	1325/5956
	Option 1. Providing site size is not too small.	1525/6028
Option 2.	1601/6083	

Key Theme 3: Community Life Issues and Options – Housing Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Equality and Access to Housing Question 35 continued	Not much scope for housing in City Centre. Affordable housing scope – Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York Northwest – both sites.	1791/6129
	Options 2 and 4. Option 4 would enable people to do without a car and taking industry outside ring road would leave City free of heavy wagons.	1817/6144
	Option 2.	2161/6888
	Options 2 and 4. Option 4. Near Navigation Road fronting on basin leading off River Foss.	2239/6239
	Options 1, 2 and 3. Option 1. Better achieved by some form of gradation. Option 2 has some value, particularly in targeting wasted potential of flats above shops.	2461/6320
	Option 2.	2469/6363
	Option 3.	2552/6395
	Option 2.	2595/6457
	Need for affordable housing should be balanced against practical and economic factors. Practicality of providing low cost units on small City Centre sites seems limited. Better to focus on existing empty properties, and above shop developments, for low cost provision and at larger sites, for more mixed developments, where some expensive units would be acceptable. It City's economy is to be vibrant and resilient needs to be a good proportion of high earners living there.	2614/6510
	Option 2.	2628/6659
	A rigid policy would not address affordable housing needs and would deter investment.	2633/6721
	Option 3.	2636/6761
	Vacant upper floorspace important. Apart from opportunities for more varied and intensive use of properties, it keeps them in good repair.	2638/6784
	Option 2.	2643/6859
Option 1. No, would lead to listed buildings missing out on valuable opportunities for refurbishment and have serious implications for future maintenance and welfare of historic built heritage.	2644/6788	

The Opportunity Areas

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Section includes duplication of issues from one area to another, which begs the question of whether the areas have been chosen on the basis of a firm evidence base. Presumably unique areas would to a large extent have different issues	1/5193
	Overall, agrees with aspirations for each area. Particularly welcomes the reference to encouraging biodiversity, in areas such as the riverside.	4/5209
	All of the Opportunity Areas are enjoyed by visitors, but it is recognised that further improvements can be made. Welcomes practical opportunity, through designation of such Areas, to address these themes. Consider, however, that to the visitor (and resident) the City Centre is compact enough to be accessible in its entirety, so any opportunity to roll out improvements – either physical or strategy/policy-led – from the Opportunity Areas into the rest of the City Centre should be encouraged.	373/5481
	Designation of all these areas will offer opportunities for explaining and enhancing the local historic environment.	441/5516
	Questions do not seem to invite choices of what, which and how.	526/5693
	Helps to direct interests and championing of causes into more manageable chunks, engendering more sense of ownership.	2638/6785
	Question 36	Yes.
Yes, generally, but strongly opposed to the designation of a 'Cultural Quarter'.		441/5517
Yes, but priority should be the development of the Castle Piccadilly area.		456/5554
Concerned that use of term "Cultural Quarter" suggests by implication that remainder of the City Centre is non-cultural.		458/5589
Yes, improvements to areas excessively dependent on developers proposing schemes.		526/5691
Opportunity Areas (particularly Castle Piccadilly) should be a priority for action.		532/5718
Castle Piccadilly must not become a major extension to retail area in City Centre. Mixed-use development of Piccadilly is acceptable alongside a green and open performance space across River Foss in Castle Area. Why create a 'Cultural Quarter' not including Castle Museum, Clifford's Tower, Jorvik, St. Mary's Church, Fairfax House, Grand Opera House, City Screen, National Centre for Early Music, Merchant Adventurers' Hall, Quilt Museum, Barley Hall, etc. There is a danger in putting all eggs in one basket. The 'gateway streets' are a better Opportunity Area, welcome any opportunity to enhance and protect areas of 'little shops' - streets like Micklegate, Goodramgate and Gillygate etc.		535/5743
Yes.		945/5824
Castle Area should not be developed but improved visually.		1325/5957
Yes.		1525/6029
Yes.		1601/6084

The Opportunity Areas Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 36 continued	Yes.	1791/6130
	Yes.	2239/6240
	Don't agree with some of proposed areas. Castle Piccadilly should not be major extension to retail area, but could accept mixed-use on Piccadilly together with a 'central park' performance space on Castle Car Park. Reservations about branding any part of York as a 'Cultural Quarter' as will not encompass York's entire cultural offer. Investment would be good thing, but area must not become homogenised as a result, nor branded as 'The Cultural Quarter'. Could be to detriment of other parts of York. In favour of focus on 'gateway' streets, but railway station is also a gateway. City Spaces are important and regard Castle Car Park as an Opportunity Area under City Spaces rather than as a shopping destination. Riversides could go much further North, and also South to Rowntree Park. Should note that River Foss is an important habitat for wildlife and be preserved.	2461/6321
	Yes, but with public consultation/agreement on space usage.	2552/6396
	Yes.	2614/6511
	Castle Piccadilly. Yes but not for retail on Castle area. Cultural Quarter. No. York is small enough not to need 'Quarters'. Gateway Streets. Yes. Could see Piccadilly as a 21 st Century architectural treasure. Perhaps a competition for newly qualified architects. Use quality materials by craftsmen.	2617/6554
	Yes. Concerned about having 'cultural quarter'. What does that make rest of City Centre.	2628/6660
	Yes. Castle Piccadilly of strategic importance to future economic health of City.	2633/6722
	Opportunity Areas not yet clear. How do they fit with attempts being made to create 'Quarters' in area within and immediately beyond Bar Walls?	2636/6762
	Yes.	2643/6860
Question 37	Interface from each of the Gates/Bars between inside and outside the Walls needs to be taken up as another Opportunity Area. Perhaps by ringfencing the Walls with a green corridor and improving pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular interfaces.	43/5260
	Given mix of uses proposed for York Central and suggestion in response to Question 48 that part of York Central should be included within City Centre boundary, York Central should be explicitly recognised as a priority project within City Centre AAP	214/5388 & 621/5409
	Newgate market area should be regarded as a priority for action. Should be moved to Parliament Street, and the vacated space should become an open space. Station Road should be regarded as a Gateway Street.	441/5518
	Micklegate/George Hudson/Rougier Street should be a priority area - not as a gateway.	511/5646

