

Annex B

Options Appraisal – Emerging Preferred Options

January 2010

Annex B – Options Appraisal – Emerging Preferred Options

| Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| <u>The Vision for the city centre</u> | 1 |
| Key Theme 1 – Economic Vitality | |
| Shopping in the city centre | 18 |
| Tourism | 32 |
| Evening Economy | 38 |
| Offices in the city centre | 43 |
| Universities | 54 |
| Accessing the city centre | 62 |
| Key Theme 2 – Historic Environment | |
| Conservation and Design | 85 |
| Public spaces, footstreets and rivers | 102 |
| Key Theme 3 - Community Life, Community Services and facilities | |
| Community services and facilities | 136 |
| Cultural activity | 143 |
| Evening activity | 148 |
| Housing | 157 |
| Opportunity Areas | |
| Castle Piccadilly | 167 |
| Cultural Quarter | 171 |
| Gateway Streets | 180 |
| City Spaces | 185 |
| Riversides | 191 |
| <u>The Boundary of the city centre</u> | 198 |
| <u>Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal – brief descriptive summaries</u> | 203 |

VISION FOR THE CITY CENTRE: QUESTION 1

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS 1 states that centres should be a focus for developments “that attract a large number of people, especially retail, leisure and office development”. This is in order to promote their vitality and viability, social inclusion and more sustainable patterns of development”.

PPS 6 sets out the Government’s approach to city centres - They should be the focus for retail, leisure, offices, culture and tourism.

PPS 12 states that “Area action plans should be used when there is a need to provide the planning framework for areas where significant change or conservation is needed. Area action plans should:

- deliver planned growth areas;
- stimulate regeneration;
- protect areas particularly sensitive to change;
- resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressures; or
- focus the delivery of area based regeneration initiatives.

In areas of conservation, area action plans should set out the policies and proposals for action to preserve or enhance the area, including defining areas where specific conservation measures are proposed and areas which will be subject to specific controls over development.

PPG15 and PPG16 gives statutory protection to the historic environment, requiring preservation and enhancement.

English Heritage, Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas

Change is inevitable in most conservation areas; the challenge is to manage change in ways that maintain and, if possible, reinforce an area’s special qualities. AAPs should set out the policies and proposals for action, based on the character appraisal, required to preserve or enhance the area.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

At a regional level, RSS states that the centres of sub regional cities, such as York, should be the focus for high trip generating

uses such as offices, retail, leisure, culture and tourism. It also states that development, environmental enhancements and accessibility improvements should take place to create a distinctive, attractive and vibrant sense of place and identity for each centre.

Policy Y1: York sub area policy, Key drivers for the City Centre AAP:

- “Diversify and grow York as a key driver of the Leeds City Region economy by encouraging the business and financial services sector, knowledge and science-based industries, leisure and retail services and the evening economy, and further developing its tourism sector”
- “Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas”
- “Develop the role of York as a key node for public transport services for the sub area”
- “Improve accessibility to and within York, particularly by improved facilities for walking and cycling, increased capacity and quality of public transport, and new park and ride facilities”.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy sets the high-level objectives for the city:

- Building confident, creative and inclusive communities
- Being a leading environmentally-friendly city
- Being at the forefront of innovation and change with a prosperous and thriving economy
- Being a world class centre for education and learning for all
- Celebrating our historic past whilst creating a successful and thriving future

The Strategy also contains an objective to be “a city of high quality spaces” which the AAP is key to delivering. The Strategy states:

- An urban design plan will drive a visionary architectural approach, combining the historic with excellent 21st century design, to provide a dynamic, exciting and vibrant cityscape
- Spaces will be attractive and stimulating to the senses. Through colour, texture, ornament, materials, decoration harmony will be balanced with contrast, history with context, and the familiar with the new and stimulating
- Public art will be integral to creating a high quality urban environment
- Spaces will be decluttered, creatively lit, and equipped to be accessible, eventful and vibrant, capable of promoting York City of Festivals

- Spaces will be linked with clear, and perhaps themed routes that encourage exploration and travel on foot by day and after dark
- The experience of the city centre will be lifted with exciting interpretation
- High quality café-bar environments around public spaces and by rivers will add vitality, colour and bustle
- The river fronts will be opened up and their recreational opportunities exploited.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy is at Preferred Options stage and provides the context for the AAP, including the role of the city centre in delivering the spatial vision for York over the next 20 years. The Strategy vision builds on the Community Strategy: “York aspires to be: a city of confident, creative and inclusive communities; economically prosperous at the forefront of innovation and change; and a world class centre for education; whilst preserving and enhancing its unique historic character and setting and fulfilling its role as a leading environmentally friendly city. This will be achieved in a way that ensures that York fulfils its role at the centre of the York Sub Area and as a part of the Leeds City Region. The LDF will take this agenda forward providing a planning framework to 2030 and beyond for the City’s sustainable development.”

The Strategy sets specific requirements for the AAP:

- “The AAP will ensure that York’s heritage is preserved and enhanced; in particular the architecture and archaeology of its historic centre; its skyline, street patterns, the Minster and its precinct, the Medieval and Roman walls, Clifford’s Tower and valued open spaces that contribute to the City’s setting”
- “By the end of the plan period (2030), York will have strengthened its role as a *sub*-regional shopping and entertainment centre. This will be achieved by halting the decline of the city centre’s regional market share for comparison goods retail and increasing it to around 34%. This will involve increasing the supply of modern retail units and enhancing department store representation in the city centre to attract a broader range and quality of multiple retailers to trade alongside the already strong independent retail sector”.
- The Core Strategy aims to provide “accessible and varied opportunities for leisure and recreational activities in order to promote healthy lifestyles including ensuring all residents have access to an appropriate range of recreational open spaces and sports facilities”. The Strategy states that “a key element of this will be to deliver a new City Centre swimming pool”.

Policy CS2: York City Centre

The Core Strategy also contains a City Centre specific policy:

“The LDF will continue to support the city centre as the cultural, economic and social heart of York. The LDF will ensure a strengthened role for the city centre as the core of a sub-regional city, whilst preserving and enhancing its unique historic character

and setting.

The Council will prepare an AAP for the city centre which will:

- ensure that the city centre remains the primary focus for retail, leisure, tourism and office development;
- establish a framework for decision making in the city centre and a context for development projects and funding bids;
- develop a transport accessibility masterplan to improve movement to and from and within the city centre, to improve air quality, to improve the ambience of the area and to promote sustainable transport choices; and
- develop a city centre public realm strategy and masterplan to enhance the appearance, connectivity and functionality of key public spaces and areas of change within the city centre, and to ensure that areas of change are fully integrated”.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

LDF Evidence Base

Employment Land Review

York's Employment Land Review (Entec, 2009) identifies the city centre as a strategic location for office employment (B1(a)) reflecting PPS6 and its current role as a main employment area, currently accommodating 30% of jobs in York local authority area. The Review outlines a requirement for 193,329sqm of office (B1a) floorspace to 2029. The Review identifies opportunities to accommodate this partially within the city centre, through sites such as Hungate, but recognises that these are limited because of the relatively small size of the centre and its historic nature. The 19 short-listed supply sites for B1a office space includes 6 potential city centre sites: 1-9 St Leonard's Place & 2-4 Museum Street; Coppergate 2 (Castle Piccadilly); Hungate; James Street/Foss Islands Road (also short-listed for B1c, B2, B8 use); Hudson House and Old Station Buildings (also short-listed for B1c, B2, B8 use).

Retail Study

York's Retail Study (GVA Grimley LLP, 2008) recommends that the decline in the city centre market share is halted and then increased to a 34% share in order to maintain its position in the wider regional retail hierarchy. The Study identifies significant capacity for additional retail floorspace up to 2029. In accordance with the spatial strategy, the priority for this additional floorspace will be within, or adjacent to, the central shopping area of the city centre (i.e. Castle Piccadilly and the Stonebow area). However, similarly to employment, the Study recognises that potential sites will be limited by the constraints of the historic environment and the size of the centre.

Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study

The Study identified a sufficient supply of open space in the city but a lack of natural and semi-natural space, a sufficiency of amenity green space, a lack of provision for children and facilities for young people and a lack of outdoor sports facilities.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2007) concludes that there is an expressed need for small (21 % want 1 bed), medium (29% want 2 bed) and larger family housing (29% want 3 bed, 21% want 4 bed+), and 60% of the need is for houses/ 40% for flats – which reflects regional and national objectives to build new housing for a wide variety of households. The Strategy also concludes that, given the massive shortfall of affordable housing in the city, there is justification for setting an affordable housing target of 50% in new housing developments. Overall there is expected to be greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 982 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply). The tenure split within this target is given as 60% social rented and 40% discount sale – again to reflect the need for housing identified in the study.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

The SHLAA will identify housing sites to inform the LDF. At the current stage 0.58ha of potential housing land in the city centre has been identified for further review. This includes 7 sites: Castle Piccadilly, Area North of Trinity Lane, Peel Street/Margaret Street, Bonding Warehouse, Monk Bar Garage, Reynard's Garage, St Leonard's Place. These sites may be allocated in the Allocations DPD rather than the AAP, as with other uses, however the AAP will need to address the impact of these developments on the proposals for the city centre as a whole in terms of accessibility and services.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

There is a well documented history of flooding in the city centre. The 2000 flood was over 11 times the normal average summer flow flooding over 350 premises. Most of the city centre was protected by flood barriers but river rises have, since then, come dangerously close to overtopping defences even with the Foss Barrier (built in 1986/7 following severe flooding in 1947/ 1978 and 1982). The Assessment notes the need to reduce surface water run off as one of several measures including slowing down and storing the rainfall from surrounding hills before it reaches the city centre. No actions to be taken forward in the AAP.

Other Local Strategies

Local Transport Plan 2

The Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2) sets-out the desired transport measures for the short term up to 2011 and the principles for a longer term transport vision to 2021. The LTP2 vision for York is for a city....:

- With a thriving, sustainable, vibrant community where people want to live and work and where businesses are able to develop and grow;
- Where traffic will be less congested and there will be cleaner air;
- That can function with a reduced reliance on non-renewable resources;
- Where everyone can access services and enjoy a better quality of life, without dependence on the availability of a car; and
- With communities with no casualties and where people feel safe and secure.

There are other proposed actions in LTP2 which involve or could lead to physical changes within the city centre and are therefore planning issues relevant for this AAP to consider. These include:

- City centre road space freed up by redistributed traffic could be reallocated for wider footways, cycle paths and bus lanes
- Tackling congestion through demand management measures such as parking controls and access restrictions in the city centre
- Enhancement of the Footstreets Pedestrian Priority Zone
- Providing more and better cycle parking
- Improving accessibility for disabled people
- Improving the cycle route network
- Improvements to bus interchange facilities in the city centre to increase bus patronage and to link the 'overground' bus network – orbital public transport loops linked into the main radial routes into the city centre
- Developing a city centre electric shuttle bus system
- Investigating the potential for water-based transport
- Developing a freight 'transshipment' centre.

Sport and Active Leisure Strategy

The city centre is the focus for leisure and tourist related development. Information on active leisure and sports is set out in the Sport and Active Leisure Strategy (2005). The Strategy is supported by a planning tool which identifies current gaps in provision, this includes a shortage in swimming pool provision, with a particular need for new provision in the city centre.

Visit York

Visit York, the city's single tourism organisation, has proposed a Vision for Tourism for the city, and a set of ambitions. The vision seeks to deliver long-term and sustainable growth in the value of the visitor economy (the target is a minimum of 5% average annual growth in visitor expenditure), building on York's distinctiveness, enhancing the quality of the visitor experience and

promoting the city as a world class visitor destination. Visit York's ambitions for tourism include:

- Enhance York's public realm so it becomes the most special in England;
- Develop York's position as a leading European cultural centre, combining a unique heritage with a modern outlook.

Future York Group

The Group recognised the importance of the city centre as an economic driver of the York economy, both in terms of the image it projects and the commercial, tourism, retail and evening economies it contains. Key recommendations of the Group that could be taken forward by the AAP include:

- Improved streets and public spaces with a high quality well designed public realm, that is spectacular both by day and night, with an exciting programme of events and activities for residents and visitors.
- Provision of a Flagship department store, together with a wide range of leading shops in a development of high quality design at Castle Piccadilly.
- The creation of new world-class attractions, demonstrating the ambition of the city, and encouraging discerning visitors.
- A gateway to the region; in the top league of European visitor destinations; a city with an expanded and enhanced tourism, cultural and retailing offer, where there is always something new and exciting to make the city attractive for investors, visitors and shoppers.

York Business Pride – A Vision for York City Centre, 2006

The Vision, will focussing more on the management of the city centre, contains a number of aspirations that could be taken forward by the AAP. These include:

- A physical and economic environment which will delight business, residents and visitors alike.
- A protected heritage with the vitality and vibrancy of a modern city.
- Provision of the infrastructure necessary to ensure a successful future for York.

Neighbourhood Action Plans

A Neighbourhood Action Plan analyses the needs of a neighbourhood, recognises specific local issues and develops a planned approach to tackling these issues in partnership with the community and service providers.

Guildhall:

Ambition 1: A user-friendly city centre for residents and businesses

Ambition 2: A cleaner, greener, safer city centre

Ambition 3: More inclusive city centre communities

Fishergate:

Ambition 1: Kerbside recycling for every ward

Ambition 2: A safe ward, easily accessible facilities and an active role for young people in the community

Ambition 3: Road safety

Micklegate:

Ambition 1: Increased recycling

Ambition 2: An enhanced environment

Ambition 3: Young People and Community Life

Ambition 4: Community Life

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE BASE INFORMATIVES FOR THE VISION

- Strengthen the role of the city centre as the core of a sub-regional city
- Ensure that the city centre is a thriving location for retailing, leisure, offices, culture and tourism.
- Deliver a physical and economic environment which will delight business, residents and visitors alike.
- Combine a protected heritage with the vitality and vibrancy of a modern city.
- Provide the infrastructure necessary to ensure a successful future for York.
- Include policies and proposals for action to preserve and enhance the conservation area.
- Manage change in ways that reinforces the area's special qualities including its unique historic character and setting.
- Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas
- Work towards World Heritage Status by 2029
- Provide the framework for a public realm strategy and masterplan to enhance the appearance, connectivity and functionality of key public spaces and areas of change within the city centre, and to ensure that areas of change are fully integrated.
- Enhance key spaces in the city centre to create a distinctive, attractive and vibrant sense of place and identity.
- Enhance York's public realm so it becomes the most special in England.
- Enhance the Footstreets Pedestrian Priority Zone.
- Ensure that the city centre is an area of High Quality Spaces

- Spaces will be attractive and stimulating to the senses.
- Public art will be integral
- Spaces will be decluttered, creatively lit, and equipped to be accessible, eventful and vibrant, capable of promoting York City of Festivals
- Spaces will be linked with clear, and perhaps themed routes that encourage exploration and travel on foot by day and after dark
- The experience of the city centre will be lifted with exciting interpretation
- High quality café-bar environments around public spaces and by rivers will add vitality, colour and bustle
- The river fronts will be opened up and their recreational opportunities exploited.
- Provide open space and recreation for children and young people
- Develop the role of York as a key node for public transport services for the sub area
- Improve accessibility within the city centre, particularly by improved facilities for walking and cycling.
- Improve movement to and from and within the city centre, air quality and the ambience of the area
- Reallocate city centre road space freed up by redistributed traffic for wider footways, cycle paths and bus lanes
- Tackle congestion through demand management measures such as parking controls and access restrictions in the city centre
- Promote sustainable transport choices
- Allocate a number of sites for office employment
- Ensure that the decline in the city centre market share for retailing is halted and then increased to a 34% share in order to maintain its position in the wider regional retail hierarchy
- Allocate a number of sites for housing, addressing the need for all types of housing and affordable housing.
- Provide a swimming pool in the city centre.
- Develop York's position as a leading European cultural centre, combining a unique heritage with a modern outlook.
- Contribute towards the aim of 5% average annual growth in visitor expenditure

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The Sustainability Statement did not specifically analyse the visions.

THE VISION FOR THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- AAP should be locally distinctive, realistic and inclusive to show what the city centre will be like at the end of the plan period.
- Spatial vision should flow from Core Strategy but be locally specific.
- No strong overall vision just a series of tactics but no clear overall strategy.
- Graphics and illustrations and plans help understanding of area, context and overall vision.
- Needs to show how it links with and helps to deliver other key strategies, e.g. RSS, Future York etc.
- Recurring economic and growth themes – need a more balanced view.
- No aspiration to build a sustainable or healthy city.
- Should add stronger emphasis on Climate Change and environmental issues at vision stage along the lines of ‘creating a city centre that lives within its environmental limits adapting to, and mitigating, climate change’.
- Key visions too extensive and detailed and should be shorter. Details can be listed separately but fundamental over riding vision should be considered.
- Vision should set out meaningful locally relevant and achievable goals providing realistic targets for improvement and tie in with YNW and other adjacent areas.
- Three visions should be combined into one overall holistic vision.
- Would be helpful to consider how city centre supports other targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20-25% by 2016.
- Vision should support sustainable development by promoting new development where it would mitigate and adapt to impacts of climate change and should include criterion promoting the use of sustainable construction and design measures.
- Visions are exactly right and 3 key themes are correct.

VISION FOR ECONOMIC VITALITY - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

Vision for Economic Vitality

In 2029 York city centre:

- will be a successful shopping destination with a major addition to York’s shopping offer at Castle Piccadilly;
- will have strong links with York Northwest’s retail and office offer and the National Railway Museum;
- will be more attractive to inward investors and businesses;
- will have a refreshed tourism offer;
- will be more attractive to students and academics which will help the universities maintain their competitiveness and maximise the benefits the universities bring to the city;

- will have a range of quality office accommodation that meets market needs;
- will have a more diverse and inclusive evening experience including a thriving early evening economy; and
- will be more readily accessible by public transport, by foot and by cycle with reduced congestion.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| Response: | 0 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 7 Mixed | 2 Comment | 9 Total Responses |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|

Key points made:

- Accessibility by public transport is a community issue rather than an economic one.
- York should have a major conference venue and at least on 5 star internationally renowned hotel.
- Vision for economic vitality should merge first 2 bullet points and refer to York central.
- Amend first bullet to ‘will be a successful shopping destination for local people and visitors’.
- Vision should consider how city centre and communities are connected to key city economic elements, e.g. Science City York and the Universities. Suggest amending criterion 2 to ‘will have strong links with YNW retail and office offer, the NRM, SCY and the city’s universities.
- First bullet point under Vision for Economic Vitality should be expunged as it would lead to a loss of identity of York.
- Desire to create major additional shopping offer at Castle Piccadilly is misguided because it is a major heritage location and would have a detrimental effect on the rest of the city. Should concentrate on providing a distinct, unique shopping experience.
- Economic Vitality – add ‘to support local businesses and local production, including food’,
- Amend first bullet to ‘will be a successful shopping destination for local people and visitors’.

VISION FOR HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

Vision for Historic Environment

In 2029 York city centre:

- will have retained its unique and special character;
- will showcase the highest quality of contemporary design;
- will have a high quality public realm with the infrastructure, flexibility and access to enable a wide range of activities and events to promote a world class setting for York’s heritage;
- will have world class interpretation of its unique history and archaeology;
- will have a larger pedestrian zone for people to be able to move around more easily;
- will have a higher quality environment with more green spaces and trees;
- will have a dedicated outdoor performance area;
- will have a thriving and prosperous historic market place; the river areas will be thriving with leisure, commercial and tourist

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| activity. | | | | | |
| Response: | 0 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 5 Mixed | 1 Comment | 6 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have World Heritage Status by 2029 with an improved character with a developed emphasis on the Victorian aspects of the city in the Cultural Quarter. • Better links between the city centre and YNW could conflict with vision for historic environment. • First bullet should read 'we will have retained and enhanced its unique and special character'. • Some aspects e.g. dedicated outdoor performance space, only have tenuous links with the vision for historic environment, more of a social aspiration. Suggest replacing first bullet point with we will have retained, and enhanced where possible the unique and special historic character' suggest second bullet reads 'will showcase the highest standards of contemporary contextual design'. • City centre is largely Central Historic Core Conservation Area so first bullet should read ' will retain its unique and special character and appearance which will have been preserved and enhanced'. Suggest adding ' will be exemplary of good conservation practice'. | | | | | |
| VISION FOR COMMUNITY LIFE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| Vision for Community Life | | | | | |
| <p>In 2029 York city centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ will have a wide range of homes to suit particular needs of older people, younger people, single people, disabled people and families including affordable homes; ▪ will be more accessible to older people, younger people, disabled people and families; ▪ will promote more opportunities to lead healthier lifestyles; ▪ will have more opportunities and places to express and sample culture from across the world; ▪ will provide community facilities that meet the needs of everyone; and ▪ will play a major role in meeting the social and community needs of all sections of York. | | | | | |
| Response: | 0 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 2 Comment | 5 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Life should include reference to swimming facilities and cycle ways as part of healthier lifestyle statements. • Sixth bullet point in economic vision should refer to the fact that the city centre, together with York Central, will have a range of office accommodation that meets market needs. • Community life – statement 4 should be amended by adding ' whilst retaining a strong element of the York and Yorkshire | | | | | |

culture and tradition’.

- Community Life – add at end of last bullet ‘as home and homecoming where all feel they can belong’.
- Vision should consider how city centre and communities connected to key city economic elements, e.g. Science City York and the Universities.

PREFERRED OPTION

There was a limited response to the 3 visions set out in the Issues and Options document, these were not supportive. The guidance of the revised PPS12 and good practice guidance from PAS emphasises the importance of a vision being specific and relevant to the area and the issues. Rather than simplistically group the themes of the AAP around social, economic and environmental issues (as in the Issues and Options document), the Preferred Option is to group the objectives around 6 key strands of the vision for the city centre. This is more specific to the AAP and better reflects the emerging purpose and scope of the document.

Vision

The city centre in 2030 will be the finest city centre in England, raised to the highest level that York’s reputation deserves.

The city centre will be a distinctively high quality place - a sophisticated, cutting-edge and prestigious location for business, cultural tourism, the arts, quality retailing, boutique hotels and cafe culture; and a focus for pride in the city for local residents.

York will be internationally renowned as an excellent example of sensitively using historic buildings to contribute to economic success. The city centre will grow through high quality new developments and in so doing will add to the special qualities of the historic core.

As a key cultural centre in the North of England, York will feature many must-see events and festivals and these will be creatively showcased within a revitalised high quality public realm. The city will have the revitalised streets and spaces it deserves, with long-lasting well thought-out improvements that brings the city’s amazing history to life.

Spaces will provide a better platform for events and streets will be designed around function, not vehicle movement. Civilised streets will put the local communities priorities first in a city centre that is easy, enjoyable and safe to move around.

With an enhanced image and new commercial development, the city centre will continue to be the business heart of the City, a prestigious and desirable location for thriving businesses.

The city centre will make every York resident rightly proud and will continue to be the civic and social heart of the city.

Place-making Objectives

Thriving

- Ensure that the city centre is a thriving location for retailing, leisure, offices, culture and tourism to strengthen the role of the city centre as the core of a sub-regional city.
- Grow the commercial heart of the city to ensure the long-term viability of the York economy. Growth to the South will take advantage of major opportunities to enhance Piccadilly and develop a stronger retail offer, to enhance the setting of important buildings and to better link the centre with the cultural attractions of the Barbican, Clifford's Tower and the Castle Museum.
- Ensure that the decline in the city centre market share for retailing is halted and then increased to a 34% share in order to maintain its position in the wider regional retail hierarchy, through allocation and delivery of new retail development and protection of existing retail frontage.
- Improve the viability of independent retailing in York city centre - a major component of the uniqueness of the city – through improvement to Gateway Streets and a revitalised outdoor market place.
- Focus commercial office use in the vicinity of the railway station, which is a sustainable location and good for business, to complement the new offer at York Central.
- Support the growth and success of both the city's universities within the city centre through improved physical linkages, student accommodation and facilities for showcasing talent.

Enjoyable

- Revitalise the heart of the city as the focus of city life and the host of festivals and events.
- Provide public art as an integral component of place-making and public realm enhancement.
- Create a lighting strategy for the city centre to illuminate places of interest and aid navigation.
- Lift the experience of visiting the city centre with exciting interpretation using innovative means.
- Provide high quality café-bar environments around public spaces and by rivers that will add vitality, colour and bustle.
- Provide a swimming pool in the city centre as a resource for the resident community of the city centre and the wider city, to promote active and healthy lifestyles.
- Develop York's position as a leading European cultural centre by enhancing the experience of visiting our many cultural attractions through combining unique heritage with a modern outlook.
- Ensure the redeveloped Barbican site is easily accessible and well integrated with the city centre.

Protected

- Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster, important open areas and archaeological remains.
- Include positive actions and proposals to preserve and enhance the conservation area.
- Plan for sensitive growth through a suite of policies in the Plan and ensure high quality contemporary design preserves and enhances the special qualities of the City Centre.
- Ensure developments are environmentally sustainable through raising environmental quality, minimising resource demands from development, and responding proactively to the global and local effects of climate change.
- Work towards World Heritage Status.

Redesigned

- Enhance York's public realm so it becomes the most special in England, adding to the unique York ambience.
- Revitalise key spaces and remake streets as places for people that are distinctive, attractive and vibrant through a public realm strategy and masterplan that also enhances connectivity and functionality of the public realm to ensure that areas of change are fully integrated.
- Significantly improve the setting of the Minster and other special buildings and enhance key vistas.
- Improve Gateway Streets and peripheral streets to encourage residents into the city centre and visitors to explore further.
- Expand the pedestrian core of York through extension of the Footstreets area.
- Declutter spaces and modify them to be more accessible and better able to promote York as a City of Festivals.
- Make more of the riversides including encouraging active frontages and a possible new footbridge to further link riverside walks.

Connected

- Through an Accessibility Framework, re-model accessibility within the city centre, with a particular focus on the 2 key transport corridors between the station and Bootham/Gillygate and Layerthorpe, to promote sustainable lifestyle choices, improve pedestrian / cycle connectivity between the areas of change and meet the access needs of York in 2030.
- Create an attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists with an improved network of routes.
- Improve physical linkages between York Central and the City Centre and improve other key linkages with important destinations including the station, hospital, York St John University, the Barbican site and Foss Islands.
- Protect and enhance the Snickelways and hidden spaces that contribute to the connectivity and uniqueness of the city centre.

- Tackle congestion through demand management measures such as parking controls and access restrictions in the city centre.
- Reallocate city centre road space freed up by redistributed traffic for wider footways, cycle paths and bus lanes.
- Develop the role of York as a key node for public transport services for the sub area.
- Ensure the city centre continues to be accessible for businesses.
- Consider the potential role of the river in providing alternative access to the city centre.

Liveable

- Allocate a number of sites for housing, addressing the need for all types of housing and affordable housing.
- Protect the amenity of residential areas including those at Aldwark, Walmgate and Bishophill.
- Ensure a full range of community facilities are available.
- Provide sufficient open space and recreation opportunities for children and people of all ages to improve the quality of life for people who live in and visit the city centre.
- Provide a safer and healthy place to live.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>N/a</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The Community Strategy objectives for a “a city of high quality spaces” are reflected in the vision and objectives. The AAP is the lead document for delivering these Community Strategy objectives.</p> |
| <p>3) Regional and national guidance</p> | <p>The vision and objectives are consistent with the RSS policy to improve accessibility in the city centre and to protect and enhance the historic environment. Nationally, local authorities are encouraged to produce AAPs for areas of significant conservation interest that are sensitive to change.</p> |
| <p>Justified 4) Consultation response</p> | <p>There was a limited response to the visions contained in the Issues and Options document, but comments were generally not supportive. The revised vision and objectives above is significantly different to the Issues and Options vision and aims to address the concerns</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | raised. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Reflects the options taken forward. All of these options were supported by the Sustainability Statement. Includes specific sustainability objectives |
| 6) Community benefits | The vision and objectives are a framework to deliver significant enhancement of the city centre. The AAP takes a broad approach to planning issues and incorporates issues around living ion the city centre, entertainment, culture and community facilities. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The vision and objectives are based on the Core Strategy policy for the city centre which is itself an evidenced approach. The objectives are based on AAP emerging preferred options, the evidence for each is set-out in each proforma. |
| Effective 8) Viability | The viability of the vision and objectives is considered in detail through the analysis of each option. |
| 9) Deliverability | The deliverability of the vision and objectives is considered in detail through the analysis of each option. For the AAP to be a success, partnership working and buy-in across the authority and from external partners is essential. |
| 10) Flexibility | The vision and objectives must be high level to allow for flexibility and to provide a framework for planning in the city centre for a 20 year period, but must also provide a clear direction as to the authorities intention to seek redevelopment/redesign of key sites, spaces and streets. To strike this balance, much of the detail of redevelopment/redesign will be provided through SPD which will be based on principles adopted in the AAP. |
| NEXT STEPS Amend the vision and objectives to reflect the preferred options as they emerge and to reflect Members comments. Subject the vision and objectives to early consultation to engage key partners through the vision prospectus, as recommended to Members. Review feedback from the Core Strategy preferred options consultation with regard to both the vision and city centre policy. | |

KEY THEME 1: SHOPPING IN THE CITY CENTRE: QUESTIONS 2, 3 and 4

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005): emphasises the need for Local Authorities, in planning for development, to address accessibility (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community to jobs, health, housing, education, shops, leisure and community facilities. It advises that they should provide improved access for all to such facilities by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car.

Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres, which relates to town centres and town centre uses, which include shops, restaurants, bars, and other cultural facilities, places emphasis upon the need to meet everyone's day to day shopping and service needs at the local level. In this context, it identifies the need for local authorities to consider the need for, and where appropriate, designate new centres to meet the needs of areas where significant new development is proposed. It also makes clear the need for local authorities to take into account the catchment area intended to be served when carrying out assessments of need for new facilities.

Planning for Town Centres: Guidance on Design and Implementation Tools (March 2005) deals specifically with design issues relating to planning for town centres and some of the main tools available to secure the implementation of town centre planning policies and proposals. It supports PPS6.

Use Classes Order 2005 introduced changes to ensure LPA's had more control over managing town centre development by introducing two new use class - A4 for pubs and bars and A5 for takeaways. Also Nightclubs were reclassified as Sui Generis. These changes mean that the uses will not be permitted to change as easily as a planning application will be required.

Design Reviewed Town centre Retail by CABE (2004) provides a series of lessons learnt and illustrates what they consider to be good practice.

Some of the issues raised:

- Successful town centres need to have a vision.
- New retail development should add and enhance the existing public realm.
- Areas should contain mixed uses – this makes a town centre environment more lively, economically successful and safe.

- Car parking is needed to compete with out of centres. Beyond the obvious options should be explored.
- If there is a design vision/masterplan some of the most successful schemes developed have been where a developer has appointed a lead architect but then broken up the development into bits to allow other architects to take on individual building commissions against the master plan.
- For smaller infill developments architects should avoid creating a stylist approach so that distinctiveness and variety gives way to difference.
- An artist should be employed as part of the collaboration with the architect and landscape architect; this will allow artwork to infuse with the project
- Retail Development in Historic Areas by English Heritage (2005)

Retail Development in Historic Areas by English Heritage (2005) sets out guidelines for achieving high quality new retail development in historic areas. The document informs that the retail sector performs an important role in many historic centres. Cities such as York act as a focal point for the leisure and tourist industries. Visitors enjoy the opportunity to shop and linger in an attractive historic environment and the existence of strong retail and leisure facilities provides an important additional reason for people to visit historic centres. The importance of trading in historic centres is key to their durability. In addition retailing makes a key contribution to the culture and economy of towns today as well as allowing for the continued viability of historic buildings through their adaptation for new uses.

The document highlights:

- Larger unit sizes are more challenging to fit in historic buildings. Similarly new units require careful design to be accommodated within new developments in order to be in keeping with their historic neighbors.
- Mix uses can increase dwell times and provide more reasons for people to visit, increase shopping out of hours, and increase perception of safety. This may have particular benefits to the historic locations, as it may allow for greater flexibility with regard to the uses, which can be accommodated on the upper storey
- The dramatic rise in new technology including Internet and television home shopping as forms of retail. Centres offering a range of complementary non-retail attractions will be more resilient to these changing patterns.
- Certain services have been able to trade from older buildings because they do not require large display windows. However post offices numbers are in decline and there has been a steady decline in bank branches. Some times these buildings are suitable for A3 uses.
- The need to maintain and enhance local distinctiveness of historic areas to give them a competitive edge.
- Retail sector represents a dynamic, fast changing and competitive environment. Centres, which cannot adapt to new challenges and respond to the ever-increasing competitive pressures, are likely to lose trade to those centres, which can.

New retail development in historic areas should always seek to preserve and enhance its surroundings.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

- Policy Y1A – Develop role of York as a sub regional city
- Policy E1 – Creating a successful and competitive regional economy
- Policy E2 – Town centre and Major Facilities
- Policy E3 – Land and premises for Economic Development
- Policy Y1 – York Sub area Policy

Sustainable Community Strategy:

Improving retail in York is identified as one of the components in ensuring York is a successful economic centre in the Sustainable Communities Strategy. It links into the second Strategic Ambition – ‘*We will keep York’s employment levels high and economy buoyant by supporting local employers, developing a diverse economy and balanced employment structure*’. Enhancing retail and ensuring York is a vibrant retail centre will help to deliver the strategic aims of those contained in the partnership themes – The Thriving City, The Sustainable City and The Inclusive City.

LDF Core Strategy:

- Directs that’s the Market Share decline is halted and then increased to 34%
- City Centre to be primary focus for non-food retail, increasing the supply of modern retail units, as well as retaining independent stores
- Key diagram identifies Stonebow (Stonebow House, Telephone Exchange and Hungate) and Castle Piccadilly on key diagram as retail growth areas, with both being sequentially equal.
- Small food retail should be directed to the city centre first.
- Recognises limited space in city and edge of centre will be needed to accommodate unmet retail capacity. The draft second stage of retail study recommends York Central is the most appropriate location by providing a complementary offer to the city centre and seeking to facilitate linked trips

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

- York Retail Study 2008 by GVA Grimley
- Extension to Retail Study in connection with York Central is currently being produced, one of the key components this study focuses on it the amount of retail that could be accommodated on York Central without effecting the vitality and viability of the city centre. It will also explore improved linkages between the city centre and York Central.

- York Tourism Strategy (2007)
- City of York Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2011
- York City Centre Partnership Action Plan (2006-2008)

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|------|----|------|
| 1. York as a first choice retail destination | I | I/? | O | I | ?/O | O/I | O | ? | I/? | * | ?/ _ | ? | ?/ _ |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. York as a first choice retail destination | O | I | I | ? | O | I | ** | ? | ** | |

SHOPPING IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

PROTECTING THE EXISTING SHOPPING ENVIRONMENT - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments

- Boundary should not be formulated until overall approach to retail provision is understood and agreed in the Core Strategy, and should follow this approach
- Do not believe that any expansion of shopping area is desirable

Question 2: Where should the Central Shopping Boundary be?

