

York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal consultation comments: August/September 2011: General comments			CYC response	ABA response
Theme	Reference	Source	Comment	
Pedestrian zones		James Binns	You are right to emphasise the unique character of historic York, and the way it is threatened by traffic. You say in the *Principles of Management*(4) that the city centre should be *first and foremost an area for pedestrians.	No action
		James Binns	I do not think, though, you have taken account of the fact that the existing pedestrian zone is unenforced. I have just spent ten minutes in Blake Street, and during that time observed fifteen violations of the zone by cars, and two by cyclists. The remedy is obvious, to enforce the zone by rising bollards which only public service vehicles can operate by transponder. This is what is done in Liverpool, where cars are permanently banned from the main shopping area. In continental cities too, --Munich, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Hanover--it is impossible for a car ever to drive through the historic core. Only commercial vehicles are allowed in for delivery until mid-morning. York is one of the few cities I know to allow vehicles with disabled badges to enter the zone. In so doing it does a great disservice to the genuinely disabled, who more than others need a quiet and tranquil environment.	It is a management issue. New recommendations in strategy are: 1) Footstreets should operate 10-6pm to revitalise early evening economy 2) Speed limits in footstreets should not exceed 20mph, and ideally within the whole walled area 3) Remove yellow lines and alter signage to indicated new restrictions. Bays needed for disabled and loading vehicles.
		James Binns	Based on my observations as a regular pedestrian in the zone, there are roughly 1000 violations of the zone a day; in addition several hundred vehicles with disabled badges use the zone. (But all too clearly the badges are being fraudulently used in most cases.)	
		James Binns	As a result the zone is only a very partial success--it works in Coney Street, perhaps, but not in Blake Street, Davygate, St Sampson's Square and so on. And Goodramgate/Colliergate is used as a rat-run at all times	See above
		James Binns	I am sorry to say this as a Yorkshireman, but I find walking in York a most unpleasant experience. Unless transponder bollards are introduced, I fear that this will continue to be the case.	See above
Executive summary		Bernard Spears	My immediate concern is that the oldest church (St Mary's Bishophill Junior) and possibly the oldest house (Jacob's Well) are described as "Victorian and Edwardian Civic and Religious", along with Holy Trinity Church and the adjacent timber frame buildings fronting Micklegate.	See above
		Bernard Spears	The Saxon Tower of St Mary's is also not included while the tower of St Martin's is, despite being hemmed in by tall buildings, lower down, and totally invisible from any distance is shown as a prominent landmark.	No action
		Bernard Spears	The proposal to reduce traffic across the Lendal and Bishopgate Bridges without suggesting an alternative is neither realistic nor sensible.	Landmarks are subjective
				No action

	Bernard Spears	Traffic on the Bishopgate Bridge barely impacts on the historic core at all, whereas there is a clear conflict between pedestrian and vehicle use of Micklegate Bridge.	I assume Bishopgate Bridge is Skeldergate Bridge and Micklegate Bridge is Ouse Bridge. Disagree with comment on Skeltergate Bridge.	No action
	Bernard Spears	Without having had time to study the report in detail I would seriously question the competence of the people who have produced it.	Hopefully, once the report is studied in detail this view will change. No action required.	No action
	Bishophill Action Group	A group of over twenty residents attended a public meeting at the Priory Street Centre on Thursday 28th July to discuss the contents of this appraisal and to listen to an informative presentation by Bob Sydes. The opinion of the meeting was that the appraisal was an excellent, well presented and researched document. There was agreement with the general principles of conservation and sympathetic improvement.		