The Opportunity Areas Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 37 continued	Each surface car park should be reviewed to see if will be needed in lifetime of plan, and whether its capacity can be reduced, with a view to returning land to affordable housing	526/5692
	The Groves, South bank and Chapelfields.	945/5825
	Not sure.	1325/5958
	The Riverside.	1443/5991
	No.	1525/6030
	York Walls a major asset.	1791/6131
	No.	2239/6241
	York Central/Railway Station.	2461/6322
	Lower Piccadilly (the Polar Garage and neighbouring work places are a disgrace).	2552/6397
	Identification of other areas would diminish focus of these. Must not underestimate obstacles likely to be faced in these areas.	2614/6512
	No.	2628/6661
	Opportunity Areas not yet clear. How do they fit with attempts being made to create 'Quarters' in area within and immediately beyond Bar Walls?	2636/6763
	Rowntree Park, it's a valuable green area and River Walk down to Millennium Bridge.	2643/6861

The Opportunity Areas – Castle Piccadilly

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Will only happen if it's viable. Council should only get involved in aesthetics and some basic elements such as pedestrian links/car parking etc. Business knows what will and will not work.	198/6812
	Proposals for this area must accord with the Planning Brief of 2006.	441/5519
	Agree appropriate area and should be a priority for action.	479/5610
	Openness of area is an amenity itself. Building on Castle side of river would be a blight.	503/6817
	In terms of density and character of development, a clear distinction should be made between Castle (land between Clifford's Tower and the Foss) and Piccadilly.	526/5694
	Could be used for small cottage type industries like glass blowing, pottery etc.	945/5833
	Car park area adjacent to Clifford's Tower should be green open area and car park relocated to Piccadilly on opposite bank of River Foss, screened from view by trees.	1299/5919
	Best retail development in vicinity of Clifford's Tower would be low-rise, occupy only the eastern part of current car park, and link up with both existing Coppergate retail area and, via a footbridge or footbridges over River Foss, with proposed new development area in Piccadilly. Area around Castle motte should be grassed.	2028/6148
Paragraph 9.08	Piccadilly portion should be chief location for retail. Castle portion should be more appropriately developed as part of historic environment.	103/5316
Paragraph 9.10	If developers were required to allow adequate riverside strip this would allow for greater emphasis on provision of green corridor along both banks of the River Foss. Pedestrian bridges would add charm and encourage flow between the two portions.	103/5317
Paragraph 9.11	Whatever changes are envisaged to car park area, essential to keep access for pedestrians along edge of river. Trees along river edge are important in riverside scene.	102/5314
	Castle portion ideal site for Council Offices. Could be built so space available below for a market. (Good home for displaced Newgate Market) Offices could be built round three sides of a square opening on to Clifford's Tower which would provide performance and relaxation space. Foss facing side would provide good boundary for green corridor. Site is in Flood Zone 2 and raised office building would remove chance of water entering the offices.	103/5318
Question 38	This is identified as a major development site in the Core Strategy; therefore the ST and ET should be undertaken at that level. Reference to avoiding and managing flood risk needs to be included as an additional issue, under whichever heading appropriate - possibly the Historical Environment.	5/5222
	Yes, except for retail development. Should only refer to Piccadilly side not the whole site.	203/5369
	Yes.	242/5436
	No. See Question 39.	441/5520

The Opportunity Areas – Castle Piccadilly Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 38 continued	Difficult to visualise how family housing can be accommodated. Should concentrate on retail development and office accommodation with associated green spaces and pedestrian and cycle routes.	456/5555
	Agree with idea of open space around Clifford's Tower. Do not believe that retail development on scale envisaged by retail study is appropriate for area or for City Centre as a whole. Would like to see Tower Gardens incorporated in any redesign.	458/5590
	Yes.	511/5647
	Yes. An important Opportunity Area and implementation of high quality development including retail and leisure facilities is essential.	532/5719
	Suggest remove 'New retail development' in 'Economic Vitality' as could have opposite effect than intended. Refer to views of Reference Group and Planning Inspector. No point in continuing to undertake consultation if Council ignores people's opinion about Coppergate/Castle Piccadilly and continues with development based on more retail. A major shopping mall would be more likely to damage economic vitality of City Centre, destroying local traders and unique 'little shops' while replacing them with chain stores.	535/5744
	No need for new retail development other than convenience food store.	580/5754
	Yes.	945/5826
	Yes.	1325/5959
	Yes.	1525/6031
	Yes.	1601/6085
	Housing should not be a priority in this area.	1791/6132
	Yes.	2239/6242
	No. Not a suitable site for new retail, particularly on Clifford's Tower side of River Foss. Under 'Historic Environment' add, "Explain and enhance the historic environment". Under 'Community Life' add a potential for "performance space".	2461/6323
	Yes. Historic Environment and Community Life. Economic Vitality see Question 39.	2552/6398
	Yes.	2614/6513
	Yes.	2628/6662
	Yes. Table 1 replace issues with objectives of Council. Core Objective for Castle Piccadilly should be clearly stated as, 'to achieve a substantial retail development providing a concentration of large modern shop units capable of accommodating needs of national and international retailers', to reduce substantial amount of locally generated expenditure currently leaking to competing facilities elsewhere, and retain it in City.	2633/6723
	Yes.	2636/6764
	Yes.	2643/6862