OPTION 1: It should reflect the recommendations in the Retail Study (2008)

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 5 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | 10 Total Responses |
| Key points made: No key points made | | | | | |
| Question 2: Where should the Central Shopping Boundary be? OPTION 2: The Local Plan boundary on Map 3 (Central Shopping Area and Potential Shopping Streets) should be incorporated in the AAP | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
| Key points made: No key points made | | | | | |
| Question 2: Where should the Central Shopping Boundary be? OPTION 3 : The boundary should be redrawn to delete or encompass other areas you consider could form part of the Central Shopping Area | | | | | |
| Response: | 17 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only Piccadilly side of the Foss should be included • York Central should be included on Map 4 as a Major Development Opportunity • Shopping should not extend along Piccadilly after Merchantgate, this area should be retained for offices • Gateway Street areas should be included • West of Ouse should be included • Piccadilly area should not be included • St Leonard's should be included • Micklegate should be included • Fossgate and northern Walmgate should be added | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTION It is considered that Option 1 should be advanced to the preferred options stage for the reasons set out below: | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent 1) Contribution to overall | | Whilst all the three options are consistent with AAP Vision for Economic Vitality, its is considered that option one provides the most appropriate central area shopping boundary | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>vision and strategic development objectives</p> <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> <p>3) Regional and national guidance</p> | <p>(CASB) for retaining/enhancing the viability and vitality of the city centre shopping area. This is based on the view that a CASB defined as set out in the Retail Study 2008 will assist most effectively in delivering the objectives of the Core Strategy. Whilst all three options are consistent with the Sustainable Community Strategy, national and regional guidance set out above, Option 1 CASB will provide expansion space for modern units on sites that are well related with the existing shopping centre. This should help to stop the decline in market share and provide new opportunities for future enhancement. The preferred options of the Core Strategy now makes reference to Stonebow House and Piccadilly based on the findings of the retail study, therefore this is another reason why it would be inappropriate to exclude them, and go with a different option.</p> |
| <p>Justified</p> <p>4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Whilst mixed support for all three options was received, it is considered that the Local Plan boundary (option2) is out of date and whilst many representors supported option 3 and suggested additional areas, most of the areas are already included in Option1 or would be inappropriate to include in the CASB in accordance with PPS6. Other areas suggested for example the gateway streets need other mechanisms for enhancing retail and other uses in these areas. Inclusion of these streets in the CSA boundary would create a distorted area for the sequential test. A number of respondents objected to the west of the Foss being included. The Castle Piccadilly site is identified as the key development site for providing retail space in the city, with out this the study warns that York's market share will continue to fall. The plan promotes this site as a mixed used development that will include a larger element of retail but will also include civic space as set out in the adopted development brief for the site.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>No one option was considered better than the other in the sustainability statement (SA). As set out above all three options were identified as having either a positive or no significant effect. The SA highlights that a boundary should not lead to the exclusion of other uses within this area if deemed suitable. Creation of a single use centre would not create a diverse and prosperous city. This is certainly not the intention of the AAP.</p> |
| <p>6) Community benefits</p> | <p>A strong vibrant defined retail centre will enable visitors and residents to identify the predominant retail offer and will help in terms of accessibility to services by them being concentrated in a defined area. It is important though that resident's needs are not overlooked in the CASB and their needs are considered.</p> |
| <p>7) Evidenced approach</p> | <p>This boundary is most aligned with the recent approved local evidence base – Retail Study 2008. It is considered that a central shopping boundary that reflects the recommendations of</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | the Retail Study 2008 provides the most appropriate sequential test boundary for which future retail applications should be judged. As set out in the above bullet points the retail study concludes that the existing Local Plan boundary is out dated and suggested sites put forward to option 3 were similar to those included in the Retail Study or would have resulted in an inappropriate sequential test boundary in accordance with PPS6. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Whilst one of the overarching aims of the CASB boundary is to help create a viable retail city centre, it is considered no additional viability testing is required for the boundary. Viability was considered in the Retail Study 2008; for example, the area west of the Ouse was considered unviable for redevelopment and therefore has not been included in the CSAB. |
| 9) Deliverability | No additional finance is required to deliver this option. City of York Council will be the lead. |
| 10) Flexibility | An element of flexibility has been included in the boundary by defining it to include future development opportunities that will allow for consolidation of the retail area i.e. Piccadilly and Stonebow House. It cannot be too flexible, as it needs to provide a firm starting point for the sequential test. |
| NEXT STEPS The recommendations of the retail study (2008) in respect of the Central Shopping Area be translated into map form. | |
| MANAGING RETAIL USES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | |
| QUESTION 3: Should some street frontages be protected for retail uses, and if you agree, how should they be protected? | |
| General Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic shop frontages should be protected from unsuitable alterations • Fail to see the threat from non retail uses opening up, cannot see justification for policy to require buildings to be used for retail. Premises should be allowed to be used for whatever uses they will most benefit from and maintain high footfall • Too many restrictions can strangle development • Consider incentives – rents/business rates to encourage more shops • Don't need to compete with other cities (general) • Distinction needs protecting • Need a mechanism to encourage more food based shops to open in the centre | |
| QUESTION 3: Should some street frontages be protected for retail uses, and if you agree, how should they be protected? | |
| OPTION 1: Yes, continue to identify street frontages on a map where we would restrict development mainly to shopping | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| uses (Primary Shopping Frontages) | | | | | |
| Response: | 21 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected streets should be extended to include High and Low Petergate, Parliament Street, Coney Street, Market Street High and Low Ousegate, Colliergate and all of Goodramgate | | | | | |
| QUESTION 3: Should some street frontages be protected for retail uses, and if you agree, how should they be protected? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Yes, secondary shopping frontages should be identified to help protect the vitality and viability of secondary retail areas | | | | | |
| Response: | 16 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gateway Streets should be included Retail frontages should be protected in secondary streets as well as primary streets Any formula should not preclude punctuating secondary retail streets with return of some properties to domestic use Any formula should not be too prescriptive, some areas are appropriate for a greater mix Piccadilly should not be included as a secondary street | | | | | |
| QUESTION 3: Should some street frontages be protected for retail uses, and if you agree, how should they be protected? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Yes, have a policy that restricts the loss of retail stores/subdivision of retail floorspace in the centre shopping area and which limits other non-retail uses | | | | | |
| Response: | 12 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 13 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reservations on this option as could lead to loss of job opportunities Option 3 should go further and restrict the amalgamation of neighbouring small shops to form larger retail premises A policy could encourage expansion of retail units into adjacent properties with appropriate retention of character of each | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTION(S) | | | | | |
| It is considered that York needs a combination of all three options for the reasons set out below: | | | | | |
| Consistent | | To ensure that the centre contains an appropriate mix of shops and other uses; and to ensure it delivers the objectives of the APP, the ethos behind national policy and the Sustainable Community Strategy, along with the implementing the Core Strategy and Regional Policy a combination of all three options is considered the best way forward. Through the un-adopted Local Plan a policy relating to primary frontages has been successfully operated to ensure that | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| strategy/local area agreement 3) Regional and national guidance | retail is not diluted in the main shopping street, there is no evidence to go against this stance. It is considered that designating secondary shopping frontages in York will help other streets in York for example the peripheral streets, it will assist in better management of uses in these areas. |
| Justified 4) Consultation Response | There was a wide range of support for all three options, including representor's identifying that a combination of options is needed. Whilst it is important to protect loss of retail within the city centre, a variety of uses are important to ensure a vibrant city centre, rolling out protected streets too far across the city would be harmful for the centre. |
| 5) Sustainability Response | The SA points out that the options are not mutually exclusive but should be considered as a package to gain the full economic benefits. It warns that Option 3 needs careful planning to ensure that its benefits are positive, and is perhaps limited so it does not have a negative impact on independent stores that seek smaller units. The designation of primary and secondary streets is seen as having a number of positive benefits for the vitality of the city centre. |
| 6) Community Benefits | The provision of a wide range of retail goods within York is vital to meeting the needs of the population. It is important that residents and visitors are able to access and find the type of retail they require. Designating street frontages would be a useful tool in meeting social sustainability objectives such as accessibility and equity of access by retaining and possibly enhancing the service function of the city centre. |
| 7) Evidenced Approach | The designation of primary and secondary streets is advocated in PPS6 as good practice. The Retail Study 2008 endorses the approach, which has previously been adopted in York i.e. designation of the primary shopping street but sets out that York would benefit from the introduction of designated secondary streets to assist in protecting their vitality, particularly on streets such as Fossgate and other peripheral streets, and to prevent against undesirable uses such as fast food takeaways. The retail study focuses on the need for creating more larger scale units and subdivision is an option provided as referred to in the SA that this is not at the expense of smaller independent stores. This could therefore be limited to certain parts of the city |

| | |
|--|--|
| Effective 8) Viability | The protection of streets in the city centre for specific uses is a method established in national guidance to help vitality and viability of centres by ensuring the concentration of such uses in the centre. The existing protected/primary streets in York provide an excellent starting point for establishing which streets should be covered by the policy and the Retail Study 2008 provides up to date evidence and guidance. There are no specific financial costs associated with the establishment of this option. |
| 9) Deliverability | This policy will be delivered by the City Council |
| 10) Flexibility | The policy and the way it operates will ensure that there is flexibility in respect of uses within the centre whilst ensuring that retail is not diluted to ensure that the city centres remains full of Vitality |
| NEXT STEPS Policy development and street/area designations in line with the 3 options | |
| QUESTION 4: Do you agree with the approaches proposed in the retail study for delivering new retail space in the city centre? General Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of suitable space to accommodate largest retail units • Shoppers are attracted to York due to its unique offer • York needs to remain a compact and a circular pedestrian shopping location • Retail development should be directed to the city centre first, out of town development should be restricted • Disagree with the premise that more retail space is needed • Any retail development should not be at the detriment of other shopping areas in the City particular smaller shops • Specialist and unusual retailing should be protected and encouraged, large multiple stores duplicate provision elsewhere and erode uniqueness • Sceptical about prescriptions of Retail Study • Any new retail site needs to be carefully considered as to traffic management, parking and whether it is compatible with the historic environment and green issues • New retail should be out of centre at Monks Cross, Clifton Moor, McArthur Glen • No need to compete with other cities, should be building on historic character • A food store would be useful • New development should be open-air not indoor malls | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|----------|---------|--------------------|
| QUESTION 4: Do you agree with the approaches proposed in the retail study for delivering new retail space in the city centre? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: Castle Piccadilly area should be promoted within the AAP as the key retail site in the city centre | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 8 Not Supported | 17 Mixed | Comment | 36 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Piccadilly should be a mixed development • Oppose linear extension down Piccadilly • Development on car park area/Castlegate should be restricted, a civic green space should be provided • Retail should be tightly knit to the existing shopping area on Castle Piccadilly • Only Piccadilly side should be developed not castle side of Foss • Redevelopment of Castle Piccadilly is not opposed as long as it follows the lines of the latest Development Brief • Castle Piccadilly should not be promoted • Castle Piccadilly is not the only option for retail; other parts o the city may have opportunities. Detailed assessment of Castle Piccadilly are needed to identify level of retail along with other uses • Castle Piccadilly is the key retail site in the city and should be a priority • Piccadilly should be used for small cottage type industries • Castle Piccadilly needs better access and parking to work • Castle Piccadilly attractive for supplementary retail but should not be key one • Large units could distort historic character of Castle Piccadilly area • Majority of Castle Piccadilly should be kept free i.e. around Clifford's Tower etc. Piccadilly Road in dire need of renovation • Castle Piccadilly needs to respect necessary separation of Clifford's Tower but could compensate by its height. Bold modern design would be desirable • Castle Piccadilly should be for small businesses not national chains. Car Park should be turned into a open market | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: The APP should promote the redevelopment/infill of sites which satisfy other planning requirements in the Central Shopping Area, for example any individual infill opportunities within the areas shown on Map 4 (Potential Redevelopment/Infill areas for Retail) | | | | | |
| Response: | 13 Supported | Not Supported | 4 Mixed | Comment | 15 Total Responses |

Key points made:

- Redevelopment along Goodramgate should not have an affect on the grain of streets in this part of the city
- Telephone Exchange/Stonebow House offer ideal potential for additional retailing
- Riversides should be enhanced
- Redevelopment should not occur in Goodramgate but support other areas
- Infill opportunities for tidying up areas such as Ogleforth, Tanner Row and west side of Gillygate
- Not sure where redevelopment opportunities exist in Goodramgate, this area should improve with growth of University
- Less opportunity for enhancing west side of river Ouse
- Hard to image where opportunities are in Goodramgate, some are Heritage kind
- George Hudson street maybe a possibility
- Additional shopping should either hug top of Piccadilly or be located within existing shopping area

QUESTION 4: Do you agree with the approaches proposed in the retail study for delivering new retail space in the city centre?**OPTION 3: Improved linkages and integration with York Central should be developed to allow this area to provide a complementary retail role**

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|---------|--------------------|
| Response: | 20 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | Comment | 25 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|---------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- York Central should provide a complementary role
- Highlight opportunity for new retail development at York Central
- Whilst linkages with York Central are favoured this should not have any adverse impact on the historic character of the City
- Not clear how linkages with York Central can be achieved and there is limited potential for retail on this site. Large shops may find themselves isolated, ideally retail areas should flow into each other so to feeds off one another
- Recasting Rouiger Street or area behind Station Rise, War Memorial and through arch at Queen Street may help integration of York Central
- Improved linkages and integration with York Central need be developed
- Linkages to York Central should be by sustainable transport modes
- Option 3 not sure linkages could be achieved. Inclusion could risk impacting on City Centre and jeopardise progress on Castle Piccadilly
- Option 3 is an exciting concept. It takes the large scale pressure off historic city and creates a sense of place in a new

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map should highlight retail development at York Central | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTION</p> <p>It is considered that a combination of all three options is the most appropriate way forward for the reasons set out below:</p> | |
| <p>Consistent</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement Regional and national guidance | <p>To ensure that retail development is first accommodated in the city centre, as directed by national, regional guidance and the Core Strategy; additional floorspace is required in the city centre to meet the recommendations of the Retail Study 2008. Given limited opportunities within the built up city, a combination of all three option is considered appropriate, to ensure that the city centre remains a vibrant and viable shopping centre. This approach should ensure that York retains and in the future improves its market share. Clearly any development needs to be sensitive to its surroundings to ensuring that there is no detrimental adverse affect on the historic environment to ensure that development does not contravene higher-level policy or strategies.</p> |
| <p>Justified</p> <p>4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Various support was received for the different options, there is strong opposition to the Castle Piccadilly site, particularly to development on the west side of the Foss. However, this is the key development site in the city, and is promoted in the Retail Study. It is important to point out that the retail element will be part of a mix use scheme. A development brief has been adopted by the Council which requires civic space and that the scheme takes into account its historic setting.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>No one option was considered better than the others in the Sustainability Statement. As set out above all three options were identified as having either a positive or no significant effect. The SA highlights that a city centre approach to retailing should aid car reduction around the city. It highlights that development could put an existing strain on the centre and that the development of option 1 needs to take into consideration the important elements surrounding/within the site but this option does offer good potential to increase retail floorspace as set out in the Retail Study. Better linkages with York Central could assist pressure on the city centre but care needs to be taken to ensure that such a development so close to the city will not affect the viability and viability of the centre.</p> |
| <p>6) Community benefits</p> | <p>New retail development should have a positive effect meeting needs locally. It could also lead to job creation and help to reduce deprivation. Measures will need to be employed to ensure that increased retail offer does not adversely affect people living in the city and does not affect businesses currently operating.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Retail Study 2008 states that it is imperative that additional retail development is provided in the city centre in order to halt York's declining market share. The retail study sets out that Castle Piccadilly is the key retail site in the city, which should be brought forward as soon as possible as part of a mixed use development, whilst preserving the setting of the historic buildings/area surrounding the site. To retain the market share areas mentioned in option 2 also need to be allocated for example Stonebow House/Telephone Exchange. The integration of York Central with the city is mutually important for both areas. Linkages with York Central are important on all levels, not just for retail but also to ensure that the benefits from both areas are shared. With respect to retail any development on this site needs to ensure that the vitality and viability of the city centre is not affected, particularly given its close proximity to the centre but complementary retail with good linkages as promoted in the core strategy should enhance both areas. |
| Effective 8) Viability | An additional evidence based document has been commissioned by the Council to establish the level/type of development that York Central can accommodate, to prevent it having a negative impact on retailing in the city centre. The Retail Study 2008 does emphasis that there are costs associated with the telephone exchange site, additional feasibility work maybe needed. |
| 9) Deliverability | The schemes will need to be brought forward by private developers. |
| 10) Flexibility | Given the sensitively of Castle Piccadilly and operational costs associated with the telephone exchange, these developments are likely to be mid length projects. A policy that allows sensitive infill or redevelopment should ensure an element of flexibility of bringing new retail developments forward. |
| NEXT STEPS Investigate linkage opportunities between the City Centre and York Central Feasibility work for Telephone exchange Allocate sites Policy development to aid retail sites being brought forward | |

**KEY THEME 1: IMPROVING YORK'S VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS (TOURISM):
QUESTION 5 AND 6**

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Department of Communities and Local Government, 'Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism' (2006) replaced guidance in PPG 21. This acknowledges the importance tourism plays in contributing to the national economy and the prosperity and growth of many towns and cities. It highlights that the tourism industry should flourish in response to the market, whilst respecting the environment which attracts visitors.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS (Yorkshire and Humber Plan, May 2008) acknowledges the importance of tourism in the Yorkshire and Humber economy. York clearly has a central role to play in the development of tourism in the region, based on the strengths of York as Yorkshire's premier visitor destination. Policy E6 Sustainable tourism promotes, supports and encourages tourism by adopting an overall approach to tourism that has economic, social and environmental sustainability at its core. Policy Y1: York sub area policy seek to develop the role of York as a Sub Regional City and support the roles of Selby and Malton. Policy E2 recognises the need to ensure that uses such as entertainment, art, culture and sport including health care and leisure facilities are located within city centres. Yorkshire Forward's strategic framework for the visitor economy supports innovation and product development with an emphasis on value over volume.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The theme partnership 'York – The Thriving City' has the strategic aim to be ranked as an international quality leisure and business visitor destination. 'York – A City of Culture' aims to encourage culture to be a central element of place making.

LDF Core Strategy:

Strategic objective to ensure that York's tourism and evening economy is promoted.

York Evidence Base

York: A Vision For Tourism (Visit York): Includes seven ambitions to deliver long-term and sustainable growth in the value of the visitor economy, for the benefit of visitors, businesses and residents.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------|----|-------|
| 4. Strengthened tourism offer | ? | 0 | ? / - | - / I | I / ? | * / I | - | 0 / ? | 0 | I / * | I / - | ? | ? / - |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-------|
| 4. Strengthened tourism offer | * | I | I | ? | ? | ? | ** / I | ? | ** | 0 / * |

IMPROVING YORK’S VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS (TOURISM) - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 5: How can we help to improve York’s overall visitor experience and exceed expectations?

OPTION 1: Redesign city centre public spaces to enhance the physical experience of the city centre and install the necessary infrastructure to enable a greater number and variety of events.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 28 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 11 Mixed | 8 Comment | Total Responses 48 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|--------------------|

OPTION 2: Provide appropriate temporary and permanent signage in public spaces in order to promote key events of interest.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | Total Responses 16 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

OPTION 3: Enhance existing and/ or encourage major new tourist attraction.

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 12 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 3 Comment | Total Responses 17 |
| QUESTION 5: How can we help to improve York's overall visitor experience and exceed expectations? | | | | | |
| OPTION 4: Do nothing, there is no need to intervene or change York's visitor experience. | | | | | |
| Response: | 4 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 8 |
| <p>Key points made: <i>Individual responses to Q5 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ View that option 3 should be covered by options 1 and 2 was expressed. ▪ Signage requires attention but should be rationalised not added to. ▪ Cross Ouse linkages and riverfront could be improved. ▪ Provide a well designed public space at Clifford's Tower. ▪ Redesign of public spaces requires a more comprehensive evidence base than exists | | | | | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTIONS - The preferred approach to question 5 is to develop Preferred Options principles to inform a subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy through the City Centre AAP and this will include variations on options 1, 2 and 3, see City Spaces option soundness evaluation.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>NEXT STEPS Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of principles through which to develop a public realm and movement strategy.</p> | | | | | |
| QUESTION 6: How can we support the growth of the visitor economy through planning visitor accommodation? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: The city centre AAP should contain a policy to ensure that the necessary type and standard of hotel development takes place. | | | | | |
| Response: | 17 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 3 Comment | Total Responses 21 |
| OPTION 2: Include a policy which protects overnight accommodation in the city centre a) threshold based criteria e.g. hotels with 30 or more rooms b) type based criteria e.g. smaller scale accommodation c) other criteria | | | | | |
| Response: | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| General | 2 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 3 Comment | Total Responses 6 |
| a) | 2 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 4 |
| b) | 3 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 4 |
| c) | 0 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 1 |
| QUESTION 6: How can we support the growth of the visitor economy through planning visitor accommodation? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: It should be left to the market to decide on the type and location of visitor accommodation. | | | | | |
| Response: | 6 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 6 |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <i>Individual responses to Q6 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.</i> | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mix of options 1 and 3. ▪ Support aspiration for York Central site to provide a hotel. ▪ Visit York, with key stakeholders, will look to identify sites and opportunities for development that meets accommodation requirements of high spend. ▪ Efforts should be made to ensure the city centre has sufficient stock of good quality overnight accommodation to discourage use of residential properties as holiday flats etc. ▪ Sites suggested for hotel developed are York Central, St Mary's car park, Piccadilly, The White Swan on Piccadilly. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTION | | | | | |
| Option 3 as subject to regional and national planning policies will be advanced to the Preferred Options stage for the reasons set out below. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | This option is consistent with the AAP vision for Economic Vitality especially the aspiration for a refreshed tourism offer and a more diverse and inclusive evening experience as it places the city centre as the priority location of future investment in the sector. | | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | This option is consistent with the AAP vision for Economic Vitality especially the aspiration for a refreshed tourism offer and a more diverse and inclusive evening experience as it places the city centre as the priority location of future investment in the sector. | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The SCS includes a strategic aim to be ranked as an international quality leisure and business visitor destination by investment directed through Visit York. | | | | |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | This option would be directed through regional and national guidance (PPS 6 Planning for Town Centres). The Planning Use Classes Order identifies uses class C1 Hotels covering hotels, boarding and guesthouses. Planning uses classes and planning policy makes no distinction | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | between the grade of visitor accommodation. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Consultation responses were mixed. Option 1 received the most support and no opposition. There was an insignificant number of representations to option 2 and comments received relating to each option were not in favour of a criteria based policy. Option 3 was more popular with respondents believing the market should determine the type and size of visitor accommodation. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Locating visitor accommodation within the city centre as per sequential approach (PPS 6) will have a positive effect on travel patterns and encourage people to walk and travel to York city centre by public transport. City centre accommodation will support the tourism economy and have a positive impact on related businesses. Maintaining a variety of accommodation through market forces will attract a cross-section population and serve needs. |
| 6) Community benefits | City centre sites will have community benefits in terms of reducing traffic congestion and associated environmental and health benefits. Facilities associated with many hotels such as restaurants, health clubs etc are accessible to York residents. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Council will conform with PPS 6 sequential approach and RSS Policy E6 which seeks to promote sites close to key tourist attractions and transport hubs as preferred locations for visitor accommodation. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Sequential approach requires applicants to demonstrate: a) the need for development b) that the development is of an appropriate scale c) that there are no more central sites for the development d) that there are no unacceptable impacts on existing centres e) that locations are accessible |
| 9) Deliverability | The AAP will involve input from key stakeholders and wider public consultation at Preferred Options and Publication stages. Sites within the city centre approved against the criteria aims, and objectives of regional and national planning policy, local strategies and viability work potential objections and barriers to development can be mitigated. |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| 10) Flexibility | In applying the sequential approach, and considering alternative sites, developers and operators should be able to demonstrate that they have been flexible about their business model in terms of the following considerations: the scale of development, the format of the development, car parking provision, and the scope for disaggregation. The LPA will also be realistic in considering whether sites are suitable, viable and available. |
|-----------------|--|

NEXT STEPS

If it is appropriate to determine hotel/visitor accommodation applications through the PPS 6 Sequential Test it will be beneficial for the Council and/or Visit York to have the evidence base against which to test future applications. For this approach it is recommended that an assessment of visitor accommodation demand and capacity is undertaken.

KEY THEME 1: EVENING ECONOMY: QUESTION 7

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 6 promotes the vitality and viability of town centres. Encourages local planning authorities to adopt a plan-led approach including managing the role and function of existing centres so they meet the needs of residents and visitors. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister ODPM (2004) *Good Practice in Managing the Evening & Late Night Economy* promotes measures such as new developments including a mix of uses into the evening and night-time economy that help create a busy atmosphere day and night, encouraging diversity and local distinctiveness as well as the need for non-alcohol centred evening activities such as galleries, museums etc.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS aims to grow York as a key driver of the Leeds City Region economy by encouraging amongst other sectors the evening economy.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The theme partnership 'York –City of Culture' has the strategic aim to integrate our product e.g. events calendar, licensing policy, transport connections, attractions opening hours, shopping hours, and pedestrian hours. As well as encourage high quality café bar environments around public spaces.

LDF Core Strategy:

Contains a strategic objective to ensure that York's tourism and evening economy is promoted.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

City of York Council and Visit York study *York After Dark* aims to promote, improve and diversify the City’s evening economy and encourage more people to take part. The strategy conforms with the ‘Civic Trust’ vision and aspirations for the evening economy for all UK towns and cities. CYC Statement of Licensing Policy seeks to ensure that the City of York Council continues to offer a wide choice of high quality and well managed entertainment and cultural venues within a safe, orderly and attractive environment, valued by those who live in, work in, and visit the city centre. Lifelong Learning and Culture: Service Plan 2008/09 includes objectives to make York more eventful and develop a vibrant culture infrastructure.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|--|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|
| 7. Diverse and inclusive evening economy | * | * / - | O / ? | - / ? | ? / - | I / ? | ? | O | O / ? | * | I / _ | ? | I / _ |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|--|-------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 7. Diverse and inclusive evening economy | I / * | I | I | O | O | ** | * | O | ** | ? |

EVENING ECONOMY- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 7: Are there opportunities for a more vibrant evening economy starting earlier in the day?

OPTION 1: Pro-actively encourage a vibrant evening economy including shopping and entertainment, through the following actions: a) Extend the hours of operation of the existing footstreets in the 5-7pm period (or potentially later) as an incentive to encourage shops, cafes and attractions to stay open later by making them more convenient for people

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| after work. b) Physical improvements to the pedestrian environment. c) Creating new pedestrian zones throughout the evening ('evening footstreets') e.g. Fossgate, Goodramgate and Micklegate? | | | | | |
| Response: | | | | | |
| a) | 21 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 3 Comment | Total Responses 27 |
| b) | 8 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 10 |
| c) | 7 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 1 Comment | Total Responses 11 |
| QUESTION 7: Are there opportunities for a more vibrant evening economy starting earlier in the day? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: It is for individual retailers and proprietors to determine opening hours and there is no need to introduce incentives to encourage them to stay open later. | | | | | |
| Response: | 2 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 8 |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pedestrianisation of Fossgate supported but some concerns about access. ▪ Overall reduction or restriction of traffic. ▪ Physical improvements to pedestrian environment are definitely required. ▪ Extend Footstreet zone times and area. ▪ Extensions suggested to Goodramgate, Micklegate, Fossgate, George Hudson Street | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS - | | | | | |
| The preferred approach to question 7 (including a review and potential extension of the Footstreets zone beyond 1600) is to develop Preferred Options principles to inform a subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy through the City Centre AAP and this will include variations on option 1 a, b and c subject to the findings of the Footstreets Review and City Centre Accessibility Framework. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | This approach will help to deliver the AAP Vision for Economic Vitality for a more diverse and inclusive evening experience including a thriving early evening economy. | | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The SCS partnership 'A City of Culture' has the strategic aim to integrate York's product e.g. events calendar, licensing policy, attractions opening hours, pedestrian hours into the evening as well as daytime. Extending hours of operation of existing and new footstreets into the 5 to 7pm period will help to realise this aspiration. | | | | |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | ODPM (2004) <i>Good Practice in Managing the Evening & Late Night Economy</i> encourages diversity and local distinctiveness, café cultures, a mix of uses into the evening and night-time | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | economy to help create a busy atmosphere day and night. PPS 6 Planning for Town Centres promotes the importance of AAPs in the design and implementation of strategies to promote vitality and viability. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Each option received mostly support at Issues and Options consultation. Comments and some mixed responses referred to the way options are implemented and managed. Option 1 a) received by far the most support and a number of representations felt that option 2 would be a progression of option 1 with more businesses choosing to extend their operating hours. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Increased footfall may adversely effect the built environment. Increased visits may also increase traffic and have a negative impact on air quality and the environment. Increasing evening activity could potentially increase light pollution as well, this would affect residents and impact on resource consumption. However the options proposed will help to enhance the character of the streets by not only limiting traffic but by also making streets more attractive for retailers and shoppers. If retailers extend their opening hours into the 5-7pm period and encourage people to stay / visit the city centre after work it will stimulate business for cafes, restaurants and attractions. A potentially negative social impact could be noise disturbance to city centre residents, however benefits include increasing access to local services for everybody. |
| 6) Community benefits | The community would benefit from natural surveillance and potentially a reduction in crime and fear of crime, as there would be more people visible in the streets. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | A key evidence base for the AAP is the emerging city centre accessibility framework. This will review and assess all transport, walking and cycling issues and rehearse proposals including how they're managed. Integral to this is a review of the current operation of the footstreets area. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Positive effects of increased participation in the early evening economy are considered viable against the cost of implementation and management. The Footstreets Review forms part of the wider accessibility framework which will determine the viability of extending the area to include additional streets and hours of operation. |
| 9) Deliverability | Delivery of the preferred approach will be Council led. The AAP process will implement a full review leading to changes to the existing arrangements for the city centre footstreets area. Footstreets were first introduced in 1987 and CYC have been responsible for their operation since. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 10) Flexibility | The AAP will be monitored and reviewed over the life-time of the plan and this will include future footstreet operation. As the Council will be responsible for the implementation and management of any changes to the footstreets it will retain the authority and flexibility to respond to changing circumstances . Expansion of the footstreets area and hours will allow greater flexibility in terms of other initiatives and proposals developing through the AAP. |
| <p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of a public realm and movement strategy for the city centre. The Preferred Options stage will put forward principles on which the future strategy will be written.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review (TPU and Halcrow consultants) ▪ Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option ▪ Lessons learnt form People changing Places programme and Car Free Day 22nd September | |

KEY THEME 1: OFFICES IN THE CITY CENTRE: QUESTIONS 8, 9

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS1: Sustainable Development sets out the main principles for all development, of which one of its four main aims is the 'maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment' as well as providing a positive planning framework for sustainable economic growth to support efficient, competitive and innovative business, commercial and industrial sectors.

PPG4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms refers to the reuse of urban land given the increasing amount of under used or vacant industrial site and states that optimum use should be made of potential sites and existing premises in inner cities and other urban areas. The guidance also encourages developments which minimise the length and number of trips and can be served by energy efficient modes of transport, and discourages developments that would unacceptably add to levels of congestion.

PPS4 Sustainable Economic Development is a consultation draft of the document that will, when adopted, eventually replace PPG4. This document sets out the Government's current thinking on planning policy relating to economic development. The statement relates to economic development in a wider sense than does PPG4 (i.e. it does not predominantly relate to the industrial use classes). A positive stance is taken towards economic development with a stated desire for an increased emphasis on economic development than has perhaps been present in the planning system previously. The statement also includes a requirement for local planning policy, when developing allocations, to take market information, including prices, into account. The PPS4 consultation draft also states that regional and local planning authorities should develop flexible policies which are able to respond to economic change. It is also stated that planning authorities should avoid designating sites for single or restricted use classes wherever possible and avoid carrying forward existing allocations where this cannot be justified.

PPS6: Town Centres refers to the town centre uses which include retail, leisure, entertainment, offices and arts, culture and tourism and refers to a sequential approach to site selection for offices and other main town centre uses which includes: First, locations in appropriate existing centres, suitable sites or buildings for conversion which are, or are likely to become, available within the development plan period, taking into account an appropriate scale of development in relation to the role and function of the centre; Edge of the centre locations, with preference given to sites that are or will be well connected to the city centre; and then; and Out of the centre sites, with preference given to sites which are or will be well served by a choice of means of transport and which are close to the centre and have a high likelihood of forming links with

the centre.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The 2008 RSS Policy Y1 (York Sub-Area Policy) states that: Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes for the York sub area should:

B Economy:

1. Diversify and grow York as a key driver of the Leeds city region economy by encouraging the business and financial services sector, knowledge industries and science based industries, leisure and retail services and the evening economy, and further developing its tourism sector;
2. Spread the benefits of York's economic success to other parts to the sub area and ensure that all members of the community have access to employment opportunities;

F Regionally Significant Investment Priorities:

1. Develop the sub area economy with major new development and initiatives including Science City York, York Northwest, further developing and expanding York University; and
2. Manage flood risk in line with the Policy ENV1 along the Ouse at York.

Policy E3 Land and Premises for Economic Development states that plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should make use of appropriately located previously developed land and current allocations and should ensure availability of sufficient land and premises in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy.

Policy E5 Safeguarding Employment Land states that Local Development Frameworks should define criteria or areas where it is considered necessary to offer special protection to designated employment sites.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Community Strategy contains objectives for 'York – The Thriving City', including: To continue to enhance the economic well-being of the city by:

- Being at the forefront of innovation and change with a prosperous and thriving economy
- Supporting the progress and success of existing businesses and encouraging new enterprises that will sustain high employment rate
- Ensuring that all sections of the community are able to benefit from economic opportunities.

The Strategy recognises that an issue facing the City is a “Lack of quality employment sites and accommodation particularly within the city centre, whilst recognising the availability of significant brownfield land”.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options states that “in terms of the distribution of new employment sites, the Employment Land Review indicates that B1(a) Office uses would be appropriate within York City Centre, and surrounding urban areas including the York Central site, Hungate, Terry’s, Nestlé, Monks Cross, the front of York Business Park and the Layerthorpe Area.

The Preferred approach for B1(a) office development, is within York city centre; immediately adjacent areas such as the proposed new York Central office quarter; established employment areas in the urban area such as Monks Cross and York Business Park and the key redevelopment opportunities at Terry’s, Nestlé and the Layerthorpe area;

Policy CS9 - Future Growth of York’s Economic Sector - states that the authority, in accommodating the need for office development (B1a), will allocate sites within:

- York City Centre;
- the new York Central office quarter and redevelopment opportunity
- areas in the Layerthorpe area, Terry’s and Nestlé; and
- Monks Cross and York Business Park.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Employment Land Review

The York Employment Land Review (ELR) (stage 1, 2007) indicates that 50% of the 306,000 sq m of office floor space that was available in York in 2003, is located within the walled city. There is a variety of office accommodation in the city centre ranging from businesses occupying small premises to large purpose built office buildings. The ELR indicates that the office market in York currently supports demand for up to 15h of land (2006-21: 8.80 ha, 2006-26: 12.53 ha, and 2006-29: 15.10 ha). Demand for office space is forecast to continue. The ELR concludes that occupiers often choose out-of centre premises as a ‘second choice’ because of the level of availability of high quality city centre office accommodation.

The Employment Land Review (stage 2, 2009) has identified 19 sites throughout the city to meet the demand for B1a office accommodation. These sites have been ranked. The following sites are within or adjacent to the city centre:

- 2 Hudson House and Old Station Buildings, Station Rise/Toft Green (1.82ha)
- 3 1-9 St Leonard's Place & 2-4 Museum Street (0.3ha)
- 4 Coppergate 2 (Castle Piccadilly) (2.3ha)
- 5 Hungate, Peasholme Green (4.1ha)
- 7 James Street/Foss Islands Road (35.39ha)
- 8 British Gas Site, 24 Heworth Green (3.5ha)

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 6. Range of quality offices that meet market demand | */I | I/? | O | O/I | I/? | O/I | O/I | ? | I/? | ? | ? | ? | ? |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|---|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6. Range of quality offices that meet market demand | O | I/? | I/? | O | O | O | ** | ? | ** | ?/- |

OFFICES IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- 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.
- 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.

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| EXISTING OFFICE SPACE IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| General Comments on this Issue: None. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 8: What should be the policy approach of the AAP for existing office space in the city centre? OPTION 1: Develop a policy approach consistent with the existing Draft Local Plan approach described above - a presumption in favour of retaining office buildings in employment use except in exceptional circumstances. | | | | | |
| Response: | 10 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 14 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in use of existing buildings due to job losses. • Restricting use of current office buildings to office use would restrict the availability of sites for retail. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 8: What should be the policy approach of the AAP for existing office space in the city centre? OPTION 2: Develop a policy to designate an “office quarter” centred around the Toft Green / Rougier Street / Blossom Street area to promote the area as a focus for business activity well connected with the railway station and to restrict change of use. | | | | | |
| Response: | 10 Supported | 5 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 4 Comment | 19 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • New build may be along The Crescent through to Station. Here, for once, a higher build may emphasise the characteristics of railway sheds. • 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. • Valid if part of Northwest Area comes within easy reach on foot of railway station and any transport interchange. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 8: What should be the policy approach of the AAP for existing office space in the city centre? OPTION 3: Develop a policy to designate other area(s) as an “office quarter”. Please state which area. | | | | | |
| Response: | 2 Supported | 10 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 6 Comment | 18 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly object to 'zoning' in City Centre, which is now an outdated practice. • Opposed to development of 'Quarters'. York is a very small city and as such benefits from a well-mixed use of space. | | | | | |

- Designating areas to be office quarters does not serve any useful purpose.
- 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.
- 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.
- Sections of City are 'dead' at night when offices are closed.
- Much depends on gateway routes into York Northwest from Blossom and Queen Streets.
- 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.
- Piccadilly area has potential to provide good quality office space, offering choice and a mix of redevelopment options as part of Castle Piccadilly proposals.
- 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.
- Hungate area not designated for housing.

QUESTION 8: What should be the policy approach of the AAP for existing office space in the city centre?

OPTION 4: Develop a policy to allow the change of use of certain office buildings where they are considered to be ill-suited to modern business needs, subject to criteria, and seek to maximise the benefit from redevelopment opportunities as and when they arise.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 16 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 4 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Will happen in any case without any intervention.
- 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.
- Limited marketability of certain premises needs to be seriously considered.
- 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.
- 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.

| | |
|--|--|
| PREFERRED OPTIONS | |
| It is considered that options 1 and 4 should be advanced to the preferred options stage for the reasons set out below: | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
| Consistent | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | The emerging objectives for a Thriving city centre require a strong commercial presence in the city centre. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Thriving City objectives identify a lack of quality office space in the city centre as an issue which supports the need to retain existing offices and allow modernisation where required. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | There is a clear policy requirement to retain office use within the city centre. The city centre is the most sustainable location for this use. The presence of offices within the area has wider economic benefits. PPS6, PPG4 and RSS policy requires city centres to be the focus for B1a use. This is emphasised in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | Options 1 and 4 were supported. Consultees supported retaining office use in the city centre, but did not support the designation of office quarters. Consultees were generally supportive of retaining the offices in the Toft Green area, but designation of a quarter was seen as unnecessary, particularly in light of option 1. The option of quarters was not supported as they could potentially be 'dead' areas at night and not in keeping with the mixed-use character of the city centre. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | The City centre is the preferred location due to ready access to public transport. Designating quarters could potentially have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area. The provision of office space within the city centre is paramount to the success of the economy of York. |
| 6) Community benefits | There are clear economic benefits for the city in retaining a strong commercial sector within the city centre. There are also benefits from the reduced need to travel by car in focusing office use in the centre of the city. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Employment Land Review shows a need for B1a use in the city and proposes a number of sites within the city centre that can contribute to meeting the demand. |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | The supply and demand for office accommodation will need to be kept under review throughout the life of the Core Strategy and AAPs. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| 9) Deliverability | Policy approach deliverable through development control. | | | | |
| 10) Flexibility | A criteria-based policy approach will provide a robust framework to ensure the city centre remains the focus for B1a use in the city, whilst allowing flexibility in terms of refurbishment and change of use where it can be shown that offices are not needed or no longer suitable or where an argument could be made for a beneficial alternative use. A balanced approach is required to ensure York's historic buildings will have an economic future. The policy needs to be flexible to allow for circumstances where reuse/redevelopment of an office is not viable for office use. | | | | |
| NEXT STEPS | | | | | |
| Draft the preferred option based on options 1 and 4. The Toft green area should be allocated for office use in line with the findings of the revised Employment Land Review with regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and policy choices through the Core Strategy process for sites with potential alternative uses, to reflect the redevelopment potential in the area and the importance of the site to office supply in the city. Policy to be developed using Local Plan and ELR as a basis and incorporating the flexibility described in option 4. | | | | | |
| NEW OFFICE DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITY CENTRE – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| General Comments on this Issue: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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. • Use existing but redundant office space and provide much cheaper public transport to it.. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 9: How should the AAP identify opportunities for new office development? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: Identify opportunities for large floorplate new office development in the city centre. | | | | | |
| Response: | 6 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 7 Comment | 14 Total Responses |

Key points made:

- Piccadilly should be targeted.
- Should be on edge of City Centre.
- Office development to be kept away from historic core of City.
- Ryedale House is an eyesore and should be pulled down.
- 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.
- Opportunities should be sought in Hungate area.
- 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.

QUESTION 9: How should the AAP identify opportunities for new office development?**OPTION 2: Concentrate new office development within an identified office quarter centred on Toft Green.**

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 14 Supported | 5 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 7 Comment | 26 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Less attractive to businesses/developers as saturation is reached with time.
- Not a great deal of scope for office development in Toft Green area.
- Development should not adversely affect important historic buildings in area.
- 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.
- Concentration of new office development on Toft Green has limited potential as it is within the Bar Walls.
- Should not be concentrated in one area. New retail and other mixed-use buildings should be part of any new developments.
- 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.
- Could also include York Northwest near station. All developments to be in easy reach of park and ride/sustainable transport hub.
- 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.
- Larger proposals may be accommodated in edge of centre locations with good accessibility to City Centre.