General	Dr D M Chalmers	I should like to express strong support for this excellent analysis and would agree with the great majority of the suggestions for action.		No action
	Friends of York Walls	Overall the draft was identified as a valuable comprehensive appraisal of what makes York unique. We agree that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the study does define York's historic core.</li> <li>• has priorities of public spaces, pavements, signage.</li> <li>• protecting some of York's skyline views are important (perhaps some key views 7 &amp; 8 are unrealistic expectations).</li> <li>• building heights should be considered in future planning submissions.</li> <li>• schedule 4 should be enforced on buildings identified in the draft.</li> </ul>		No action
	Friends of York Walls	It seems a useful and impressive document but there's a need for corrections of several sorts....typing-type errors...picture selection/captioning errors ...Possible factual mistakes in maps ...Unintentional and possibly misleading omissions ...Exaggerations/highly questionable judgements (examples occur as referenced comments).		No action
	Friends of York Walls	In places the draft appraisal seems to undervalue the informal, the quietness of the quieter places and the barriers that support these qualities. Examples of this are:		They have been addressed
	Friends of York Walls	a. The informal path in the ditch by Lord Mayors' walk is mentioned as "informal breathing space" but there is also almost a recommendation to "make more of it" by doing what many would think of as spoiling it –making it a "permanent landscaped pathway" –possibly even with lighting [p.185].		The intention for intervention is low key. Cross referenced to feasibility study.
	Friends of York Walls	b. The beauty of the wide rampart grassland by Jewbury is noted but it is also said to be "not used for any particular purpose" [p.194], as if this is sad -but in warm weather I usually see several groups of people sitting there [reading, sunbathing or chatting], in snow this last winter it was a toboggan run and it helps create great views of the walls and the city inside from the road, pavements and wall		Noted

	Friends of York Walls	c. The relative quiet of Deans Park, well used by local people, is noted then it recommends making it more tempting to visitors.		Agree it is a spiritual place - there is a need to conserve the saced, reflective character so it is a place of rest and reflection
	Friends of York Walls	d. The railings of King's Manor are seen separating its relative green quiet from Exhibition Square, some of its value is noted but the draft appraisal also sees this as an opportunity to unify the open spaces in the area.		We do not advocate removing the railings
	Friends of York Walls	e. The quiet Library lawn should be "enhanced" [p.160] and access made easier with an eye to its being used more.		Agree - see referenced comments on this
	Friends of York Walls	To be fair this undervaluing may be mild and qualified -and it may be popularly shared -but I think it should be guarded against. Otherwise money will be used and carbon emitted in order to spoil what is valued by many -in the belief that a greater number of others will gain something, a belief which may be mistaken.		
	Friends of York Walls	I have focussed on ways I think the draft can be improved but it seems generally excellent in its recommendations on the walls. Its view of the 4 principle issues is persuasive [p.499]. When it suggests a need to improve signage to make a walk of the complete circuit of the City Walls easier and says "current routes are poorly marked, for example, missing street studs along the city wall trail" [p.497] it could have gone even further, pointing out that 3 studs are misplaced and no easily available map or account shows or explains the route of the studs fully. It is properly cautious about the potentially good idea of some information being provided at particularly fine view points on the walls near Robin Hood's Tower [p.84]. It is cautious yet properly enthusiastic for disabled/flat access to and along the much pierced bits of wall between the railway station and the Ouse. It seems properly firm on banning development on the ramparts and ditches around the walls [and banning higher or poor quality buildings where replacement is being considered]. It is right to think that the walls and ramparts have a potential for increasing biodiversity in York and, of course, to see traffic and parking as a major distracter from the attractions of the walls and bars.		Stenghtened access to walls text - there is a real need for access and opportunities exist, especially where it is victorian fabric
	Isobel	I found it both interesting and clear (although some of the maps would do with magnification. This a minor quibble although I could not follow the numbering system on page 6).		no action