The Opportunity Areas – Castle Piccadilly Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 39	Additional issues arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access. Prime location for new Council HQ building.	43/5261
	Broadly agree that the issues identified are correct.	242/5437
	Economic Vitality - new retail development should be restricted to Piccadilly only. Historic Environment - Castle car park area of the site could be used as a performance space and will be a prime location in which to explain and enhance its historic character.	441/5521
	Concerned about misplaced prioritisation. "New retail development" heads up list. Castle Area should not be 'retail-led', even if Piccadilly is.	511/5648
	Redevelopment has stalled and parts do not provide a positive image. Need to reconsider strategy and approach. Comprehensive development for whole area may not be appropriate, given physical constraints, different land ownerships and character areas. Piccadilly is a distinct area in its own right and has potential of being delivered separately from Coppergate and Castle car park. Consideration will need to be given to integrating area with City Centre and providing good quality public realm and riverside treatment. Given location of Piccadilly, that retail development may not necessarily be appropriate. Other town centre uses may be appropriate, such as hotels, offices and restaurants/cafes.	532/5720
	Performance space. Lack of public open space in City Centre. Education and interpretation of historic environment.	535/5745
	Cost.	945/5827
	Maintaining wildlife habitats.	1325/5960
	No.	1525/6032
	Green open space/cultural area next to Clifford's Tower and top quality retail along riverside and Piccadilly. At least one footbridge across Foss and special lighting.	1791/6133
	May be site for relocated market and bus interchange with access from Piccadilly on remote side from River Foss.	2239/6243
	Performance Space?	2461/6324
	Under Economic Vitality add 'Retention of existing and recruitment of new "iconic" small businesses to ensure that York does not join other UK cities in having identical "high streets" of national chain stores only'.	2552/6841
	Issue of provision of extra green space in this part of City. Should be provided between Clifford's Tower and Foss with ample tree planting and seating.	2612/6475
	No.	2614/6514
	Fragmentation of shopping area, taking away from heart of City.	2622/6608
	Promoting local distinctiveness especially in retailing.	2628/6663

The Opportunity Areas – Cultural Quarter

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Are anxious about nomenclature, particularly in respect of 'The Cultural Quarter'. Ideas being promulgated are clearly excellent, but the name seems to suggest that other areas do not have 'cultural' importance.	110/6809
	Government funding is unlikely to be forthcoming therefore clever PR is the key together with improvements to area around Art Gallery. E.g. put exhibitions in front and fill in the fountain to give more space. Museum gardens will get a new entrance from the river, which should open them up. Could be used more e.g. classic/pop concerts exhibitions, not just as gardens. A new footbridge from York Central is a great idea, but the riverbank itself needs floating restaurants/houses possibly even a nightclub etc. The river is one of the most underused resources and is effectively land that could be used for purposes unheard of e.g. a floating stage for performances on the river. Could bring land above Scarborough Bridge into great use and be culturally interesting. A statue walk between York Minster and the station would be a great draw. Doesn't have to be expensive but could be to showcase local craftsmen/artists. This could also be along the riversides by linking up final pieces of walkway between Lendal and Skeldergate bridges. Could be floating on the river with some little cafes on them to make them fun.	198/6813
	Welcome recognition of 'critical physical linkages between City Centre and York Northwest AAP site'. It is important that both AAPs clearly outline opportunities for improving these linkages. Would be helpful to include redevelopment of York Northwest as an economic issue in Table 2, which would recognise need to improve the links between NRM and City Centre.	479/5611
	Not clear what developer plans to do with Library and St Leonard's Place. Wicked of University to develop arts facilities so far away from Centre to be of benefit either way. Theatres and Opera House fail to deliver cutting edge programmes. Need for a good dance programme.	503/6818
	Scheme lacks definition. Most schemes outlined are relatively minor and could be realised by other means. Scheme as a whole seems not to conform to usual regeneration led aims of other Cultural Quarters.	526/5695
	Pleased to note its recognition. Clear need to promote enhancements to public realm along route network. St Leonard's Place falls within Cultural Quarter and is suitable for a variety of uses including hotel, residential, offices, retail, and food and drink. Such a mix of uses would help promote cultural and evening activity in the area.	611/5774

The Opportunity Areas – Cultural Quarter Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
<p>General continued</p>	<p>Support creation of a better and safer pedestrian link between NRM/Station area and City Centre. Suggest construction of a pedestrian way from short-term parking area between Platform 1 of station and Royal York Hotel northwards over eastern portal of Marble Arch tunnel, utilising a narrow area of scrubland between footpath adjacent to Royal Mail sorting-office and railway to provide a same-level link with existing footway across Scarborough Bridge. A redesigned ramp at northern end of bridge would enable pedestrians to access City Centre via riverbank or Museum Gardens without being exposed to traffic or having to go up or down steps, and cost of this should be far less than constructing a new bridge.</p>	<p>2028/6151</p>
	<p>Suggest that boundary line may be more appropriate if included Stonegate area, taking in St Helens Square. Would have advantage of taking in historically significant places such as Assembly Rooms, Mansion House, Guildhall and Barley Hall and public spaces of St Helens Square and Norman House area.</p>	<p>2596/6459</p>
	<p>Idea of a cultural quarter is saying that certain areas of York are more important culturally than others. Whole of area inside City Centre boundary, Draft Local Plan 2005, is York's cultural heritage, and should remain designated as such.</p>	<p>2630/6678</p>
<p>Question 40</p>	<p>Reference to avoiding and managing flood risk needs to be included as an additional issue, under whichever heading appropriate - possibly the Historical Environment.</p>	<p>5/5223</p>
	<p>Recognise importance of improving connectivity between York Central and city centre. Welcome reference that Cultural Quarter project and Opportunity Area will be looking at critical physical linkages between city centre and York Northwest AAP site. Important that City Centre and York Northwest AAPs include opportunities for improving these linkages.</p>	<p>214/5389 & 621/5410</p>
	<p>Broadly agree that the issues identified are correct.</p>	<p>242/5438</p>
	<p>No. See Question 41.</p>	<p>441/5522</p>
	<p>A vague set of issues.</p>	<p>511/5649</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>945/5828</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>1325/5961</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>1525/6033</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>1601/6086</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>1791/6134</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>2239/6244</p>
	<p>No. See Question 41.</p>	<p>2461/6325</p>
	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>2614/6515</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>2622/6609</p>	
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>2628/6664</p>	