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| QUESTION 9: How should the AAP identify opportunities for new office development? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Identify opportunities for new small to medium size office development in the city centre. | | | | | |
| Response: | 10 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 5 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assume by redevelopment of existing office property. Piccadilly from its bridge through Ryedale House would make a fine site for new Council HQ. • York Central, close to station, should be targeted. • 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. • Especially utilising space above shops. • 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. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – NEW OFFICE DEVELOPMENT IN THE CITY CENTRE | | | | | |
| It is considered that option 3 should be advanced to the preferred options stage for the reasons set out below: | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | | | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | <p>The emerging objectives for a Thriving city centre require a strong commercial presence in the city centre. Large offices are potentially out of character with the city centre and with the creation of a new CDB at York Central, alongside other sites identified in the ELR, there is sufficient land to deliver the space required for B1 use over the timeframe of the LDF. Existing large offices would be protected as above (question 8).</p> <p>There is potential to redevelop the Toft Green area to provide additional office accommodation, subject to design and conservation issues, and sites here will be allocated as above.</p> <p>The option for small to medium size offices was supported as this would be more in keeping with the character of the city centre. The city centre is the preferred location for office use in terms of national and regional planning policy. Therefore opportunities to provide new space</p> | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| | within the city centre should be encourage. There is potential for new accommodation within the Layerthorpe, Castle Piccadilly and Hungate areas. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Thriving City objectives identify a lack of quality office space in the city centre as an issue which supports the need to provide more offices. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | PPS6, PPG4 and RSS policy requires city centres to be the focus for B1a use. This is emphasised in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Consultees supported retaining office use in the city centre, but did not support the designation of office quarters. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | The City centre is the preferred location due to ready access to public transport. Designating quarters could potentially have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area. The provision of office space within the city centre is paramount to the success of the economy of York. |
| 6) Community benefits | There are clear economic benefits for the city in retaining a strong commercial sector within the city centre. There are also benefits from the reduced need to travel by car in focusing office use in the centre of the city. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Employment Land Review shows a need for B1a use in the city and proposes a number of sites within the city centre that can contribute to meeting the demand. |
| Effective 8) Viability | The supply and demand for office accommodation will need to be kept under review throughout the life of the Core Strategy and AAPs. |
| 9) Deliverability | Policy approach deliverable through development control. |
| 10) Flexibility | The policy approach and allocations will provide a robust framework to ensure the city centre remains the focus for B1a use in the city. Through incorporating office use as a component within a mix of uses on larger developments, there is flexibility in terms of the type, location and size of accommodation. |
| NEXT STEPS Draft the preferred option based on option 3, to encourage the development of office space throughout the city centre. Include office space within the allocations of sites at Layerthorpe, Hungate and Castle Piccadilly. Through the allocation of land at Toft Green and 1-9 St Leonard's Place & 2-4 Museum Street, make reference to the potential to provide additional accommodation, informed by the Employment Land Review, with regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and policy choices through the Core Strategy process for sites with potential alternative uses. | |

KEY THEME 1: SUPPORTING THE UNIVERSITIES IN THE CITY CENTRE

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) emphasises the need for Local Authorities, in planning for development, to address accessibility (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community to jobs, education, and community facilities. It advises that improved access for everyone should be available to such facilities by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS states the intention to develop a knowledge driven economy by supporting the potential of higher and further education institutes, research institutes, hospitals and other knowledge based industries.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Community Strategy specifically recognises the physical impact of the expansion of the University and its benefits for the city and seeks to ensure continuity of learning opportunities that are central to increasing economic activity and cultural life as well as to 'continue to develop progression routes to and through higher education for young people and mature learners' as well as to increase the number of graduates linked to local job opportunities'. It has strategic aims to have a leading edge, modern knowledge and science based economy to ensure that the University of York maintains its top position and recognises the Universities' roles as major local and regional economic generators helping to increase economic activity and contributing towards cultural life. These are expressed in the partnership themes of The Thriving City, The Learning City and The Cultural City.

LDF Core Strategy:

The City of York Core Strategy Preferred Options (April 2009) recognises York's role as a key driver in the regional economy and notes the need to facilitate the continued success of higher and further education institutions in the city including extensions of campuses.

The current Draft Local Plan (Approved April 2005) notes the expansion of the University of York is expected to result in an additional 5,500 students totally around 14,500 with 2,500 staff making it one of the City's largest employers and generating millions in research income and encourages the continued presence within the City Centre.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

- York – A City Making History, Vision and Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2025 vision states ‘being a world class centre for education and learning for all’ as a key aim. Local strategies acknowledge that the universities are important economic and cultural institutions which attract a significant number of students and staff who bring economic, social and cultural benefits to the city centre including voluntary work with local communities.
- There is an expressed need from the Universities (supported by the responses sent to the individual Universities) and the Economic Development Department (CYC) through the Economic Development Strategy - who work with the universities, for the Area Action Plan to support measures to retain students within York to acknowledge and maximise the benefits and skills given to the city centre by their presence. University statistics show that less than half of the students responding to University questionnaires were retained in York and of those, many had taken jobs that did not require degrees indicating their desire to remain within York. The need to promote the benefits of having students and staff in the city centre was emphasised by the responses to questionnaires received from both Universities as part of a targeted consultation in 2008.
- Science City York Strategy and University of York Strategic Plan.
- At the University of York in July 2007, data was captured six months after graduation. Of the 6318 respondents, 1003 used a York postcode. 340 were classified as being in non-graduate level work, 600 were in graduate level work (including all health care professionals working in the area) and 63 were in further study.
A number of factors that might have an impact on this figure include:
 1. 2749 did not give any postcode
 2. A number of the respondents are health care or nursing graduates, who tend to be recruited from the York area pre University enrollment.
 3. This is a snapshot - graduates tend to be highly mobile immediately after graduation, so many may have left York soon after this data was gathered, while others may have returned after a stint at the family home.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----------|---------|----------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 5. Attractive to students / academics & maximise benefits from universities | ? | * | O/* | ? | ? | ?/* | ? | * | O | O | O | ?/* * | -/ O | ?/* * | O | ? | O | * | ? | ? | ** | * |

SUPPORTING THE UNIVERSITIES – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

General Comments:

- Some respondents stated that a dedicated space may not be a good idea as it may not be in use most of the year, and that Universities should provide accommodation for the majority of students along with additional public transport for the extra numbers of students expected.
- St Leonard’s Place was suggested for studios, teaching facilities and venues.
- Two respondents felt that supporting universities was worthwhile but should not be a priority for council action.
- Gillygate is a major pedestrian route for students and suffers from air pollution.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 10: What approach should the AAP take to support the continued growth and success of the universities within the city centre?

OPTION 1: Review physical linkages between York St John’s Campus and the City Centre.

Response: 9 Supported 2 Not Supported 2 Mixed 2 Comment 15 Total Responses

Key points made:

Routes are restricted by the bar walls, better signposting needed and clearer signage (including buses going to universities).
 Cycle contra flow lane along St Maurice’s Road then Foss Islands Road is worthy of consideration.
 The Universities stated that many students have their own cars and therefore green routes from the Universities into the city centre

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| are important to encourage more sustainable modes of transport and reduce carbon emissions. | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Investigate ways to work with the universities to encourage students to come to, and remain within, York. | | | | | |
| Response: | 13 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
| <p>Key points made: Supporters felt it was important to bond international students to the locality. Suggestions for areas that students could use included Hungate Square, St Leonard's, Stonebow or behind the Art Gallery Some felt that the Universities themselves should provide for the needs of the students and this was not a council priority.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTION – SUPPORTING UNIVERSITIES Option 1 to be pursued as part of the accessibility masterplan. Option 2 to be explored further particularly in relation to the Employment and Education strategies</p> | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>Options 1 and 2 comply with, and will help to deliver, the Core Strategy objectives and the AAP vision. It complies with the Corporate Strategy which aims to retain and support York University and offers the expansion and diversification of learning opportunities.</p> | | | | |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>York – The Thriving City, has a strategic aims stating that the University of York maintains its top global position as a key local and regional economic generator' and increasing the 'scale and impact of all further and higher education institutions in the city'. It further states that need to ensure 'those who live and work in York have the education and skill that will enable them to play an active part in society and contribute to the life of the city'. York is seen as a 'nationally and internationally recognised centre of excellence for education and learning with a commitment to lifelong learning and a culture of enterprise, innovation and creativity that is second to none'. These are realised through objectives 5 and 11. The Community Strategy specifically recognises the physical impact of the expansion of the Universities and its benefits for the city and aims to continue to develop progression routes to and through higher education for young people and mature learners and to increase the number of graduates linked to local job opportunities. Partnership working between universities and business will</p> | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>nurture creative career opportunities in the arts, promote the city's cultural offer and help drive innovation between cultural, scientific and economic sectors. This is recognised through York – A City of Culture (objective 5).</p> <p>Both options are consistent with the Local Area Agreement which notes the need to increase people's knowledge and skills to improve their future employment prospects and provide a skilled pool of employees locally .</p> |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | Both options are consistent with national and regional policy objectives to develop a knowledge driven economy by supporting the potential of higher and further education institutes, research institutes, hospitals and other knowledge base industries and innovation centres. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | <p>Both options received support during public consultation and more fully supports the universities' own aspirations to retain graduates wherever possible as well as promote the benefits that the universities bring to York city centre and provide the students with the opportunities to showcase their talents and work within the city.</p> <p>Option 1: (review physical linkages between York St John's Campus and the city centre) did receive support and this option will be taken forward through the emerging accessibility masterplan. The CCAAP team are currently working closely with the transport and highways team and it is considered that the concerns expressed by the Universities regarding linkages would need to be addressed in the emerging accessibility masterplan who are currently assessing accessibility and improvements at Gillygate. This would certainly help York St John students who use Gillygate as a main thoroughfare into York.</p> <p>Option 2 would promote and expand creative talents links helping to retain and improve social bonds between students and the local community and promote the contribution that the students, and staff make to the voluntary and business sector within York city centre. This option is to be explored further with the Economic Development Unit, Education Department and others.</p> |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | <p><u>Key Positive Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Improving pedestrian and cycle (green) routes fro students could help reduce their need to travel by car. • Option 2: The presence of students has a beneficial effect on the city economy and retail sector and retaining students would help to provide a local skilled workforce and promote students' |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p>skills as well as a attracting inward investment for the city.</p> <p><u>Key Constraints and Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, both options were identified as having either a positive or no significant effect. As with the other options, the impacts and effects of some objectives would be dependent on implementation. • Both options assessed had an element of uncertainty for some objectives due to lack of implementation or other details. • One possible negative impact for Option 2 was identified for S4 stating ‘students take up lets which is good for landlords but it can help to keep house prices higher than they would be otherwise. Student lets can become run down and cause adverse impacts for the area’. However, the CCAAP is not suggesting student accommodation as part of its policy as this will be dealt with in the Core Strategy and the current ‘normalisation’ of house prices should go some way to help students get into the housing market. <p><u>Key Opportunities and Enhancements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 particularly, could help to meet SA economic objectives by helping to provide good educational opportunities for all to help sustain a stable economy and investment with employment opportunities being met locally. |
| 6) Community benefits | <p>Support for a knowledge based sector will help to deliver the wider strategic objectives for a healthy economy and social benefits as outlined in national guidance. It would be more beneficial long term for the city to investigate the best ways to support the universities as it will ultimately help the economy by encouraging students to retain within York, and help to provide a creative and skilled workforce for the future economy. Students and staff add to the vibrancy of the city centre as well as make use of, and contribute to, the city centre economy, services and facilities.</p> |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>The Council’s Corporate Strategy, Local Area Agreement and Children and Young People’s Plan notes the need to increase people’s knowledge and skills to improve future employment prospects with some employers highlighting major skills shortages. The Lifelong Learning and Culture Service Plan: 2008/09 has objectives to engage more people by providing opportunities for everyone to access creative learning opportunities and notes the need for significant improvement in the skills base of the workforce. Both universities are expanding and the contribution and needs of increased staff and students, will increase as their city centre presence increases and as numbers are set to increase</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>significantly this will put added pressure on accessibility issues. Additionally, the government has announced a package of measures to prevent town centres becoming ghost towns with empty shop fronts. The provisions include planning application waivers, standard interim-use leases, and temporarily leasing shops to councils will allow empty shops to get makeovers for use as cultural, community or learning services. New legislation will allow local planning authorities to implement ideas for reviving town centres and enable communities the opportunity to temporarily transform vacant premises into something innovative for the community – a social enterprise, a showroom for local artists or an information centre – and stop the high street shops being boarded up. The Council’s own Economic Development Unit work with the Universities and evidence shows that graduates do stay within York but many stay in low paid jobs. It is not a given that graduations find graduate status jobs immediately in the current employment market, especially in York, but many opt for the way of life to stay in York or use it as a stepping stone to a more highly paid job. There are still very high expectations for many students, but research shows that the job market currently often requires students to work below their expectations to find a way into the job arena as highly paid jobs for all graduates is not a possibility. The issue with York is therefore not retaining graduates but trying to get a wider range of graduate (and non-graduate) jobs - as much employment currently tends to be centred around service jobs and knowledge based/science work.</p> |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | Both Options are considered to be viable as the Universities have expressed a desire to continue working with the Council to investigate further ways to ensure easy access to the city centre, which will have a significant and longer term positive impact. |
| 9) Deliverability | Both options have no known barriers to delivery as the Universities have expressed the desire to continue to work with the Council. A positive, partnership approach will help promote the benefits that universities bring to the city centre working and identify ways to support their needs. |
| 10) Flexibility | Option 1 will be considered in the Accessibility Framework and has some flexibility. Option 2 will have sufficient flexibility for changing circumstances working in partnership with the universities to ensure students’ needs are considered and this can be reviewed over time if necessary. |
| NEXT STEPS | |
| <p>The Universities stated they were generally happy with their location and students were happy with the city centre but there were further suggestions that were made that could support the universities. Whilst the accessibility issues will be taken further in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, the AAP will continue to support the needs of students to help to maximise the benefits of having students and staff within the city centre.</p> | |
| Option 1 | |

Accessibility to both Universities to be considered in the Accessibility Framework to ensure that York St John's University is easily accessed from the city by non-vehicular routes and that green routes to and from the University are present, signposted and maintained. Other ideas to be pursued include tourist information and bus tours for students, investigate free or discounted access to museums during freshers week.

Option 2

Investigate particular student needs for both universities and assess whether and how the Council can support these e.g. can Council support workshops/accommodation for projects short term (over shops)? Identification of the type and location of facilities that would support the Universities and the students' needs e.g. identification of dedicated performance space (part of the city spaces audit, investigate whether the Hungate square could be used for performances, use of prefabs behind the art gallery or St Leonard's Place as studios or venues for smaller performances.

CYC will continue working with Universities to promote students as positive community influencers stating their contribution towards voluntary work, to businesses, and promotion of York St John's as part of a cultural hub in the city centre.

KEY THEME 1: ACCESSING THE CITY CENTRE: QUESTIONS 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPG13 “Transport” highlights that planning can help contribute to sustainable development through reducing the need to travel, reducing the length of journeys and through making it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling. Two Government White Papers on Integrated Transport (1998) and the Future of Transport (2004) aim to encourage people to reduce car usage in favour of more environmentally friendly modes through measures such as better land-use planning and greater parking restrictions as well as better investment in public transport.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

One of the primary objectives of the RSS is to integrate transport and land use planning. In particular it recognises the need to support regeneration and economic growth in the main urban areas, to support sustainable development, to reduce the need to travel especially by car, to reduce the impact of traffic and travel on the environment and to improve access to opportunities in a manner that is equitable and socially inclusive. RSS Policy Y1 seeks to:

1. Develop the role of York as a key node for public transport services for the sub area
2. Implement stronger demand management in York and in relation to the strategic highway network
3. Improve accessibility to and within York, particularly by improved facilities for walking and cycling, increased capacity and quality of public transport, and new park and ride facilities
4. Improve public transport links between Local Service Centres and other rural communities and York and the sub area’s Principal Towns
5. Improve access between York and Scarborough / the east coast.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

To emphasise the need to reduce the excessive environmental impacts of motorised transport by encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport and giving priority in roadspace allocation to these modes.

To build on York’s established role as a strategic transport hub by developing sustainable means of travelling to, from and within York that meets the needs of residents, visitors and the economy:

- To ensure that the networks of highways, cycle ways, footpaths and public transport services are appropriate for the needs of

the city and that the necessary priority is given to more sustainable modes.

- To reduce, by progressive planning, the distances people need to travel for all purposes and to promote walking and cycling.
- To create an integrated network of public transport that is of the highest quality, priced in the public interest and given priority in use of road space to achieve maximum operational reliability.
- To substantially reduce the volume, speed, noise, pollution and visible intrusion of motor traffic.

LDF Core Strategy:

Policy CS12: Local Transport Considerations – states that: "The Local Development Framework will support accessibility, help reduce congestion through promoting a shift to more sustainable forms of transport, reduce the need to travel and promote the delivery of a high quality sustainable transport network. This will be achieved through ensuring the sustainable location of development and aiding the delivery of the transport schemes and programmes":

Scheme and programmes relevant to the city centre include:

Public Transport - the development of a bus interchange facility in the City Centre through the creation of a transport interchange as part of the longer term development of land near the railway station as part of the York Northwest Area Action Plan (2011-2021); and to facilitate additional coach Rendezvous Points in the Piccadilly and Lord Mayor's Walk areas, by safeguarding land through the Allocations DPD.

Parking - Parking control by both car parking standards and price will continue to be used in York where city centre charges are used to encourage long-stay car parking at Park & Ride sites. This approach will help manage demand and car trip generation and support priority to non car modes. The number of car parking spaces available in the city centre will remain broadly as they are now in order to protect the viability of the retail economy. Details of car parking will be explained in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD); and the city currently has no plans to introduce congestion charging.

Cycling and Walking - Expansion of (safer) cycling and walking routes throughout the city by supporting the delivery of 'Cycling City' Strategy Projects. These include the provision of additional 'on' and 'off' road cycle paths, the expansion of secure cycle parking including the Lendal sub-station in the city centre (2011) and a new pedestrian / cycle bridge at Scarborough Bridge (2011-2021); and Further expansion of Footstreets Zone including Goodramgate and Fossgate (the forthcoming City Centre Area Action Plan will provide more detail on the development of Footstreets).

Freight - Identify locations for a possible freight centre on the outskirts of York.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Local Transport Plan 2 (2006-2011).

Sets-out the desired transport measures for the short term up to 2011 and the principles for a longer term transport vision to 2021. It seeks to build upon the aims and achievements of the first Local Transport Plan covering the period 2001-2006, but in the context of the shared priorities (with government) of tackling congestion and improving air quality, accessibility and road safety, taking into account the changing context of the City's Community Strategy as well as land use plans and economic development priorities. It is of note that local residents and stakeholders identified congestion as their main area of concern through the LTP2 consultation exercise with 34% of local people and 54% of businesses believing "reducing congestion" to be the most important transport facing the City.

Local Transport Plan 3 (2011-)

The first stage in the production of LTP3 is a questionnaire 'Towards a new Transport Plan for York' that will be distributed in December. The results of this consultation will feed into the production of the City Centre Accessibility Framework. Feedback will be available in February 2010 and options to inform LTP3 available in April 2010. In addition, feedback from consultation undertaken on high-level access options developed by the Traffic Congestion Ad-hoc Scrutiny Committee will be co-ordinated within LTP3.

City of York Cycling City Strategy, 2008

This is a Strategy that aims to increase levels of cycling significantly by the end of the project. This is also the headline aim of the current Cycling Strategy, adopted as part of the Council's second Local Transport Plan (LTP2). Increased resource levels will ensure that new and innovative initiatives can be launched to tackle specific obstacles and targeted groups. The Strategy includes actions to improve cycle routes and facilities for cyclists (including parking) some of which are within the city centre.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 8. Readily accessible by public transport, foot and bicycles to reduce congestion. | I | ** | O | ** | ** | I/* | * | O | * | * | ? | * | ** |
| Objectives | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | | | |
| | ** | ** | * | I | O | ** | ** | ** | O | ** | | | |

ACCESSING THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- 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.
- Transport and traffic congestion must be planned properly.
- 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.
- 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.

- Would like to be consulted about any new park and ride sites being proposed.
- Welcome 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Charge a flat rate of £1 for all buses, anywhere within the city limits.
- 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.

CONGESTED ROAD NETWORK - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

None.

QUESTION 11: What methods could be supported by the AAP to help reduce traffic congestion in the city centre?

OPTION 1: Close or restrict access to certain streets and / or bridges within the city centre subject to a comprehensive assessment of traffic impacts and forecasts of future demand.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Response: | 17 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 18 Comment | 40 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- Encourage no car use inside ring road during peak daytimes.
- More streets should be restricted access, more one-way systems.
- Need a new 'Middle Ring Road'.
- Footstreets could be extended both in time and number.
- More footstreets can make City Centre more appealing and reduce pollution.
- To cars, not to cyclists, buses or motorised wheelchairs.
- Freeing up roads gives space for wider pavements e.g. Piccadilly.
- 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.
- Need to make York more accessible and not put visitors off who wish to visit by car.
- No need to close bridges. More pedestrian areas and cycle tracks.
- Won't work because it would block the A64. Need to look at widening roads and better parking systems.
- Not possible to close bridges as either part of Inner Ring Road or important bus routes.
- Moves to discourage cars useful provided alternative transport available.
- 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.
- Also support a 20mph zone in City Centre. Could improve environment for walking and cycling.
- Road pricing should be given consideration.
- For these to work public transport would have to be dramatically improved and the price differential would have to be in its favour.

QUESTION 11: What methods could be supported by the AAP to help reduce traffic congestion in the city centre?

OPTION 2: Limit or actively seek to reduce the level of car parking provision in the city centre.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 10 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 4 Mixed | 4 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |

- Advantage in closing Castle Car Park to enable its early redevelopment, especially for enhanced public realm.
- Essential for operation of station and NRM that adequate car parking is provided for station users and visitors to NRM.
- For these to work public transport would have to be dramatically improved and the price differential would have to be in its favour.
- Would have deleterious effect on evening activities of local people, and many evening tourists.
- 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.
- 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?
- City Centre car parks should charge more to encourage people not to use them.
- 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.
- 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.
- Concern about any proposal to reduce short stay car parking as would impact on retail.
- 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.

QUESTION 11: What methods could be supported by the AAP to help reduce traffic congestion in the city centre?
OPTION 3: Support a requirement for new residential and commercial development in the city centre which do not incorporate parking.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 11 Supported | 5 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | 19 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Consider underground or ground level parking for new development.
- 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.
- 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.

- No. 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.
- Underground parking may conflict with archaeology, but more ground floor and podium parking could be physically accommodated.
- The AAP should include a statement about Travel Plans and Transport Assessments which will help to determine what transport improvements are necessary.
-

PREFERRED OPTIONS – CONGESTED ROAD NETWORK

Option 1 should be advanced to the preferred options stage.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

In order to achieve objectives for a thriving, vibrant and sustainable city centre it is necessary to better integrate the areas of change and to address severance caused by a congested road network. The best approach to this is a co-ordinated accessibility strategy that will address access needs and pressures, new developments in the city centre and the sustainability agenda.

Option 1 – this issue is being considered in detail through work on a City Centre Accessibility Framework, being lead by the Transport Planning Unit. Initial work has been undertaken, but with no modelling work as yet. Work to date has identified two strategic access corridors through the city centre that provide good accessibility to the area by bus but also, in some places, create a barrier to pedestrian flow. The use of these streets is therefore under review in terms of how they might change to meet the strategic objectives of the AAP to better integrate the areas around the core of the city centre. This review will examine direction of travel, restrictions to access, junction improvements, opportunities for cycle routes etc. The Framework will also review, at a high level, trends in accessibility requirements/travel patterns and how these might change over the next 20 years and how the AAP might address those needs.

Options 2 and 3 – Core Strategy Preferred Options policy has stated that “The number of car parking spaces available in the city centre will remain broadly as they are now in order to protect the viability of the retail economy. Details of car parking will be explained in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)”.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Sustainable Community Strategy contains a number of objectives under the theme 'York – The Sustainable City' that the AAP can deliver, including giving priority to more sustainable modes of travel, integrating the public transport network and reducing the volume of traffic. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | The Accessibility Framework, through the AAP, will assist to deliver the aims of PPS1, PPG13 and RSS Policy Y1. These documents require improvements to accessibility for walking and cycling and improvements in accessibility to jobs, shopping and leisure facilities by public transport. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | There was clear support through the consultation to review existing access arrangement to promote better access for public transport and to reduce congestion in the city centre. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | This option had predominantly positive or very positive effects on SA objectives. |
| 6) Community benefits | An (enlarged) city centre that is easier to move around on foot and cycle has clear benefits in terms of the ambience of the city centre, the protection of the historic environment and a reduced carbon footprint. It will be important to ensure that access is maintained for the less mobile through careful planning of access restrictions on the road network and the management of the footstreets area. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Accessibility Framework and LTP3 will provide the evidence for the AAP. |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | Changes to access arrangements within the city centre will have implications in terms of funding improvements to the road network in terms of public transport, general traffic, cycling and walking. Funding issues will be reviewed when preferred options for access have been determined. |
| 9) Deliverability | The highway network is within the control of the Council. Any options will need to be taken forward in partnership with public transport operators. |
| 10) Flexibility | The Accessibility Framework can develop and test a range of options, from minor interventions to significant changes to the nature of access to the city centre. A phased approach can also be developed. |

NEXT STEPS

Develop preferred options to address the city centre's congested road network through further work on the Accessibility Framework.

PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ROUTES INTO THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:**General Comments on this Issue:**

None.

QUESTION 12: What improvements are needed to pedestrian and cycle routes into and through the city centre?

OPTION 1: Develop policy in the AAP to require development proposals to include all feasible opportunities to provide new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes, linking key locations and following 'desire lines'.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Response: | 20 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 26 Comment | 49 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- To enable non-car dependent movement to be properly encouraged AAP must give priority to pedestrian and cycling linkages.
- Should be a consistent and connecting network of cycle lanes
- Need more parking for bikes.
- A policy lead approach is important to ensure that new developments take into account need to make provision for sustainable modes of transport.
- Should liaise with Cycling Bid to ensure cycling facilities are harmonised and prioritised.
- Travel plans are an effective way to achieve this.
- City Centre riverside route would be expensive and impractical.
- Cycles should have a speed limit and be required to consider pedestrians.
- Concern that cycling is dangerous within pedestrian areas and cyclists should be kept out of the City Centre.
- Opposed to provision of excessive signage and road/pavement markings to differentiate these uses as visually intrusive.
- Examine options for delineation of cycle routes, plus surface and edging treatments to minimise risk to pedestrians especially those with mobility restrictions.
- Encourage employers to create on-site employee parking, to reduce on-street demand.
- Introduce a 10 second advance for cycles at all traffic lights
- Introduce two-way cycling on all one-way streets.

Various new/improved pedestrian/cycle routes were proposed:

- Footstreets should be accessible to cycles.
- new river bridges
- Acomb - Millennium Bridge
- University route to City Centre via Hamilton Drive
- east side of ECML from Holgate Bridge to Station
- bridge between Navigation Road and Hungate
- bridge over Foss especially between Huntington Road and Heworth Green/ Dodsworth Avenue
- next to Scarborough bridge with direct access into railway station
- link along back of hospital to join Sustrans route 66
- direct route into station from south, from Cambridge Street
- Blake Street, Davygate, Parliament and Piccadilly as two way daytime cycle routes
- 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.
- 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.
- Make Gillygate one-way to vehicular traffic, maintaining two way cycle access at all times
- Introduce a one lane, alternate traffic light system on Lendal Bridge for vehicles, while maintaining two ways cycle access; Cyclists' needs should be considered as part of the design of all signalised junctions.

QUESTION 12: What improvements are needed to pedestrian and cycle routes into and through the city centre?

OPTION 2: Identify a North-South cycle route as part of the strategic cycle network.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 17 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 5 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- A North-South cycle route is an excellent aspiration
- 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.
- Provide cycle parking where areas are pedestrianised, and next to key green spaces.
- Inner Ring Road needs to be tamed in places.
- Hungate development may go some way towards this, linking Walmgate with Aldwark.

- 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.
- Desirable access North Street to Coney Street.
- Time restrictions on Goodramgate should be avoided.
- 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.
- 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.

QUESTION 12: What improvements are needed to pedestrian and cycle routes into and through the city centre?

OPTION 3: Reallocate sections of the inner ring road, giving priority to cycles.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 13 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 6 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- 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.
- Option appears unfeasible unless vehicular traffic volume can be limited to allow priority to cycles.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ROUTES INTO THE CITY CENTRE

An option based on option 1 should be advanced to the preferred options stage.

| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
|--|---|
| Consistent | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | In order to achieve objectives for a thriving, vibrant and sustainable city centre it is necessary to better integrate the areas of change and to improve the walking/cycling network into and around the city centre. The best approach to this is a co-ordinated accessibility strategy that will address access needs and pressures, new developments in the city centre and the sustainability agenda. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Sustainable Community Strategy contains a number of objectives under the theme 'York – The Sustainable City' that the AAP can deliver, including giving priority to more sustainable modes of travel, integrating the public transport network and reducing the volume of traffic. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | The Accessibility Framework, through the AAP, will assist to deliver the aims of PPS1, PPG13 and RSS Policy Y1. These documents require improvements to accessibility for walking and cycling and improvements in accessibility to jobs, shopping and leisure facilities by public transport. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | There was clear support through the consultation to improve access for pedestrians and cyclists. With regard to cycling, much of the responses to the Issues and Options consultation focussed on issues that will be addressed through the Cycling City programme (including an orbital cycle route, similar to option 2, and improvements on radial routes) and subsequently through LTP3. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | This option had predominantly positive or very positive effects on SA objectives. |
| 6) Community benefits | An (enlarged) city centre that is easier to move around on foot and cycle has clear benefits in terms of the ambience of the city centre, the protection of the historic environment and a reduced carbon footprint. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Accessibility Framework and LTP3 will provide the evidence for the AAP. |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | Improvements to the walking/cycling network will require funding. Some projects will be progressed through the Cycling City programme and have funding. The viability of a number of options will be dependant on the funding available to implement the Public Realm and Movement Strategy. Funding issues will be reviewed when preferred options for access have been determined. Major interventions such a new foot/cycle bridges will have significant cost implications. |
| 9) Deliverability | The highway network is within the control of the Council. |
| 10) Flexibility | The Accessibility Framework can develop and test a range of options. |
| NEXT STEPS | |
| An analysis of the pedestrian movement network is need to identify desire lines, severances, barriers and pinch points. This is a potential project for the Renaissance team. Options will be developed through the Accessibility Framework and Placecheck for a | |

number of spaces and junctions where improvements could be made.

BUSES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- 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?
- Issue could be explored. Strong preference for small vehicles and electric powered.
- 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.
- Companies operating bus tours around City should be required/encouraged to reduce emissions/use less polluting types of engine.

QUESTION 13: What could be done in the city centre to improve bus accessibility?

OPTION 1: Improve the location of bus stops and bus routes to maximise the accessibility and attractiveness of public transport in the city centre.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 3 Comment | 18 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Location of bus stops and routes should be under constant review.
- 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).
- Bus routes need to be frequent, cost-effective and accessible to all York residents, not just ones on high volume (high profit) routes.
- 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.
- Option needs to be weighed against impact buses, bus stops and signage might have upon character and setting of City's historic assets.
- 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.

Question 13: What could be done in the city centre to improve bus accessibility?
OPTION 2: Investigate opportunities to re-locate bus stops where they detract from the setting of key buildings or spaces, or create an obstruction when queues form.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

- Key points made:**
- Wherever possible all bus signage should share streetlight or other utility poles. Modern covered bus shelters present less transparency.
 - Ideally bus shelters should be located at kerb edge so as not to impede pedestrian flows.
 - Move bus stops outside Library as causes severe problems.

QUESTION 13: What could be done in the city centre to improve bus accessibility?
OPTION 3: Provide a city centre shuttle bus to link the railway station (and transport interchange) with key destinations including for example tourist attractions, shopping areas and the hospital.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 27 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 1 Comment | 31 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

- Key points made:**
- Probably not enough demand. Existing buses need more publicity.
 - Shuttle bus long overdue.
 - No, short distance to walk to City Centre.
 - Could be either shuttle bus or road train.
 - 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.
 - Free buses might encourage more commuters to come by train rather than car.
 - With clear key destinations for shopping.
 - City Centre to Hospital bus would be welcomed.
 - Service from Station to Hospital could benefit University. A second NRM 'train' to Castle would be useful.
 - Free bus would be good. York needs a bus station or central point, railway station or Rougier Street an obvious solution.
 - 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.
 - Whatever is adopted "bendy buses," are just not right for City.

- Option needs to be weighed against impact buses, bus stops and signage might have upon character and setting of City's historic assets.

QUESTION 13: What could be done in the city centre to improve bus accessibility?

OPTION 4: Investigate the feasibility of creating a bus interchange point with the East of the city centre to complement the proposed interchange to the West of the city centre adjacent to the railway station.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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
- Identify proper interchange for buses, taxis etc.
- Bus Station could be on teardrop site.
- If transport interchange located in teardrop site, second interchange desirable.
- Hub Station cycle hire/secure parking facility. Only reasonable site might be as part of York Central.
- Definite need for a purpose built bus terminal within area of railway station.
- A bus interchange point at Castle Piccadilly, perhaps East side.
- Interchange point should be located in Piccadilly area.
- Provided could be delivered in a manner, which safeguards special character and setting of City.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – BUSES

Option 1, 2 and 4 should be advanced to the preferred options stage, dependant on the outcomes of the Accessibility Framework.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

In order to achieve objectives for a thriving, vibrant and sustainable city centre it is necessary to better integrate the areas of change and to address severance caused by a congested road network. The best approach to this is a co-ordinated accessibility strategy that will address access needs and pressures, new developments in the city centre and the sustainability agenda.

Option 1 is dependant on the bus routes within the city centre which are being reviewed as part of the Accessibility Framework. Option 2 is dependant on the routes. However, relocations/redesigns

| | |
|---|--|
| | are potential options to be progressed through the Public Realm and Movement Strategy, also informed by the Conservation Area Appraisal. Option 3 is not currently being progressed by the Council. Option 4 is also dependant on the bus routes identified in the Accessibility Framework. NB. A transport interchange to the west of the city centre, near the railway station, is an option being reviewed as part of the York Northwest AAP. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Sustainable Community Strategy contains a number of objectives under the theme 'York – The Sustainable City' that the AAP can deliver, including giving priority to more sustainable modes of travel, integrating the public transport network and reducing the volume of traffic. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | The Accessibility Framework, through the AAP, will assist to deliver the aims of PPS1, PPG13 and RSS Policy Y1. These documents require improvements to accessibility for walking and cycling and improvements in accessibility to jobs, shopping and leisure facilities by public transport. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | There was clear support through the consultation to review bus access arrangements to promote better access for public transport and to reduce congestion in the city centre. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | This option had predominantly positive or very positive effects on SA objectives. |
| 6) Community benefits | A city centre that is easier to access by public transport has clear benefits in terms of the function of the city centre as the economic, social and cultural hub of the city. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Accessibility Framework and LTP3 will provide the evidence for the AAP. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Changes to access arrangements within the city centre will have implications in terms of funding improvements to the road network in terms of public transport, general traffic, cycling and walking. Funding issues will be reviewed when preferred options for access have been determined. |
| 9) Deliverability | The highway network is within the control of the Council. Any options will need to be taken forward in partnership with public transport operators. |
| 10) Flexibility | The Accessibility Framework can develop and test a range of options, from minor interventions to significant changes to the nature of access to the city centre. A phased approach can also be developed. |

NEXT STEPS

Complete work on the Accessibility Framework and draft a preferred option based on options 1, 2 and 4. Option 2 can be progressed through the Public Realm and Movement Strategy, where feasible. The Conservation Area Appraisal will inform this option.

RIVER TRANSPORT - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:
None.

QUESTION 14: Is there potential for river transport in York to ease congestion in the city centre?

OPTION 1: Include a policy in the AAP to support the potential for river transport for freight and / or passengers.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 29 Supported | 7 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 5 Comment | 43 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- Could be an attractive proposition for certain types of customer at certain times of year.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Ouse could be used for transport of construction materials and possibly as a relaxing (if rather slow) way to commute from Poppleton and Naburn.
- It could be used to the south for transhipment to low emission vehicles.
- Could link with Park and Rides.
- Could be used by coach parties.
- Could have ferries for shorter journeys.