	John Gough	The Appraisal is easy to use and readable. However, it was tedious to download by being split into so many separate sections. For the future, could you consider offering a single download file (or a very small number if just one were felt to be too large)?	The file size (>300mb) precluded use as a single download. The report was broken down into logical elements to make it easier for the majority.	The whole document will be offered as a single download for those with broadband access
	John Gough	The Appraisal does clearly explain the character of the Conservation Area		No action
	Dr John Gough	In general, I felt that this was an excellent and convincing document that takes a careful look at the current state of the inner city, warts and all, and has some very sensible things to say about a way forward.		No action

			<p>. York buses are a disaster. They are infrequent, do not run to a fixed timetable, are very slow, and are very expensive for those who have to pay for them. I cannot see how such a slow and unpredictable service can ever attract people out of their cars. And yet I cannot see how the service can be speeded up without more restrictions on motor vehicles in the core area, both to give buses priority through both controlled and uncontrolled junctions and to prevent stationary vehicles (either parked or loading and unloading) from obstructing buses, as, for example, they do all too frequently in Coppergate in the middle of the morning. There is also a problem about serving the inner area. Where I am the nearest buses are 6 or 7 minutes walk away. Is there a case in York for the sort of minibus service that is used in Central Vienna?</p>	Perhaps in appropriate places the report might link what it says about buses with these other issues.	Action as CYC suggest
6.9	John Gough		<p>, I was very much impressed by the document as a whole. But when I came to look in detail at what is said about my own area, I rather wondered how much detailed observation those who drew up this report have undertaken...I am in the Aldwark area. Most of the general points are very well made (and especially the firmly-given view that both the Stonebow buildings and Hilary House are thoroughly inappropriate to the areas in which they stand!...(see further referenced comment)</p>		No action
	John Gough		<p>As to the parking and through traffic, the regulations do work reasonably well, but there is a problem with commercial operators attempting to make deliveries when they know there will be no-one in businesses to receive them, so that they park illegally for lengthy periods, with one particular business routinely abusing parking regulations at its back entrance, and with the problem that seems common throughout York where one sees cars draw up and stop and one or two people then walk happily away, having left a Disability permit in their windcreens (an episode last weekend being when a young couple parked to go and exercise their four dogs).</p>	Strengthen text?	See above
	Dr John Gough		<p>A final point I should like to mention, which again would be missed by people looking at an area only during the day, is street lighting. This city uses in its inner-city residential areas lighting that throws as much light sideways and upwards as downward on to the footpaths, and is thus very intrusive into people's accommodation as well as being environmentally very poor by today's standards because of its light-pollution of the night sky. The buildings in this area are not listed, so there can be no objection to decent modern design, and indeed the city uses lights that throw most of their illumination downwards around the plague burial ground near the station (where there are plenty of pedestrians but no residents) -- so it does have the equipment.</p>	Agreed. Need to have something on lighting as part of the public realm stuff?	Added new management recommendation - CYC should produce a Lighting Strategy to take account of emerging technology, health, safety and equality issues
	Dr John Gough		<p>I read with interest Alan Baxter's appraisals and management proposals for the Central Area of York and am pleased to see that such a breadth of issues have been addressed, particularly the townscape. I fully support the removal of the clutter of signage of every kind which, as indicated in some of the German examples given, could be implemented here and would most certainly allow for a more sustainable maintenance regime for the present floorscape, street scene etc.</p>		No action
	Janette Ray		<p>The Report gives the impression of being the result of an initial rapid survey that has been based on the designated architectural and ancient monument heritage of the city. The ingredients (or criteria) that have been used to identify and assess the character of the character areas are rather restricted when compared with a more holistic perception and interpretation of the history, character, and heritage of York...</p>	The report has been based on many assessments which have also included ambiance, non-designated assets (buildings of merit), views etc. It was never designed to deliver a complete understanding of York. That would have been an enormous undertaking resulting in a far larger piece of work. Some of the recommendations, such as public realm strategy and streetscape manual as well as the historic characterisation study are designed to provide a further level of understanding.	No action