The Opportunity Areas – Cultural Quarter Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 40 Continued	Yes.	2636/6765
	Yes.	2643/6863
Question 41	Additional issues: - arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access.	43/5262
	In Table 2, connectivity to York Central should be included as a key issue in economic vitality section, as should opportunity to contribute to sustainable tourism. Map 10 shows Cultural Quarter Opportunity Area boundary, and York Northwest AAP boundary. These boundaries remain in draft and should be labelled as indicative at this early stage in both AAPs' preparation. Should the NRM fall within the boundary of both York Northwest and City Centre AAP areas, as Map 10 insinuates, need to ensure a consistency of approach within emerging DPDs to planning of this area of the city.	214/5390 & 621/5411
	No.	242/5439
	Map 10 should show The Theatre Royal as a cultural venue within the Cultural Quarter. The theatre is shown on the summary leaflet but not on Map 10. Boundary for a cultural quarter is impracticable as the city contains so many cultural venues and sites that those outside this proposed boundary (e.g. The Grand Opera House in Cumberland Street and the new Friargate Theatre) would be disadvantaged. Suggest that the use of the word 'Cultural' in the title is inappropriate and this opportunity area should be re-named for its locality (e.g. North West) rather than its topic. Cultural services and tourism are inter-dependent. 'Culture' can also mean customs, behaviour and beliefs, and these too can be expressed through cultural activities.	324/5455
	Generally support approach. Royal Mail Delivery Office identified within cultural quarter where public realm improvements and other works may be used to provide better linkage between NRM and Minster. Not clear how plans may affect future operation or redevelopment of Mail Centre. Centre has large number of vehicle movements and should be fully consulted on any proposals in its area especially those involving pedestrian linkage. This is to ensure operations are not interrupted and pedestrian safety.	327/5456
	Totally opposed to labelling part of the historic City as a 'cultural quarter'. The whole of the CHCCA is of cultural importance because of its high historic value and significance. If one part is designated a 'cultural quarter' other areas will be diminished in value and likely to suffer neglect by comparison. Further, no logic to area proposed as a Cultural Quarter, which excludes Cliffords Tower and the Castle precinct. Perverse to try to force a connection between the National Railway Museum and the Big Wheel, the Yorkshire Museum and the Minster, separated as they are by centuries in time and the physical barrier of the River Ouse.	441/5523

The Opportunity Areas – Cultural Quarter Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 41 continued	Congestion is another issue. Leeman Road will provide main road transport connections to York Central from City Centre. How will this be managed so that pedestrian environment, green space, and the coach park are not jeopardised.	511/5650
	Question if right to carve a small City up into 'Quarters'. Naming any one area as 'Cultural' Quarter may suggest that rest of York is devoid of culture, which would be wrong and could damage cultural institutions outside designated area.	535/5746
	Extend boundary to include northeast side of Bootham and junction with Gillygate. Title 'Cultural Quarter' should be abandoned. Already a well recognised 'quarter' in Swinegate area. Further designations would devalue it.	580/5758
	Cost.	945/5829
	Maintain/promote wildlife habitats.	1325/5962
	No.	1525/6034
	Connections vitally important.	1791/6135
	Minster Plaza - should refer to requirements of Minster's Heritage Lottery Funding.	2161/6188
	Improved pedestrian river crossing would be a valuable benefit justifying another bridge.	2239/6245
	Under 'Economic Vitality' needs consideration of how investment may lead to a decline in economic vitality of surrounding areas. Needs consideration of problems in branding part of City in such terms and whether better to pursue investment using this jargon but avoid using it in public thereafter. Policing/security will become a more important issue.	2461/6326
	No.	2614/6516
No.	2628/6665	

The Opportunity Areas – Gateway Streets

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Suggested that Station Road is added to the list of 'Gateway Streets' since it is clearly part of route taken by many visitors from station to City Centre. NB: there is an error in description of Walmgate: Piccadilly was created in early years of twentieth century. There is a second error in Piccadilly description: River Foss is not parallel to Piccadilly: Piccadilly crosses the river at right angles, at Merchantgate, as stated.	441/5524
	Future York Group report has outlined a need for improved streets and public spaces, creating a high quality well designed public realm. Visioning work being undertaken by Yorkshire Forward and Council has potential to make an important contribution to future development of these opportunity areas.	479/5612
	Little point in new investment if the medieval character of the City is to be destroyed.	503/6819
	Micklegate is more than just a 'gateway street'. Gillygate is a major challenge.	511/5651
	Worrying that streets identified as gateways are also identified as potential footstreets. Would render City Centre almost opaque to traffic outside existing footstreet hours. The junctions of City Centre streets often have a poor character. Very few have anything like gateway status.	526/5696
	Should also consider St Leonard's Place together with Bootham and Gillygate.	611/5775
	Fossgate - Pedestrianisation would benefit some traders, particularly those associated with hospitality trade. Reduction or restriction of traffic and 'smartening up' of street surface and architecture would attract more footfall. However, until proposals are known impossible to comment on effect of such a move. If decided to close Fossgate to all vehicular access from 10.00am -11.00pm, it might mean Merchant Adventurers Hall would be unable to operate as a venue for weddings and other private hire events. Concerned at effect on local residents who currently benefit from vehicle access and off street parking. Would they be denied vehicle access to their own properties? Proposal to turn Fossgate into gateway street may have merit and help to address 5-7pm lull issue. Until there are specific proposals of how much of street is to be closed to vehicles and for how long, impossible to comment further.	2210/6199
	Micklegate area and how this ancient entry into City could be widely improved and regenerated should be re-examined. It would be particularly pleasing to see Micklegate improved as a daytime visitor experience from Bar onwards.	2601/6464
	Castlegate fully paved to become a gateway street to Museums and Clifford's Tower. Make gateway routes to early Music centre via river Foss banks.	2610/6845
Question 42	Fully support proposal to make gateway streets more cycle and pedestrian friendly.	111/5323
	Yes.	242/5440
	No. See Question 43.	441/5525