QUESTION 14: Is there potential for river transport in York to ease congestion in the city centre?
OPTION 2: Do not pursue a policy to promote commercial river transport in York.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 7 Supported | 29 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | 36 Total Responses |
|------------------|-------------|------------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- 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.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – RIVER TRANSPORT

Option 1, for freight transport, should be advanced to the preferred options stage, dependant on the outcomes of the LTP3 Freight Strategy.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

The use of the river for freight has the potential to decrease the level of commercial vehicles entering the city centre by road. In order to achieve objectives for a thriving, vibrant and sustainable city centre it is necessary to better integrate the areas of change and to address severance caused by a congested road network. Commercial traffic (see question 15) can have a detrimental affect on the ambience and safety of the city centre footstreets.

| | |
|---|--|
| | The use of the rivers for passengers, as a stand-alone business, has been reviewed as part of the LTP2 and found to be not viable. Freight transport, as part of a package of measures, including transshipment, may have a great potential to attract funding. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The Sustainable Community Strategy contains a number of objectives under the theme 'York – The Sustainable City' that the AAP can deliver, including giving priority to more sustainable modes of travel, integrating the public transport network and reducing the volume of traffic. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | A Freight Strategy as part of LTP3 will assist in the delivery of the aims of PPS1, PPG13 and RSS Policy Y1. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | There was clear support through the consultation to utilise the rivers for passenger and freight transport. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | This option had predominantly positive or very positive effects on SA objectives. There are clearly ecological issues to be assessed as part of a review of river transport. |
| 6) Community benefits | There are community benefits from the reduction of commercial traffic accessing the city centre in terms of public transport movement, road safety, emissions and the ambience of the city centre. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Accessibility Framework and LTP3 will provide the evidence for the AAP. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Funding issues will be reviewed when preferred options for river transport have been determined. There is potential for river-based freight transport to be funded as part of a transshipment project. |
| 9) Deliverability | Appropriate moorings would be required and some riverbank is within the control of the Council. Any options will need to be taken forward in partnership with operators. |
| 10) Flexibility | The LTP3 Freight Strategy can develop and test a range of options. |
| NEXT STEPS Review the potential for the use of the river for freight as part of the LTP3 Freight Strategy and draft a Preferred Option based on the findings. Review the potential for river-based transshipment – see question 15. | |
| COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: General Comments on this Issue: None. | |
| QUESTION 15: What methods could be supported by the AAP to reduce the amount and impact of commercial traffic in the city centre? | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| OPTION 1: Change the times of access to the Footstreets area for commercial traffic. Please state which times of day you think would be best. | | | | | |
| Response: | 13 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variety of times of restriction on commercial traffic in the footstreets area where suggested, generally increasing the amount of time when the footstreets would be free of commercial traffic. • Extending operation of footstreets could significantly change the “feel” of the City Centre and encourage growth of the “café culture”. • 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. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 15: What methods could be supported by the AAP to reduce the amount and impact of commercial traffic in the city centre? OPTION 2: Explore opportunities as part of the LTP2 Freight Strategy to condense deliveries to a smaller number of vehicles, including less polluting vehicles, through a new transshipment centre. | | | | | |
| Response: | 21 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 1 Comment | 26 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • Consider using River. • Final delivery vehicle should be less polluting. • Cycle couriers should be encouraged wherever possible. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC Option 1 and 2 should be advanced to the preferred options stage, dependant on the outcomes of the Footstreets Review, Accessibility Framework and LTP3 Freight Strategy. | | | | | |

| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
|---|---|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>Both options were supported in the consultation and would have positive sustainability effects. Reducing the impact of the extent and nature of commercial traffic in the city centre would assist in making the city centre a more attractive pedestrian environment which would in turn assist with promoting a different ambience in the city centre, particularly in the early evening.</p> <p>Option 1 would require a change in culture of retailers if a radical change was made to the hours of access. It will need to be demonstrated that there are significant environmental and safety benefits deriving from removing commercial traffic from the footstreets during periods of highest pedestrian flow. It may be possible for varying restrictions to be placed on different areas around the city centre and on different days/times, such as when markets or festivals are on, or in areas promoted for evening activity. However, it is recognised that extending the footstreets hours will only be viable if it does not impact on the attractiveness of the city centre for retailers. It needs to be supported by retailers and further, more targeted, consultation will be required. The potential of this option will be explored in the Footstreets Review.</p> <p>Option 2 could help in meeting a number of the objectives to enhance the experience of moving around the city centre. However, it is recognised that a transshipment centre will only be viable if it does not impact on the attractiveness of the city centre for retailers. It needs to be supported by retailers and further, more targeted, consultation will be required. The development of retailing at Castle Piccadilly presents an opportunity to pilot a transshipment project. York Central may also offer an opportunity for transshipment. The option will be explored further in LTP3 through a Freight Strategy.</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The Sustainable Community Strategy contains a number of objectives under the theme 'York – The Sustainable City' that the AAP can deliver, including giving priority to more sustainable modes of travel, integrating the public transport network and reducing the volume of traffic.</p> |
| <p>3) Regional and national guidance</p> | <p>A Freight Strategy as part of LTP3 will assist in the delivery of the aims of PPS1, PPG13 and RSS Policy Y1.</p> |
| <p>Justified 4) Consultation response</p> | <p>There was clear support through the consultation to reduce the impact of commercial traffic on the city centre.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | This option had predominantly positive or very positive effects on SA objectives. |
| 6) Community benefits | There are community benefits from the reduction of commercial traffic accessing the city centre in terms of public transport movement, road safety, emissions and the ambience of the city centre. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The Accessibility Framework and LTP3 will provide the evidence for the AAP. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Transshipment would reduce the need for on-site storage in retail units thereby increasing the retail floorspace. This would be of benefit to retailers in terms of sales and property value. This may also improve the maintenance of upper floors within the core of the city centre. Funding issues will be reviewed when preferred options for the footstreets and transshipment have been determined. |
| 9) Deliverability | Variations to access to the footstreets can be met through existing budgets. A transshipment centre would require a funding package to be established and a site found. |
| 10) Flexibility | The Footstreets Review/Accessibility Framework and the LTP3 Freight Strategy can develop and test a range of options. |
| NEXT STEPS Review the potential of option 1 through the Footstreets Review / City Centre Accessibility. Review the potential of option 2 through the LTP3 Freight Strategy. Explore both options with the Retail Forum and City Centre Management team. | |

KEY THEME 2: CONSERVATION AND DESIGN: QUESTIONS 17, 18, 19

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS1 asserts that high quality and inclusive design means ensuring that a place will function well and add to the overall character and quality of the area, not just for the short term, but over the lifetime of the development. It states that good design is indivisible from good planning and should respond to its local context and create or reinforce local distinctiveness. It advises that design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

The English Heritage / Planning Advisory Service document 'Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas' states that local authorities should: "include policies in the local development documents to safeguard the character or appearance of conservation areas and their settings; formally adopt and publish the character appraisals and management proposals for each of the authority's conservation areas in support of the relevant supplementary planning document(s)". With regard to Area Action Plans, the document states that AAPs "should set out the policies and proposals for action, based on the character appraisal, required to preserve or enhance the area".

PPG15 and PPG16 are currently under review. The policy requirements of the new combined Planning Policy Statement will be taken into account in the development of the AAP as and when they are adopted. The City centre designated as an Area of Archaeological Importance under the 1979 Ancient Monuments Act. The Central Historic Core designated a Conservation Area under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 1990.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The 2008 RSS Policy Y1 (York Sub-Area Policy) states that: "Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes for the York sub area should: Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas". Policy ENV9 (Historic Environment) states that: "Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should conserve the following regionally-distinctive elements of the historic environment, enhance their character and reinforce their distinctiveness: The street patterns, sky lines, views and setting of the historic City of York".

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy contains the Strategic Ambition that "We will use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development". The Strategy

states that: “York’s visual landscape sets the scene for the city’s individuality. This is not just confined to the prime conservation area in the main city centre, it also includes the strays and ‘green wedges’ that surround York as well as the conservation areas beyond the city walls”. This emphasises the importance of the special character of the city centre to the cultural and economic success of the city.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options includes a section on ‘York’s Special Historic and Built Environment’. The Strategy states that: “The Local Development Framework (LDF) vision for York is that high quality design and architecture will be promoted throughout the whole of the built environment, but particularly that it’s unique historic character and setting will be preserved and enhanced. In recognition of this, the Core Strategy will establish policy to protect and enhance the built environment and ensure that it is managed in an appropriate way.

It will also establish design priorities and fundamental principles to guide future development. Section 15 ‘Resource Efficiency’ deals with the further issues of sustainable design, construction and resource use”.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Draft Heritage Strategy for the City of York

The Draft Heritage Strategy for the City of York for the period 2010 to 2013 sets out the key objectives for the sustainable management of the heritage of the city. The Strategy contains objectives for the 'Historic Environment' objectives including: To ensure that York's historical and archaeological wealth and their setting is recognised, conserved and enhanced; To promote pride of place amongst local residents and support them in improving the quality of their communities. The Draft Strategy includes current strengths, issues to address, priorities and actions for the Historic Environment and training and learning. Of particular relevance to the AAP are actions to: Use the LDF process to raise expectations of good design in a heritage context; undertake conservation area appraisals; promote York's case for World Heritage status; provide training / awareness raising for decision makers.

Archaeology

The management of archaeological deposits within the City Centre is based on the principles set out in two documents: the *York Development and Archaeology Study* (Arup et al 1992) and the policy document *Conservation Policies for York: Archaeology* adopted by York City Council in 1992. These are supported and supplemented by the guidance set out in Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning. These principles were incorporated into policies HE9 and HE10 in the Draft Local Plan.

Local List

The York Local List has over 10 buildings and structures within the city centre.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|----|
| 9. Retaining York's unique and special character | I | ** | ** | O | O | I/? | ? | * | * | ? | I/* | O | O |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|--|----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 9. Retaining York's unique and special character | O | I/* | I/* | I/* | O | O | ?/* | O | O | I |

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|---|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 10. Ensure the highest quality of urban design and architecture | I | **/I | O | ** | ** | ** | ** | I/* | ** | * | ** | * | ** |

| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|---|----|----|----|----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 10. Ensure the highest quality of urban design and architecture | * | * | ** | * | **/I | * | ? | O | ** | I |

CONSERVATION AND DESIGN - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- City Centre redevelopment should be maintained in keeping with the history of the area and not be overly modern in design.
- Areas such as those around the Castle (Goodramgate, old shops and church) should be developed to ensure the integrity of these historic areas.
- 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.

- New build should be in keeping with feel of an ancient city.
- 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.
- Support an approach that promotes new high quality contemporary design in City Centre.
- Agree with emphasis on need for ensuring quality design.

MANAGING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

NB. No options were presented for this issue. The Preferred Options for Managing the Historic Environment will be written when the Conservation Area Appraisal has been completed. The Issues and Options document proposed that the AAP contain a statement and policies for each character area, based on the findings of the Appraisal to identify the key elements of character that need to be safeguarded and enhanced, parameters for new development, opportunities for new development and opportunities for streetscape enhancement. There is potential for the AAP to go further than this and to act as the Management Strategy for the Appraisal.

MANAGING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

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.

QUESTION 17: How do you think we should manage the Archaeological Resource in the city centre?

OPTION 1: Revisit the principles in the Arup Report in the light of archaeological advances made since 1992.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 12 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 3 Comment | 16 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Evidence should be incorporated into interactive GIS linked to CYCHER and Conservation Area Appraisal.
- Need to evaluate how successful past management strategy for archaeological resource has been. Only then is it possible to ascertain whether Option be adopted.

QUESTION 17: How do you think we should manage the Archaeological Resource in the city centre?

OPTION 2: Adopt a formal policy framework for the installation and monitoring of groundwater and archaeological deposits.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Response: | 13 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should form part of evidence base. GIS will go a long way to satisfying this. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 17: How do you think we should manage the Archaeological Resource in the city centre? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Provide opportunities for education and public engagement for all archaeological interventions. Please state which methods of education and engagement should be used. | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 13 Comment | 25 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where feasible “hands on” and visits to sites. • Guided visits, open days and press reports. • 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. • Selection of deposits needed to achieve right balance. • Methods should vary with scale and importance of investigation. • Where possible community should be involved in management. | | | | | |
| OPTION 4: Require developers to make a contribution towards the development and maintenance of the CYCHER. Please state what level of contribution you think is appropriate. | | | | | |
| Response: | 9 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 5 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of contribution to be calculated when new Heritage Bill is passed. • Concerned that level of contribution requested would affect likelihood of developers agreeing to pay. • Contributions should be dependent on the extent of the site and archaeological interest. | | | | | |
| OPTION 5: Require that all excavated material from excavations in York must be deposited with the Yorkshire Museum. | | | | | |
| Response: | 10 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 14 Comment | 26 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement is not legally binding but agree owners should be encouraged. • Excavated material needs to be deposited at a registered Museum. • It would seem appropriate that any materials are deposited at the Yorkshire Museum. | | | | | |

- Why not in planning already? Universities archaeology dept could help with this.
- Materials belong to landowners but should be encouraged to deposit materials.
- More of an ambition than something, which could, or should be enforced.
- Will Yorkshire Museum be able to store an increasing quantity of material?
- Contributions should be dependent on the extent of the site and archaeological interest.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – MANAGING THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE

Good support for all 5 options. There is not sufficient justification to pursue a city centre specific approach to archaeology. The LDF should contain an overarching policy for archaeology. It would therefore be most appropriate for this to be contained within the Core Strategy, or subsequent SPD. The findings of the City Centre AAP Issues and Options have been very useful and will feed into development of the policy. The AAP Preferred Options should therefore make reference to the Core Strategy / SPD in terms of archaeology.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

| | |
|--|-----|
| Consistent | N/a |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | N/a |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | N/a |
| Justified | N/a |
| 4) Consultation response | |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | N/a |
| 6) Community benefits | N/a |
| 7) Evidenced approach | N/a |
| Effective | N/a |
| 8) Viability | |
| 9) Deliverability | N/a |
| 10) Flexibility | N/a |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| NEXT STEPS | | | | | |
| The outcomes of the consultation will feed into the Core Strategy. | | | | | |
| DESIGNING IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| General Comments on this Issue: | | | | | |
| None. | | | | | |
| Question 18: What approach should the AAP take to design in the City Centre? | | | | | |
| Option 1: Develop a policy based on the criteria set-out in the Draft Local Plan. | | | | | |
| Response: | 6 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 9 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2: Develop a policy approach that requires design to be drawn from the requirements of the Conservation Area Appraisal and considered in that context. | | | | | |
| Response: | 18 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support for proposed Conservation Area Appraisal. Promote the role of townscape and landscape character assessment, which will help inform this AAP as well as the planned LDF Site Allocations DPD. Option useful in allowing gifted architects with experience of design in sensitive locations to develop innovative approaches but they are not that common. | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Develop a Design Code to provide a series of design principles to be applied to all new development in the city centre. Please state which principles should be included. | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 7 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could provide flexible guidelines giving effect to Options 1 and 2. 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. | | | | | |

- 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.
- 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.
- New buildings in historic area should respect and blend in with existing structures, both in scale and overall design and appearance.
- A Design Code might be useful. Should be based on the Conservation Area Appraisal.
- Areas suitable for modern-looking offices and those where only traditional looking buildings can be constructed can be designated.
- 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.
- Code should be worked up in partnership with CABE, English Heritage and involve urban designers as well as conservation architects.
- Care should be taken with design codes so particular styles and approaches are not prescribed.
- 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.
- 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.
- Would lead to blander and less exciting options being proposed.

QUESTION 18: What approach should the AAP take to design in the City Centre?

OPTION 4: Develop a policy on views, vistas and tall buildings to protect against developments that detract from the skyline and key features of the City Centre.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 18 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 5 Comment | 25 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Height limits useful but has to be room for exceptions.
- Tall Buildings need to take into account the CAA and any landscape and townscape character and setting including the historic environment.

- Strategy for identifying and protecting key views and vistas has to encompass whole of City and not just be restricted to City Centre.
- 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.
- Nothing too prescriptive as it stops innovation, rules to avoid price above aesthetic design and to be in keeping with historic nature are necessary
- More tall buildings are neither necessary nor appropriate.

QUESTION 18: What approach should the AAP take to design in the City Centre?

OPTION 5: Opportunities should be explored to create new contemporary landmarks in the City Centre.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 10 Supported | 5 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 4 Comment | 21 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Opportunity should be taken to encourage use of new landmarks and contemporary buildings that reflect present period.
- Must not be afraid of height. Criteria should be quality.
- Icons are necessary, not everywhere, but at right points, which can be derived from Conservation Area Character Assessment.
- Using top quality architects and materials.
- New landmark zones could be identified within AAP. Could include Piccadilly.
- Issue is better dealt with as appropriate in Design or Planning Briefs.
- York does not lack landmarks.
- New contemporary landmarks should be discouraged.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – DESIGNING IN THE CITY CENTRE

It is considered that options 2 and 4 should be advanced to the preferred options stage for the reasons set out below. Option 5 will be taken forward as part of the public realm and movement strategy.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

Seeking to control the design of new development in a way that ensures that the character of the conservation area is preserved and enhanced is consistent with the vision and objectives. Protecting the special qualities of the city centre is vital to ensure York remains an attractive

location for businesses, shoppers, tourists and residents.

General design policy for the LDF is being taken forward in the Core Strategy (see Preferred Options policy CS4 Urban Design in the Historic Environment). Responses to the Issues and Options consultation have fed into the creation of that policy. Responses have emphasised the importance of the Appraisal and using context as a basis for design. The variety in architectural language in the area make it difficult to apply a more rigid code. The Core Strategy Policy and the Appraisal will also be key in developing the principles for the public realm and movement strategy.

With regard to tall buildings, there was general support for limiting the height of new buildings rather than developing a policy to identify areas where tall buildings might be suitable, which is the ethos of the joint English Heritage / CABE guidance on tall buildings (2007). The requirements of the emerging Core Strategy design policy would be sufficient for the authority to determine an application for a tall building should one be proposed. Decision making would be greatly assisted, however, if an Analysis of Strategic Views were undertaken. A number of consultation responses felt that a policy principle should be adopted that restricts the height of any new building in York to a maximum set as a particular point on the Minster (potentially the eaves). This can be taken forward as a component on the Core Strategy policy. Detailed guidance on maximum heights within the city centre could be included in the AAP, focussing on key vantage points and key views of historical significance, through the use of 'view cones'. The analysis of views will be undertaken as part of the commission for the Conservation Area Appraisal.

There was a mixed response to the idea of creating new landmarks in the city centre. It does not appear necessary to develop a specific policy with regard to landmarks. York does not lack landmarks, however designing-in focal points in new development as orientation points or hubs of activity (e.g. the community focal building and St John's Square at Hungate) can be considered on a case-by-case basis. Public art can be incorporated into public realm designs and this should be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on the needs of each space and the findings of the Conservation Area Appraisal.

| | |
|---|---|
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Seeking to control the design of new development in a way that ensures that the character of the conservation area is preserved and enhanced is consistent with vision for York in the Community Strategy. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | PPG15 and RSS policies emphasise that new development in historic areas should seek to complement and where appropriate enhance the character of that area. This is best achieved through a policy that reflects a clear understanding of the context. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Given the importance of achieving high standards of design in a sensitive historic context, there was a great deal of support for design policy generally. A great number of responses in relation to the conservation and design section and the brief descriptive summaries (questions 49 and 50) focussed on the need to undertake a Conservation Area Appraisal and for the Appraisal to form the basis for the area action plan. Therefore, to progress a policy for design standards to be based in the context of the Appraisal, is consistent with the consultation response. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Options likely to have a positive or very positive impact. |
| 6) Community benefits | The benefit to the community of a robust policy to help achieve good quality design is in the ability to ensure the special qualities of the city centre are not eroded by new development thereby retaining the city's cultural identity. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The preferred options are consistent with guidance on the management of conservation areas. |
| Effective 8) Viability | The policy relies on the production of the Conservation Area Appraisal – see response to questions 49 and 50. |
| 9) Deliverability | The policy relies on the production of the Conservation Area Appraisal – see response to questions 49 and 50. |
| 10) Flexibility | A design code, based on the policy of the AAP and the Appraisal, could be produced and adopted as a supplementary planning document after the adoption of the AAP, if it was felt that it was necessary at the time. |

NEXT STEPS

Develop a preferred option based on the character appraisal when it is complete. The outcomes of the consultation with regard to tall buildings will feed into a the Core Strategy.

A preferred option should be developed to complement the Core Strategy policy that requires the justification for a design solution to be based on the findings of the Conservation Area Appraisal. In particular to emphasise the importance of preserving and enhancing the “special qualities” of the city centre (as will be defined in the Appraisal) in terms of views, vistas, street pattern, public and private space, permeability, heights, scale, massing, materials and detailing etc. Some of the detail of the Core Strategy Preferred Options policy CS4 can be removed from the Core Strategy and incorporated into the AAP policy as it is city centre specific.

DESIGN DECISIONS - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:**General Comments on this Issue:**

- 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.
- Should take English Heritage out of equation and start using some common sense.
- Design Awards stimulating interest. Visioning and 3D thinking, and raised expectations, urban design studies to be at core of strategies and planning briefs.
- 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 CABA will fail.
- Pleased to see recognition of potential of York Design Awards and support for them.
- Educate decision makers on design issues. Employ Chief Planning Officer with power over design.
- 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.

QUESTION 19: In what way can the AAP help to improve the decision making process?**OPTION 1: Continue with our existing approach.**

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| Response: | 2 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 8 Total Responses |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing procedures are proving less effective. Need augmenting with a range of new safeguards. Greater emphasis on an integrated approach by all departments within Council. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 19: In what way can the AAP help to improve the decision making process? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Promote the creation of Design Competitions for major or sensitive schemes. | | | | | |
| Response: | 12 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 8 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Competitions are a good idea for major or sensitive schemes. For major development schemes only. Providing that initial stage is an open competition. Can be successful but Council needs adequate historic environment and urban design resource. 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. Would help to concentrate minds of developers and architects and give more opportunity for public involvement. Of use in only a limited number of cases, expensive and of varying benefit. Provided judge is from outside York and not blinkered by familiarity, would also need to be of high calibre. As long as full public consultation on designs chosen. Design competitions would exist purely within professional architectural world. Challenge is to bridge that world. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 19: In what way can the AAP help to improve the decision making process? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Promote the appointment of a Design Champion. | | | | | |
| Response: | 6 Supported | 9 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 4 Comment | 21 Total Responses |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Champion not necessary to ensure this, just properly developed and integrated policies, which are comprehensively and consistently applied. • Too much for one person. • Could usefully supplement a fully staffed dedicated conservation team. Could help co-ordinate work of departments. • No a waste of money. • Not certain of benefits. • Presence of a Councillor in role of Heritage Champion is a step forward. If this works well, should have first Design Champion ready available. • Suggest that heritage champion also pick up on design portfolio. The two are too firmly linked. • How would Design Champions be appointed and who selects the Design Committee? | | | | | |
| QUESTION 19: In what way can the AAP help to improve the decision making process? | | | | | |
| OPTION 4: Promote the creation of a Design Panel for significant developments. | | | | | |
| Response: | 14 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 10 Comment | 26 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposal to create a Design Panel for significant developments. • Should be a Local Design Panel. • Should be in addition to, not a replacement for, other bodies, statutory and non-statutory consultees. • Urge that Panel membership be not limited to 'experts'. Should include ordinary members of public. • Should be based on existing Conservation Area Advisory Committee. • What is most needed is a fully staffed Conservation Team in Planning Department. • Must be linked to architectural conservation and historical experts to advise on designs. • Care needs to be taken to ensure not over balanced in favour of preservation and a too conservative approach. • Agree paragraphs 7.40 to 7.42. Design Panels should root back into community, e.g. York • 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. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – DESIGN DECISIONS | | | | | |
| It is considered that options 1 and 4 should be advanced to the preferred options stage for the reasons set out below. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Consistent</p> <p>1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>Seeking to control the design of new development in a way that ensures that the character of the conservation area is preserved and enhanced is consistent with the vision and objectives. Protecting the special qualities of the city centre is vital to ensure York remains an attractive location for businesses, shoppers, tourists and residents.</p> <p>There was a general feeling in the responses that the existing approach to determining applications, with regard to design issues, is not achieving satisfactory results, and therefore some initiative is required to address this.</p> <p>The option for design competitions, which have taken place in York previously, was supported. This approach would be for significant and sensitive schemes to drive-up design quality and to encourage fresh thinking. This will be taken forward for key developments and for public realm enhancements via the implementation of the public realm strategy. This can be considered on a case-by-case basis and there is no need for a specific AAP policy.</p> <p>A design champion was not supported as an option. It was felt that placing too much influence with one individual would not be appropriate for York. This, however, is not an issue that needs to be taken forward as part of the AAP process. A decision to appoint a new Champion is outside the scope of the AAP. The Charter for Place concept being pursued to place quality of design high-up the agenda could achieve some of the benefits of a Champion. Senior Officers acting as project champions has been successful and would assist in the delivery of key AAP projects.</p> <p>A design panel was supported, however there was no consensus on what form this could take. There is potential to form a design review panel, following a format promoted by CABE. However, a Regional Design Review Service is being created by Integreat Yorkshire/Yorkshire Forward. There will therefore be the opportunity to refer schemes of a regional significance to this service. The combination of this with the existing arrangement of the Conservation Area Advisory Panel would ensure that the quality of design of scheme is rigorously assessed. In addition to these approaches, consultation on the AAP, public realm and movement strategy, Conservation Area Appraisal and Development Briefs will provide opportunities for comment by all on the quality of design. The Draft Heritage Strategy also recommends providing “training / awareness raising for decision makers” which can be taken forward through the Heritage Strategy process.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Seeking to control the design of new development in a way that ensures that the character of the conservation area is preserved and enhanced is consistent with vision for York in the Community Strategy. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | National guidance promotes the use of design review panels as best practice for significant and / or sensitive schemes. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | There was clear support for a design panel. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Options likely to have a positive or very positive impact. |
| 6) Community benefits | The benefit to the community of a robust policy to help achieve good quality design is in the ability to ensure the special qualities of the city centre are not eroded by new development thereby retaining the city's cultural identity. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | National guidance promotes design panels as best practice for significant and / or sensitive schemes. |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | The Regional Design Review Service is being created by Integreat Yorkshire (Yorkshire Forward's Regional Centre of Excellence for regeneration, renaissance and place making skills). The Conservation Area Advisory Panel already exists. |
| 9) Deliverability | Scheme can be referred to the Review Service by existing staff. |
| 10) Flexibility | The Council can consider which schemes to refer to either panel on a case-by-case basis. |
| NEXT STEPS | |
| Draft policy regarding referring schemes of a regional significance to the Regional Design Review Service and these schemes and others to the Conservation Area Advisory Panel. | |

KEY THEME 2: CONNECTIVITY, PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC SQUARES AND SPACES AND EXTENSION OF THE FOOTSTREETS: QUESTIONS: 20, 21 AND 22

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development emphasises that plans should seek to enhance as well as protect the historic environment, landscape and townscape character and design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres seeks to retain the economic vibrancy of city centres.

Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning which governs the protection of historic parks and gardens or battlefields.

Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 emphasises the need to take account of the future impacts of climate change including increased summer heat, increased rainfall and flooding events, and higher wind speeds including promotions of non-vehicular modes of transport to reduce harmful emissions.

Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning considers the need for planning to consider high quality and sustainable design that focuses on sustainable areas with existing amenities and services such as city centres.

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation seeks to ensure that there is sufficient amenity open space that is accessible for urban residents and visitors.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS seeks to develop the role of York as a sub regional city as well as improve facilities for walking and cycling and support local cultural distinctiveness which will improve the quality of life in communities. It aims to promote tourism and associated development of an appropriate scale and type along waterways and realise the potential of heritage leisure and cultural assets by promoting the role of cities as modern, varied and colourful destinations of choice. These are realised through policies Y1a, Y1d and E6 of the RSS.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Community Strategy has ambitions for all developments to contribute to the special qualities and distinctiveness of York by being well designed, sustainable and meeting the needs of local people' ensuring that the physical appearance of the City's streets attract further inward investment, economic development and physical growth without compromising that which makes the city attractive'. The strategic ambition states 'We will use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development'. Objective 10 of the Sustainable City section

states 'We will endeavour to balance physical growth and environmental sustainability with responsible choices in respect of climatic and environmental changes. Other strategic aims include the need to encourage walking and cycling and to clearly define and communicate the special qualities of York and the distinctiveness of the city and ensure future development and growth strengthens these qualities and the city's unique environment'.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document has strategic ambitions to use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further, with spatial strategies to protect York's unique character and setting, develop strong and durable communities and strike a balance between physical growth and environmental sustainability. It seeks 'inclusive access and movement for pedestrians, and promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and easy to move through for all' and 'improve the quality of the public realm and environment presenting first impressions to visitors arriving in, or passing through, York.'

Strategic Objective 5: Quality City

- Preserve and enhance York's exceptional historic legacy and important views and the distinctive townscape characteristics of York's neighbourhoods;
- Ensure that all new development delivers a high quality of urban design, architecture and public realm.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy (2008) has high level objectives for amongst other things a Thriving City and a City of Culture. Under a Thriving City it identifies a lack of investment in the city's heritage and tourist industry with increasing competition and a fall in visitor numbers. It seeks investment in the heritage and cultural infrastructure to support this. Under the City of Culture it has a Strategic Aim, amongst other things "to be a city of high quality spaces" with actions to achieve this identified as:

- an urban design plan
- creating attractive and stimulating spaces
- de-cluttered and creatively lit spaces
- spaces will be linked with clear and perhaps themed routes
- river fronts opened up and their opportunities exploited.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Cultural Quarter - report to the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group (December 2008) CYC

Review of Leisure Activities Strategy (October 2007) CYC

The **Future York Group Report** (2007) contains key recommendations including developing a clear masterplan to guide

development and investment decisions; continued growth in tourism spend; and delivering transformational enhancements to York’s visitor attractions and **to the quality of the public realm** (Recommendations E4 and P6). One of the significant actions identified was “improved streets and public spaces with a high quality well designed public realm, that is spectacular both by day and night with an exciting programme of events and activities for residents and visitors.” (page 7). It also says that “City of York Council should give priority to improving the quality of the public realm across the historic city including paving, lighting, signage and public spaces.” (page 24).

The Visit York partnership document “**York a Vision for Tourism**” (2009) is seeking to achieve 5% average annual growth in expenditure to support the 10,000 plus jobs in tourism. One of the seven ‘key ambitions’ to deliver the new vision for tourism is: “enhance York’s public realm so that it becomes the most special in England.”

Streets For All Yorkshire and Humber offers guidance on the way in which our streets and public open spaces are managed. The **Footstreets Review** (City Centre Accessibility Framework) is being done following extensive consultation and requests to expand the footstreets in York, particularly Fossgate.

Emerging Evidence Bases include:

Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal **will provide guidance on development of the historic city center.**

The emerging **Biodiversity Action Plan** and **Green Infrastructure Strategy** will provide guidance on the green space management to enhance ecological biodiversity.

The **Climate Change Strategy** will provide guidance on sustainable development.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN 1 | EN 2 | EN 3 | EN 4 | EN 5 | EN 6 | EN 7 | EN8 | EN 9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S1 0 | EC 1 | EC 2 | EC 3 | EC 4 |
|---|------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|----|-------|-------|----|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| 3. Attractive to Inward Investors | * | * / ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | * | 0 | ? | 0 | I / ? | 0 | ? | 0 | * | 0 | * | ? / * | ** | 0 |
| 9. Retaining York’s unique and special character | I | ** | ** | 0 | 0 | I / ? | ? | * | * | ? | I / * | 0 | 0 | 0 | I / * | I / * | I / * | 0 | 0 | ? / * | 0 | 0 | I |
| 10. Ensure the highest quality of urban design and architecture | I | ** / I | 0 | ** | ** | ** | ** | I / * | ** | * | ** | * | ** | * | * | ** | * | ** / * | * | ? | 0 | ** | I |
| 11. High quality public realm for activities and events | * | ** / I | * / I | I / ? | I / ? | I / ? | ? / * | ? | ? | ** | ? / I | ? / * | ? | I | I | I / * | 0 | 0 | I / * | * | 0 | ** | ? |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|----|-----|----|------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 13. Larger pedestrian zone for ease of movement around city centre | O | * | O | ** | * | * | O | O | * | * | **/? | * | O | I/? | ** | ** | ** | O | * | ? | O | O | ** |
| 14. High quality environment (inc.greenspaces and trees) | I | ** | ** | * | ** | ? | ? | * | ** | ?/ | ?/ | ** | I/? | O | ? | I | I/ | O | O | ? | O | * | O |
| 17. Use river areas to stimulate leisure, commercial and tourist activity | * | O | O | -/I | O | - | I/- | I | I | ** | I/ | ? | ? | O | ? | I/ | I/ | O | ? | ** | O | ** | * |
| 19. Make the city centre accessible to all | I/? | O/I | ?/ | -/I | I/? | ? | ? | I/ | ? | ** | ? | ? | I | * | **/ | **/ | ** | O | ** | * | O | * | O |
| 20. Promote opportunities for healthy lifestyles | O | O | * | ** | ?/ | * | * | O | ? | * | * | ** | O | ? | * | * | I/ | O | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| 21. Provide opportunities and places for cultural activity. | I/? | ** | * | I | I/? | O | O/I | ? | I/? | ** | I | O | I/? | ** | I | I | O | O | * | ?/ | * | ** | * |
| 22. Provide community facilities for all | I/? | ? | I/? | I | ? | * | * | ? | I/? | ** | ? | * | ? | ** | I | I | ? | O | ** | ?/ | ** | * | O/ |
| 23. Help to meet the social and community needs for all people in York | I/? | ? | ? | I/? | ? | O | ? | * | * | ** | ? | ** | I | * | I | ? | ? | ** | ** | I | I | O | O/ |

The above sections are all relevant because successful public realm spaces are the hub of cultural and social activities and good quality urban spaces encourage healthier lifestyles, attract inward investment and help to improve the quality of life for everyone.

PUBLIC SPACES IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

Q21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?

- Don't over organise - some confusion and clutter is part of the charm of York.
- All public spaces should be enhanced and de-cluttered versus the view to concentrate on getting one area to a good standard and not spreading resources too thinly.
- Clean up the alleyways and make sure they are well lit and attractive.
- Litter and graffiti gives a bad impression of the city centre. Suggested trained wardens to deal with littering/antisocial acts.

- De-cluttering was strongly supported and appropriate signage that does not add to clutter.
- Bootham Abbey Wall Gardens should have a memorial plaque and seats.
- Costas area could describe the only unmarked Roman Corner Tower.
- More trees and green spaces instead of unappealing concrete.
- Market is shabby area next to the Shambles with empty stalls and needs an urgent revamp. Present situation is not good.
- Market needs investment to be a great attraction for residents and tourists.
- Market could be covered with a glass roof, café seating and areas of market split into different sections.
- Make Newgate food only and put rest in Clifford's Tower/Castle area.
- Market is sensitive issue and some were not convinced that relocation will address the issues faced by Newgate Market.
- Improve Whipmawhopmagate, Station Rise, Duncombe Place and Stonebow/Aldwark junction.
- Quality public art and distinctive street furniture was supported but should be appropriate for the location.
- Public art should be designed into street furniture and based on a thorough understanding of the character of the area so that it does not add to street clutter and is appropriate for the location. Some suggested public art that was temporary.
- Cycle storage in prominent locations should be designed into place settings, Newgate for example.
- Children's area could be put in Parliament Street.
- Parliament Street, Kings Square and St Helen's Square are already used well for performance areas but there is nowhere to host large events.

Q22: Where, if at all, should the footstreets be extended?

- Cycles should be allowed in footstreets.
- Footstreets should be traffic free with full restrictions for cars and vans from 11a.m. – 7 p.m.
- Too many blue badgeholders in pedestrian areas especially St. Sampson Square.
- City centre should be fully pedestrianised with drop kerbs and P&R rise and fall facilities.
- Do not allow cycles in pedestrian areas. Riversides could be improved further.
- Memorial Garden green space is important coach drop off and should be improved for coach users.
- Access improvements from gardens to city centre welcome.
- Wall walk between Monk Bar and proposed gardens at St Anthony's Hall at ground level next to the wall for people unable to climb steps or
- Consult on extension of footstreets including Fossgate, Micklegate, Goodramgate, Gillygate, Duncombe Place and Ouse Bridge.
- illuminate walls.

- Improve passageway between Leeman Road and Marygate near Marble Arch. Spaces should feel they are for residents as well as tourists.
- Protect existing green spaces and create new one round Clifford's Tower.

PUBLIC SPACES IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 20: Do you think that the existing routes that connect our public spaces and green spaces could be improved and if so how?

General Comments on this Issue:

- Quarters/designated areas are a good idea as it stops the city merging into one and easier to navigate. Need to open up and link areas which could be given themes for identification and walking tour guides could be produced for varying length walks highlighting attractions.
- Signage of routes should not create clutter – laser lighting can be used at night.
- Railings should not imprison pedestrians behind them.
- Several places where the footpaths should be widened.
- Cycle storage is needed.

QUESTION 20: Do you think the existing routes that connect our public spaces and green spaces could be improved and, if so, how?

OPTION 1: Carry out an assessment to identify areas where conflict exists between different road users and apply this to a strategy to manage such conflict in the public realm

N.B. 7 responded that Option 1 and 2 should be considered together and these comments have been counted separately below.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 supported | 0 objected | 0 Mixed | 2 Comments | 17 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|------------|---------|------------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Shift favour towards cyclists and pedestrians with more cycle storage in the city centre.
- It is critical for the AAP to enable primary modes of transport to be non-car and provide public and green spaces that enhance the quality of City's environment for residents and visitors.
- Need robust strategy to manage conflicts.
- Better to improve areas where conflict occurs than use resources to provide dedicated routes for tourists.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|------------|--------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particular attention should be given to improving the snickleways making sure they inviting and clean. • Castle Piccadilly would provide opportunities to connect green spaces to city centre. • Extend opening hours in the city from 08.30 to 17.30. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 20: Do you think the existing routes that connect our public spaces and green spaces could be improved and, if so, how? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Develop and expand the ‘Songline’ concept by defining a clear and recognisable network of routes around the city centre that encourages people to explore. | | | | | |
| Response: | 14 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 3 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of songlines is useful but name is meaningless. • Use Bristol’s legible city’s example. • City should be walkable for everyone | | | | | |
| QUESTION 20: Do you think the existing routes that connect our public spaces and green spaces could be improved and, if so, how? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Do nothing, the routes to and around our public spaces do not need promoting or improving. | | | | | |
| Response: | 5 Supported | 4 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | 12 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do nothing approach is unacceptable. • Litter and graffiti should be tackled as it gives very bad impression. • City should not be over-organised, part of York’s charm is within its hidden delights and chaos. • Too much signage creates clutter and confusion. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in the city centre in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: Enhance and de-clutter public spaces where necessary and re-design areas to incorporate co-ordinated lighting and street furniture improvements throughout the city centre. | | | | | |
| Response: | 15 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 15 Comment | 34 Total Responses |
| Key points made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large variety of paving materials should be rationalised and natural, traditional materials used. • Distinction between public spaces and routes not necessarily meaningful. | | | | | |

- Not helpful to separate green spaces from public spaces – there should be more green spaces.
- Public spaces could be transformed by modest enhancements.
- Maintenance is equally important – do not spread resources too thinly, ensure existing spaces are high quality.
- All Saint’s Pavement Churchyard and Alley to Coppergate. Garden unused and needs new grass and trees trimming. Whipmawhopmagate could be better with St Crux as a focus building by removing low barrier at the end of Stonebow House and more traditional wooden benches.
- Improve Whipmawhopmagate, Station Rise, Stonebow/Aldwark and Duncolmbe Place.

QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in the city centre in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?