	Peter Goodchild				No action

			<p>The results of the Baxter Report need now to be put more clearly into a wider heritage context. The generic ingredients of this wider heritage context include such things as the following: (i) A deeper and more detailed local knowledge of York and its archaeology and history (including historical associations). (ii) The natural and landscape dimensions of York's heritage. (iii) The potential for improving the presentation, appreciation and enjoyment of central York's history and heritage.</p>	<p>This is covered by many other existing studies in various levels of detail however, it is right to say that we need further in-depth analysis. The recommendations to deliver a heritage strategy, a review of the Ove Arup Development &amp; Archaeology Study as well as the public realm strategy and wayfinding strategy are designed to do just that.</p>	No action
		Peter Goodchild	<p>York has a very rich, complex, and deep history. The documentary and also the physical (archaeological) evidence are exceptionally good. Much has been written about York's history and there is a long standing tradition of people from the city and elsewhere, both specialists and non-specialists, taking an active interest in it and being knowledgeable about it. If the assessment of York and its component areas is to be satisfactory for the purposes of sustaining and improving the 'quality of place' in the city, it is highly important that the rich background information and the local and personal knowledge that are available are added to the assessment and incorporated into it any resulting proposals.</p>	<p>The assessment cannot achieve this finer grain of detail in the time and resources allowed for the project. Some local and personal knowledge gleaned from workshops and consultation comment has been and will be included but only where it adds value or illustrates a particular point. Also, see above entry 38 and 39.</p>	No action
		Peter Goodchild	<p>The ideas set out in the Baxter Report also need to be integrated with the ideas in City's Core Strategy document (January 2011) and the Simpson Report (2011).</p>	<p>They are.</p>	No action
		edward freedman	<p>Inner Ring Road: Please note that the Civic Trust, referred to in the text as being responsible for opposing the inner ring road proposals of the 1960s/70s, was actually a vociferous supporter of the scheme, along with the York Georgian Society, and both Patrick Nuttgens and John Shannon spoke in favour at the Public Inquiry, prioritising the city centre over the harm to the periphery. It was in response to the support of the primary civic groups that a pioneering pressure group, York 2000, was formed by opponents to oppose the scheme, employing novel techniques to raise the national profile of the campaign and recruiting celebrity members such as Mortimer Wheeler and JB Priestley. In the event, the scheme was probably abandoned because of government budgetary constraints as well as a shift away from grant redevelopment schemes, and the Minister finally rejected the scheme in the mid 70s years after the conclusion of the Inquiry, rejecting the Inspector's decision to support the scheme. I wrote a MSc dissertation on post-war conservation in York with much more detail on that sort of thing.</p>		Corrected text
		Pamela Nyman	<p>In my opinion the biggest problem York faces as an Historical City is the general dirtiness of so many of our city streets. I'm referring particularly to the disgusting state of the pavements that are often vomit spattered - stained with this, chewing gum remains and fast food that has been dropped and left etc. The City Council should seriously consider a service that I saw in Paris a few years ago - the hosing down of the streets on a regular basis, using high pressure water jets. As York's main 'industry' is now Tourism I think that the perception that our city is clean, that we CARE about the state of our streets, matters a great deal. Having travelled in Europe a fair bit, I've not encountered as much general dirtiness in the streets of other towns and cities - it makes me feel rather ashamed of York - and this is NOT a good feeling to have.</p>	<p>Perhaps bring this out somewhere? This is a comment that was made several times during the York Explore exhibition.</p>	Amended text to include references to variable levels of cleanliness and need for litter bins
		Rupert Scott	<p>Insofar as I can understand it (I visited the exhibition at the City Library on Friday last week) I agree with the draft Conservation Appraisal, including the boundary changes and the increased protection for certain streets. But unless I have missed a lot it seems to be very general at the moment - "improve important public spaces" etc. etc. without specifying how. We shall have to wait to see how this turns out in practice.</p>		See above - it is a high level study. Other strategies will implement recommendations.