The Opportunity Areas – Gateway Streets Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 42 continued	Support aim of enhancing economic vitality and physical environment in gateway streets. Support “gateway” concept. Station Road/ Rise should also be considered.	458/5591
	Piccadilly performs a gateway role. Needs enhancing through public realm projects and allowing greater mix of uses. Important to maintain active street during day, evening and weekends so should not be restricted to retail. Could include hotels and restaurants etc.	532/5721
	Support any move to enhance and preserve the traditional shopping streets as provide an alternative shopping experience to that available in Leeds or Hull.	535/5747
	Yes.	945/5830
	Yes.	1325/5963
	Yes.	1525/6035
	Yes.	1601/6087
	Yes.	1791/6136
	Yes.	2239/6246
	Yes. Broad agreement. St. Anthony’s Hall is now occupied by Quilt Museum & Gallery.	2461/6327
	Yes.	2552/6399
	Yes. Different streets present different challenges and require different approaches.	2614/6517
	Yes.	2622/6610
	Yes.	2628/6666
	Yes. Would be helpful if text referring to Piccadilly is more explicit. Should be more frank in stating that this is an unattractive and somewhat run down part of City Centre that detracts from Conservation Area and wide historic environment, which is in need of complete regeneration.	2633/6724
Yes.	2636/6766	
Yes.	2643/6864	
Question 43	Additional issues arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access. Walmgate and Micklegate need developing.	43/5263
	Cycles should have access to pedestrianised zones at all times. Fossgate should be closed to traffic at all times. Gillygate would similarly benefit from periods where traffic is prohibited. Vehicular traffic does not contribute positively to a 'cafe culture'. More areas safe for cyclists will encourage more people to cycle. Will increase fitness and well-being of residents and improve environmental condition of the city.	111/5324
	No.	242/5441
	Description of none of these streets makes any mention of historic environment yet all include a number of listed buildings, which contribute to their character.	441/5526
	Cost.	945/5831

The Opportunity Areas – Gateway Streets Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 43 continued	Reduce vehicle access to promote pedestrian and cycle use.	1325/5964
	Road congestion at junction of Bootham and Gillygate.	1525/6036
	Each gateway should carry on developing own character. As much pedestrianisation as possible, definitely Fossgate. Most of Piccadilly could be demolished providing opportunities for retail. Council HQ should be located ion Hungate.	1791/6137
	At southeast corner of Pavement-Piccadilly cross roads, former hotel in need of renewal or restoration. The public convenience block on Parliament Street may benefit by removal towards Hungate. For disabled an easily accessible layout is desirable.	2239/6247
	Many are traditional shopping streets and deserve additional interest to maintain viability. Strongly believe hold key to promotion of York as shopping destination of distinction.	2461/6328
	No.	2614/6518
	Traffic reduction.	2628/6667

The Opportunity Areas – City Spaces

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Future York Group report has outlined a need for improved streets and public spaces, creating a high quality well designed public realm. Visioning work being undertaken by Yorkshire Forward and Council has potential to make an important contribution to future development of these opportunity areas.	479/5613
	City needs shops opening until at least 9.00PM. Theatre should bring in night crowd for restaurants and cafes. Present non-resident parking fees deter most from villages from coming into York. Retailers must be deterred from using Monks Cross and Clifton Moor as bad for environment as only accessible by car and prevent the carless from using them. City fails to benefit properly from racecourse as it shuts as racing ends. Could provide more jobs. Not enough people live in City. Centre is dying.	503/5492
	City Spaces should include the small garden on the West bank of the Ouse. Duncombe Place should be made into a pedestrian environment. Support improvement of snickleways - many of these could be improved enormously with very little effort, and they provide a valuable contribution to York as a walkable city.	511/5652
	Quality is determined by quality of the buildings, which define them, and their maintenance. As for the attributes of these spaces over which Council has direct control, much could be achieved by decluttering, and this could be effected very soon. So could many of the suggestions made here. No need to entomb minor improvements in a report.	526/5697
	Agree potential to improve spaces around Exhibition Square.	611/5776
	Suggest linking Exhibition Square to Art Gallery giving a lovely square and pedestrianised up to Piccadilly and Kings Square. To get people round use electric bus or road train.	945/6822
	Parliament Street proposals desirable but not essential.	1659/6824
	Emphasis should be on improving and de-cluttering existing spaces. Exhibition Square, could benefit from being turned into a proper piazza with bus parking removed or reduced, a larger and more clearly-defined pedestrian area, seating, and perhaps some trees and flowers. St. Sampson's and King's Squares could also be made more attractive by removal of clutter. Newgate Market is overcrowded and easily overlooked, so give serious thought to returning some of it to Parliament Street.	2028/6150
	Demolition of toilet building on Parliament Street would deny opportunity to use it for a good purpose. Consider using as a base for police and paramedics to help reduce crime.	2469/6840
	Castlegate should be included. Would contribute to three Key Themes. Make it a pedestrian zone from 11.00am to 11.00pm all week. Would continue Coppergate pedestrian area and make Castlegate an attractive main footfall to Castle Museum and Clifford's Tower etc. Cobbling the street and allowing businesses to embrace café culture would make area attractive, protect buildings and make area safer for visitors.	2637/6772

The Opportunity Areas – City Spaces Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 44	Yes.	242/5442
	No. See Question 45.	441/5527
	Priority for action, but should not compromise existing wildlife corridors (e.g. along the Foss). Construction of buildings in flood risk areas should not be permitted. Support idea of an Ouse boardwalk in principle.	458/5592
	Castle Precinct has potential to become an important area of public open space. Its early development could act as a catalyst for development of Piccadilly and other areas.	532/5722
	Yes.	1325/5965
	Yes.	1525/6037
	Yes.	1601/6088
	Yes.	1791/6138
	Yes.	2239/6248
	No. See Question 45.	2461/6329
	Yes.	2552/6400
	Do not all present same degree of challenge. See Question 45.	2614/6519
	Should grasp nettle with Exhibition Square and make traffic free.	2628/6668
	Yes. Redevelopment of Castle Piccadilly area provides opportunity to improve public space around Castle Precinct by removal of car park and creation of public space adjacent to Clifford's Tower.	2633/6725
	Yes.	2636/6767
Yes.	2643/6865	
Question 45	Additional issues arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access. Snickleways need maintenance to make them attractive to use.	43/5264
	No.	242/5443
	Any or all of these would provide opportunity to explain and enhance historic environment. Other Spaces should be added to list: e.g. Tower Gardens at end of Skeldergate Bridge. No mention is made of spaces on Micklegate side of river (e.g. North Street Gardens, Memorial Gardens and the Cholera Burial Ground) although shown as part of DCLP City Centre boundary. Not clear whether only City-owned spaces are subject of this section. There are a number of small, quiet spaces like the churchyards of Holy Trinity, Goodramgate; St Martin cum Gregory, Micklegate; St Mary's, Bishophill Senior in Cromwell Road. Council has responsibility for maintenance in City churchyards. Also Deans' Park behind The Minster. Suggest 'Snickleways' should be classed as "alleys", since "snickleway" is a modern invention and not a traditional term.	441/5528