OPTION 2: Review the potential to re-design and enhance Newgate Market to maximise the potential of the site and ensure the continuation of the historic market.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 15 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 6 Mixed | 5 Comment | 28 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Any changes should be done in full consultation with the market traders.
- Unconvinced redesigning the area will address the challenges faced by Newgate Market.
- Should be set up by 0830 and kept open until 1730 with no vehicles allowed in before then. Litter is a problem in the area.
- Remove one row of stalls from entrance and extend market onto Parliament Street on Friday and Saturdays.
- Newgate Market is shabby and needs an urgent revamp and investment particularly as it is a great attraction and is next to the Shambles.
- Why not cover with glass and split into different sections with more café seating.
- Market should be protected from the wind, be within 200m of the city centre and have improved stalls, lighting and services.

QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in the city centre in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?

OPTION 3: Relocate the market stalls to another site as part of wider proposals to improve the use and prosperity of Newgate Square. Where do you think this should be?

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 12 Supported | 7 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 3 Comment | 24 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- There was generally more support to retain Market in current position with a redesign of the space and possibly theme sections to improve viability of the market (see Option 2).
- North west end of Piccadilly may suit Market relocation. 9 suggested Parliament Street and 1 said it would not be suitable. 2 suggested Cliffords Tower Castle Car park.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market Stalls could extend on to Silver Street as the area suffers crime at night. Use area as a car park in the evening. | | | | | |
| <p>QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in the city centre in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?</p> <p>OPTION 4: Provide a dedicated outdoor performance space. Where do you think this should be?</p> <p>a) Newgate area beside the market b) Castle Piccadilly c) St John's Square (Hungate) d) Duncombe Place e) Somewhere else – please state where.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Response: (this has not been tabled to make it easier to record for the sub sections)</p> <p>a) 4 supported and 2 disagreed. b) 8 supported and 1 disagreed. Good location with setting for performance area. c) 5 supported, 2 objected and 1 mixed. More green spaces e.g. Castle Piccadilly d) 7 supported 1 objected and 1 mixed. e) 6 suggestions: (see second bullet on key points in next box below)</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Key points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More use should be made of existing spaces, there is no need for a dedicated outdoor space in the city centre. Suggested places for a performance space included Deans Gardens, Cliffords Tower/Castle Car Park, Exhibition Square, By the Museum in Museum Gardens, Open Space in Piccadilly, Newgate area instead of the market. | | | | | |
| <p>QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in the city centre in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?</p> <p>OPTION 5: Provide for public art schemes within the city spaces</p> | | | | | |
| Response: | 3 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 1 Comment | 8 Total Responses |
| <p>Key points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage artists to design public spaces through design briefs. One felt it should only be on occasional display and another felt there should be limits. Framed pictures project throughout city centre was very popular and transitional exhibits should be displayed. | | | | | |
| <p>QUESTION 22: Where, if at all, should the footstreets be extended?</p> <p>OPTION 1: Fossgate</p> | | | | | |
| Response: | 20 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 3 Comment | 25 Total Responses |
| <p>Key points made:</p> | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fossgate is unsupported by a well defined shopping area and would be viable as a footstreet as part of a more extensive scheme including Merchantgate and Piccadilly. • This would sever another cross city route and make the provision of a city centre North South route more difficult. • Should be shared area with cyclists permitted to use footstreet street. | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Goodramgate | | | | | |
| Response: | 21 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 1 Comment | 24 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor idea. Micklegate in both directions is part of the West-east cross city traffic route. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 22: Where, if at all, should the footstreets be extended? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Duncombe Place | | | | | |
| Response: | 14 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 1 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving the north end and Blake Street an extended use should be a priority. | | | | | |
| OPTION 4: Piccadilly | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 16 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piccadilly should be tree lined boulevard and pedestrianising this would require the central area traffic to be re-planned. • It would connect Castle Piccadilly/Tower area to rest of the city. • Coppergate and Piccadilly between Pavement and Merchantgate should be footstreets | | | | | |
| OPTION 5: Other areas: | | | | | |
| Response: | 8 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 2 Comment | 14 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petergate but would need to further examine restrictions on traffic currently exempt for Petergate • Micklegate is part of WE cross city traffic route and should not be considered. • Should include Micklegate in evenings. • Walmgate • St Leonard's Place • Gillygate through Colliergate • St Sampson's Square • Ouse Bridge • All in city walls except major roads. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| OPTION 6: No extension of the footstreets | | | | | |
| Response: | 2 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | 3 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None | | | | | |
| OPTION 7: Further restrictions on vehicles that are currently exempt in order to reduce traffic in certain areas. | | | | | |
| Response: | 7 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 9 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many disabled drivers (blue badge holders) in pedestrian areas during restricted times. • Would like to see all taxis licensed only if run on more environmentally friendly fuels within 10 years time. • Cycles should be permitted in all footstreets sharing space with pedestrians. • Coaches should be kept out of the city centre where possible. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – EXTENSION OF THE FOOTSTREETS | | | | | |
| QUESTION 20: Options 1, 2 and 3 will all be taken forward through LTP2 and the city centre accessibility work that the transport team are undertaking with the city development team. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 21: Options 1, 2 and 4 are the preferred options. Option 3 was abandoned because whilst part of the market could be relocated to another site it was the desire to retain the market on its current site but rationalising the space already there to reduce the financial loss currently subsidised by the Council. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 22: Options 1- 5 and 7 will be taken forward and individual actions for specific areas will be delivered following the completion of the Footstreets Review and the work currently being undertaken for the Footstreets and accessibility study by Halcrow. Option 6 (no extension of the footstreets) is unlikely to be taken forward as this option would not deliver the expected benefits of extending the footstreets. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | | Improvement of the connectivity and enhancement of the environment of city spaces will help to realise Strategic Objective 5 of the Core Strategy: Quality City which seeks to preserve and enhance York’s exceptional historic legacy and important views and the distinctive townscape characteristics of York’s neighbourhoods as well as to ensure that all new development delivers a high quality of urban design, architecture and public realm that will help to retain York’s international status as a key destination and help to attract inward investment as well as retaining a vibrant and pleasing city for the local residents and businesses. | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community | | This approach is consistent with the Community Strategy and will help to deliver strategic | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| strategy/local area agreement | ambitions of the Community Strategy which states that ‘the special characteristics of York – built and natural environment – must be enhanced’ ...’to attract further inward investment, economic development and physical growth without compromising that which makes the city attractive’ using York’s distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development. Other strategic aims include the need to balance physical growth and environmental sustainability with responsible choices, encourage walking and cycling and to clearly define and communicate the special qualities of York and the distinctiveness of the city and ensure future development and growth strengthens these qualities and the city’s unique environment’. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | These options have the potential to improve the environment and the viability of the city centre by ensuring that the city centre remains vibrant and economically viable in the face of increasing competition with other cities in the region. These options will help to maximise the economic, social and environmental benefits by attracting inward investment, safeguarding service sector, cultural, leisure and retail industries and ensuring that city spaces are attractive, active and interesting places to be for the whole community thus helping to achieve the aims set out above relating to PPS1, PPS6, PPG16 and PPG17. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Extension of the footstreets was supported in the consultation exercise. Work carried out so far, including consultation, for the Footstreets review has yet to conclude which streets will be taken forward for extension. At this stage identified likely extensions include Fossgate, Duncombe Place and Goodramgate as the most likely to go forward (Fossgate has been identified by local petitioners requesting extension of this street). However, whilst Options 1, 2 and 3 seem to be most likely to be progressed for extension at this stage this will not preclude other streets being included at a later date perhaps on a phased basis, if other criteria such as servicing, extension of opening times etc. permit. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | All of the options assessed had an element of uncertainty for some objectives due to lack of implementation or other details. QUESTION 20: Do you think the existing routes that connect our public spaces and green spaces could be improved and, if so, how? Option 1 to identify and develop a strategy to manage conflict in the public realm would encourage people to walk and cycle more, reduce carbon emissions and contribute towards reducing the impacts of climate change. It would also help people to feel safer if traffic conflicts were more comprehensively managed. |

Option 2 to define clear and recognisable routes around the city centre to encourage people to explore would help to sustain York's economy as they would feel more connected to main hub of the city and visit secondary streets more possibly encouraging them to stay longer. It would also mean that residents may find access to a wider variety of services.

Option 3 to do nothing would be the least sustainable option and would probably lead to the deterioration of some public spaces and increasingly disconnected streets in parts of the city. A combination of Option 1 and Option 2 would be the most sustainable and would encourage less dependency on cars in the city and help to achieve SA objectives EN2, S4 and EC3. Numerous positive effects identified, no negative identified. Some unknown (S2 & S6).

QUESTION 21: What do you think should be done to improve the public streets, squares and spaces in order to protect and enhance their quality and how do you think public art should be used to enhance the city centre?

Option 1 to enhance and redesign public spaces where necessary throughout the city. Positive effect if it helped to improve an areas appearance including the area around it as it would attract greater footfall and benefit local businesses. Would need to ensure individual character of areas was retained and that de-cluttering did not mean less seating or facilities rather that they are better organised and efficient.

Option 2: to review the potential to redesign and enhance Newgate Market to maximise the potential of the site and ensure it's continuation. Support for steps to help the market prosper.

Option 3: to relocate the market stalls to another site as part of wider proposals to improve Newgate Square and relocation to an area of greater footfall may help its survival. Positive if this was done in a way sympathetic to new surroundings and that met the market's requirements and would need to be readily accessible for non-motorised traffic. Newgate Market, especially the food market helps to meet local need and its continuation is important and supported.

Option 4: to provide dedicated performance area e.g. a) alongside current market, b) Castle Piccadilly, c) St John's Square (Hungate), Duncombe Place or elsewhere. Positive in that it gives people greater opportunities to participate providing access is by sustainable modes. Noise may be increased to surrounding areas and potential adverse impacts on surrounding areas need to be considered. This was mainly positive especially for objectives S1, S10, EC1, EC2 and EC3 with possible negative impacts for EN1, EN2, EN3 and S2 and with many

effects identified as uncertain.

Option 5: to provide public art would have a positive impact on area's characters by showcasing art works and could be combined with Option 1. Negative impacts could include increased litter and strain on the built environment from increased use. Could help to achieve SA objectives EN2, S1, S3 and EC3. Negative effects were indicated for objectives EN7, S2 and S4 with unknown impacts for some of the objectives and dependent on implantation for S6 & S7.

QUESTION 22: Where, if at all, should the footstreets be extended?

Options 1 and 4 very positive as they lead into and help serve the city centre. Restrictions on vehicles would encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport and improve air quality. Would need to ensure accessibility for disabled users.

Option 4: Provide dedicated performance area e.g. a) alongside current market, b) Castle Piccadilly, c) St John's Square (Hungate), Duncombe Place or elsewhere. Positive in that it gives people greater opportunities to participate providing access is by sustainable modes. Noise may be increased to surrounding areas and potential adverse impacts on surrounding areas need to be considered. This was mainly positive especially for objectives S1, S10, EC1, EC2 and EC3 with possible negative impacts for EN1, EN2, EN3 and S2 and with many effects identified as uncertain.

Option 5: to provide art schemes within city spaces would have a positive impact on area's characters by showcasing art works and could be combined with Option 1. Negative impacts could include increased litter and strain on the built environment from increased use. Could help to achieve SA objectives EN2, S1, S3 and EC3. Negative effects were indicated for objectives EN7, S2 and S4 with unknown impacts for some of the objectives and dependent on implantation for S6 & S7.

Option 6 is identified as the least sustainable option by the SA.

Option 7 would mean areas were more accessible to people and increase the city's attractiveness and businesses more accessible. Could make it difficult for some businesses as well if they depend on vehicular access e.g. venues etc. Social benefits are positive as footstreets are felt to be safer and services could be better integrated into peripheral roads and it would encourage healthier lifestyles. Users need to be considered to ensure negative impacts are not experienced by the elderly or infirm. Would help to achieve SA objectives EN2

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | and S8. Numerous positive effects identified, no negative effects identified. |
| 6) Community benefits | Social benefits are positive as footstreets are felt to be safer, and more attractive city spaces are felt to be safer and services could be better integrated into peripheral roads and it would encourage healthier lifestyles. Improved green spaces will help to mitigate the impending impacts of climate change and have proven social benefits increasing well being and encouraging more active lifestyles. Encouraging greater use of the riversides will attract inward investment and improve the environment of the underused and run down spaces beside the rivers as well as helping to reduce crime. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>Taking this approach will help to deliver the objectives of the Cultural Quarter as set out in the report to the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group (December 2008), the Review of Leisure Activities Strategy (October 2007) CYC, the Future York Group Report (2007) which has recommendations for a clear masterplan to guide development delivering transformational enhancements to the quality of the public realm. One of the key objectives was “improved streets and public spaces with a high quality well designed public realm, that is spectacular both by day and night with an exciting programme of events and activities for residents and visitors.” (page 7). It also says that “City of York Council should give priority to improving the quality of the public realm across the historic city.” (page 24). Visit York’s partnership document “York a Vision for Tourism” also seeks improved public realm to increase visitor spend and stay and the consultation carried out in the Area Action Plan’s Issues and Options and the Cultural Quarter consultations showed strong support to enhance the environment of the city to achieve the objectives set out above.</p> <p>The Council is currently developing a Street Design and Place Principles guidance which will form a make contribution to both the objectives and implementation of the public realm strategy. The emerging city centre accessibility framework is a key evidence base which will review and assess all transport, walking and cycling proposals including their management. This will also include a review of the current operation of the footstreets.</p> |
| Effective 8) Viability | Improving the city centre public realm is considered viable to retain York’s international status and inward investment. The City Centre Accessibility Framework will ultimately determine the viability of access and movement proposals and provide the basis on which to determine site specific proposals. |
| 9) Deliverability | The recommendations of the key evidence bases (the Transport Accessibility Study and the Historic Core Character Appraisals) will inform the next stage of the AAP. The footstreets |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>review being undertaken by Halcrow is being done in 3 phases: one to show the strategic context and city centre accessibility work, two to show the use and misuse of the footstreets and three to recommend phasing of work. Once the above studies are finalised and assessed then site specific proposals will be taken forward in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy. More details will be outlined in the City Centre Area Action Delivery Plan. Delivery of the preferred approach will be implemented by the Council and identified partners. Enhancements may include a range of proposals including traffic management and regulation to physical improvements to streets and spaces. Each will require a specific range of proposals to meet differing objectives with some major changes and others being minor.</p> |
| 10) Flexibility | <p>This approach will be flexible as it will be developed as part of the public realm strategy in partnership with others. The AAP will be monitored and reviewed over time and improvements forming part of a city centre public realm strategy will involve several proposals in various locations ensuring flexibility as delivery is phased. Whilst it is able to be adapted to changing circumstances it will also remain consistent with the overall objectives for design, access and movement.</p> |
| <p>NEXT STEPS Improvement of the connectivity of city spaces, enhancement of the environment of city spaces and extension of some of the footstreets, will be taken forward in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy. Additionally, the Footstreets Review (being carried out by Halcrow who will make recommendations) will form the evidence base for the Movement strategy and LTP3 and this will inform (and form part of) the development of the Strategy.</p> | |

KEY THEME 1: GREENING THE CITY CENTRE AND USE OF RIVERSIDES: QUESTIONS 23 and 24

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development has key principles to ensure development plans address the causes and potential impacts of climate change as well as the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and provision of good quality green and open space.

Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 notes the importance of green spaces and infrastructure in helping to combat the impacts of climate change including storage for flood water, helping to reduce carbon emissions and surface water run-off and reducing the heat island effect in cities.

Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, acknowledges that biodiversity should be enhanced in green spaces to benefit wildlife and people to improve the quality of life.

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation and the Companion Guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities reflect recognition of the wider benefits of open space to encourage healthy lifestyles, improve well-being and community cohesion as well as recreational facilities.

Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control notes the need to protect and improve the natural environment, public health, safety and amenity. Protection and enhancement of green spaces is an important aspect of this with its natural capacity to absorb carbon emissions and reduce air pollution in city centres.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS notes the need to manage land for biodiversity enhancement and increasing tree cover noting that LDFs should identify the functional role of green infrastructure in supporting the provision of renewable energy, urban microclimate control and flood risk management. It highlights the need to identify the functional role of green infrastructure in supporting the provision of renewable energy, urban microclimate control and acknowledges the need to improve health by maximising opportunities to develop walking and cycling routes as part of green infrastructure plans.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

Strategic Aim 8 seeks 'to increase the amount and quality of publicly accessible green open space' by 'promoting a green infrastructure approach to planning with green linkages between open spaces to maximise their benefit to people and wildlife' as well as 'to protect and enhance the biodiversity, landscape character and environmental quality' to balance physical growth and environmental sustainability with responsible choices in respect of climatic and environmental changes'.

The Community Strategy aims to enable everyone in York to enjoy, conserve and enhance the natural and built environment for the benefit of present and future generations as well as promote local access to the natural environment for physical activity, health and the wellbeing of communities.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Council will set out a strategic approach in the Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Document as part of the emerging Core Strategy. The two regionally significant green corridors are the River Ouse and River Foss as well as the Sustrans cycle route connecting St Nicholas Fields with the northern part of the city. The Core Strategy Issues and Options 'Festival of Ideas 2' public consultation identified the most important priority as being 'reducing our impact on the environment' (63%). Green spaces and green infrastructure are an important part of helping to achieve this as they reduce the need to travel by car, encourage biodiversity and

increase well being and healthy lifestyles for all.

Regarding flows of pedestrians around the city it is worth noting that the Local Transport Plan 2 (2011-2021) seeks reallocation of road space in the city centre for cyclists and pedestrians with establishment of a low emission zone. The zone is likely to be identified as the city centre and will be clarified in the emerging Feasibility study.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (December 2008) PMP, CYC identified a sufficient supply of open space in the city but a lack of natural and semi-natural space, a sufficiency of amenity green space, a lack of provision for children and facilities for young people and a lack of outdoor sports facilities.

There was strong support in the consultations to improve the quality of green spaces and support to green the city wherever possible (including green roofs although a few expressed concern that some buildings would not be appropriate).

The UK Green Building Council and Greening UK's cities (March 2009 and May 2008) have both stressed that green roofs, living walls and traditional parks can make us all feel happier and healthier as well as giving something back to nature. There is increasing evidence that green spaces increase the economic value as well as biodiversity enhancement (complementing PPS9 which notes the importance of improving the amount and quality of green space in cities).

Botanical Survey of the embankments of York's city walls, Martin Hammond audits the variety of plants and animals on the city walls which provide the settings for the city walls.

Yorkshire and Humber Climate Change Strategy Draft (2009)

Further Evidence Base Documents currently being prepared

Emerging York Biodiversity Action Plan (due to be completed by the end of 2009) CYC will identify key priority species and habitats

Emerging Green Infrastructure SPD, CYC will set out detailed objectives, recommendations and actions to protect green spaces.

Emerging Climate Change Strategy (CYC) due in Spring 2010 will outline out recommendations to mitigate Climate Change.

Emerging Regional Biodiversity Strategy is seeking to conserve and enhance our biodiversity and ensure that biodiversity fully contributes towards the region's aspirations.

Proposed Tree Strategy (CYC) will give guidance for the whole of the York administrative area.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|---|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|----|-------|-------|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 11. High quality public realm for activities and events | * | ** / | * / | / ? | / ? | / ? | ? / * | ? | ? | ** | ? / - | ? / ? | | | / * | / O | O | O | / * | * | O | ** | ? |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|-----|----|---|-----|-----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|---|
| 14. High quality environment (inc.greenspaces and trees) | I | ** | ** | * | ** | ? | ? | * | ** | ?/ | ?/ | ** | I/O | ? | I | I/ | O | O | ? | O | * | O | |
| 17. Use river areas to stimulate leisure, commercial and tourist activity | * | O | O | -/I | O | - | I/- | -/I | I | ** | -/I | ? | ? | O | ?/ | I/ | I/ | O | ?/ | ** | O | ** | * |

GREENING THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- Green spaces received strong support by respondents with many stating that they should be considered in the wider context of green infrastructure connections. Most wanted more green spaces with a few stating we should improve existing spaces.
- Street trees were welcomed to increase biodiversity, and to help to reduce heat island effect and surface water run off.
- The CCAAP intention should be to ensure Green Infrastructure is appropriately managed and new development takes account of the impact on green spaces.
- Support to protect existing green spaces and create a new one round Clifford’s Tower where the car park currently exists.
- Cycle route (green route) to rail station needed.
- Hungate, YNW and Foss Islands could all offer areas for green spaces/parkland.
- Piccadilly should be a tree lined boulevard if central area traffic is re-planned.

Consultation at the ‘Festival of Ideas 2’ Event in October 2007 revealed that participants felt the emphasis should be on improving the quality rather than the quantity of green space noting the needs of teenagers and children should be met in parks and open spaces as they are the main users. Key areas offering opportunities to add green cover in the city centre included large sites such as Hungate which does not include green space.

GREENING THE CITY CENTRE- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 23: What are the best ways to improve access to, and awareness of, key green spaces, and in which areas?
OPTION 1: Improve access between the riverside and the Memorial and Museum Gardens by opening up spaces to the riversides where appropriate.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 17 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | 21 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- The Memorial Garden now has an improved path to riverside and would benefit from more seating, lighting and artwork. A third access between the rowing club and walls could be pursued but access can be improved without wholesale opening up.
- Whilst many supported greater access to the rivers it was also stated that opening up Memorial Garden would lead to a loss of distinction between stillness of green spaces and general movement of the city and as such, should not become a thoroughfare.
- Museum Gardens have listed railings and quiet spaces at present and opening later would present night security issues. Railings are listed and define walkways and the gardens already have double gates to the river.
- Castle Piccadilly would provide opportunities to connect green spaces by the river to the city centre.

QUESTION 23: What are the best ways to improve access to, and awareness of, key green spaces, and in which areas?

OPTION 2: Integrate the large green space at Station Road with the Memorial Garden to form one large green space.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 10 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 3 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Whilst many felt this would create an alternative green route into the city centre others felt this option was not practical or cost effective and would result in a loss of character of both Station Road and Memorial Gardens.
- A few supported the option if the green areas were to remain enclosed – but there were mixed views and others did not want to create a busy thoroughfare through these quiet spaces and stated the Memorial Gardens should be retained as a quiet space.

QUESTION 23: What are the best ways to improve access to, and awareness of, key green spaces, and in which areas?

OPTION 3: Further explore the viability of projects such as the City Wall ramparts (a green corridor around the city walls).

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 13 Supported | 5 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | 21 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Most supported measures to investigate the viability of projects to green the city walls included seeding green area around the walls with native plants to create meadowland to replace sterile grass. A minority felt that spaces around the walls are part of the scheduled monument and setting of the walls and felt that this does not mean they are underused and they should be left as they are.
- Planting of more flowers and shrubs are preferable to trees which may obscure important views.
- Commuted sums were suggested to secure wall improvements from development in the vicinity of the walls
- Historic trail around the city walls would be a good idea.

**QUESTION 23: What are the best ways to improve access to, and awareness of, key green spaces, and in which areas?
OPTION 4: Explore the need for and viability of creating a new children’s play area. Where do you think this should be located?**

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 13 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 7 Comment | 24 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- The principle of play space was supported but views about location were very mixed. Suggestions for childrens’ play spaces included: next to Skeldergate Bridge, St John’s car park, York Northwest, Bootham Hospital field, Coppergate centre, Newgate Market, Museum Gardens behind Marygate Tower, Castle Piccadilly and York Northwest.
- Sports and recreation should be included in Green Infrastructure strategies.

QUESTION 24: How should we be developing further opportunities for ‘greening’ the city centre and enhancing existing green spaces?

OPTION 1: Investigate and identify city centre opportunities for additional new planting of appropriate indigenous plants and trees

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 30 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 4 Mixed | 6 Comment | 40 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- Trees in Parliament Street were supported but some felt that they are the wrong type, in the wrong place and obscure key views.
- An ongoing gradual replacement of trees now too large for their location was supported with maintenance/replacement of existing trees noting particular care needed for trees by roads.
- Minster area, the city walls, Castle Piccadilly, Nunnery Lane, Exhibition Square and Parliament Street were all suggested for additional planting.
- Many welcomed greening strategies and street trees to increase biodiversity, reduce runoff and to help to reduce heat island effect improve air quality and reduce the effects of climate change.
- Urban tree loss is a problem and need a proactive approach.
- Should make reference to SUDs and consider the wider context of green corridors, not as a bubble of greenness.

QUESTION 24: How should we be developing further opportunities for ‘greening’ the city centre and enhancing existing green spaces?

OPTION 2: Green roofs should be encouraged where appropriate on new and refurbished buildings to improve biodiversity and

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| surface water run-off. | | | | | |
| Response: | 20 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 4 Mixed | 1 Comment | 28 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although this option received general support for the benefits that green roofs would provide, the emphasis was ‘where appropriate’ in historic settings and some felt green roofs may be problematic for minor buildings. • Water permeable surfaces should be a priority. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 24: How should we be developing further opportunities for ‘greening’ the city centre and enhancing existing green spaces? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Maximise opportunities for Green Infrastructure by linking green spaces and corridors. | | | | | |
| Response: | 23 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 4 Comment | 28 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven respondents suggested the Castle car park as a new green open space. • Should refer to the contribution green spaces make to improving the environment. • Policies should explore management of green space to enhance biodiversity including more bat and bird boxes in the city with more window boxes encouraged. • Improving green Cycle routes is important to support improvement of green infrastructure. There are opportunities to create continuous green link between Castle precinct and Tower Gardens and exploit green space between Foss and Ouse. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – | | | | | |
| <p>Question 23: Options 1, 3 and 4 are the preferred options to take forward in the CCAAP because all of these were supported through the consultation and would help to improve the permeability of the city centre, support the emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy and would be the most beneficial for York in terms of maximising the benefits to residents, businesses and tourists.</p> <p>Question 24: Options 1 – 3 were all supported and will be taken forward for inclusion in a general policy principle for the City Centre that will complement the emerging Biodiversity Action Plan for York, the Green Infrastructure Strategy (part of the Core Strategy) and the proposed Tree Strategy.</p> | | | | | |

| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
|---|---|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>The AAP is consistent with the emerging Core Strategy approach to enhance and protect all green assets in York where possible acknowledging the opportunities for improving the quality of life, health and well-being, contributing to climate change and flood mitigation, enhanced inward investment and helping to create a sense of place. It is consistent with targets to improve biodiversity, protect and increase the amount and quality of open space and increase the amount and quality of green corridors and supports the Regional Biodiversity Strategy and York Biodiversity Action Plan. The Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 seeks to increase levels of walking and cycling and promotion of health living and improving the green corridor network should help to reduce reliance on cars which is consistent with the Transport Plan aspirations.</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The AAP is consistent with the Community Strategy which outlines how the quality of life can be improved across the city through objectives in York – The Healthy City ensuring residents enjoy healthy lifestyles and objectives in The Sustainable City to ensure that York has a quality, built and natural environment encouraging development of green spaces for all. The York Local Area Agreement notes green spaces will help to deliver objectives to address deficiencies in provision for young people, ensure the quality of facilities meet local needs, through the promotion of good quality design and ensure that all residents have access to high quality public spaces.</p> |
| <p>3) Regional and national guidance</p> | <p>The objective to increase both the quality and amount of green space complies with PPS 9 which has objectives to conserve and enhance biological and geological diversity, sustaining and improving the quality and amount of habitat where possible. The AAP objectives concur with protecting networks of natural habitats including rivers in urban environments and contributing towards urban renaissance, and a better quality of life through a high quality environment and people’s sense of well-being.</p> <p>The AAP is consistent with PPG17’s objectives to support urban renaissance, promote social inclusion and health and well-being as well as sustainable development.</p> <p>The AAP supports aims of PPS1 seeking to promote high quality urban regeneration, improve access to good quality open space, improve the natural environment in urban areas and conserve and enhance wildlife and PPS23 outlines the need to protect environmental quality and natural resources such as air and water quality and protected species.</p> <p>The Plan supports the objectives of RSS which outline importance of retaining and incorporation of</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>biodiversity in development and networks of green infrastructure and ecological corridors is highlighted along with the need to improve health by maximising opportunities to develop walking and cycling routes as part of green infrastructure plans. These are realised through Policies YH1, YH8, ENV1, ENV8, and ENV11.</p> <p>The Yorkshire Plan for sport has priorities to improve health and wellbeing and widen access to open space helping to create stronger, safer communities.</p> |
| <p>Justified 4) Consultation response</p> | <p>All of the options to green the city received strong support with the vast majority wishing to ensure that green spaces were increased in amount and quality and this is entirely in keeping with national, regional and local objectives to protect and enhance green space to improve health and wellbeing, biodiversity and inward investment.</p> <p>QUESTION 23.</p> <p>Option 1 received support, it was felt that opening up the riverside has, to some degree, would improve access and linkages between sites that would support the aim to make green spaces more accessible and better linked to each other and the city centre. Whilst extra entrances are unlikely to be an option in the short term it would tie in with the Museum Garden's own aspirations to improve the entrances to the park to give more of a sense of arrival for visitors. Improvement of the riverside areas was supported and will be pursued through the Public Realm Strategy for the city centre as an identified project area for improvement.</p> <p>There was strong support for the construction of a pedestrian bridge crossing from the Railway Station to the Museum Gardens were to be constructed then this would provide a key green route into the city along the riverside and through the Museum Gardens. This was to be considered in the York North West Area Action Plan which is currently on hold but it is considered that the most likely realisation of a bridge crossing would be through large scale development of this site and it is hoped that this will still be realised in the future.</p> <p>Option 3 will benefit the people of York, businesses and tourists by improving the setting and attraction of the walls which attract millions of visitors each year and is a major tourist attraction for the city.</p> <p>Option 2 was discarded and whilst this did receive support, on further investigation this option</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>proved to be neither practical or cost effective due to the amount of services beneath the road and the need to retain access for emergency vehicles to these. Additionally, some felt that combining the spaces would result in a loss of character of both Station Road and the Memorial Gardens.</p> <p>Option 4 will be taken forward through the Council's Leisure Department who have recently won a successful bid through PlayBuilder 2009. This scheme will allow the creation and/or refurbishment of 22 new sites across York. Provisional locations for these have been identified and one in the city centre (in Guildhall) will fill the gap identified in the Open Space Study carried out for the City of York Council (final sites are being discussed at present but favoured sites have been the Museum Gardens to the rear of the Art Gallery and Exhibition Square). There may be the opportunity for other more informal play areas within the city centre in the future and these will not be precluded. The CCAAP will support the aims of the playbuilder scheme.</p> |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | <p>QUESTION 23: Green Spaces and riversides Green spaces will play an important part helping York adapt to climate change by reducing flood from intensive rainfall, and help to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the city centre. Improving riverside spaces would encourage walking and cycling into the city and reduce carbon emissions. Option 3 has the potential to adversely impact the setting of the city walls if not done sensitively. Enhanced riverside areas would encouraging higher footfall helping to promote new businesses. SA Objectives EN2, EN3, EN5 and S1 could be met. Option 4 would help to address deficiencies of children's play space. Most would positively contribute towards SA objectives especially EN2, EN3, EN4, EN8, EN9, S1, S3, S8 and EC3. Some were not expected to have significant impact and the only possible negative identified was S2.</p> <p>QUESTION 24: Opportunities for greening the city Benefits would depend on implementation. Options 1 & 2 would absorb carbon emissions, encourage improved air quality, rainfall absorption and biodiversity. Option 2 would reduce energy use but may conflict with design considerations. Option 3 would benefit biodiversity. Options 1 & 3 would create a better environment for the city with opportunities to improve knowledge of biodiversity and energy through information panels but would also be the most resource intensive in terms of cost.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | SA objectives EN3 could be met and actively help the city to adapt to climate change and the options were identified as being very positive for most objectives with only one possible negative impact for objective S2 identified. |
| 6) Community benefits | Studies carried out by CABI and others, highlight evidence to support the benefits of green space for communities including: improved social inclusion/community cohesion, better air quality and biodiversity, economic uplift, mental well-being and encouragement of physical activity. Successful green spaces attract and help to combat the effects of climate change by absorption of water and reduction of the heat island effect in cities. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (December 2008) PMP, CYC notes the need to provide a sufficient mix of open space in the city to encourage healthy lifestyles and provide local amenity but highlights a lack of natural space.</p> <p>Local Transport Plan 2 study found that whilst it is unfeasible to introduce commercial river transport in York in the short term, an option in the longer-term could focus on opportunities to divert construction traffic onto the river, as this is something that has proved viable in the past and would be a potential option for the proposed public realm enhancement works.</p> <p>Green Space Report, CABI (2002) highlighted that parks and open spaces offer opportunities for social inclusion, and link to other agendas such as education, diversity, economic benefits, social inclusion, environment and healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>Regional Biodiversity Strategy outlines the need to conserve protected species and their habitats (Otters, bats and river species such as lampreys and crayfish all live in city environs).</p> <p>Botanical Survey of the embankments of York's city walls, Martin Hammond (2002) listed the species of flora found within the green spaces around the walls.</p> <p>Yorkshire and Humber Climate Change Strategy Draft (2009) contains recommendations to mitigate the effects of climate change which includes the protection of green spaces and flood storage areas that all Local Development Documents will need to comply with.</p> <p><i>Note- further Evidence Base Documents currently being prepared include:</i></p> <p>Emerging York Biodiversity Action Plan (due to be completed by the end of 2009) CYC Emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy (CYC) will have SPD status, and set out detailed objectives, recommendations and actions to improve green corridors.</p> |
| Effective 8) Viability | The 7 options suggested will all be investigated further through the Spatial Masterplan approach with the areas suggested subject to further targeted consultation followed by a programme of enhancement and improvement for specific sites. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| 9) Deliverability | Taking the options forward through the Public Realm Masterplan and Accessibility Framework will result in a hierarchy of improvements in throughout the city centre that will be delivered as resources permit. The AAP will link with/be informed by the emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan and the Tree Strategy at a high level |
| 10) Flexibility | The AAP will be flexible enough to cope with changing circumstances. |

NEXT STEPS

Three emerging studies: 1) York BAP, 2) Green Infrastructure Strategy and 3) York Climate Change Action Plan, will inform the final policies for the LDF and the Area Action Plan.
Ongoing liaison with internal departments re biodiversity, climate change, parks, flooding, leisure services, landscaping and street trees.
Continued dialogue with Museums Trust regarding future development plans for Museum Gardens.
Review of green spaces in the city centre to identify the location and type of improvements that could take place as part of the Public Realm and Movement Strategy.

FLOODING IN THE CITY CENTRE: QUESTION 25

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (December 2006) seeks to reduce flood risks to the built and natural environment and balance the needs of development with an approach that does not add to flood risk. The Pitt Review (2008) investigated the 2007 floods noting the increased need for actions to address flood risk where possible.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

At a regional level the adopted RSS (May 2008) requires 'help to mitigate flooding through proactive planning and management and provide appropriate protection, especially in York and Selby'. The RSS also requires that the region will manage flood risk proactively by reducing the causes of flooding to existing and future development, and avoid development in high flood risk areas where possible.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

York - The Sustainable City has strategic aims to support measures to reduce the risk of flooding in York. This specifically acknowledges the need to support a partnership approach in river catchments above York by the Environment Agency.

LDF Core Strategy:

The emerging Core Strategy has a strategic objective to ensure that new development is not subject to, nor contributes to, inappropriate levels of flood risk from the Rivers Ouse, Foss and Derwent and other sources, taking into account the full likely future impacts of climate change. Strategic Flood Risk Zones are noted below for reference:

Zone 1: Little or no risk.

Zone 2: Low to medium risk.

Zone 3a (1) – areas at high risk of flooding which are currently defended to 1 in 100 year protection.

Zone 3a (ii) – areas at high risk of flooding which are currently defended to 50 year protection for existing development, but are not defended to the appropriate 1 in 100 year for new development.

Zone 3a (iii) – areas at risk of flooding which are not currently defended to 50 year protection.

Zone 3b Functional Floodplain.

The emerging Policy CS15: Flood Risk will ensure flood risk is minimised to new development from the rivers and their tributaries and watercourses. Development in the Flood Zone 3b will not be allowed apart from Water Compatible and Essential Infrastructure uses. Development in high flood risk areas (Flood Zone 3a(i,ii, and iii)) will be subject to consideration of the most sustainable options at all levels of flood risk posed.

In line with the City of York Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (that considers future climate change) must be submitted with appropriate planning applications (as outlined in PPS25). This covers Flood Zones 2, 3a(i), (ii), (iii) and 3b and development proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1.

Brownfield developments in York will be required to demonstrate that there will be a reduction of at least 30% in existing run-off rates as a result of the development, this includes an allowance of 20% for Climate Change. Greenfield developments need to demonstrate no alteration of run-off rates following completion of development.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2007) for CYC notes the need to reduce surface water run off as one of several measures including slowing down and storing the rainfall from surrounding hills before it reaches the city centre. Well documented history of flooding. The 2000 flood was over 11 times the normal average summer flow flooding over 350 premises. Most of the city centre was protected by flood barriers but river rises have, since then, come dangerously close to overtopping defences even with the Foss Barrier (built in 1986/7 following severe flooding in 1947/ 1978 and 1982).

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|----|------|----|------|------|------|----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 14. High quality environment (inc.greenspaces and trees) | I | ** | ** | * | ** | ? | ? | * | ** | ?/ * | ?/ - | ** | I/ ? | O | ? | I | I/ * | O | O | ? | O | * | O |
| 17. Use river areas to stimulate leisure, commercial and tourist activity | * | O | O | -/ I | O | - | I/ - | -/ I | I | ** | -/ I | ? | ?/ - | O | ?/ O | I/ * | I/ * | O | ?/ * | ** | O | ** | * |

The above is directly linked to flood risk as flooding both erodes the high quality of the built and natural environment and impacts upon the tourism uses on rivers and riversides as well as tourism generally as it causes loss of tourism income especially through poor press reporting.

FLOODING IN THE CITY CENTRE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- The area at Clifton Ings stores water and this area is being enhanced as a flood storage area by the Environment Agency and the policy needs a wider approach than these options, or a combination of them, can provide.
- A wider technical approach was needed over a catchment basin area to be effective which included flood prevention measures in conjunction with the Environment Agency upstream such as moorland gripping, upstream catchment areas etc. Support through technical solutions is important but need to consider whole area not just city centre. Need flood plains, tree planting and wider solutions.
- Should insist on the following: SUDs such as green roofs, rainwater reuse and porous surfaces, recognised flood resilience and resistance principles for flood zones 2 & 3 and a 30% reduction in run off for brownfield sites.
- There was general support (with a few objectors) for green roofs - but strong support was given for SUDs/porous surfaces and water/rain harvesting as well as other technical solutions and these will be taken forward through other strategies.