			<p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the consultation document of the above title. I appreciate this was originally sent to Station Manager David Watson, in our Fire Safety department at York, however we have discussed the document together and are in general agreement on our findings. The document appears comprehensive and makes good use of GIS mapping to illustrate and identify the key issues for York's historic core. We appreciate the emphasis of the document is around future planning and therefore deals in depth with issues such as; landscape, development and transport etc.</p>		No action
		North Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service	<p>We do feel it may be of benefit to consider the risk to York's heritage from fire and we would be happy to provide advice on this in terms of what can be reasonably expected from the Fire Service in terms of our statutory obligations to the community for operational response and the level of advice we can provide for free to owners of buildings and businesses in the York area.</p>	<p>Addition to the text somewhere?</p>	Noted - no action
		Yorkshire Philosophical Society	<p>We do not feel qualified as a society to comment extensively on the other areas, but would like to back the general direction of the consultation particularly with regard to the - dismantling of street clutter, an improvement in the approaches and protecting the city skyline.</p>		No action
		Yorkshire Philosophical Society	<p>We would like to warn of a standardised approach to new paved areas and walkways (see the library forecourt). One of the attractions of York is the close proximity of its multifaceted historic buildings from different eras, and the pedestrian areas and walkways around these buildings should be designed to allow their 'difference' to be celebrated but not 'standardised*' as in a theme park.</p>		Noted - this issue will be covered in Public Spaces Strategy and Streetscape Manual
		English Heritage	<p>We warmly welcome the document and its proposals. We are pleased to have been associated with the study and we are highly supportive of its aims and objectives. It will play a vital role in the future management of the historic core of York, both safeguarding and enhancing the City's special qualities and communicating what makes York special to a wider audience.</p>		No action
			<p>Looking at the overall document and its approach we consider it to be generally very good and competent. It has been well thought out, is presented logically and has flair, making it a good read – vital if it is to be widely read and actively used. It avoids jargon and has a comfortable mix of text with images and it has captured succinctly the comments and feedback from the workshops and as a result we do not have a large number of comments.</p>		No action
		English Heritage	<p>The Character Areas analyse the gentle as well as striking differences in these 24 areas and perceptively describe their attributes and failings. We consider that five in particular are of prime importance to the future development of the city – Castle, Piccadilly, Railway Area, Minster Precinct and lastly Museum Gardens and Exhibition Square.</p>		No action
		English Heritage	<p>We broadly support the Recommendations; however some make clear that they will be implemented by CofYC but what of the rest? This needs to be clarified. Many also start the City of York Council should, but many also do not. This is important as most of the Recommendations do require City of York Council input and leadership. Clarification in this regard is needed.</p>		The action plan will form a separate document. It has been removed from the appraisal and management strategy
Management Strategy		English Heritage	<p>Regarding the wider text, as it is very detailed it would be helpful if the salient points were to be highlighted to make them more readily located in the text.</p>		* what do we do about this?

City walls	English Heritage	regarding the City Walls which are unique in England for their survival and length, we are concerned that in the text and maps in particular, the Walls are categorised as a barrier when more often they are a means of enclosure, creating a sense of place.	?? I see where EH are coming from. Maybe this could be re-visited.	See comments on referenced sheet on this subject
	Keith Dagggett	Navigation needs a complete rethink. The 'artistic' contents page is next to useless, with entries 400 pages apart. Page references to each character area should be given. The headings on each page should be expanded to include the topic: for example: 'Part One/ Understanding the City>Character Areas>Twenty Four: The Mount'. There are few references in the text to page numbers. References are to sections – but they are difficult to find. The page numbers in Part Two are white on pale green, and cannot easily be seen. The figure and ground layer of mapping is too pale. The sequence of topics within each Character Area should be absolutely uniform. It almost is. A few 'extra' headings need to be demoted typographically. It would be helpful to distinguish pages which introduce topics peculiar to a section – usually 'close-ups' - by a lightly coloured background.	This will all be dealt with in the final web based version.	All character areas have been reviewed and where necessary amended to create identical structures.