The Opportunity Areas – City Spaces Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 45 continued	Castle Precinct is an important public space and should also include Castle Car Park.	535/5748
	Not sure.	1325/5966
	No.	1525/6038
	Wonder if Newgate stallholders would like a new pitch at Clifford's Tower car park assuming it is closed. Could be used for cultural events in the evening.	1791/6139
	No.	2239/6249
	Extend Castle Precinct to include Castle Car Park, Clifford's Tower, and Tower Gardens. Others missing include City Walls, churchyards on Micklegate, and North Street Gardens.	2461/6330
	Exhibition Square and Duncombe Place have issues largely related to traffic and parking. Would be a mistake to think that glamorising Newgate or relocating market will change the area. Strongly opposed to moving market to Parliament Street as would take away improvements gained through pedestrianisation. Snickleways only need to be cleaned, washed and graffiti controlled. Smartening up or enhancement would be counter to their character.	2614/6520
	Most of shared spaces could be enhanced and made more pedestrian. St Helen's Square with Mansion House needs improving/enhancing.	2622/6611
	Make Exhibition Square into a Piazza.	2628/6669

The Opportunity Areas – Riversides

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Riverside area could be further developed subject to flood defences being improved.	76/5309
	Future York Group report has outlined a need for improved streets and public spaces, creating a high quality well designed public realm. Visioning work being undertaken by Yorkshire Forward and Council has potential to make an important contribution to future development of these opportunity areas.	479/5614
	No don't agree, Yorkshire Eye is a blot on landscape.	503/5493
	Access issue - bringing into use stretches of riverside walkway from which public continues to be excluded: - Foss Walk/Garden alongside DEFRA; Walkway from Queen's Staith. Also an access issue for people who cannot use steps. A slope with landings should be put between Ouse Bridge and North Street Garden.	526/5698
	There is considerable scope for improving areas along banks of both rivers, particularly Foss. Castle Piccadilly area should include provision of pedestrian footways along both banks of river with one or more footbridges across river to link two parts of Castle Piccadilly development. Banks of Foss could be further enhanced if it were possible to extend proposed footways as far as Castle Mills Bridge and alongside St. George's Fields to link up with existing Ouse bank pedestrian and cycle way at Blue Bridge. Further up Foss beyond Piccadilly Bridge, as far as Wormald's Cut, every effort should be made to encourage improvements in appearance of and access to this stretch of river. Beyond Wormald's Cut also offers scope for improving existing access, with aim perhaps of linking up with eventual Hungate development. So far as River Ouse is concerned, favour extending pedestrian access along northern bank behind Lendal, Coney Street and Spurriergate to provide missing link between Lendal Bridge and Ouse Bridge. On opposite bank if pedestrian link could be installed between Ouse Bridge and Skeldergate Bridge, whole river frontage of Ouse through City Centre would be opened up.	2028/6149
	Would like to see some vision on River Foss, with navigation and mooring points on some sections. Wildlife must be respected by development. Bridges over the Foss must be high enough to allow access for at least narrow and long boats. Dredging and cleaning of bank sides is essential. Need pump at locks to replace water lost in access by boats to Foss.	2467/6336
	Could be spectacular if developed so people could actually walk along the entire route.	2570/6429
	Support developing riverfront. Consider more activities on waterfront. Make gateway routes to early Music centre via river Foss banks.	2610/6846
Paragraph 9.29; 9.31 - 9.33	Whatever changes are envisaged to the car park area, essential to keep access for pedestrians along edge of river. Trees along the river edge are important elements in riverside scene.	102/5315

The Opportunity Areas – Riversides Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Paragraph 9.32	Opportunity should be taken to implement the Foss walkway scheme prepared in 1998. Foss walkway would form inner city section of Foss walk, which runs from York to source of Foss. Where redevelopment is planned, emphasis should be on maintenance and development of natural corridor. (For detail comments on route see representation).	103/5319
Question 46	Reference to avoiding and managing flood risk needs to be included as an additional issue, under whichever heading appropriate - possibly the Historical Environment.	5/5224
	Yes.	242/5444
	No. See Question 47.	441/5529
	Remove retail development from Economic Vitality.	535/5749
	Yes.	1325/5967
	Yes.	1525/6039
	Yes.	1601/6089
	Yes.	1791/6140
	Good idea to develop Ouse north bank.	2161/6889
	Yes. An extended boardwalk to rear of Coney Street would be beneficial amenity. Seems too much for this to connect direct on to Museum Street so providing continuity with Judi Dench Walk on other side, as shown on Map 13. Re Foss, almost complete scheme of walks both sides from Monkgate to Ouse confluence is welcome.	2239/6250
	Yes, basically correct but uncover some conflicts. See Question 47	2461/6331
	Yes. Add to pedestrian routes 'a full length of riverbank through the City' as a goal.	2552/6401
	Yes in some respects.	2614/6521
	Yes.	2628/6670
	Yes. Redevelopment of Castle Piccadilly provides opportunity to provide access to Foss and improve pedestrian connections. Should be recognised and acknowledged that river is also a major constraint on potential regeneration of area. A balance needs to be found between both improving public access to river and need to accommodate substantial amount of retail floor space required to strengthen retail function of City Centre.	2633/6726
	Yes.	2636/6768
	Yes.	2643/6866
Question 47	Arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access.	43/5265
	No.	242/5445
	City's rivers "are intrinsic to York's history and form". Both potentially add to explanation and enhancement of historic environment. Suggested extent of Riverside area should be extended upstream on both sides of Ouse to Scarborough Bridge and downstream on Micklegate side along Skeldergate and Terry Avenue to junction with Clementhorpe.	441/5530