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| FLOODING - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| QUESTION 25: What approach should the AAP take to address flood issues? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: Investigate the requirement for all development in the city centre to incorporate rainwater harvesting and re-use of water where appropriate. | | | | | |
| Response: | 18 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 19 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other measures are needed - to prevent reduction of green space and over development of areas in and around the city. • Options 1-3 should be pursued across the whole area not just the city centre along with appropriate drainage infrastructure. • The need for permeable surfaces was emphasized. • Other policies are needed as flood risk cannot be dealt with solely by adoption of these options. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 25: What approach should the AAP take to address flood issues? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Investigate the requirement for all development in the city centre to incorporate technical solutions that will mitigate against flooding such as recognised flood resilience and resistance measures. | | | | | |
| Response: | 20 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | 20 Total Responses |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include use of SUDs. Important that AAP outlines it's approach to climate change impacts and considers the Regional Climate Change Study. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 25: What approach should the AAP take to address flood issues? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Investigate a requirement for all development within the city centre to incorporate means of reducing run off such as porous surfaces, green roofs, etc. | | | | | |
| Response: | 15 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | 17 Total Responses |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include use of SUDs. Important that AAP outlines it's approach to climate change impacts and considers the Regional Climate Change Study. • The AAP should refer to the importance of SUDs and soakaways and promote awareness of issues of surface water from new development and redevelopment. • Green roofs should be encouraged on all new development as well as rainwater re-use to help prevent flooding and reduce heat absorption (this was a response to Greening the City p.68). Whilst there was overall support for green roofs a few expressed concern on the impact on York's character and setting stating that green roofs were inappropriate and would impact on York's character and historic settings. | | | | | |
| QUESTION 25: What approach should the AAP take to address flood issues? | | | | | |
| OPTION 4: Do nothing, flood risk management is dealt with through other policies and strategies. | | | | | |
| Response: | 4 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 0 Comment | 8 Total Responses |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding in York is caused by rainfall on the Pennines and needs a wider approach to that which the AAP can offer with some emphasising the need to consider the whole area including flood plains, tree planting and wider solutions. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS - FLOOD RISK | | | | | |
| The principles of Options 1 to 3 will be taken forward through more strategic policies and in the Flood Risk Guidance being developed by CYC which will be used by Development Control for new development not just in the city centre but throughout York. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | The options will be taken forward through other policies which are consistent with the Core Strategy which applies a risk-based approach to the preparation of development plans and development control decisions through a sequential test and considers flood risk areas and advice from the Environment Agency. The AAP is consistent with, and informed by, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2007) which is a key evidence base. The Exception Test helps to balance wider sustainability issues with flood risk and allows a balance to be struck in some instances between flood risk and wider sustainability objectives for the city centre in the context of global warming. | | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Options are consistent with Strategic Aim 12 of the community strategy as it fully supports the flood risk management partnership projects in river catchments above York (currently being developed by the Environment Agency). | | | | |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | Consistent with PPS25; Development and Flood Risk which sets out the need to adopt a risk-based approach to proposals for development in, or affecting, flood risk areas and the RSS particularly the following: Policy YH1 which states the need to avoid increasing flood risk and manage land and river catchments for | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>flooding mitigation, renewable energy generation, biodiversity enhancement and increasing tree cover, Policy YH8 that notes LDFs should identify the functional role of green infrastructure in supporting the provision of renewable energy, urban microclimate control and flood risk management. Policy Y1c notes the need to mitigate flooding and improve air quality and Policy Y1f notes the need to manage flood risk in line with Policy ENV1 along the River Ouse. The principle of options 1 - 3 will be taken forward through other strategies that are consistent with, and take forward these policies.</p> |
| <p>Justified 4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Most responses wished to take forward options 1 – 3 with some noting the need for higher level measures. Since the City Centre Area Action Plan: Issues and Options Report was published the emerging Core Strategy has taken forward Policy C14 to address flood risk in the city centre in line with the National and a Guidance Note for Development in Flood Risk Areas is being developed and considered for statutory status and will be used by Development Control within the Council and options 1-3 will be progressed by other policies designed to tackle flooding at a more strategic and more effective level.</p> <p>The principles of Options 1 to 3 will be taken forward in the Flood Risk Guidance being developed by CYC which will be used by Development Control for new development not just in the city centre but throughout York. The Council fully recognise that flood risk avoidance is of vital importance for York but policies that tackle the city centre only will be ineffective compared to measures currently emerging that will tackle flood risk mitigation on a more strategic level. A combined and co-ordinated approach needs to deal with flooding through wider reaching strategies and to this end, flood risk policies are currently being developed at a regional and local level. Regionally, catchment area river basin management look at upstream measures to reduce rainfall reaching York in the first place as part of a more extensive geographical, co-ordinated approach by the Environment Agency. This course of action reflects the way we work and will work in the future, a task which should be made easier by impending legislation in the Flood and Water Management Bill, currently out to consultation.</p> <p>Whilst no specific flood policy will be proposed in the AAP it will be made clear that other plans and strategies to prevent/reduce flooding will be supported including green and brown roofs where appropriate.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>All of the options assessed had an element of uncertainty for some objectives due to lack of implementation or other details.</p> <p>Climate change will have a significant effect on the frequency and severity of flooding. A Climate Change Strategy for York is currently being developed.</p> <p>Combination of options 1, 2 & 3 should be encouraged and incorporated into a design guide which would help</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | to limit flood risk. Options 1 and 3 would help to reduce the impact of flooding. Incorporating technical solutions would add to the cost of new developments and impact on the viability of homes in some areas. Would help to achieve SA objectives EN6 and EN9. Very negative effects could result if implementation was not sensitively handled for objectives SEN9 and S2 with possible negative impacts for EN4, EN6, EN7 and S4 (dependent on implementation). |
| 6) Community benefits | A significant proportion of the city centre lies within flood zones 2 and 3 and certain communities are affected more than others. A combination of options 1 – 3 taken forward through wider reaching strategies will enable a balance allowing the city centre to develop and change to retain its economic, social and environmental vibrancy and effectiveness without increasing flood risk through new development helping to protect homes and businesses. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The flooding of 365 properties and the threatened flooding of a further 5000 caused by high levels of rainfall following a wet autumn initiated the development of the City of York Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (September 2007) which is a key evidence base and splits the city into zones according to their level of flood risk. The Exception Test helps to balance wider sustainability issues with flood risk and allows a balance to be struck in some instances between flood risk and wider sustainability objectives in the context of global warming. The Pitt Report and PPS25: Development and Flood Risk and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2007) for CYC has informed the option appraisal. |
| Effective 8) Viability | Option 4 was felt to be the most effective approach as it will ensure that mitigation measures are dealt with in the higher strategies and in the most appropriate way (flooding in York is caused by high rainfall from the surrounding hills and as such is best mitigated at catchment level). It is necessary to tackle flood risk in a more wide reaching strategy such as river catchment management plans to be truly effective. Locally effective means of tackling flood risk such as SUDs, porous surfaces, flood storage areas and flood defence schemes are already in place for York and will be included in the Core Strategy Policy CS14 (and will be considered in the emerging Climate Change Strategy) whilst the emerging Flood Risk Guidance includes technical solutions with the intention of becoming a statutory strategy. |

| | |
|--|---|
| 9) Deliverability | A way of balancing the need to develop and mitigate flood risk is needed at a much wider level. The principle of options 1 – 3 will all be delivered through other, higher level strategies and at a local level these will be realised through required Flood Risk Assessments and the Flood Risk Guidance which will advise on technical solutions for development at risk of flooding in line with PPS25: Development and Flood Risk with advice from the Environment Agency. Options 1, 2 and 3 were not taken forward through the Area Action Plan because it was felt that, with the emerging Flood Risk Guidance and wider EA any further options for the city centre are not wide reaching enough and would not offer effective impacts and there needed to be a much wider approach. The CCAAP will support the higher level strategies. Policies for flood risk will be delivered through Policy CS15: Flood Risk in the emerging Core Strategy and the Flood Risk Guidance which will inform and assist new development. |
| 10) Flexibility | Option 4 allows for changing circumstances through the wider reaching partnership approach being considered by the Environment Agency at a regional and catchment level and a local level through the Core Strategy and Flood Risk Guidance. Both these documents will help to mediate/reduce flood risk through a more comprehensive range of policies and recommendations than the AAP could deliver but take forward the principles of all of these options must be considered and upheld. Existing strategies ensure that development in flood risk areas are subject to a Sequential Test to ensure there are no better alternative sites and the Exception Test (which gives requirements to mitigate flood risk) in order to balance the needs of development with mitigation of flood risk. |
| <p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Continued liaison with internal departments and the Environment Agency to ensure continuing compliance with the emerging Core Strategy policies and emerging Flood Risk Guidance/Strategy as well as the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for York. These will be referred to in the CCAAP as well as consideration of the emerging Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>Internal officers have met to discuss guidance and the consensus at the time was that the guidance was too complicated and need to be simplified for more straightforward types of application. Although we are asking for information at the validation stage (based on the guidance produced) discussions have taken place regarding the emerging guidance and looking into incorporating it into the application validation checklist along with various other updates.</p> <p>To date a report has not been submitted to a Committee because of these issues, and also due to the awareness of changes to the requirements for SUDS. Once these issues have been overcome the Flood Risk Guidance will be in a position to be completed and will take forward the principles of Options 1 –3 along with the other strategic guidance already mentioned above.</p> | |

KEY THEME 3: COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES: QUESTION 27, 28 AND 29

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1 emphasises the need for Local Authorities, in planning for development, to address accessibility (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community to jobs, health, housing, education, shops, leisure and community facilities. Planning Policy Statement 6 relates to town centres and town centre uses, and advises that uses including shops, restaurants, bars, and other cultural facilities are firstly located in town centres. Planning Policy Guidance 17 advises that recreational uses are located in sites where they can contribute to town centre vitality and viability.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS (Yorkshire and Humber Plan, May 2008) Policy Y1: York sub area policy seek to develop the role of York as a Sub Regional City and support the roles of Selby and Malton. Policy E2 recognises the need to ensure that community facilities such as entertainment, health care and leisure facilities are located within city centres.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The theme partnership 'York – The Inclusive City includes the strategic aim to ensure that as many residents as possible can share in the city's economic, environmental and social well being. The city centre will be vibrant, young people welcome, visible and prominent and residents will consider cultural provision to be "for them".

LDF Core Strategy:

New community facilities should be in locations which are well served by public transport and are accessible by walking and cycling. The Council will seek to protect against the loss of existing local services. Core Strategy - Preferred Options document identifies gaps in provision, including a shortage in swimming pool provision.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

The Council's Lifelong Learning and Cultural Service Plan: 2008/09 contains objectives related to making York more eventful, engagement in learning, being healthy, supporting stronger communities and developing a vibrant cultural infrastructure. The Council's Retail Study (2008) identifies the need for a city centre convenience store and it's Open Space and Recreation Study (2007) identifies a deficiency in facilities for children and young people, allotments, natural and semi natural open space and outdoor sports facilities in the centre of York. The Children and Young People's Plan 2009-2012 includes a commitment to providing new youth facilities as resources

permit, and specifically, a city centre facility that includes a youth café.

Review of Leisure Facilities Strategy (swimming facilities)

Active York has carried out analysis of supply and demand for swimming facilities. Analysis shows an unmet demand for an additional twelve 25m swimming lanes (16 by 2015). Greatest demand is in the south and the east of the city.

The University: signed Statement of Intent with regard to the development of a competition standard pool based on that of the University of East Anglia.

The Review of Leisure Facilities recommended swimming pool option was for the Council to reconfirm its commitment to the partnership with the University and also plan for an additional city centre pool to meet further identified needs.

A city centre pool would have to:

- Be deliverable without major Council capital investment;
- Stimulate new types of demand and create new markets not to compete with the University scheme.

Ideally a central location could be found close to an employment centre but also able to serve the residential population. The Council however would need a commercial partner but given the unsatisfied demand and closure of the Barbican pool this should be a viable commercial proposition.

Wm Saunders Architects have been commissioned to produce a standard pool design. Designs show that a minimum footprint of 1,870m² would be required for a 6 lane pool and 2,820m² for an 8 lane pool and this is based on a simple rectangular plan. Analysis has shown there are no city centre sites that could progressed in the short term. However there is the option to consider development sites as they come forward over the longer term. For example, the future of the York RI facilities at Queen Street is in doubt because of the potential redevelopment of that site (YNW AAP) and it will be important to re-provide these on a comparable scale and therefore with the potential for a community pool.

| SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|----|-----|----|
| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
| 22. Provide community facilities for all | I/? | ? | I/? | I | ? | * | * | ? | I/? | ** | ? | * | ? |
| S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 | | | | |
| ** | I | I | ? | O | ** | ?/* | ** | * | O/* | | | | |
| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
| 23. Help to meet the social and community needs for all people in York | I/? | ? | ? | I/? | ? | O | ? | * | * | ** | ? | **I | * |
| S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 | | | | |
| I | ? | ? | ? | ** | ** | I | I | O | O/* | | | | |
| COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| QUESTION 27: Should there be more community services and facilities in the city centre? | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: The AAP should seek to identify the need for community services and facilities and potential delivery options (e.g. local food stores, health care, recreational and sport, other service or facilities), please state? | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Response: | 19 Supported | | 0 Not Supported | | | 1 Mixed | | 8 Comment | | Total Responses 28 | | | |
| QUESTION 27: Should there be more community services and facilities in the city centre? | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Leave it to the market to provide community services and facilities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Response: | 3 Supported | | 1 Not Supported | | | 1 Mixed | | 0 Comment | | Total Responses 5 | | | |

Key points made:
Individual responses to Q27 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.

- Lack of sporting and leisure facilities
- Permanent skating, bowling, dancing and swimming facilities
- Convenience stores
- Spaces for performance and social events
- Loss of Barbican keenly felt
- Local food stores
- Place for children and teenagers
- Children’s play ground
- Inner city allotment
- Community gardens

QUESTION 28: How can we ensure that city centre facilities and services are accessible to all members of the community?
OPTION 1: By adapting existing services and facilities to improve accessibility for all needs.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 14 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 15 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

QUESTION 28: How can we ensure that city centre facilities and services are accessible to all members of the community?
OPTION 2: By providing facilities to improve accessibility for all needs.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| Response: | 7 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 9 |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|

Key points made:
Individual responses to Q28 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.

- Do not believe any single section of the community should be targeted
- Consult with teenagers
- Provide flexible / multiuse facilities

QUESTION 29: Where and how should these facilities be provided to meet local needs?
OPTION 1: Provided on-site as part of all new developments, regardless of location, that are likely to create additional demand

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| for community services and facilities. | | | | | |
| Response: | 7 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 13 |
| QUESTION 29: Where and how should these facilities be provided to meet local needs? OPTION 2: Use Section 106 developer contributions from developments to comprehensively plan the provision of services and facilities off-site in areas where there is a proven need. | | | | | |
| Response: | 8 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 12 |
| <p>Key points made: <i>Individual responses to Q29 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should not include a blanket requirement for on-site provision as part of all new developments, but should incorporate off-site contributions ▪ Account should be taken from needs arising from York Northwest development ▪ Should be firmly limited by need ▪ Question 29 combination of options | | | | | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTIONS - The Core Strategy topic paper on Infrastructure Delivery will assess the need of community infrastructure including health, education, open space and built sports facilities on a city wide basis including the city centre. The AAP preferred option will therefore make provision for these findings. A combination of both on-site (where appropriate) and off-site contributions (question 29 options 1 and 2) is the preferred approach to providing facilities. This is subject to the Council's response to the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Based on existing evidence base the AAP will pursue options for a convenience store, facilities for children and young people and swimming pool options.</p> | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | Improving provision and accessibility of community services and facilities for all will help achieve the AAP vision for Community Life to meet the needs of everyone. | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) partnership 'The Inclusive City' contains a top level objective to ensure that all citizens can take part in the life of York by promoting opportunities for all and enabling everyone to access services and facilities. RSS identifies Community Strategies as the main | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | mechanisms for delivery. York LDF Core Strategy seeks to create sustainable neighbourhoods with access to quality local services. New development will contribute towards ensuring there are sufficient facilities to meet community needs. New facilities should be in locations which are well served by public transport and are accessible by walking and cycling. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | PPG 17 Open Space, Sport and Recreation advises local authorities to locate more intensive recreational uses on sites where they can contribute to town centre vitality and viability. Guidance also encourages improving access through quality public realm design. RSS core approach includes strengthening the role and performance of the region's main towns and centres by regarding them as the logical focus of local communities and efficient hubs of connected activity, accessible by public transport. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | The options outlined in the preferred approach received public support. The predominate view was that the provision of community services and facilities should be to meet the needs of all as oppose to targeting specific needs. However, consultation suggests that young people/ teenagers and the elderly need to be better provided for. There was a mixed response to where and how services and facilities should be provided in terms of either on-site as part of new developments or in areas of proven need funded through developer contributions. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Options would potentially reduce the need to travel with benefits in terms of air quality and carbon emissions. It may also create opportunities for the expansion of skills and learning through community facilities. The preferred approach will help to address a range of different accessibility needs. |
| 6) Community benefits | Increasing opportunities to access community services and facilities and the frequency and range of facilities within the city centre will have implicit benefits for the community, such as better community cohesion and an increase in participation levels at community events and life. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The LDF evidence base, including the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2007 (SHMA) and the Council's Open Space and Sports Study 2008, identifies a city centre shortfall in leisure facilities, several forms of open space, especially children's play spaces and natural and semi natural space. It also highlights the importance of considering how accessible the facilities are to different groups of people. City of York Council's Lifelong Learning and Culture: Service Plan also provides up-to-date information and targets the AAP can help to deliver. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Effective 8) Viability</p> | <p>The AAP must conform with the approach taken in the LDF Core Strategy which will set the City-wide approach to the provision of community facilities. City centre specific provision will require up-to-date information on existing facilities and requirements. This information can be gathered from Council services and may also involve a specific city centre study. The Council's approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy will help to determine a viable approach to provision through the AAP.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>The overall approach to provision of new facilities through the LDF will be planned through development contributions and on-site in appropriate developments. Provision will be corporate led and community focussed. Although the Core Strategy will set the overall approach to city-wide delivery of community services and facilities, the AAP will be an important policy tool to identify and direct new developments, initiate and facilitate opportunities through projects and funding bids and improving access to existing facilities.</p> |
| <p>10) Flexibility</p> | <p>The options proposed are not inflexible and could be adapted to changing circumstances. Future development can be adaptable in terms of levels of funding and need.</p> |
| <p>NEXT STEPS Review findings of the Core Strategy topic paper on Infrastructure Delivery. Work with the PlayBuilder team to deliver facilities for children. Work with Life Long Learning and Culture to identify opportunities for the development of facilities for young people. Pursue swimming pool options with Leisure Services. Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option.</p> | |

KEY THEME 3: CULTURAL ACTIVITY: QUESTION 30

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1 emphasises the need for Local Authorities, in planning for development, to address accessibility (both in terms of location and physical access) for all members of the community to jobs, health, housing, education, shops, leisure and community facilities. Planning Policy Statement 6 relates to town centres and town centre uses, and advises that uses including shops, restaurants, bars, and other cultural facilities are firstly located in town centres.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS (Yorkshire and Humber Plan, May 2008) Policy Y1: York sub area policy seeks to develop the role of York as a Sub Regional City and support the roles of Selby and Malton. RSS recognises the need to ensure that a wide range of community facilities including health care and leisure facilities are accessible to all without the need to rely upon the private car.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The theme partnership 'York – A City of Culture' includes a strategic aim to encourage culture to be a central element of place making and 'York – The Inclusive City' includes a strategic aim that the city centre will be vibrant, young people welcome, visible and prominent and residents will consider cultural provision to be "for them".

LDF Core Strategy:

New community facilities should be in locations which are well served by public transport and are accessible by walking and cycling. The Council will seek to protect against the loss of existing local services.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

The Council's Lifelong Learning and Cultural Plan 2007 to 2010 has the vision to celebrate both York's uniqueness and diversity, and promote a culture that helps build a confident and creative community, welcomes and inspires resident and visitor alike, and encourages quality opportunities for fun, learning, and fulfillment open to all.

| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|-----|
| 21. Provide opportunities and places for cultural activity. | I/? | ** | * | I | I/? | O | O/I | ? | I/? | ** | I | O | I/? |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|----|---|--|--|--|
| 21. Provide opportunities and places for cultural activity. | ** | I | I | O | O | * | ?/* | * | ** | * | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|----|---|--|--|--|

CULTURAL ACTIVITY- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 30: How should the AAP provide opportunities for the city's cultural and social scenes to be developed?
OPTION 1: Develop new cultural facilities and venues within the city centre. Tell us what facilities and venues you would like to see developed?

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 17 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 5 Comment | Total Responses 22 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

QUESTION 30: How should the AAP provide opportunities for the city's cultural and social scenes to be developed?
OPTION 2: Develop local skills, traditions and produce within York's cultural attraction, and appoint local artistic talents

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| in projects to enhance public spaces. | | | | | |
| Response: | 13 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 15 |
| QUESTION 30: How should the AAP provide opportunities for the city's cultural and social scenes to be developed? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: Retain redundant places of worship for cultural and/or community uses. | | | | | |
| Response: | 21 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 7 Comment | Total Responses 32 |
| Key points made: | | | | | |
| <i>Individual responses to Q30 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.</i> | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historic buildings provide a wide range of venues which are otherwise difficult to find. ▪ Need for outdoor multifunctional space, which can accommodate large-scale performances. ▪ Consider the Focal Building to be built at Hungate. ▪ Visual art scene is underdeveloped with limited opportunities to obtain studio accommodation. ▪ New building for Historic Archives – consider site of Peasholme Centre. ▪ For an Anglican Parish church to change use formal procedures must be followed and it would not be possible for the Council to retain such places for cultural or community uses without statutory course. ▪ Venues for bigger events. ▪ Exhibition Square should be made traffic free and used for cultural activity, festivals and performance. | | | | | |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS - | | | | | |
| A combination of options 1 and 2 will be advanced to the next stage for the reasons set out below. Option 2 will need to be addressed in Preferred option principles to inform a subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy produced through the City Centre AAP. | | | | | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | | | | | |
| Consistent | This approach will help to deliver the AAP vision for community life in particular providing opportunities and places to express and sample culture from across the world. | | | | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | | | | | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Options can help to deliver the SCS 'A City of Culture' top level objective in providing opportunities for fun and inspiration and making York a more active and participative city. | | | | |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development promotes the need for inclusive, accessible development in achieving sustainable communities. The Good Practice Guide on Tourism recommends that facilities are integrated with their surroundings in terms of design and layout, | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | and that they are located to maximise synergies with other attractions. RSS Policy E6 supports local cultural distinctiveness and contributes to the quality of life in the community. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Option 1 and option 2 are supported by representations. New cultural facilities and venues suggested by the public include better provision for outdoor events, visual arts and new home for the City Archives. Option 3 received support and representations identified that it would not be possible for the Council to retain an Anglican Parish church for cultural or community uses without statutory course. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Enhancing public spaces would be a good way to integrate people with their environment. Retaining places of worship for community use would help to maintain the character and integrity of the buildings. The economy in York is reliant on the cultural activities provided in the city centre and as such this option would be beneficial as it would help to encourage more people to visit the city centre and potentially increase spending. More cultural facilities will mean a greater variety of activities and greater opportunities for people to participate. |
| 6) Community benefits | Option 1 will help to provide a greater range of interests for the public and may encourage events and activities currently missing in York. Option 2 who commission local people with artistic talents and provide employment. It would also encourage communities to participate and become more interested in spaces around the city. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | CYC Public Arts Strategy promotes steps which encourage new audiences to experience arts activity, it also seeks to encourage participation in arts activity, support new work and help develop audiences. CYC Lifelong Learning and Culture Service Plan: 2008/09 contains the following objectives to make York more eventful, engagement in learning, being healthy, supporting stronger communities and developing a vibrant cultural infrastructure. |
| Effective 8) Viability | The AAP can encourage and support cultural activities through new developments and public realm enhancements which can respond to the space and infrastructure requirements of the cultural calendar and aspirations of the York City of Festivals programme. |
| 9) Deliverability | Implementation of public realm improvements such as events space will be planned through an integrated and rolling programme of work which will encourage capacity building and best practice. It is proposed that identified developers and partners will help to shape design and delivery of specific projects. It may also be possible to deliver projects in phases where appropriate. |

| | |
|--|--|
| 10) Flexibility | The options proposed are not inflexible and could be adapted to changing circumstances. Development and enhancement projects are also flexible in terms of the level of funding and resources available at any given time especially where a phased approach is taken. |
| NEXT STEPS Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of a public realm and movement strategy for the city centre. The Preferred Options stage will put forward principles on which the future strategy will be written. Key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Completion of City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review (TPU and Halcrow consultants)▪ Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option | |

KEY THEME 3: EVENING ACTIVITY: QUESTION 31, 32 & 33

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 6 promotes the vitality and viability of town centres and encourages local planning authorities to adopt a plan-led approach including managing the role and function of existing centres so they meet the needs of residents and visitors. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2004) Good Practice in Managing the Evening & Late Night Economy promotes measures such as new developments including a mix of uses into the evening and night-time economy that help create a busy atmosphere day and night, encouraging diversity and local distinctiveness as well as the need for non-alcohol centred evening activities such as galleries, museums etc.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS aims to grow York as a key driver of the Leeds City Region economy by encouraging amongst other sectors the evening economy.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The theme partnership 'York –City of Culture' has the strategic aim to integrate our product e.g. events calendar, licensing policy, transport connections attractions opening hours, shopping hours, and pedestrian hours. As well as encourage high quality café bar environments around public spaces.

LDF Core Strategy:

Includes a strategic objective to ensure that York's tourism and evening economy is promoted.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

City of York Council and Visit York study York After Dark (April 2007) aims to promote, improve and diversify the City's evening economy and encourage more people to take part. The strategy conforms with the 'Civic Trust' vision and aspirations for the evening economy for all UK towns and cities. CYC Statement of Licensing Policy seek to ensure that the City of York Council continues to offer a wide choice of high quality and well managed entertainment and cultural venues within a safe, orderly and attractive environment, valued by those who live in, work in, and visit, the city. Lifelong Learning and Culture: Service Plan 2008/09 includes objectives to make York more eventful and develop a vibrant culture infrastructure.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

| Objective s | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
|--|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|
| 7. Diverse and inclusive evening economy | * | * / - | O / ? | - / ? | ? / - | I / ? | ? | O | O / ? | * | I / _ | ? | I / _ |

| Objective s | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 |
|--|-------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 7. Diverse and inclusive evening economy | I / * | I | I | O | O | ** | * | O | ** | ? |

EVENING ECONOMY- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 31: How can we encourage greater diversity in York's evening economy, and what level of intervention is appropriate ?

OPTION 1: Maximise the potential of what we already have such as museums, galleries and libraries, which could open later into the evenings.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 21 Supported | 0 Not supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | Total Responses 22 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| QUESTION 31: How can we encourage greater diversity in York's evening economy, and what level of intervention is appropriate? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Pursue greater diversity through new development which promotes evening activity. What types of facilities are we currently lacking? | | | | | |
| Response: | 11 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 11 |
| OPTION 3: Pursue greater diversity through restricting the growth of alcohol dependent activities, specifically Planning Use Class A4 drinking establishments. | | | | | |
| Response: | 12 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | Total Responses 13 |
| Key points made: <i>Individual responses to Q31 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.</i> | | | | | |
| Question 31 | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Castle car park could provide outdoor performance space ▪ Opportunity to stimulate evening economy further through provision of riverside activity ▪ Development that attracts more families ▪ Good performance venue needed | | | | | |
| QUESTION 32: How can we help to improve the ambience and perception of the city centre in the evening ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: Work with the relevant licensing decision makers to promote greater adoption of café culture by encouraging more outdoor seating for café bars and restaurants. | | | | | |
| Response: | 16 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 3 Mixed | 4 Comment | Total Responses 25 |
| OPTION 2: Improve the amenity value of the city centre by expanding lighting schemes so that a wider area is well lit after dark. In which areas would lighting be most beneficial. | | | | | |
| Response: | 9 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 4 Comment | Total Responses 17 |
| OPTION 3: Do nothing, there is no need to intervene and change the ambience or current perceptions of the city centre in the evenings. | | | | | |
| Response: | 1 Supported | 3 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 0 Comment | Total Responses 4 |
| Key points made: <i>Individual responses to Q32 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to</i> | | | | | |

summarise key points in response to the question.

QUESTION 32

- Greater seating for bars and cafes could help to promote “café culture”
- May need to restrict traffic to achieve this
- Alcohol free venue needed
- Newgate could be used after dark
- Seating in front of establishments should be confined to locations where it can coexist with existing functions of public realm
- Areas suggested for expanded lighting include Toft Green, Micklegate, Piccadilly and riverside walks
- Concern about spreading pub culture into public space

QUESTION 33: Are there opportunities to provide a safer and more flexible choice of night-time transport?

OPTION 1: Park and Ride schemes should operate later into the evening (e.g. until 11.30pm) specifically to cover times when people are leaving evening entertainment venues such as the theatre, opera house and concerts.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 21 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 1 Mixed | 3 Comment | Total Responses 25 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

OPTION 2: Work with transport providers to extend their services into the evening.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 18 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 2 Comment | Total Responses 20 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

OPTION 3: Work with stakeholders to facilitate improved facilities at city centre taxi ranks in the evenings and at night.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 12 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 1 Comment | Total Responses 13 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

Individual responses to Q33 tended to cover all options rather than give separate responses to each. It is therefore appropriate to summarise key points in response to the question.

- Taxi ranks need managing
- Park and Ride should operate to 11.30
- Work with rail for later Harrogate and Scarborough trains
- Buses (not just Park and Ride) should run later in the evening – improve links to rural areas and tourist attractions (liaise with National Trust and local villages)
- Encourage People Carrier sized taxis for young people after events in the City with a Young Person’s travel card.
- Extending Park and Ride would benefit those who have come from elsewhere by car, but not those who live in York, for which a night bus service might be more appropriate.

| | |
|---|---|
| PREFERRED OPTION(S) QUESTION 31 - A combination of all options will be advanced to the next stage for the reasons set out below. Option 3 will need to be informed by the CYC Statement of Licensing Policy and form a planning policy within the LDF. | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
| Consistent | The preferred approach is consistent with the AAP Vision for Community Life in particular to broadening accessibility in all sectors of the city centre economy to all people. |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | This approach complements a more integrated response to providing a diversity of things to do in the evenings and will benefit both residents and visitors. In addition to the social benefits it is appropriate for retaining/ enhancing the viability and vitality of the city centre. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | ODPM (2004) Good Practice in Managing the Evening & Late Night Economy promotes measures such as new developments including a mix of uses into the evening and night-time economy that help create a busy atmosphere day and night, encouraging diversity and local distinctiveness as well as the need for non-alcohol centred evening activities such as galleries, museums etc. RSS aims to grow York as a key driver of the Leeds City Region economy by encouraging amongst other sectors the evening economy. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | Representations were almost unanimously in favour of the options put forward. This also concurs with the consultation undertaken as part of the York After Dark research. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Sustainability Appraisal suggests that careful management would alleviate possible negative environmental impacts, attracting more people to the city centre in the evenings and diversifying the offer will have a positive economic effect. Socially more people would have greater access to activities in the evening. |
| 6) Community benefits | Community benefits would be achieved through broadening the appeal of activities for all residents. Attracting a more diverse population to enjoy activities in the evening would help to reduce some of the existing concerns over the night-time environment and safety issues in the city centre. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | Options have evolved from research and findings from the Council's York After Dark study (2007). Option 3 would reflect the CYC Statement of Licensing Policy 2008 and national Licensing Act 2003. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Effective 8) Viability | The positive effects of increased participation in evening activities is considered viable against the cost of provision. Viability assessments will be undertaken on proposals developed through the composite of options presented at the first stage. This will also be tested against the full evidence base. |
| 9) Deliverability | Would depend on a level of collaboration between key stakeholders and providers of activities suitable for the evening sector. Management and implementation of a coordinated evening programme would be Council-led and further expansion would rely on stakeholder involvement and consumer participation. |
| 10) Flexibility | The approach would allow for flexibility in that the effectiveness will be monitored and reviewed. |
| PREFERRED OPTION(S) QUESTION 32 The preferred approach to question 32 is to develop Preferred Options principles to inform a subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy through the City Centre AAP and this will include variations on options 1 and 2. | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
| Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | This approach is consistent with the vision for both Economic Vitality to have a more diverse and inclusive evening experience including a thriving early evening economy. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Improving the ambience and perception in the evenings and throughout the day would help to deliver many of the strategic aims of the SCS especially the City of Culture partnership. The approach would help deliver high quality café-bar environments around public spaces and rivers. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | ODPM (2004) Good Practice in Managing the Evening & Late Night Economy promotes measures such as new developments including a mix of uses into the evening and night-time economy that help create a busy atmosphere day and night, encouraging diversity and local distinctiveness as well as the need for non-alcohol centred evening activities such as galleries, museums etc. RSS aims to grow York as a key driver of the Leeds City Region economy by encouraging amongst other sectors the evening economy. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Justified</p> <p>4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Representations were predominately in support of options 1 and 2 provided that appropriate management is forthcoming.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>Sustainability Appraisal suggests that encouraging more people to the city centre for outdoor activity may be beneficial for the economy but may result in some negative environmental impacts. However, effective management would offset this impact. This approach will encourage the day time economy to expand into the evening and night time. It would have a wider appeal for residents and would potentially attract repeat visits due to improved ambience and experience. Solar lighting schemes provide an opportunity to reduce resource consumption whilst providing the necessary lighting to reduce people's fear of crime and make walking in the city centre after dark feel safer.</p> |
| <p>6) Community benefits</p> | <p>Increased accessibility will in turn encourage greater provision of a more broad range of activities with associated community benefits.</p> |
| <p>7) Evidenced approach</p> | <p>York After Dark research (2007) identified both café culture and lighting schemes as ways of diversifying the evening economy and widening it's appeal. SCS Thriving City and City of Culture include strategic aims that the AAP could help to deliver through these options.</p> |
| <p>Effective</p> <p>8) Viability</p> | <p>The positive effects of increased participation in evening activities is considered viable against the cost of provision. Viability assessments will be undertaken on proposals developed through the composite of options presented at the first stage. This will also be tested against the full evidence base.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>Would depend on a level of collaboration between key stakeholders and providers of activities suitable for the evening sector. Management and implementation of a coordinated evening programme would be Council-led and further expansion would rely on stakeholder involvement and consumer participation.</p> <p>Any possible negative impact on the Historic Core Conservation Area, as well as the environment and residential amenity would need careful consideration and effective management.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 10) Flexibility | The approach is not prescriptive in terms of the site(s) of outdoor seating nor lighting schemes. Trial periods could be employed and the approach should be flexible to changing circumstances. |
| PREFERRED OPTION(S) QUESTION 33 - A composite of options 1 to 3 will be advanced to the next stage for the reasons set out below. In order to successfully implement options 1 and 2 the AAP needs to help create viable commercial conditions through a more diverse evening economy to attract a wider audience and greater patronage. Therefore it is considered that these options may be implemented at a later stage of the AAP lifetime. Option 3 will be a key consideration when developing Preferred Options principles that inform a subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy. | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
| Consistent | |
| 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | A more flexible choice of night-time public transport and improved facilities at taxi ranks would help to deliver the AAP vision for Economic Vitality and Community Life. This approach will make the city centre more readily accessible in the evenings and at night time and support a more diverse evening economy. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | A greater choice of public transport options would contribute to the strategic aims of the SCS 'Sustainable City', 'Safer City' and 'Inclusive City' partnerships by improving access, reducing levels of antisocial behaviour and developing sustainable means of transportation. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | PPS 1 highlights the need for inclusive, accessible developments and PPS 6 recommends a planned approach to managing the role and function of city centres. RSS policy E2 promotes environmental enhancements and accessibility improvements to create a distinct, attractive and vibrant sense of place for city centres. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | Each option was supported by the representations and there were no representations against. In addition, qualitative feedback from workshops also supported the options presented for question 33. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Sustainability Appraisal suggests that promoting sustainable transport modes at all times of day will help gain maximum benefits for the environment. However, it must first be economically viable for transport companies for them to participate in taking forward option 2. Improve taxi rank facilities would contribute to a safer environment and safer modes of transport are paramount to how late people are willing to stay in the city centre. |
| 6) Community benefits | Benefits to the community include a greater choice of safe transportation, helping to maintain a |

| | |
|---|--|
| | safe environment and reducing instances of antisocial behaviour. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The approach is consistent with the current Local Transport Plan and emerging key evidence base work on the City Centre Accessibility Framework. |
| Effective 8) Viability | <p>The positive effects of increased participation in evening activities and the contribution to a safer environment is considered viable against the cost of provision. Viability assessments will be undertaken on proposals developed through the composite of options presented at the first stage.</p> <p>Viability of option 2 may be determine by the success of other options and the implementation of various actions proposed by the AAP.</p> <p>The City Centre Accessibility Framework, AAP transport and public realm proposals will have to inform any infrastructure upgrades.</p> |
| 9) Deliverability | Would depend on a level of collaboration between key stakeholders and transport providers in particular evening services. Taxi rank improvements could be an important element of the public realm strategy and therefore funded accordingly. In order to successfully implement options 1 and 2 the AAP needs to help create viable commercial conditions through a more diverse evening economy to attract a wider audience and greater patronage. Therefore it is considered that these options may be implemented at a later stage of the AAP lifetime. |
| 10) Flexibility | The approach is not prescriptive in terms of Park and Ride services and trial periods could be employed. The approach should be flexible to changing circumstances. |
| <p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of a public realm and movement strategy for the city centre. The Preferred Options stage will put forward principles on which the future strategy will be written.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review (TPU and Halcrow consultants) ▪ Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option ▪ Consider the findings of the Local Transport Plan 3 | |

KEY THEME 3: HOUSING TYPES: QUESTIONS 34 AND 35

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS1 – Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) recognises the needs of everyone, and promotes social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal well-being. As a central principle, the policy states that development should support existing communities and contribute to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities

PPS3 – Housing (March 2005) stresses the need for mixed and balanced communities, and emphasises the government’s key housing policy – to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. PPS3 states that the characteristics of a mixed community are a variety of housing, particularly in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people. It goes on to say that the proportion and profile of new housing should be based upon the findings of the local Strategic Housing Market Assessment findings and other local evidence.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS reinforces national policy aims to create mixed and balanced communities, and acknowledges the high demand status of York. It sets an affordable housing target of at least 40% on all new housing developments.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

York as an Inclusive City is identified in the Community Strategy as a strategic ambition. Specifically, the strategy identifies the need to provide more affordable housing, ‘life standard’ and sustainable housing in balanced communities. It aims to work with neighbouring Council’s to develop new approaches to affordable housing, and to reduce homelessness.