	Keith Dagggett	Readability can only be considered in relation to an audience. Here the aim is 'to produce a readable and engaging document' York audiences love detail! It would be a mistake to reduce the text further. I have noted many instances where an explanatory or descriptive phrase – just a few words; nothing to compromise the open appearance of the layout - would be helpful, and enliven text which is becoming faceless or superficial. There is nothing interesting in the word 'interesting'!	Okay, but the majority of comments on this subject have been favourable. The balance between detail and legibility is about right considering the strategic nature of the appraisal.	No action
	Keith Dagggett	...I hope my responses don't seem too Beckmesserish: I can't see the point in telling experts that they are right, which of course they are - for most of the time. I'd like to thank everyone involved in getting the document to this stage; it promises to be very good, and I hope the final version has a wide circulation...		No action
	Monica Nelson	Many of the observations (in the report) are timely and persuasively put, and the recommendations which relate to the provision of open space and to improving access to the river banks should be adopted.		No action
	Monica Nelson	You have created an important document...this will be to the benefit of visitors and residents alike.		No action
	Monica Nelson	...you make constructive suggestions for putting these ideas into practice within a defined timescale. Let us hope it will not join the other well-intentioned reports which have been welcomed and discussed, but eventually have failed to be put into practice.	The document is designed to be used and will be uploaded onto a web site. Many of the actions and recommendations are obviously dependant on resource but some important ones such as public space strategy and de-cluttering as well as public space improvements are already being advanced.	No action
	CPRE, York & Selby Branch	The appraisal is an important and comprehensive study succinctly presented. It should do much to ensure the healthy development of the City and hopefully discourage the imposition of further architectural monstrosities upon the city. We are in accord that the answer to all four questions in the pamphlet is yes.		No action
	The University of York	This is an excellent document which the University warmly welcomes. It is well-researched, factually accurate and acute in its observations...Overall, we very much welcome this significant contribution to planning within the Central Conservation Area.		No action



York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal consultation comments: August/September 2011: Referenced comments			CYC response	ABA response
Theme	Reference / Source	Comment		
	5 Isobel	I appreciated the paragraph Conserving its Special Interest. I agree with all four points and especially its emphasis on doors and windows and unsympathetic shop fronts. This is important as many are distinctly displeasing and the shopping area should complement the historic core.		No action
	5 Isobel	I like too the emphasis on Views and Building Heights.... pictures of that ghastly hotel at the bottom of Piccadilly should be engraved on the hearts of those Councillors that allowed it		No action
	5 English Heritage	at Development and Design add potential	Not sure if this is necessary in the context of the appraisal.	No action
	7 K Richmond	With reference to page 7 of the Executive Summary: Principles for Management, the line in item 4: "This should be a city centre first and last for pedestrians" needs to add the words "and with excellent overall access for cyclists". .	We do not think this is necessary - there is plenty of support for cyclists in the document	
	7 English Heritage	We consider that there is some scope to strengthen the summary especially at page 7, Principles for Management point 5). As we consider that this issues (5) is fundamental to the successful implementation of most of the actions. There is a wide range of Council activities impacting on the historic core and better co-ordination and resource management should be one of the highest priorities for the Council.		
	12 English Heritage	suggest map should have M62 and A1(M) in blue not red	agreed	Agreed - corrected
	17 English Heritage	these definitions may be better presented in alphabetical order	agreed	Agreed - corrected
	21 English Heritage	the word "subtle" is being used confusingly here and we suggest that subtle would be better replaced by complex	okay!	Agreed - corrected
	27 Cllr Merrett	Enlarge map	agreed	Agreed - corrected
	28 Cllr Merrett	Enlarge map	agreed	Agreed - corrected
	28 English Heritage	including a map of the strays would be helpful	okay	Names referred to in text
	34 Cllr Merrett	mention foot streets and the refurbishment of historic buildings. Also enlarge Esher's plan	The Shambles for instance was bought by the City Council and restored in 1950's	Text amended and map enlarged
	35 English Heritage	1st paragraph - amend "more energy or commercially efficient" and at 2nd paragraph add at Universities an explanation of the arrival of York St John in York		
	35 Cllr Merrett	completion of the ring road was late 20th century	Okay	Corrected
	36 Cllr Merrett	19th 20th century shopping area yes, but with older buildings - recategorise?	correct this	Corrected
	37 Cllr Merrett	use of word 'spectre' is a bit loaded!	The map I think is designed to be relatively general so maybe not?	Introduction to plan explains this map is intended to show general and prevailing character; it is not intended to show all richness and complexity
	38 Cllr Merrett	Small area of commercial to add around the hotels on blossom Street	change word?	Corrected
	39 English Heritage	the interpretation of PPS5 is a little wobbly here. PPS5 discusses undesignated assets and by this it means both buildings and archaeological sites – but could also mean spaces	?	?