The Opportunity Areas – Riversides Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 47 continued	Concern about development along River Foss as it is home to a variety of flora and fauna, which could be disturbed. A natural green corridor flowing through City and this environment should be preserved, especially historic linkage in Castle Area between Foss and Clifford's Tower. No buildings should be constructed there.	535/5750
	Improve access to riversides.	1325/5968
	No.	1525/6040
	Top quality vandal proof seating/litterbins and anti-graffiti control.	1791/6141
	Provision of walkway to rear of Skeldergate may be worth addressing.	2239/6251
	Opening up River Foss at Hungate and Castle Piccadilly may have detrimental effect on wildlife corridor. New retail at Castle Piccadilly should not canyonise and spill over River Foss. Clifford's Tower must not be isolated from River Foss as is part of its historic defences. Development of frontages on River Ouse more preferable.	2461/6332
	Technical, structural and economic problems would make some aspirations for riversides difficult to achieve. Whilst worthy long term objectives, other Opportunity Areas present more easily achievable goals in the short term.	2614/6522
	No.	2628/6671

The Boundary Of The City Centre

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Consideration of the boundary is located near the very end of the report. At next stage of process should be located at beginning.	1/5191
Question 48	The walled city.	43/5266
	Agree Option b) but consider adding areas of Draft Local Plan boundary outside Central Historic Core Conservation Area. Would relate well to area being considered as World Heritage Site. Resulting area should be maximum size for CCAAP.	203/5370
	Given emphasis on improving connectivity between York Central and city centre within both the City Centre and York Northwest AAPs, suggest including eastern edge of York Central teardrop site within city centre boundary. Note NRM is included within Cultural Quarter Opportunity Area within City Centre AAP. Ask if this implies NRM is included within emerging city centre boundary. Believe boundary should be extended to include NRM, in context of a joined-up approach to tourism in the city, linking NRM to other established visitor attractions north of River Ouse.	214/5391 & 621/5412
	Given character of City Centre, essential that AAP boundary is drawn sufficiently widely to include not only area encompassed by City Walls but also those parts of the City beyond the walls which need to be planned in conjunction with its historic core. AAP boundary should be along the lines of that in the Draft Local Plan City Centre Inset.	242/5446
	Recommend AAP boundary should be a combination of a) and b) – rationalisation and adjustment of boundaries of DCLP City Centre and Central Historic Core Conservation Area so they are contiguous. Where they diverge outer boundary should be limit of the area. Revised boundary would include Hungate area, Kent Street and Barbican site and close the gap along railway line between station and Holgate Bridge behind Lowther Terrace and Cambridge Street.	441/5531
	Needs to consider impact that options have on areas outside any proposed boundary, particularly transport. The boundary could therefore be flexible enough to accommodate spillover issues. E.g. city spaces need not have same boundary as housing. Transport measures would have a much bigger boundary.	456/5556
	In response to York Northwest AAP Issues and Options, highlighted that railway station and land east of railway lines could be considered a City Centre location. Would be merit in examining opportunities for City Centre to grow beyond boundaries currently identified in draft Local Plan. Would also create opportunity to enhance the public transport links between York Central and City Centre, e.g. through provision of a shuttle bus. Suggest that boundary include development of York Central, particularly eastern section of site.	479/5615

The Boundary Of The City Centre Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 48 continued	Draft Local Plan boundary seems most sensible. St George's Field is gateway for pedestrians and cyclists arriving from south. Barbican site dominates view from City Walls, and Hungate site should be included if Council's aspirations for it are to be consolidated. Former District Hospital and St John's University are significant sites, which should be included, however do not see Bootham Park site as connected with City Centre.	511/5655
	Combine Central Historic Core Conservation Area boundary, enlarged to include Hungate development and Draft Local Plan City Centre boundary.	526/5699
	Extend to include eastern edge of Foss Islands Road and across Fossbank to include lower section of Layerthorpe to Persimmon development. Would form part of strategy for landscaping inner ring road from Monksbridge roundabout to Fulford Road.	580/5759
	C). The Walled City.	945/5832
	D). The outermost line covered by all, but also include York Northwest.	1325/5969
	B).	1525/6041
	B).	1601/6090
	B).	1791/6142
	A).	1817/6145
	B).	2153/6176
	B).	2161/6890
	B).	2239/6252
	An amalgam of A) and B).	2461/6333
	D). Draft Local Plan should extent south to include Fishergate as far as Grange Garth.	2552/6402
	B).	2595/6458
	A).	2614/6523
	A).	2628/6672
	A).	2629/6675
	A).	2636/6769
	A).	2643/6867
	Hospital should be included as is a major employer.	2650/6797
	Incorporate land to east of Foss Islands Road from Heworth Green in north to Lawrence Street in south. Boundary should connect Heworth Green to Layerthorpe by following footpath on eastern edge of old Heworth Green Car Park and part of former gasworks site to south. Should then follow James Street link road between Layerthorpe and Lawrence Street (see plan with representation). This would incorporate an area outside of City Walls but should not be a hindrance as there are already large areas outside them that fall within existing City Centre boundary as defined in Development Control Draft Local Plan.	2655/6789

Monitoring and Delivery

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Should be a central plank of AAP and not relegated to periphery. Need to demonstrate linkages to Annual Monitoring Report. In addition to delivery mechanisms, timescales for delivery of policies should be given as well as an indication of commitment from stakeholders and partner organisations. It is advisable to have clear lines of responsibility for policy implementation.	1/5194
	Since City Centre is largely designated as Central Historic Core Conservation Area suggest first bullet point should read 'will retain its unique and special character and appearance which will have been preserved and enhanced'. Should be an additional bullet point, 'will be exemplary of good conservation practice'. Essential that LDF and its constituent parts are made to work properly through an appropriately resourced and staffed planning department. City Centre Partnership should be expanded to include not only business interests but also conservation expertise.	441/5532
Paragraph 11.05	Who will be key stakeholders, would some of these be drawn from a residents panel?	456/5557
Paragraph 11.08	Is there an area set aside for transport interchange, or will this be considered as part of the development?	456/5558
Paragraph 11.14	Welcome inclusion in the provisional list of infrastructure requirements such items as cycle and pedestrian routes, sustainable design measures, environmental improvements, biodiversity measures, open space and play space.	4/5210