The strategic aims and actions also aim to address the needs of significant pockets of deprivation, poor health and high crime within the city and to narrow the gap between the most and least deprived.

The strategy aims to focus on improving the quality of life for those communities identified as living in the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in England (which, in the city centre, includes Walmgate and Guildhall wards), with the results of a pilot partnership scheme in the most deprived area of the city (xx) being used to inform a citywide approach to reducing deprivation.

The Community Strategy looks to respond positively to the changing black and minority ethnic population in the city, and aims to ensure that preventative and effective action is taken to protect vulnerable adults from all forms of abuse, including neglect by both individuals and service providers.

LDF Core Strategy:

The strategy follows national and regional policy objectives, and aims to ensure that York's current and future residents have access to decent, safe and accessible homes throughout their lifetime. It aims to ensure that new development proposals respond to the findings of the Strategic Housing Market assessment and, in order to create a better balance between new houses and flats, sets an overall target of 70% houses, 30% flats and a density level of 75 dwellings per hectare in the city centre.

New housing development should provide affordable housing consistent with the overall strategic target of 40%, with a sliding scale increasing in affordable housing contribution as site size increases.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2007) concludes that, given the massive shortfall of affordable housing in the city, there is justification for setting an affordable housing target of 50% in new housing developments.

Overall there is expected to be greater demand for housing than the current stock of housing can meet. Across all tenures there is an apparent shortfall of 982 dwellings per annum (excess demand over supply).

The tenure split within this target is given as 60% social rented and 40% discount sale – again to reflect the need for housing identified in the study.

There is an expressed need for small (21 % want 1 bed), medium (29% want 2 bed) and larger family housing (29% want 3 bed, 21% want 4 bed+), and 60% of the need is for houses/ 40% for flats – which reflects regional and national objectives to build new housing for a wide variety of households.

| SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|
| Objectives | EN1 | EN2 | EN3 | EN4 | EN5 | EN6 | EN7 | EN8 | EN9 | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 |
| 18. Have suitable housing for range of people, including affordable housing. | I/? | ?/- | I/? | I | I/? | I/* | * | ? | I/? | ** | O | * | ? |
| Objectives | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | EC1 | EC2 | EC3 | EC4 | | | |
| 18. Have suitable housing for range of people, including affordable housing. | ? | ? | * | ? | O | ** | ** | ? | */I | * | | | |
| HOUSING TYPES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>General Comments on this Issue: Whilst tourism is important, we should not neglect local people. They also need affordable homes. Plans for additional housing need to take account of existing lively evening economy, and should not dissuade investment in improvements in lighting, performance space, etc that will bring in additional visitors and residents in the evening.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HOUSING TYPES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| QUESTION 34: For who should new housing in the city centre be designed for...single people, families, young people, older people ? | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| OPTION 1: New housing in the city centre should be built for a wide range of different people | | | | | |
| Response: | 12 Supported | 0 Not supported | 10 Mixed | 0 Comments | 22 Total Responses |
| Question 34: For who should new housing in the city centre be designed for...single people, families, young people, older people ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: Housing to suit families and older people should be prioritised | | | | | |
| Response: | 0 Supported | 1 Not supported | 11 Supported with another option | 0 Comments | 12 Total Responses |
| Question 34: For who should new housing in the city centre be designed for...single people, families, young people, older people ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: New housing should continue to be about modern city living | | | | | |
| Response: | 1 Supported | 2 Not supported | 8 Supported with another option | 0 Comments | 11 Total Responses |
| OPTION 4: New housing should especially cater for local people on low incomes | | | | | |
| Response: | 3 Supported | 4 Not supported | 12 Supported with another option | 0 Comments | 19 Total Responses |
| PREFERRED OPTIONS – HOUSING TYPES | | | | | |
| <p>Option 1 is the preferred option because it more closely reflects the views of people through consultation, and accords with national, regional and local policy objectives and evidence base. It actually includes all other options in terms of support for housing to suit families, older people, people on low incomes and modern city living, all of which received unanimous support.</p> | | | | | |

| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
|---|---|
| Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives | All four options are consistent with the AAP Vision for Community Life, especially in terms of providing a wide range of homes to suit particular needs. Some strong views have been expressed to say that particular groups should be exempt from new housing opportunity in the centre, but these views are the exception rather than the rule. Most respondents agree that new housing in the city centre should be for older people, young people, single people, families and should include affordable housing for people on low incomes. |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | Option 1 reflects the strategic objective of the local area agreement in terms of ensuring that all citizens can take part in the life of York by promoting opportunities for all, tackling poverty and exclusion and enabling everyone to access services and facilities. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | Option 1 is consistent with national and regional policy objectives to create mixed and balanced communities, and to provide more affordable housing for local people on low incomes in York. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | The overriding view expressed, that new housing should be for a range of people in the city centre, accords with the findings of the 2007 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which included 3,121 individual responses to a postal questionnaire, as well as four stakeholder events, supplemented by additional interviews with specific organisations and individuals, and face-to-face interviews with estate/ letting agents and developers. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | <p>Key Positive Effects This option will help to meet the need for more family housing. The potential to create mixed and balanced communities in the city centre is maximised through the delivery of this option. Mixed densities and housing types (detached, semi-detached, terraces, flats) will provide a range of accommodation types and prices which will appeal to a range of people in the city centre, which will help to achieve a diverse and vibrant city centre community.</p> <p>Key Constraints and Uncertainties More apartments than set out in the SHMA may be needed to ensure scheme viability. Impact of this option on the quality of the built environment and the cultural heritage of the city centre will depend on site location, scale, design, construction and operation. The biodiversity value of individual site developments will need to be considered in evaluating any development proposal. There is potential for new development to conserve or enhance biodiversity through careful design and to avoid impact on wildlife or habitat creation.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Much of the city centre is located in flood zone 3a (ii) – further assessment work is required using the SFRA and, where appropriate, mitigation measures considered.</p> <p>Key Opportunities and Enhancements Opportunity to provide housing in line with the 2007 SHMA and to provide a good balance of single and family housing in the city centre.</p> |
| 6) Community benefits | <p>National guidance expressly states that new housing should help to create mixed and balanced communities..</p> <p>Following extensive consultation with local groups and individuals, the Sustainable Community Strategy concludes that we should maintain community cohesion and develop strong, supportive and durable communities in York.</p> |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>The findings of the 2007 Strategic Housing Market Assessment fully reflect the preferred option to build housing in the city centre for a wide range of different people.</p> |
| Effective 8) Viability | <p>The preferred option will have a medium to high positive impact in the city centre due to potentially high revenue generation and additional benefits of renewal and regeneration.</p> |
| 9) Deliverability | <p>Identified developers and partners would help deliver the option (and some allocated city centre sites, such as Castle Piccadilly and Hungate, do already have the benefit of this). Due to the high profile nature and unique city centre location, it is considered that potential deliverers will come forward on unallocated sites as they become available for development.</p> <p>A positive, partnership approach to site assembly and negotiation will help to promote a good mix of house types which will help to achieve a balanced mix of people within the city centre, as will the evidence base and reasoned justification in the Area Action Plan and any supplementary site development briefs.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| 10) Flexibility | This option may prejudice flexibility over time. It would allow for flexibility for changing circumstances through the types of units at the detailed masterplanning/ design stage of development if accompanied by more updated research than the 2007 Housing Market Assessment. The Area Action Plan could include a policy approach within which target proportions for different types and sizes of home would be considered. | | | | |
| NEXT STEPS Take forward preferred option to Policies section of Preferred Option AAP. Consider update of and timetable for new Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Continue to work with house builders and consultants in order to agree a mix of housing types and sizes within new housing schemes. | | | | | |
| HOUSING TYPES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE: | | | | | |
| QUESTION 35: How should affordable housing be delivered in the city centre ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 1: By reducing the affordable housing threshold even further than currently applied in York. | | | | | |
| Response: | 1 Supported | 1 Not Supported | 4 Mixed | 17 Comment | 6 Total Responses |
| QUESTION 35: How should affordable housing be delivered in the city centre ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 2: By sticking to the existing threshold but by targeting different methods | | | | | |
| Response: | 9 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 10 Mixed | 0 Comment | 19 Total Responses |
| QUESTION 35: How should affordable housing be delivered in the city centre ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 3: There should be no variation from the Core Strategy policy for delivering affordable housing in the city. | | | | | |
| Response: | 7 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 5 supported with other options | 7 Comment | 7 Total Responses |
| QUESTION 35: How should affordable housing be delivered in the city centre ? | | | | | |
| OPTION 4 : Consider specific areas for housing renewal which would provide better quality and more appropriate housing provision. | | | | | |
| Response: | 3 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 5 Mixed | 17 Comment | 8 Total Responses |
| | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Key points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall approach will be determined through the LDF Core Strategy – any variation must be fully justified. • Living accommodation over shops is not ideal for families. • Need for affordable housing should be balanced against practical and economic factors. • If city’s economy is to be vibrant and resilient there needs to be a good proportion of high earners living there. • Need to consider implications for future maintenance and welfare of historic built heritage. | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTIONS – HOUSING TYPES</p> <p>Option 2 is the preferred option because it more closely reflects the views of people through consultation, and accords with national, regional and local policy objectives and evidence base. It will be subject to affordable housing policy review through the Core Strategy.</p> | |
| <p>OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION</p> | |
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>All four options are consistent with the AAP Vision for Community Life, especially in terms of providing a wide range of homes to suit particular needs. Some views have been expressed to say that there is not much scope for housing in the city centre, and a number of respondents point to the wasted potential of flats above shops. Most respondents agree that affordable housing in the city centre should follow the wider core strategy policy, and should also investigate other initiatives such as living over the shop .</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | The options reflect the strategic objective of the local area agreement in terms of ensuring that all citizens can take part in the life of York by promoting opportunities for all, tackling poverty and exclusion and enabling everyone to access services and facilities. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | The options are consistent with national and regional policy objectives to create mixed and balanced communities, and to provide more affordable housing in York. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | The overriding view expressed, that new affordable housing in the city centre follow the wider affordable housing policies of CYC, accords with the findings of the 2007 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which included 3,121 individual responses to a postal questionnaire, as well as four stakeholder events, supplemented by additional interviews with specific organisations and individuals, and face-to-face interviews with estate/ letting agents and developers. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | <p><u>Key Positive Effects</u> Will help to meet the need for decent, affordable housing in the city centre. Potential to create mixed and balanced communities in the city centre. Mixed housing types (market, for rent and sale, and affordable, for affordable rent and discounted sale) will provide a range of accommodation which will appeal to range of people, which will help to achieve a diverse and vibrant city centre community.</p> <p><u>Key Constraints and Uncertainties</u> Less affordable housing than set out in the SHMA may be needed to ensure scheme viability, especially on complex brownfield sites. Impact of this option on the quality of the built environment and the cultural heritage of the city centre will depend on the location, scale, design, construction and operation. The biodiversity value of individual site development will need to be considered in evaluating any development proposal. There is potential for new development to conserve or enhance biodiversity through careful design to avoid impact on wildlife or habitat creation</p> <p><u>Key Opportunities and Enhancements</u> Opportunity to provide good quality affordable housing in line with the SHMA.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6) Community benefits | National guidance expressly states that new housing should help to create mixed and balanced communities.. Following extensive consultation with local groups and individuals, the Sustainable Community Strategy concludes that we should maintain community cohesion and develop strong, supportive and durable communities. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The findings of the 2007 Strategic Housing Market Assessment fully reflect the preferred option to build affordable housing in the city centre for a wide range of different people, including those on low incomes. |
| Effective 8) Viability | District-wide viability assessment work will be undertaken in May 2009 in order to test the core strategy affordable housing proposal. |
| 9) Deliverability | Identified developers and partners would help deliver the option. A positive approach to site assembly and negotiation will help to promote a mix of house types for a balanced mix of people within the city centre, including an appropriate level of affordable housing, as will the evidence base and reasoned justification in the Area Action Plan, LDF Core Strategy, and any supplementary site development briefs. |
| 10) Flexibility | This option may prejudice flexibility over time. It would allow for flexibility for changing circumstances through the types of units at the detailed masterplanning/ design stage of development if accompanied by more updated research than the 2007 Housing Market Assessment. Planning conditions and legal (Section 106) obligations can refer to site re-appraisals should developments take a long time to come through from planning approval. The LDF Core Strategy will include a policy approach within which target proportions of affordable housing for different sizes of site development are set out. |
| <p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Refer preferred option 2 to LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. Initiate further work with CYC Housing & Adult Social Services in order to further investigate potential for living over the shop and other initiatives to make better use of vacant properties and space in the city centre.</p> <p>Continue to work with house builders and consultants in order to agree an appropriate mix of good quality, integrated affordable housing types and sizes within new housing schemes.</p> | |

CASTLE PICCADILLY OPPORTUNITY AREA

POLICY BACKGROUND

LDF Core Strategy:

The key diagram identifies Castle Piccadilly as a retail growth area

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Local Evidence

Castle Piccadilly Development Brief

The Council adopted a Development Brief in March 2006 for the Castle Piccadilly area. Its sets out the governing principles for a mixed use development on this site.

Retail Study - The 2008 GVA Grimley Retail Study identifies Castle Piccadilly as the key development site for retail in York.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The site is adjacent to the central shopping streets, is accessible to many people and would be a complementary location for a mixed-use development. The redevelopment of this area will provide an additional attraction within the city and draw people to what is currently a secondary location. A high quality development is required that takes into account its sensitive and historic location, along with ensuring that the development complements the city and does not cause conflict through competition.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

General

- The scheme will only happen if viable
- Council should only get involved in aesthetics, businesses know what will and will not work
- Proposal must accord with the adopted brief
- Area should be a priority for action
- Openness of area is important
- Site could be used for small cottage type industries
- Building on Castle side would be a blight

- In terms of density there should be a distinction between Castle side and Piccadilly
- Car park area should be a green open space
- Car park could be relocated on to Piccadilly
- Piccadilly should be chief location for retail
- Castle area should be sensitively developed due to the historic environment
- A green river corridor should be created
- Pedestrian bridges over the Foss would add charm and encourage flow between two sides.
- Trees along the riverside should be retained
- Pedestrian walkways along the river edge should be enhanced
- Castle portion good site for Council Offices

QUESTION 38 – Are the issues identified here correct

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 14 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 5 Mixed | 1 Comment | 22 Total Responses |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

- Only Piccadilly side should be referred to
- Not sure how family housing could be accommodated
- Would like to see Tower Gardens created
- Do not agree with level of retail promoted by retail study
- A quality development including retail and leisure is essential
- A major shopping mall would damage economic Vitality of the city
- No need for new retail except for a convenience food store
- Housing should not be a priority in this area
- Potential for performance space
- Key objective should be changed to read ‘ 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’

QUESTION 39 – Are there other issues to address in this opportunity area

| Response: | 0 Supported | 0 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 17 Comment | 17 Total Responses |
|---|-------------|--|---------|------------|--------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access • This should not be a retail led development • Need to consider strategy and approach as redevelopment has stalled and parts do not provide a positive image • Comprehensive development may not be appropriate due to physical and land owner constraints • Integration with the city is key • Other uses may be more appropriate than retail • Cost • Maintaining wildlife habitats • May be suitable for relocation of markets • 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' • Need to promote local distinctiveness | | | | | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTIONS - The preferred approach is for the Castle Piccadilly Opportunity Area to be taken forward as an Area of Change lead by series of objectives and the development of a mixed use development.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Consistent</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement 3) Regional and national guidance | | <p>A mixed used development on this site, following the principles of the adopted development brief, will assist in delivering improvements and enhancements to an important area of York City Centre. A high quality development will bring economic, environmental and social benefits to the area and will therefore assist the Council in achieving its aims and vision at both a local, regional, national and international level.</p> | | | |
| <p>Justified</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Consultation response | | <p>Support is received for a high quality mixed used development that respects the historic character of this area. Many representors suggest ways in which the site should be taken forward. The protection of the area and buildings around Clifford's Towers is a key issue of concern.</p> | | | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Sustainability appraisal | | <p>The SA highlights that this is an accessible site that provides a good location for a</p> | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | complementary city centre development, which will lead to greater use of the area. It highlights the importance for the need of the development to respect the area. |
| 6) Community benefits | A mixed-use development that provides civic space, along with other uses will provide community benefits for those who live, work and visit York. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | The development of this site partly for retail is promoted in the Retail Study 2008. The study highlights the importance for additional retail space in the city and this site is identified a key site for maintaining and improving the cities market share. |
| Effective 8) Viability | The creation of a mixed-use development that is viable is considered possible, even though the site has a number of constraints and key requirements. Developers are currently looking into the comprehensive development of this area based on the principles of the development brief and there development options will be presented later this year to both the Council and stakeholders (including the general public). |
| 9) Deliverability | The site is in a number of ownerships and a comprehensive approach is considered key to provide the best quality development that achieves its wide objectives. The scheme will require private development funding. A delivery plan will be developed and consulted on in the Preferred Option's |
| 10) Flexibility | The development of a series of objectives will allow flexibility in the final development of this area. |
| NEXT STEPS Develop a series of spatial objectives for this area of change. Investigate the inclusion of land east of Piccadilly for example Reynard's garage See Gateway Streets and City Space Proformas for linkages in the City In taking forward options we will take into account feedback to potential projects as outlined in the Vision Perspective | |

CULTURAL QUARTER OPPORTUNITY AREA:

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

Seeks development that is sustainable and that balances social, environmental and economic benefits making town and city centres accessible for all.

PPS 6: Planning for Town Centres

This seeks vibrant and economically active town centres with town centre uses including retail, leisure, entertainment arts, culture and tourism. The Cultural Quarter runs from the Railway Station (in the York North West Area Action Plan) through the Museum Gardens to the Minster encompassing several areas designated for improvement in the City Centre Area Action Plan to assist both tourism, culture, leisure and retail providers.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS seeks to develop the role of York as a sub regional city, helping to support local cultural distinctiveness and contribute towards quality of life in the communities. It aims to promote tourism and associated development of an appropriate scale and type along waterways and realise the potential of heritage leisure and cultural assets by promoting the role of cities as modern, varied and colourful destinations of choice. These are realised through Policies Y1a, Y1d and E6.

Yorkshire Forward (Regional Development Agency) and the Yorkshire Tourist Board seek to capitalise on the economic benefit of events and festivals. 'York City of Festivals' programme includes popular events such as the York Early Music Festival and the York Festival of Food & Drink. Large scale events such as these can attract visitors in their own right, whilst an array of smaller events contribute to the vitality of the city centre. At present the city centre lacks some of the infrastructure needed to run events and requires investment to attain this. A review of the events taking place in city centre found overwhelming support for events both as tourists attractions, and as a means of bringing residents together

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Community Strategy has ambitions to ensure development contributes to the special qualities and distinctiveness of York and is well designed and that York is recognised internationally as a cultural city with cultural provision that is distinctive, high quality, sometimes iconic with reinvestment into existing heritage and cultural attractions to raise the standards. The Community Strategy

also recognises the important contribution made by the many faith communities within York and the importance of the voluntary infrastructure not only in the faith sector but across the city centre providing leadership and enabling opportunities and initiatives, not just at the Minster but throughout the city – all adding to the cultural offer across the city centre.

LDF Core Strategy:

The preferred approach of the Core Strategy Preferred Options is to ‘allow inclusive access and movement for pedestrians, and promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and easy to move through for all’ and ‘improve the quality of the public realm and environment presenting first impressions to visitors arriving in, or passing through, York.’ This is particularly relevant to the cultural quarter as it represents a key link from the railway station and York Northwest to the city centre and as such is a major gateway route into, and out of, the city providing a main thoroughfare for residents and giving many visitors their first impression of York.

City of York Council also has a Public Arts Strategy (1998) notes that public art which is to be provided by the developer may be art that is integral to the design of the development, and the potential for open and civic space being suitable for performance and events should also be explored. This has been a requirement of several development briefs and the Hungate Development contributed a total of £0.02million for art study representing about 10% of the total development costs of the scheme. Contributions for Art (1% for Art S106 contributions) are set out in Local Plan policies GP13 and C6.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Committee have carried out much work as a separate but integral part of the CCAAP and carried out their own consultations that ran complementary to that of the CCAAP and gave further information regarding the specific aims of the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group. Additionally, the group are developing a business case and ideas for improvement based on the identified needs of the cultural community that can be taken forward as part of the CCAAP. Particular ambitions include the improvement of the ‘marble arch’ area and pursuing the pedestrian and cycle bridge between the railway station and the Museum Gardens.

Community Strategy actions require York to be recognised internationally as a cultural city of high quality places, to be a diverse, inclusive and cosmopolitan city that is active, creative and participative through partnership working through cultural activities that promote community enrichment, wealth and job creation.

Cultural Quarter - report to the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group and consultation results for Cultural Quarter (December 2008) CYC

Set out 8 Recommendations that were agreed by Members at the Meeting held in February 2009. These included:

York@Large ‘York – A City of Culture’

Endorses what makes York special in terms of its cultural offer with physical experience of the city – green spaces, squares and streets; and easy, enjoyable to move around on foot. Future proposals include an Urban design plan with public spaces that are capable of promoting York City of Festivals; café-bar environment in public spaces and by the rivers which can be opened up to exploit recreational opportunities to achieve international significance

World class heritage will continue to be the centre piece of cultural offer, but will receive reinvestment to raise them once more to state of the art, international standing.

‘Without Walls’ City Vision and Community Strategy (2004-2024)

This partnership’s top-level objective is “to support the progress and success of York’s existing businesses and to encourage new enterprises in order to maintain a prosperous and flourishing economy that will sustain high employment rates”. This objective contains a strategy, to provide a strong and distinctive cultural sector. Furthermore, the top-level objective of ‘York – A City of Culture’ partnership states that “to celebrate uniqueness and our diversity, we will promote a culture that helps build a confident and creative community, welcomes and inspires resident and visitor alike, and encourages quality opportunities for fun and fulfilment open to all”. Recent ideas by the York @ Large Partnership on updating the aims of ‘A City of Culture’ include paying greater attention to the physical experience of the city, it’s green spaces, squares and streets and ensuring that York’s cultural provision is more diverse, inclusive and accessible.

The Community Strategy sets out strategic aims in York: A City of Culture to secure a major cultural role for York at a regional, national and international level, whilst ensuring that York residents feel that what is on offer is for them and encourages them to participate. Celebrate uniqueness and diversity and promote a culture that helps build a confident and creative community, welcomes and inspires resident and visitor alike, and encourages quality opportunities for fun for all.

WOW sponsored paper ‘The Place of Culture’ highlights several key economic and social drivers of change in culture and leisure. These include;

- Changing incomes: Greater disposable income
- Demographic changes: Ageing population
- Time availability: greater need for time-value
- The third age, over 50 is the principal growth area and the paper identifies the need to retain the city’s graduates and entrepreneurs.

Many of these aims can be addressed in spatial terms, covering key aspects of York's cultural offer. The scope exists to maximise the development opportunities available in the city centre to help achieve these aims.

These aims are reflected in **York's Tourism Strategy and Action Plan (York Tourism Partnership, 2007)** which seeks to maximise the economic and employment advantages of tourism in York to the benefit of businesses, employees, residents and visitors. However, it recognises that to make the most of these benefits it is necessary to manage the environmental implications for the historic city and its citizens, such as crowded streets, and traffic problems

[York@Large](#) cultural partnership (WOW) are undertaking work on the development of the cultural quarter to ensure that the highest quality public realm will complement and support tourism and cultural initiatives in York.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The Opportunity Areas can address many of the issues identified in the Issues and Options report and provide the focus for area specific actions. See the 'Summary Matrix of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and City Centre Area Action Plan Objectives

Sustainability Statement for the Issues and Options report did not apply to the Opportunity Areas. A sustainability appraisal forms part of the option soundness evaluation below.

CULTURAL QUARTER - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- Visioning work being undertaken by Yorkshire Forward and the Council has potential to make an important contribution to the opportunity areas.
- City centre is very compact and does not lend itself to quarters. Concern about categorising part of the city and excluding key areas.
- Need to consider branding for the city centre as a whole and many objections to exclusion of key areas from the cultural quarter including the university, NRM, Guildhall, Assembly Rooms, Barley Hall, Mansion House, Yorvic, Merchant Adventurers' Hall, Castle Area and Clifford's Tower, St Helen's Square.
- Recognition of the links between YNW and the city centre.
- Support for arts centre/facility in the city centre and more use of rivers such as floating stage/restaurants etc. Riversides could showcase artists/local crafts.

- Support for explanation and interpretation of local historic environment.
- Scheme lacks definition and could be realised by other means.
- Strong support for pedestrian link between the Railway Station and the city centre and recognition of the importance of the development at York NorthWest and the impact that will have on the city centre.
- Should consider the Post Office as it has significant vehicular movement and the congestion especially at Leeman Road.

CULTURAL QUARTER - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 40: Are the issues identified here correct?

QUESTION 41: Are there any other issues to address in this Opportunity Area?

Key points made

- Very mixed response to the concept of cultural quarter especially regarding the boundary and many felt it excluded key areas of cultural interest and expressed concern that it would disadvantage key cultural institutions outside the boundary.
- The point was also made that the concept of quarters would make the city easier to navigate and many cities had them. It was a concept and the boundary merely defined the key route from the new development at York Northwest and the National Railway Museum to the Minster and was not intended to imply other institutions were not culturally important.
- The majority felt that the issues raised were the correct ones with 2 objectors (stating congestion at Leeman Road would need to be managed very carefully as well as new development at York North West; and concern expressed that investment in one area could lead to a decline in another area.
- Strong support for improved pedestrian and cycle routes from the Railway to the city centre which is a critical connection.

PREFERRED APPROACH

The preferred approach is for the Cultural Quarter Opportunity Area to be encompassed within a city centre public realm and movement strategy. The preferred approach will be developed to inform this subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy and will include the objectives of the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group agreed by the Members in February 2009.

| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
|---|--|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>The Future York report emphasises the need for improved public realm. The desire to develop a distinct Cultural Quarter within York has wide ranging implications for both the NRM and York Central in general. The existing tourism appeal of the historic core is well known but the connection between them and the NRM is very limited and a cultural trail would provide better linkage between these areas.</p> <p>This green gateway to and from the city from the York Northwest site is crucial but currently has no distinctive identity. The ambition is to create a distinctive place making identity for this ensuring that the York Northwest site has a fully integrated gateway to the historic city. Within York Central the opportunity to create an attractive new pedestrian crossing across the River Ouse would help to integrate York Central with the old City Centre.</p> <p>Referring to a independent strategic review of the York Economy by the Future York Group the Core Strategy highlights strategic aims to improve the public realm.</p> <p>Making York More Eventful City – wide programme of festivals and events aimed at improving cultural infrastructure and provision, see yorkfestivals.com. Priorities include the 2010 Mystery Plays; improving activities for young people; supporting and developing new festivals e.g. The Festival of the Rivers and increasing opportunities for communities to lead cultural events and activities.</p> <p>Cultural development needs to work alongside the York NorthWest Area Action Plan and refer to Preferred Option C1 of York North West Area Action Plan: Develop a cultural area around the NRM which links to the Cultural Quarter including the area across the river, around Museum Gardens and the Minster.</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The Community Strategy notes that improvements are needed to build on the existing cultural offer if opportunities to make the city more attractive and welcoming to both visitors and residents are to be maximised. Community Plan Strategic Aims include to provide a strong and distinctive cultural sector.</p> <p>Work on the cultural quarter project is already underway. The idea behind this project is to</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>improve a large area within the city centre which at present is failing to adequately display a large number, but by no means all, of York's built and natural cultural attractions. The proposed cultural quarter or gateway will cover an area starting at the National Railway Museum, moving eastwards and incorporating better use of the River Ouse frontages, a possible new pedestrian bridge across to Museum Gardens, St Mary's Abbey ruins, the Yorkshire Museum, the York Art Gallery, Kings Manor, the Theatre Royal, De Grey Rooms, York Minster and Dean's Park. The project will provide a focus for enhancements to the public realm along a better route way from the station area to the Minster area, which will improve visitor's interpretation and appreciation of the attractions within.</p> |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | <p>Consistent with the aims of Regional Economic Strategy, the Regional Spatial Strategy and Yorkshire Forward to develop the role of York as a sub regional city, helping to support local cultural distinctiveness and contribute towards quality of life in the communities.</p> |
| <p>Justified 4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Consultations carried out by the City Centre Area Action Plan and the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Committee supported the view that the cultural quarter should be enhanced and recognized the importance of promoting key attractions along the route between the National Railway Museum and the Minster (the two most visited attractions in York).</p> <p>Report to EMAP (Executive Member and Advisory Panel) 11/12/06 City Centre Events review held public consultation with stakeholders obtained opinions through on-street interviews, self-completion questionnaires and CYC TalkAbout panel questionnaire. Consultation with York@Large (cultural consortium) and First Stop York Tourism Partnership showed overwhelming support for events taking place in the city centre. Last 20 years there has been little significant investment in York's attractions. Furthermore, there is now stiff competition from other cities. There is a major challenge to reinvest in our heritage and cultural assets.</p> |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | <p>Sustainability Appraisal not carried out for Cultural Quarter Opportunity Area but has been carried out for city spaces which are applicable to the Cultural Quarter concept.</p> |
| 6) Community benefits | <p>The need to ensure that the tourism offer remains top quality is vital to the community as one of the aims of the AAP is to improve the tourism offer without increasing numbers of tourists to add to existing congestion problems. As many jobs in York are directly or indirectly reliant on the tourist industry it will help to protect local employment as well as providing a top quality cultural offer to local residents, businesses, groups as well as tourists. Events contribute to</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | cultural development of the city and the city's economic development, in particular those of the tourism economy. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>The Issues and Options document identified the issues to be addressed in the AAP and the Cultural Quarter was one of the opportunity areas identified and a long term aspiration of the Council. This view was largely supported during the consultation process with most feeling that the area known as the Cultural Quarter would benefit from enhancement in order to ensure that York remains a competitive city that is internationally renowned for its cultural offer.</p> <p>SRIP identifies specific cultural needs for York including Improved information provision and year round calendar for events and festivals with development of St Mary's Abbey Precinct as a key component to the area becoming a cultural quarter.</p> <p>In the 2006 issues and option consultation there was public support for improving the design and layout of public spaces and for encouraging events and festivals. A 'Cultural Quarter' was cited as a way to achieve these aspirations. City Festivals are popular e.g. York Festival of Food & Drink attracted 120,00 people and £73M.</p> <p>CYC Lifelong Learning and Culture Plan 2007 – 2010 (April 2007), replaces Lifelong Learning and Leisure Plan and seeks to challenge existing assumptions on culture and inspire citizens to do new things, and visit a variety of place through more cultural events and activities and greater public ownership and developing a vibrant cultural infrastructure.</p> |
| Effective 8) Viability | To achieve this aim Officers from various departments of York Council (Leisure, Culture and Economic Development along with other stakeholders) have drafted a Business Plan to upgrade the public realm in the Cultural Quarter. The improvement of the public realm in the Cultural Quarter (and elsewhere in the city centre) will be realised through the City Centre Area Action Plan masterplan process at Preferred Options stage with a partnership approach being adopted between the various departments and organisations involved. The AAP can encourage and support cultural activities through public realm enhancements to help deliver the space and infrastructure requirements of the City's events programme and help to deliver the York City of Festivals programme. |
| 9) Deliverability | This project has received support from businesses with some stating that they wish to be |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>included in the concept of a cultural quarter (including the Universities). An overall Public Realm and Movement Strategy will be developed and delivered through a partnership approach with a variety of partners, encompassing the aims and objectives of the York at Large research. Various cultural institutions contained within the quarter are involved in various programmes of funding bids to develop this work, including applications to the Heritage Lottery Fund. <i>The deliver of</i> public realm improvements through rolling programme will encourage capacity building and best practice. It is proposed that identified developers and partners will help to shape design and delivery of specific projects on a phased basis.</p> |
| 10) Flexibility | <p>This approach is flexible enough to cater for changed circumstances as there will be a general public realm and movement strategy that will contain a phased programme of improvements as well as key principles for development. The work being undertaken by York at Large contain a sustainable and effective programme of quality activities within the city centre which meets the aims listed in the mission statement and works alongside the aims of relevant partnerships. The options proposed are flexible and could be adapted to changing circumstances.</p> |
| <p>NEXT STEPS Take forward the implementation of the recommendations and objectives set out in the Cultural Committee Scrutiny Report agreed by Members in February 2009 being prepared by York and Large in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy together with the findings of the Accessibility study (informed by the Halcrow study).</p> | |

OPPORTUNITY AREA: GATEWAY STREETS

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development emphasises that plans should seek to enhance as well as protect the historic environment, landscape and townscape character and design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS seeks to develop the role of York as a sub regional city as well as improve facilities for walking and cycling and support local cultural distinctiveness which will improve the quality of life in communities.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Community Strategy has ambitions for all developments to contribute to the special qualities and distinctiveness of York by being well designed, sustainable and meeting the needs of local people' ensuring that the physical appearance of the City's streets attract further inward investment, economic development and physical growth without compromising that which makes the city attractive'. The strategic ambition states 'We will use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development'.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document has strategic ambitions to use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further, with spatial strategies to protect York's unique character and setting, develop strong and durable communities and strike a balance between physical growth and environmental sustainability. It seeks 'inclusive access and movement for pedestrians, and promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and easy to move through for all' and 'improve the quality of the public realm and environment presenting first impressions to visitors arriving in, or passing through, York.'

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review - key evidence bases on which to develop proposals. Local

Transport Plan 2 and the emerging LTP3 will also contain proposals and objectives which will directly impact on the Gateway Streets.

York Car Free Day surveys – Transport Planning Unit coordinated the closure of Fossgate on Car Free Day. A questionnaire was sent to all properties on the street to canvass opinion.

Peripheral streets Council motion –

Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal - key evidence base on which to develop proposals.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

It is considered that the Opportunity Areas can address many of the issues identified in the Issues and Options report and provide the focus for area specific actions. See the 'Summary Matrix of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and City Centre Area Action Plan Objectives.

Sustainability Statement for the Issues and Options report did not apply to the Opportunity Areas. An sustainability appraisal forms part of the option soundness evaluation below.

GATEWAY STREETS - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

General Comments

- Future York Group has outlined a need for improved streets and public spaces
- Suggest that Station Road is added
- Gillygate is a major challenge
- Gateway Streets are also identified as potential footstreets. Would render city centre almost opaque to traffic.
- Junctions of city centre streets often have a poor character.
- Consider St Leonard's Place.
- Consider arrangements for Merchant Adventurers Hall on Fossgate.
- Potential to widely improve Micklegate
- Consider Castlegate as a Gateway Street

QUESTION 42: Are the Issues identified here correct ?

| | |
|---|--|
| QUESTION 43: Are there other issues to address in this Opportunity Area ? | |
| <p>Key points made:</p> <p>QUESTION 42</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Priority for action. ▪ Piccadilly needs enhancing – active street during day, evening and weekends. ▪ Piccadilly in need of complete regeneration. <p>QUESTION 43</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional issues: public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access. ▪ Cycles should have access to pedestrian zones at all times. ▪ Close Fossgate to traffic. ▪ Vehicular traffic does not contribute positively to a ‘café culture’. ▪ Congestion at junction of Bootham and Gillygate. ▪ The public convenience block on Parliament Street may benefit by removal. | |
| <p>PREFERRED OPTIONS -</p> <p>The preferred approach is for the Gateway Streets Opportunity Area to be encompassed within a city centre public realm and movement strategy. Preferred Options principles will be developed to inform this subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy.</p> | |
| OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION | |
| <p>Consistent</p> <p>1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>The Gateway Streets Opportunity Area has great potential to deliver the Vision of each of the three AAP Key Themes. In particular that for York to be more readily accessible by public transport, by foot and by cycle with reduced congestion and to have a high quality public realm with the infrastructure, flexibility and access to enable a wide range of activities and events to promote a world class setting for York’s heritage.</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The role of the Without Walls SCS is to bring the issues that have been identified as being most important to the attention of plans and partnerships such as the LDF City Centre AAP. The Issues and Options report reflects the aims and objectives of all the SCS theme partnerships and will act as a key delivery plan for the SCS.</p> |
| <p>3) Regional and national guidance</p> | <p>There is no conflict with regional or national guidance. Much of the principles behind the Gateway Streets proposal are in context with the Department for Transport’s Manual For Streets and English Historic Towns Forum’s Manual for <i>Historic Streets</i>.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Justified</p> <p>4) Consultation response</p> | <p>Enhancing the Gateway Streets through a co-ordinated strategy received strong support from the Issues and Options consultation.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>By helping to address barriers to access it would also encourage people to use these streets more frequently and stimulate the economy in these areas. Reducing congestion and therefore improving air quality and reducing noise levels will have environmental benefits. It will be important to ensure regeneration does not in any way detract from the positive characteristics of these streets. Social benefits will be gained in the form of attracting more diverse groups of people to these areas and providing services to communities on the periphery of the city centre.</p> |
| <p>6) Community benefits</p> | <p>The immediate community served by each gateway street will benefit from more vibrant local service centres and a greater range of facilities and activities. Benefits also include a potential increase in community services, retail, cultural and leisure opportunities on routes in and out of the central area.</p> |
| <p>7) Evidenced approach</p> | <p>The Department for Transport's Manual For Streets (2007) is an important guidance document in which the Gateway Streets proposals in set.</p> <p>A key evidence base for the AAP is the emerging city centre accessibility framework. This will review and assess all transport, walking and cycling issues and rehearse proposals including how they're managed. Integral to this is a review of current vehicular routes in and out of the city centre.</p> |
| <p>Effective</p> <p>8) Viability</p> | <p>Positive effects of improving gateway streets is considered viable against the cost of implementation and management. The City Centre Accessibility Framework will determine the viability of access and movement proposals and provide the context and operational knowledge from which to determine site specific proposals.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>Delivery of the preferred approach will be implemented by the Council and identified partners. Enhancements may include a range of proposals including traffic management and regulation to physical improvements to streets and public spaces. A delivery plan will be developed and consulted on at Preferred Options stage. This plan will identify funding sources, delivery partners, and information on prioritising and timetabling of proposals.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| 10) Flexibility | The AAP will be monitored and reviewed over the life-time of the plan. Projects that form part of a city centre public realm and movement strategy will involve a range of spatial proposals in different areas and implementation can be flexible in terms of how delivery is phased. It can be adapted to changing circumstances and remain consistent with the overall objectives for design, access and movement. |
| <p>NEXT STEPS</p> <p>Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of a public realm and movement strategy incorporating proposals for the gateway streets.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review (TPU and Halcrow consultants) ▪ Completion of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal ▪ Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option | |

OPPORTUNITY AREA: CITY SPACES

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development emphasises that plans should seek to enhance as well as protect the historic environment, landscape and townscape character and design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation notes the increasing need for open spaces and use of riversides for sport, play and relaxation in our cities.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS promotes tourism and associated development of an appropriate scale and type along waterways and realise the potential of heritage leisure and cultural assets by promoting the role of cities as modern, varied and colourful destinations of choice. It also seeks to improve facilities for walking and cycling and these are realised through Policies Y1d and E6.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy (2008) has high level objectives for amongst other things a Thriving City and a City of Culture. Under a Thriving City it identifies a lack of investment in the city's heritage and tourist industry with increasing competition and a fall in visitor numbers. It seeks investment in the heritage and cultural infrastructure to support this. Under the City of Culture it has a Strategic Aim, amongst other things "to be a city of high quality spaces" with actions to achieve this identified as:

- an urban design plan
- creating attractive and stimulating spaces
- de-cluttered and creatively lit spaces
- spaces will be linked with clear and perhaps themed routes
- river fronts opened up and their opportunities exploited.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document has strategic ambitions to use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further, with spatial strategies to protect York's unique character and setting, develop strong and durable communities and strike a balance between physical growth and environmental sustainability. It seeks 'inclusive access and movement for pedestrians, and

promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and easy to move through for all' and 'improve the quality of the public realm and environment presenting first impressions to visitors arriving in, or passing through, York.'