			Suggest adding "...These are buildings, sites and spaces of interest to local communities for historical, architectural or social reasons..."	Agreed - corrected



40	English Heritage	we are concerned that the document as drafted, suggests that there is a misunderstanding about archaeological deposits and designation. Most of the archaeological deposits in the City are not designated. The application of the Area of Archaeological Importance (from the 1979 Act) is a mechanism for ensuring that archaeological deposits are part of the planning process and in practice this means that the responses to the archaeological deposits are categorised in three broad themes/approaches. These are that either 1) there is no impact on archaeological deposits or 2) a watching brief is required or 3) excavation is required. This is not the same as saying the archaeological deposits in the City are designated and we advise that this should be made clear in references to archaeology across the document.	The Act does state quite clearly that an AAI is a designation. The use of the term in the Appraisal is therefore correct. The majority of archaeological deposits in York are 'designated'. Protection and mitigation are secured through the planning process by reference to PPS5 and Local Plan Policy. Perhaps this latter point needs strengthening as suggested.	Agree with CYC, and amended accordingly
40	English Heritage	the penultimate paragraph on Scheduled Monument Consent process is inaccurate and should read 'without the consent of the DCMS.'	agreed	Agreed - corrected
40	English Heritage	The Area of Archaeological Importance conditions in the 1979 Act were effectively superseded by PPG16.	Maybe, but the Act is statute and PPG16 is planning guidance! No change	No action
44	English Heritage	the drawing is interesting but how much it actually helps the discussion. It might be more useful to have a smaller diagram illustrating the buildings and burgrave plots combined.	okay but is there something we can use?	We have searched for an appropriate diagram but have not found one. Please supply if available.
47	Cllr Merrett	3rd para. Right column: clarify removal of clutter and obstacles to not mean trees	The trees in Parliament Square are not an option for removal but mention should perhaps be made to better management of them by qualified arboriculturists.	Agreed - corrected
48	Peter Goodchild	Along Lord Mayor's Walk there were iron railings and a gate to separate the public footpath from the city ditch and the ramparts, but as far as is known, the ditch and ramparts were not used as a public park in a conventional sense. It was grazed by sheep	As far as I can tell all the ramparts had railings around them and gates with steps down. They were always used as public spaces/parks.	Noted - no action
48	Peter Goodchild	In the Report, there is a section that deals with 'Landscape and green space' as part of the overview of the Core Conservation Area (BRcd,39. BRpdc,48 ). Here, 'landscape' would seem to equate with 'green space'. Neither of these two terms are explained in the section on terminology	redefine?	Noted - corrected terminology definitions
48	Peter Goodchild	To start the first paragraph with "There is little green space within the densely-packed walled city" is unfortunate because in this context it is open to being interpreted as representing a rather unfocused, and possibly negative, frame of mind towards the topic of landscape and green space. An evidently more positive response is needed.	This extract and the rest of the paragraph is a factual statement. I don't think this needs to be changed.	No action
48	Peter Goodchild	I have lived in York for more than 30 years and my experience of the centre of the city, and particularly from the Walls, gives me a very different impression of it. If one adds the River Ouse and the general topography of the city to the picture, the landscape dimension of the centre is actually very significant and it is more than simply the area of land covered by 'green space'. Admittedly, the 'landscape dimension' is a broader concept than 'green space', but they are closely related and green space is a very important component of the landscape dimension. Because of the way in which they present themselves to the public, the green spaces of central York are very noticeable even if one cannot walk on all of them. They are visually accessible even if not physically accessible.	Interesting perspective but York does not have too many green spaces, especially ones that are fully accessible. I think the report makes this point well but still identifies the positives. Perhaps more needs to be made about the walls as a linear park?	Noted - no action
48	Cllr Merrett	3rd para: add to end, "outside parliament Street".	agreed	Agreed - corrected
49	Friends of York Walls	Possible factual mistakes in map. The Wall walk (between wall sections) is shown as following the pavement around what I think of as St. George's Gardens [but I think is sometimes called Tower Place or St. George's Field north] rather than going through the gardens on the route of the studs etc.		