Appendix A: York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Wish to see appraisal of wider townscape character forming part of evidence base. Could in part be achieved through proposed CAA of Historic Core, as there could be character areas beyond the geographical scope of the CAA (both inside and outside of the city centre). Therefore recommend that a landscape / townscape character assessment is carried out.	4/5211
Question 49	University and Science Park needs to be included as an area of distinct character.	43/5267
	Do not agree that the character areas identified represent coherent areas of distinct character. Disagree with the analysis of Micklegate character area and suggest it should be redefined as follows: Micklegate and its medieval tributary streets, and including Holy Trinity Priory; the river trading streets of Skeldergate (the medieval port of York) and North Street with Tanner Row; and Bishophill. Toft Green and the railway buildings should be moved to the Station character area. Likely other character areas similarly deserve redefinition. If Hungate area is eventually included in Action Area, should have a character appraisal as well. Consideration should be given to defining an area, which covers the confluence of the Ouse and the Foss, Browney Dyke and St George's Field.	441/5533
	Add Monkgate and Lord Mayor's Walk, Blossom Street, The Station and Environs. The Ouse corridor needs evaluation as a unit.	526/5700
	Should include river to Millennium Bridge and Rowntree's Park.	1325/5970
	Yes.	1525/6042
	Should include Stonebow area.	1601/6091
	Yes.	2239/6253
	The New Walk should be included.	2461/6334
	Yes but hope Hungate can be added when redevelopment is complete.	2552/6403
	Yes.	2628/6673
	Being called into question by attempt to mobilise traders in new quarters of Walled City. Clarity needed. Areas do not obviously make sense. Minster precinct feels at odds with Cultural Quarter and development of Minster Gates for example.	2636/6770
Question 50	Summary Statements fail to capture the essence of historic core or truly characterise the areas they describe. Therefore, uncertain whether or not the resulting development framework for the City Centre will adequately protect York's distinctive character.	242/5447

Appendix A: York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Continued

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
Question 50 continued	Character summaries come nowhere near providing an accurate and comprehensive basis upon which Action Plan policies might be based. Inconsistent in format, inadequate and inaccurate in understanding of historical development of areas, and sometimes contain errors of fact. Headings under which conservation area appraisals should be assessed are recommended in an English Heritage publication and summarised as follows: - origins and development of an area; uses, building types; archaeology and listed buildings; architecture - periods, style including the vernacular, materials, scale, height, and massing; topography, spaces, gardens, groups and relationship of buildings; streetscape and street furniture; important unlisted buildings; negative elements and neutral areas, capable of improvement.	441/5534
	Conservation Area Appraisal needs to be completed properly before CCAAP can be finalised.	458/5593
	If full documents have not yet been written, these cannot be summaries but plans. Taken together they indicate an approach fairly enough. Approach should be more consistent. More individual buildings need to be mentioned. The sub-area approach adopted for Micklegate - Bishophill would pay dividends elsewhere. Landmarks for City Centre may be situated outside it. These should be mentioned. Detail should be more sharply observed. Final document for each area should be considerably longer than its early version, and fully illustrated.	526/5701
	Yes.	1325/5971
	Yes.	1525/6043
	Yes.	1601/6092
	Yes.	2239/6254
	Subject to inclusion of 'The New Walk' in Question 49, would probably agree. Concern that public is being consulted without Conservation Area Appraisal for Central Historic Core being available. Seems a little 'cart before horse'.	2461/6335
	Yes.	2628/6674
	Being called into question by attempt to mobilise traders in new quarters of Walled City. Clarity needed. Areas do not obviously make sense. Minster precinct feels at odds with Cultural Quarter and development of Minster Gates for example.	2636/6771
Micklegate - Bishophill	Omits Church of St Mary Bishophill Junior, which has a Saxon tower and green space.	2552/6404

Sustainability Statement

Paragraph etc	Comments	Response Refs.
General	Overall is appropriate for this stage of development of AAP. Comments on Issues and Options Report (e.g. effects of trees on urban cooling) may be relevant to production of full Sustainability Appraisal at next stage. All land use plans are now subject to requirements of Habitats Directive following judgement of European Court of Justice in October 2005. Earlier assessment process is begun, more time and options there are for resolving issues.	4/6891
	Objectives have been developed from Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy. Should relate more specifically to City Centre. Economic Objectives appear generic and give no indication of type of development, which needs to take place within City Centre. Further economic objectives would help to ensure Appraisal is balanced and not weighted towards environmental and social considerations.	479/6898
Introduction and Approach Table 1	EN2 – Welcome inclusion of a sub-objective relating to “preserving the character and setting of the historic City of York”. However unclear how Council intends to monitor impact of proposals as no LDF documents set out, explicitly, what elements are considered to contribute towards “York’s special character or setting”.	242/6893
Identification of Potential Sustainability Issues Paragraph 3.1.1	As well as seeking to “investigate features of historical importance” should identify which features are key elements that contribute to “special character” of York. Only then is it possible to ascertain whether or not strategy for City Centre is delivering Objective EN2.	242/6894
Analysis of Vision and Objectives	Certain elements of “Vision for Economic Vitality” (e.g. encouragement of better links between City Centre and York Northwest) could conflict with aspects of proposed “Vision for Historic Environment”. It would have been useful to have undertaken a similar assessment to that advocated in Appendix 10 of ODPM guidance “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents” to test internal consistency of various parts of Vision, identify where there might be potential tensions, and indicate areas where component parts of Visions might need to be amended.	242/6895
Analysis of Issues and Options – Retail Paragraph 5.1.15	Environment - In terms of Option 2, given character of Goodramgate, redevelopment might have an adverse impact upon grain of streets in this part of City Centre, which could detract from its historic character.	242/6896
Analysis of Issues and Options – Offices in the City Centre Paragraph 5.1.54	Environment - Given character of area covered by AAP, difficult to identify possible sites for new large-floorplate office developments which would not be likely to detract from its historic character or result in erosion of its urban grain. Seems sensible to seek such sites within York Northwest and adopt Option 3.	242/6897
Analysis of Opportunity Area – Castle Piccadilly	Table on page 49 refers to site being in flood zone 2 and so sustainability objective En9 will also be relevant.	5/6892