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

The **Future York Group Report (2007)** - this set out a number of key recommendations including developing a clear masterplan to guide development and investment decisions; continued growth in tourism spend; and delivering transformational enhancements to York's visitor attractions and **to the quality of the public realm** (Recommendations E4 and P6). One of the significant actions identified was "improved streets and public spaces with a high quality well designed public realm, that is spectacular both by day and night with an exciting programme of events and activities for residents and visitors." (page 7). It also says that "City of York Council should give priority to improving the quality of the public realm across the historic city including paving, lighting, signage and public spaces." (page 24).

The Visit York partnership document "**York a Vision for Tourism**" (2009) is seeking to achieve 5% average annual growth in expenditure to support the 10,000 plus jobs in tourism. One of the seven 'key ambitions' to deliver the new vision for tourism is: "enhance York's public realm so that it becomes the most special in England."

Streets For All Yorkshire and Humber offers guidance on the way in which our streets and public open spaces are managed.

Street furniture removal report - this report gained approval in October 2009 for an annual budget from the Capital Programme to reduce the amount of street furniture on the highway network and for new highway schemes to go through a street furniture audit during the design stage. The Executive Member for City Strategy approved that Network Management Traffic Team be charged with the task of being the lead team implementing the proposals to set a basic set of guidelines showing more sensitive methods of signing for distribution to other teams / organisations carrying out work on the highway, and produce an annual review report outlining the progress made and areas where further improvements may be feasible.

City Centre Accessibility Framework (Footstreets Review) and **Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal** are key evidence bases on which to develop proposals.

Cultural Quarter Ad Hoc Scrutiny Committee final report Feb 2009 (see Cultural Quarter pro forma) – the findings and recommendations of the Committee must be taken forward as part of any future proposals to implement changes in this area. Consultation undertaken by the group is a significant source of information upon which the AAP will develop its Preferred Options.

York Minster Conservation Management Plan – the AAP and CMP should be complimentary. York Minster's plans for the public

space outside the Minster will be an important consideration to ensure proposals are coordinated.

The approved **Hungate Masterplan** is an important evidence base for the Hungate Area of Change.

People Changing Places - the purpose of the programme is to raise awareness and interest in the Council's public realm work. It is helping to facilitate stakeholder involvement (internal and external), as well as providing an ideal opportunity to rehearse public consultation methods such as 'Placecheck' and design workshops that can be used to implement the public realm proposals being developed through the Council's City Centre AAP.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

It is considered that the Opportunity Areas can address many of the issues identified in the Issues and Options report and provide the focus for area specific actions. See the 'Summary Matrix of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and City Centre Area Action Plan Objectives

Sustainability Statement for the Issues and Options report did not apply to the Opportunity Areas. A sustainability appraisal forms part of the option soundness evaluation below.

CITY SPACES - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

General Comments

- Future York Group has outlined a need for improved streets and public spaces
- City needs shops opening until at least 9.00PM
- City fails to benefit properly from racecourse as it shuts as racing ends
- City Spaces should include small garden on the West bank of the Ouse
- Duncombe Place should be made into a pedestrian environment
- Support improvement of snickleways – provide valuable contribution to York as a walkable city.
- Much could be achieved by decluttering
- To get people around use electric bus or road train
- Remove or reduce bus parking in Exhibition Square – needs a larger and more clearly defined pedestrian area, seating and planting
- Toilet building in Parliament Street could be used as base for police or paramedics
- Castlegate – pedestrian zone with cobbles and café culture.

Question 44: Are the Issues identified here correct ?

Question 45: Are there other issues to address in this Opportunity Area ?

Key points made:

Question 44

- Priority for action
- Should not compromise existing wildlife
- Grasp nettle with Exhibition Square and make car free
- Castle Piccadilly opportunity area to improve public space

Question 45

- Additional issues: public transport, interchange facilities and disabled vehicular access
- Snickleways need maintenance to make them attractive to use
- Other spaces to be added: Tower Gardens, spaces on Micklegate, North Street Gardens, Memorial Gardens, Cholera Burial Ground
- Council has responsibility for maintenance in City churchyards
- Wonder if Newgate stallholders would like a new pitch at Clifford's Tower car park assuming it is closed
- Exhibition Square and Duncombe Place have issues largely related to traffic and parking
- Strongly opposed to moving market to Parliament Street as would take away improvements gained through pedestrianisation

PREFERRED OPTIONS -

The preferred approach is for the City Spaces Opportunity Area to be encompassed within a city centre public realm and movement strategy. Preferred Options principles will be developed to inform this subsequent Public Realm and Movement Strategy.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

The City Spaces Opportunity Area has great potential to deliver the Vision of each of the three AAP Key Themes. In particular that for York to have a high quality public realm with the infrastructure, flexibility and access to enable a wide range of activities and events to promote a world class setting for York's heritage.

2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement

The role of the Without Walls SCS is to bring the issues that have been identified as being most important to the attention of plans and partnerships such as the LDF City Centre AAP. The Issues and Options report reflects the aims and objectives of all the SCS theme partnerships and will act

| | |
|--|--|
| | as a key delivery plan for the SCS. |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | There is no conflict with regional or national guidance. The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) is the Governments advisor on architecture, urban design and public space, are major advocates of the approach proposed. |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | Enhancing the public realm and future access arrangements through a co-ordinated strategy received strong support from the Issues and Options consultation. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Improving city spaces will be economically advantageous because it would encourage people to use public space and visit the buildings, shops, cafes etc located within them. Improved spaces and environments could stimulate new activities, particularly at peak times and help to boost the entertainment sector of the economy. Potential strain on the historic environment in terms of increased footfall would have to be managed effectively. Some spaces are currently dominated by vehicular access and traffic. Helping to reduce this would enhance the environment and improve air quality in the city centre. |
| 6) Community benefits | Improving the quality of the environment for both people who live in the city centre and people visiting will have community benefits in terms of greater social inclusivity. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | <p>The benefits of improving city spaces through a public realm strategy are well documented. The Department for Transport's Manual For Streets (2007) is a key part of a co-ordinated approach. As previously stated CABE are a source of evidence through a variety of guidance publications, consultation methods and case studies. Also see the 'York Evidence Base' section of this evaluation.</p> <p>A key evidence base for the AAP is the emerging city centre accessibility framework incorporating the Footstreets Review. This will review and assess all transport, walking and cycling issues and rehearse proposals including how they're managed. Integral to this is a review of the current operation of the footstreets area.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Effective 8) Viability</p> | <p>Positive effects of improving the city centre public realm is considered viable against the cost of implementation and management. The City Centre Accessibility Framework will determine the viability of access and movement proposals and provide the context and operational knowledge from which to determine site specific proposals.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>Delivery of the preferred approach will be implemented by the Council and identified partners. Enhancements may include a range of proposals including traffic management and regulation to physical improvements to streets and public spaces. A delivery plan will be developed and consulted on at Preferred Options stage. This plan will identify funding sources, delivery partners, and information on prioritising and timetabling of proposals.</p> |
| <p>10) Flexibility</p> | <p>The AAP will be monitored and reviewed over the life-time of the plan. Projects that form part of a city centre public realm and movement strategy will involve a range of proposals in different areas and therefore implementation can be flexible in terms of how delivery is phased. It can also be adapted to changing circumstances and remain consistent with the overall objectives for design, access and movement.</p> |
| <p>NEXT STEPS Ensure the key issues raised and the options supported in Issues and Options consultation are fed into the development of a public realm and movement strategy. Options advanced from question 5 <i>Improving York’s visitor experience and exceeding expectations</i>; question 7 <i>Evening economy</i>; question 20 <i>Improving pedestrian routes around the city centre</i>; question 21 <i>Improving the appearance of and de-cluttering public spaces</i>; question 22 <i>Footstreets</i>; question 30 <i>Cultural activity</i> and question 32 <i>Ambience and perceptions</i> must form part of the Preferred Options principles.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of City Centre Accessibility Framework and Footstreets Review (TPU and Halcrow consultants) ▪ Completion of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (Design, Conservation and Sustainable development) ▪ Consider consultation strategy and techniques specific to this preferred option e.g. methods being developed through People Changing Places Programme. ▪ Consider feedback to potential projects as outlined in the city centre vision prospectus ▪ Develop a delivery plan for Preferred Options | |

RIVERSIDES OPPORTUNITY AREA:

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation notes the increasing need for open spaces and use of riversides for sport play and relaxation in our cities.

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development advises that plans should seek to enhance as well as protect the historic environment, landscape and townscape character and design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted. Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 notes the need to retain water storage areas (in York this includes the Museum Gardens and St George's Field).

Greening UK's Cities' Buildings, Urban Development Group (May 2008) emphasizes the need to retain and improve, where necessary, green spaces to improve the quality of life, reduce urban heating and retain surfaces which reduce water run off. The Ings on the outskirts of York are crucial flood storage areas by the riverside and whilst not in the city centre are crucial to its function. It also critically highlights the need to retain and increase green spaces and in York this is particularly important beside the rivers which store water during periods of flood.

Planning Policy Statement 25: Flood Risk in new development notes the need for a sequential test and exception testing when developing in Flood Risk Zones as well as mitigation measures to reduce the risk of flooding and slow down surface water run off.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The RSS promotes tourism and associated development of an appropriate scale and type along waterways and realise the potential of heritage leisure and cultural assets by promoting the role of cities as modern, varied and colourful destinations of choice. It also seeks to improve facilities for walking and cycling and these are realised through Policies Y1d and E6.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

Strategic ambition is that 'to ensure that all developments contribute to the special qualities and distinctiveness of York by being well designed, sustainable and meeting the needs of local people', that the 'built and natural environment – must be enhanced for the benefit of present and future generations' ... 'to attract further inward investment, economic development and physical growth without compromising that which makes the city attractive'. The strategic ambition states 'We will use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development'. Objective 10 of the Sustainable City section states 'We will endeavour to balance physical growth and

environmental sustainability with responsible choices in respect of climatic and environmental changes. Other strategic aims include the need to encourage walking and cycling and to clearly define and communicate the special qualities of York and the distinctiveness of the city and ensure future development and growth strengthens these qualities and the city's unique environment'.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Preferred approach of the Core Strategy Preferred Options is to 'allow inclusive access and movement for pedestrians, and promote public spaces and routes that are attractive, safe, uncluttered and easy to move through for all' and 'improve the quality of the public realm and environment presenting first impressions to visitors arriving in, or passing through, York.' The riversides are well visited by locals and visitors and often present the first impression of York. Policy L4 (d) of the current Core Strategy states existing walkways and cycleways along the river banks should be retained and enhanced where possible and notes proposals to extend the network should be encouraged.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

Public Spaces and Footstreets:

Making use of York's rivers and river banks - report of the Leisure Scrutiny Board (June 2003) CYC recognised that the Rivers Ouse and Foss offer excellent opportunities for recreation within the urban area. However, access to the rivers is piecemeal and the facilities that are available are limited. It's objective was to investigate how to improve recreational use of York's rivers and banks including extending the walkways along the Ouse and most felt that rivers were an under-utilised asset. Suggestions included a reconstructed Viking/Roman wharf or boats under construction (living museum), guides and walks supported by information boards and tackling the negative publicity during and after flooding.

Cultural Quarter - report to the Cultural Quarter Scrutiny Group and consultation results for Cultural Quarter (December 2008) CYC Review of Leisure Activities Strategy (October 2007) CYC noted the importance of public spaces enabling active lifestyles.

Foss Basin Review seeks enhancement of areas along the River Foss.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

This noted that increased use of the riversides was likely to have a positive effect on the economic viability of the area as it would be attractive to inward investors, attract people to the area and also present opportunities to provide wildlife habitats. There was also a note of caution however stating that development also had the potential to have adverse impacts on the natural environment and wildlife depending how it was implemented.

RIVERSIDES- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- Visioning work being undertaken by Yorkshire Forward and the Council has the potential to make an important contribution to these opportunity areas.
- Further up the River Foss beyond Piccadilly Bridge as far as Wormald's Cut, every effort should be made to encourage improvements in the appearance of, and access to, this stretch of river. Beyond Wormald's Cut offers scope to improve access and linkages with Hungate.
- If a pedestrian link could be installed between Ouse Bridge and Skeldergate Bridge, whole river frontage of Ouse through City Centre would be opened up.
- Access is an issue (especially for disabled) - bring into use stretches of riverside walkway from which public continues to be excluded. Foss Walk/Garden alongside DEFRA walkway from Queen's Staith. Walkway from Queen's Staith. A slope with landings should be put between Ouse Bridge and North Street Gardens.
- 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 enhanced to extend proposed footways as far as Castle Mills Bridge and along St George's Fields to link up with existing Ouse bank pedestrian and cycle way at Blue Bridge.
- 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 essential. Need pump at locks to replace water lost in access by boats to Foss.
- Opportunity to implement Foss walkway scheme prepared in 1998.
- Great idea to develop Ouse north bank and extending the boardwalk to the rear of Coney Street would provide a beneficial amenity and could connect to Dame Judy Dench walk.
- Favour extending pedestrian access along northern bank behind Lendal, Coney Street and Spurriergate to provide missing link between Lendal Bridge and Ouse Bridge.
- Strong support for developing the waterfront and more activities with many expressing there is considerable scope for improving areas along banks of both rivers.
- Essential to keep access for pedestrians along edge of river. Trees along the river edge are important elements in the river scene. Pedestrian routes the full length of the riverbanks through the city should be a goal.

RIVERSIDES- ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:**QUESTION 46: Are the issues identified here correct?**

QUESTION 47: Are there any other issues to address in this Opportunity Area?

Key points made
QUESTION 46

- Good idea to develop Ouse north bank and should aim to have pedestrian routes the full length of the riverbanks through the city.
- Development of Castle Piccadilly provides opportunity to access the River Foss and improve pedestrian connections. Should be noted that the river is also a major constraint on development of the area and a balance needs to be struck between improving public access and accommodating retail space to strengthen the retail function of the city centre.

QUESTION 47

- Need arrangements for public transport, interchange facilities and disabled access.
- Both rivers add to the York’s history and form. Suggest extending riverside area upstream on both sides of Ouse to Scarborough Bridge and downstream on Micklegate side along Skeldergate and Terry Avenue to junction with Clementhorpe.
- Concerned about development along the Foss as it is home to variety of flora and fauna. The natural green corridor flowing through the City along the River Foss should be preserved especially historic links in the Castle Area.
- Opening up riverside at Hungate and Castle Piccadilly may have detrimental effect on wildlife corridor and new retail should not canyonise and spill over River Foss. Development of frontages on River Ouse preferable.
- Technical and structural problems would make some aspirations for riversides difficult to achieve and other opportunity areas present more easily achievable goals in the short term.

PREFERRED OPTION
 The AAP will take forward the enhancement of the riversides of the Rivers Ouse and Foss (balancing increased activity with the need to protect ecological value wherever possible) as a Preferred Approach within the Public Realm and Movement Strategy.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>The Core Strategy has aspirations to maximise the use of the riverfronts and the current Local Plan Policy L4 states existing walkways and cycleways along riverbanks will be retained and where possible encouraged to extend and enhance the pedestrian network where appropriate as part of new development. The Future York report also outlines the need for improved public spaces to create a high quality well designed public realm for all.</p> |
| <p>2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement</p> | <p>The Community Strategy notes that improvements are needed if the potential of the rivers are to be capitalized to make the city more attractive and welcoming to both visitors and residents.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 3) Regional and national guidance | There is no conflict with regional or national guidance which notes the need to retain significant wildlife corridors balanced with the need to enhance and increase use of the riversides . |
| Justified 4) Consultation response | <p>Consultation noted that access to the rivers is piecemeal and the facilities that are available are limited. Many would like to see more activities on the riverside as well as quiet places where people can escape the bustle and noise of the city and inclusion of accessible places for disabled. Respondents saw the potential for increased activity on the River Ouse including river buses, festivals, cafes etc. while the River Foss was generally seen as an important wildlife corridor with quieter, green spaces but with more potential for mooring of pleasure boats. Many felt that more could be made of the riversides including better seating and lighting.</p> <p>The Issues and Options Document identified the key issues faced by the city centre and requested the local community to engage with that process. Responses concurred with national and regional aims to maximise the use of the riversides where possible whilst respecting their ecological functions.</p> |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | Constraints that were identified included a lack of accessible waterfront, a sterile and unwelcoming environment in places and lack of vibrant places by the waterfronts. This should be addressed by new development at Castle Piccadilly and Hungate which will provide focal points for activity and the AAP wishes to have greater access to other sections of the rivers. Improving the river environment would improve the perception of York. Any new activities on the river would need to ensure that they did not degrade the water quality or cause major disturbance for flora and fauna. |
| 6) Community benefits | The rivers already support tourist activity such as river cruises and host events such as the Dragon Boat Race. Some of the businesses at Coney Street have extended their businesses onto the river with great success and use by the community. If the walkway were extended it would help to increase footfall for the core retail of the city supporting local businesses and create new views and experiences. The use of the rivers have great potential for cultural and leisure activity during the day and evening and increased use of the riversides would benefit communities in terms of increased opportunities for social interaction, healthy lifestyle pursuits and tourism activities. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | There has been much interest in increasing activity on the riversides with the Leisure Scrutiny Board's report and extensive consultation in 2003 resulting in comments to extend the |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>walkway along the Ouse in the city centre and improve links to other areas of the city. Most people at that time voted for improved walkways and this concurred with the results of the consultation for the AAP in Summer 2008 who again supported the idea.</p> <p>The Retail Study carried out for the Council in 2008 with a headline recommendation that policy should priorities the enhancement of river frontages, maximising opportunities to enhance the environment, café and restaurant culture and shops, enhancing linkages with existing retail frontages with designated areas for improvement.</p> <p>Focus group participants felt that the city seemed to have turned its back on the rivers and there is a policy in the Local Plan and agreement by the Council to pursue the extension of the walkway along the backs of the shops on Coney Street. The Cultural Quarter Business Plan and public realm enhancements along the riverside was approved by members in April 2009 and this included the area from York Central/NRM to the Minster alongside the River Ouse.</p> |
| <p>Effective 8) Viability</p> | <p>Improvements to riverside walkways can be delivered subject to funding and the agreement of current owners for the Ouse Walkway suggestion, who would need to sign up to new proposals to open up their businesses to the riversides. Strong support was expressed for increased activities and facilities such as seating and lighting on the riverside to support leisure, tourism and economic activity with the desire to retain some quieter, green spaces.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>Subject to funding and further consultations it is quite feasible to make the rivers more accessible in some areas. However, this would not be expected to be delivered in the short term due to the complexity of the work required for some projects. Projects that could be delivered in the short term involve improved access, more seating and improved lighting. Deliverability of the River Ouse walkway extension would only be achievable in the longer term and will rely on a partnership approach and may involve some risk as it could involve a major refit for some retailers due to differing floor levels.</p> |
| <p>10) Flexibility</p> | <p>This approach is strategic enough and relies on a partnership approach that is flexible enough to allow for changed circumstances and cater for different activities that may be proposed on the riversides in the future.</p> |

NEXT STEPS

Improvement of the Riversides in the city centre will be taken forward through a series of phased projects in the City Centre Area Action Plan's Public Realm and Movement Strategy as set out below.

River Ouse – extension of the Ouse Walkway project

Identification of land owners on the north bank of the River Ouse – Val Inwood/Land registry.

Meet with Cultural Quarter reps, Economic Development and Leisure and Tourism rep, Paul Barrett, Val Inwood, Esther Priestley to discuss and agree the way forward and engagement of landowners and retailers.

Discussions with retailers affected and assessment of work needed by them if landowners were in agreement will require project management and urban design skills to negotiate inclusion of retail units opening up the backs of their premises to the riverside.

Detailed auditing of how vibrant public spaces can replace unwelcoming riverside areas to assess how they function, strengths and weaknesses, how they could be better designed to serve the roles they play whilst considering the ecological importance of the rivers as significant green infrastructure corridors and wildlife habitats. This will require detailed audits and urban design skills to highlight the opportunities possible along the river Ouse. This would be particularly useful for the extension of the Ouse walkway which would require high level urban design experience and 3D modelling, including eye level to show different options and possibilities.

Foss Basin to Heworth and beyond

Identify and assess the feasibility of opportunities for improvement to Foss Basin and the river to Heworth and beyond for possible navigation and moorings (both permanent and temporary). Meetings with key stakeholder groups to discuss improvement of the environment of the River Foss.

Riversides of Ouse and Foss

Other possibilities along the River Ouse include better use of the riversides and walkways outside the Memorial and Museum Gardens. Provision of more seating that is able to cope with occasional flooding and opportunities for more activities such as public art/sculptures, soundscapes, art and craft stalls and exhibitions, music performances, picnic spots, more planting out and creative lighting along the riversides, markets etc.

Investigate improving disabled access to both riversides, seating, lighting and landscaping opportunities. Linkages to Friar's Quay has opportunities linked with the development of the Castle car park and Piccadilly area.

BOUNDARY: QUESTION 48

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

PPS 6 (Planning for Town Centres) defines a Town Centre as a “Defined area, including the primary shopping areas of predominately leisure, business and other main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area”. An Edge-of-Centre is, for retail purposes: “a location that is well connected to and within easy walking distance (i.e. up to 300m) of the primary shopping area. For office developments, locations outside the town centre but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange, including railway and bus stations, within the urban area should be considered as edge-of-centre locations for purposes of the sequential approach”.

PPS12 (Local Spatial Planning) states that on the adopted proposals map: "Inset maps may be used to show policies for part of the authority's area, such as the policies for area action plans, which must all be shown on the adopted proposals map. Where inset maps are used, the geographical area they will cover will be identified on the main adopted proposals map. The boundaries of each inset map must be shown precisely on the adopted proposals map but the policies shown on the inset must not appear on the main adopted proposals map.

Regional Spatial Strategy:

RSS Policy E2 (Town Centre and Major Facilities) states that: Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should strengthen the role and performance of existing city and town centres. The centres of Regional Cities and Sub Regional Cities and Towns should be the focus for offices, retail, leisure, entertainment, arts, culture, tourism and more intensive sport and recreation across the region”.

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy does not contain any objectives relevant to this issue.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options shows an indicative extent of coverage of both the City Centre and York Northwest area action plans, but does not define the boundary of either the City Centre or the City Centre AAP. Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Principle 1 – A Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy – places the city as first in the hierarchy in distributing land for development, stating that “York will provide the main focus for the majority of new development. Within the Sub Regional City, York City Centre is identified as the main focus for retail, leisure and office employment”.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

There is no local evidence base directly relevant to this issue. The Conservation Area Appraisal and York Northwest AAP, when they have progressed, could influence the option as discussed below.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The Sustainability Statement did not assess the impacts of the boundary.

BOUNDARY - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:**General Comments on this Issue:**

- Consideration of the boundary is located near the very end of the report. At next stage of process should be located at beginning.

BOUNDARY - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:**QUESTION 48: What do you think the boundary of the city centre should be for the purpose of the Area Action Plan?**

- Draft Local Plan
- Conservation Area
- The Walled City
- Should the boundary be different again, and where should it be drawn?

| | | | | | |
|------------------|------|------|------|-------|--------------------|
| Response: | A: 6 | B: 7 | C: 2 | D: 15 | 30 Total Responses |
|------------------|------|------|------|-------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- An amalgam of A) and B).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Combine Central Historic Core Conservation Area boundary, enlarged to include Hungate development and Draft Local Plan City Centre boundary.
- 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.
- Hospital should be included as is a major employer.
- 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. 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.
- The outermost line covered by all, but also include York Northwest.
- Draft Local Plan should extent south to include Fishergate as far as Grange Garth.

PREFERRED OPTION – BOUNDARY

This pro forma addresses both the issue of the boundary for the AAP and the boundary of the York City Centre which needs to be defined for the overall LDF spatial strategy and the sequential approach to development. The Central Shopping Area is addressed under question 2.

There was a mixed response to both these issues in the Issues and Options consultation and there is no obvious consensus of opinion. A number of areas around the existing Local Plan boundary were proposed for inclusion within York City Centre in order to encourage their redevelopment.

The defined extent of the City Centre is a key component of the overall spatial strategy for the city. National planning policy aims to locate travel attracting uses within defined city centres. This applies to uses such as retail, offices and entertainment. The AAP boundary will need to incorporate York City Centre and any other areas surrounding it where a policy or action is considered necessary to deliver the vision and objectives of the plan, being clear where policy applies. This may include the entire extent of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area if the AAP were to act as the Management Strategy for the Area. The AAP boundary would therefore be dependant on the outcomes of the Conservation Area Appraisal. It may also be necessary to incorporate the entire extent of the New Walk / Terry Avenue Conservation Area, and for the AAP to act as the Management Strategy for that Area also, as some potential AAP projects are within that area.

An important consideration is that the AAP boundary should not overlap the York Northwest AAP boundary. The York Northwest AAP boundary has yet to be determined and potentially may require to include part of the city centre such as areas to the east of the railway station that would require to be redeveloped to improve access to the York Central site.

Further work is required to produce an evidence base to determine both boundaries, see below.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

Consistent

1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives

No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below.

2) Consistency with community

No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below.

| | |
|--|--|
| strategy/local area agreement | |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| Justified | |
| 4) Consultation response | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| 5) Sustainability appraisal | The Sustainability Statement did not review this issue. |
| 6) Community benefits | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| 7) Evidenced approach | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| Effective | |
| 8) Viability | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| 9) Deliverability | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| 10) Flexibility | No preferred option at this stage. Further work required, see below. |
| NEXT STEPS | |
| In order to determine the Preferred Option, further work is required. A Topic Paper will be produced to justify the determination of the York City Centre boundary and to explain the methodology used. The AAP boundary will be determined by the extent of the projects involved and consulted on at Preferred Options stage. To determine the AAP boundary, a decision is required as to the York Northwest AAP boundary and the review of the Conservation Area boundary as part of the Conservation Area Appraisal process needs to be completed. | |

**YORK CENTRAL HISTORIC CORE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL – BRIEF DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARIES:
QUESTIONS 49 AND 50**

POLICY BACKGROUND

National Planning Policy:

Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a duty on local planning authorities to designate as conservation areas any 'areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'.

Planning Policy Guidance 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) states that: "The more clearly the special architectural or historic interest that justifies designation is defined and recorded, the sounder will be the basis for local plan policies and development control decisions, as well as for the formulation of proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the character or appearance of an area. The definition of an area's special interest should derive from an assessment of the elements that contribute to (and detract from) it".

The English Heritage / Planning Advisory Service document 'Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas' states that local authorities should: "include policies in the local development documents to safeguard the character or appearance of conservation areas and their settings;

formally adopt and publish the character appraisals and management proposals for each of the authority's conservation areas in support of the relevant supplementary planning document(s)". With regard to Area Action Plans, the document states that AAPs "should set out the policies and proposals for action, based on the character appraisal, required to preserve or enhance the area".

Regional Spatial Strategy:

The 2008 RSS Policy Y1 (York Sub-Area Policy) states that: "Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes for the York sub area should: Protect and enhance the nationally significant historical and environmental historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas". Policy ENV9 (Historic Environment) states that: "Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should conserve the following regionally-distinctive elements of the historic environment, enhance their character and reinforce their distinctiveness: The street patterns, sky lines, views and setting of the historic City of York".

Sustainable Community Strategy:

The Sustainable Community Strategy contains the Strategic Ambition that "We will use York's distinctiveness as a way to improve the city further by enhancing its physical and cultural qualities as a basis for community and economic development". The Strategy states

that: “York’s visual landscape sets the scene for the city’s individuality. This is not just confined to the prime conservation area in the main city centre, it also includes the strays and ‘green wedges’ that surround York as well as the conservation areas beyond the city walls”. This emphasises the importance of the special character of the city centre to the cultural and economic success of the city.

LDF Core Strategy:

The Core Strategy Preferred Options contains a vision for “York’s Special Historic and Built Environment” that specifies issues with regard to the historic environment of the city centre that the AAP will need to address: “The city’s unique historic character and setting is an essential component of its future success as well as being valuable in its own right. York’s outstanding architectural and archaeological heritage gives the city special significance, distinctiveness and sense of place. The LDF will ensure that this heritage is preserved and enhanced; in particular the architecture and archaeology of its historic centre; its skyline, street patterns, the Minster and its precinct, the Medieval and Roman walls, Clifford’s Tower, surrounding historic villages and valued open spaces that contribute to the city’s setting. High quality urban design and architecture will be promoted by the LDF throughout the whole of the York area”.

The Core Strategy sets a target for meeting the strategic objective (Delivering the quality city – retaining character and local distinctiveness) of “the completion of a Conservation Area Appraisal for the Central Historic Core, and the delivery of the City Centre AAP by 2011”. The Appraisal is a requirement of the Preferred Options Policy CS4.

YORK EVIDENCE BASE

The Draft Heritage Strategy for the City of York

The Draft Heritage Strategy for the City of York for the period 2010 to 2013 sets out the key objectives for the sustainable management of the heritage of the city. The Strategy contains objectives for the ‘Historic Environment’ objectives including: “To ensure that York’s historical and archaeological wealth and their setting is recognised, conserved and enhanced; To promote pride of place amongst local residents and support them in improving the quality of their communities”. The Strategy also includes ‘issues to address’ of relevance to the Appraisal: “Lack of a clear understanding and articulation of York’s special qualities; Organic development naturally leads to a tendency to consider schemes in isolation from a clear context”.

SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT

The Sustainability Statement did not assess the impacts of the appendix.

SUMMARY CHARACTER APPRAISALS - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

General Comments on this Issue:

- 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.

SUMMARY CHARACTER APPRAISALS - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE:

QUESTION 49: Do you agree that the 11 character areas identified in the Esher Report in 1968 (shown on the Character Areas map overleaf) still represent areas of distinct character in 2008? If you disagree, please state how the boundaries should change.

OPTION: The existing 11 character areas were shown on a map.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 2 Supported | 2 Not Supported | 0 Mixed | 8 Comment | 12 Total Responses |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- A number of areas were suggested for inclusion into the Conservation Area, including: University and Science Park; Monkgate; Lord Mayor's Walk; Blossom Street; the Station and Environs; the Ouse corridor to Millennium Bridge and Rowntree's Park; Stonebow area; The New Walk; Hungate; an area which covers the confluence of the Ouse and the Foss, Browney Dyke and St George's Field.
- Micklegate area should be redefined to include 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.
- Micklegate-Bishophill omits Church of St Mary Bishophill Junior, which has a Saxon tower and green space.
- The Ouse corridor needs evaluation as a unit.
- Do not agree that the character areas identified represent coherent areas of distinct character.
- Areas do not obviously make sense. Minster precinct feels at odds with Cultural Quarter and development of Minster Gates for example.

QUESTION 50: Do you agree that the 11 character summaries included in this Appendix are an accurate and comprehensive basis on which to progress the full Conservation Area Appraisal for the Central Historic Core Conservation Area?

OPTION: 11 character area summaries were included in the Issues and Options report as an appendix.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| Response: | 5 Supported | 7 Not Supported | 2 Mixed | 1 Comment | 15 Total Responses |
|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|

Key points made:

- 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.
- 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.
- Need to follow English Heritage guidance on producing appraisals
- Conservation Area Appraisal needs to be completed properly before CCAAP can be finalised.
- 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.
- Concern that public is being consulted without Conservation Area Appraisal for Central Historic Core being available. Seems a little ‘cart before horse’.

PREFERRED OPTIONS – SUMMARY CHARACTER APPRAISALS

There is no preferred option for the summary appraisals.

OPTION SOUNDNESS EVALUATION

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Consistent 1) Contribution to overall vision and strategic development objectives</p> | <p>The need for the Appraisal and for the Appraisal to shape the AAP is clear and this is consistent with visions of the Sustainable Community Strategy and Core Strategy visions to preserve and enhance the special historic built environment of the city centre.</p> <p>The summary appraisals were included in the issues and options document as an opportunity to get some early community engagement in the process of producing the full Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) for the Central Historic Core. A new consultant will be appointed soon to undertake the full Appraisal. The consultation on the draft Appraisal will coincide with the AAP Preferred Options consultation. The draft will be used to inform preferred options on Managing the Historic</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Environment. The AAP will also take the role of a Management Strategy for the CAA. Headline issues would be addressed in AAP Policy with detailed policy and actions incorporated into an SPD.</p> <p>The draft will also inform other preferred options in the AAP, in particular this will help to guide the location of new development, the parameters for the development of identified sites and the principles that will be the framework for the public realm and movement strategy. The Appraisal will also inform the vision and objectives of the AAP by defining what is special about the city centre.</p> |
| 2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement | <p>The Community Strategy emphasises the importance of the Conservation Area to the culture and economy of York. An Appraisal would allow us a better understanding of what elements make the area so special and therefore to sensitively plan for its future.</p> |
| 3) Regional and national guidance | <p>Guidance in PPG15 and English Heritage guidance on the management of Conservation Areas requires Appraisals to be carried out. RSS Policies Y1 and ENV9 emphasise the importance of preserving the historic setting of the city. A draft Planning Policy Statement to replace PPGs 15 and 16 is in production. When this comes into force, the policies with regard to management of Conservation Areas will be taken into account in the production of the Appraisal and AAP.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Justified</p> <p>4) Consultation response</p> | <p>There is clear support for an Appraisal and for the AAP to reflect its findings. There are a number of issues around the definition of the extent of the area, these will be resolved through the preparation of the Appraisal including a public consultation.</p> <p>The responses to the Issues and Options consultation will prove invaluable in guiding the production of the Appraisal. Consultees were in general agreement that the 11 areas as shown still represent an accurate interpretation of areas of distinct character within the city centre, with some amendments. No responses suggested excluding any areas from the Conservation Area. A number of areas were proposed as additions to the Conservation Area and these can be assessed in the production of the Appraisal. The extent of the Conservation Area boundary will be part of the consultation.</p> <p>The content of the summary appraisals was generally not supported. These should therefore not form the basis for the full Conservation Area Appraisal. There is a strong feeling that the summaries fail to capture the essence of the historic core or truly characterise the areas they describe. Respondents felt that the summaries should have more closely followed the English Heritage guidance on the production of Character Appraisals.</p> |
| <p>5) Sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>The Sustainability Statement did not assess the impacts of the appendix. However, the Statement recognises that retaining York's unique and special character can have positive impacts for sustainable development objectives. In order for the AAP to contain policies and proposals to help retain this special character, a fully complete and adopted Conservation Area Appraisal is required as the basis for those policies and proposals.</p> |
| <p>6) Community benefits</p> | <p>The Appraisal will provide a better and clearer understanding of the historic development of the area and what positive and negative factors exist in the area today. This will provide a basis for policies and actions to preserve and enhance an area that is of significant cultural and spiritual importance to the people of York.</p> |
| <p>7) Evidenced approach</p> | <p>The Appraisal will be evidence for the AAP to inform policies and actions.</p> |
| <p>Effective</p> | |
| <p>8) Viability</p> | <p>A budget exists, in partnership with English Heritage, to undertake the Appraisal.</p> |
| <p>9) Deliverability</p> | <p>A budget exists, in partnership with English Heritage, to undertake the Appraisal.</p> |
| <p>10) Flexibility</p> | <p>There are different approaches for the AAP to take forward the findings of the Appraisal, however the AAP has a focus on action rather than policy. General conservation policy will be contained in</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | the Core Strategy. Policy specific to the Central Historic Core may be best placed in an SPD to the Core Strategy, with specific projects to enhance the city centre taken forward in the AAP. |
|--|--|

NEXT STEPS

The Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development team will commission suitable consultants to undertake the Appraisal, in partnership with English Heritage. The responses to the Issues and Options consultation will be discussed with them. The draft of the Appraisal will be used to shape the AAP Preferred Options. The AAP will take forward the management strategy for the Conservation Area. The Heritage Renaissance Officer will produce the management strategy based on the Appraisal.

The aim is to consult on the draft Appraisal and Preferred Options document in parallel. The Appraisal is essential to the AAP and the Preferred Options cannot progress until it has been prepared.

The Core Strategy policy CS4 supports the production of an assessment of key views, which will aim, in particular, to preserve views of the Minster and its pre-eminence on the city's skyline. The Council will prepare and commission a brief for this work in conjunction with English Heritage.

It has also been suggested that York requires to have a landscape / townscape character assessment carried out to assess the whole city. This issue is being considered as part of the evidence base required to inform the emerging LDF Core Strategy and Allocations DPD. A topic paper is proposed, to support the Core Strategy, that will include characterisation studies for strategic sites and the views assessment (aspect and prospect). Conservation area appraisals, parish plans and village design statements will be prioritised and brought forward during the lifetime of the DPD and adopted as supplementary planning documents (SPDs).