50	Cllr Merrett	4th para: Should be Piccadilly not Navigation Road.		Agreed - corrected
51	Cllr Merrett	2nd para: ...and was the largest in northern England at that time.		Agreed - corrected
53	Cllr Merrett	Its the silver line not the grey line.	correct this	Agreed - corrected

54	Peter Goodchild	The ditch and rampart provide a semi-natural habitat for wild flowers and other vegetation, and the birds and insects that are connected with them. They have a modern day role in the centre of the city as a refuge for wildlife and this is something that should be valued and treated as a positive component of the city. The ditch and rampart are part of a network of refuges in the city centre. This idea has been included in the Minster Quarter's study.	Maybe pick this up in the text somewhere?	Covered under recommendations 5.11
55	Friends of York Walls and others.	typo. "They are well maintained and in the spring they are <b>erupt gl...</b> "		Agreed - corrected
55	English Heritage	suggest map of wall to illustrate the breaks in the circuit	??	made x-ref to where this is shown in public and green spaces plan earlier in the chapter
66	Clir Merrett	The graphic is not very clear or understandable	Rethink the graphics?	Plan enlarged
67	Clir Merrett	need another intermediate to pick up strategic views for instance: Railway terrace to station, walls and minster; St John Street from Foss Island cycle path down Heworth Green.	The Railway terrace view is certainly one I have picked up in relation to York Central.	This is a good view - but so are many others. The Key View list was drawn up in consultation with stakeholders as a representative not a comprehensive group. The opportunity exists as part of a City Views Policy Document to review and revise the list of Key Views
71	Clir Merrett	Need much better photos to justify this	agreed but how? Need perfect weather.	York Civic Trust are supplying better images which will appear in the final public version of the document
78	Clir Merrett	dubious setting - hardly attractive	This is nevertheless a good strategic view of the Minster and one had from a residential suburb via a good wide street.	No action. The contrast is significant and highlights the growth of the city and the changing setting of the Minster. This is why it was chosen
79	Clir Merrett	Needs an enhancement section added	agreed	The introduction explains that Enhancements are only suggested where they have been identified. If there are none, there is no sub section
81	Janet Hopton	Should view 11 not follow view 9? as it is the second eg. of views across the ings.	Agreed - more logical	The text on these pages was out of sequence and has been corrected. There is only one view across the ings in the final list
81	Clir Merrett	The poplars are definitely a key issue for pedestrians and cyclists down river		This view was removed from the final list of Key Views
81	Clir Merrett	2nd para: Key for Kew		Agreed - corrected
82	Railway Heritage Trust	I generally agree with the entry, but under Enhancements I wonder whether the removal of the trees that is suggested is actually possible, or whether it would meet local resistance as removing a noise barrier between the railway and local residents?		
82	English Heritage	the text could refer to the sweeping view of railway, town and bridge on the approach to Berwick?	Not sure what is being suggested here. The text seems okay to me.	Noted - no action
82	Clir Merrett	Should be another key view 13 added down Wiggington Road from beyond the ring road.		Noted - no action
			B1363. maybe. I need to check	This is a good view - but so are many others. The Key View list was drawn up in consultation with stakeholders as a representative not a comprehensive group. The opportunity exists as part of a City Views Policy Document to review and revise the list of Key Views

87	Friends of York Walls	It was surprising that none of the “key views” selected and analysed were of Clifford’s Tower on its motte [to be precise one was valued partly because it contained a small part of it] or of the rampart and city wall with the city & Minster behind [unless you include Bootham Bar as “city wall” or include views from the walls, several of which featured the walls].	Clifford’s Tower is actually quite a discrete monument and not really significantly visible other than from Piccadilly and Foss Bridge: the latter is a key view and the former is identified along with the view from Castlegate in the character area description.	See below
87	Friends of York Walls	As far as the city walls go this omission (above) may not matter as the views are selected mainly so they can be preserved from blockage by building etc. and a. the draft appraisal does recommend a ban on development in ditch and rampart areas, b. a few [very few] valuable local views of the walls on top of their ramparts are identified and c. there are comments suggesting this type of view is valued –eg. when possible lighting for a path in the Lord Mayor’s walk ditch is mentioned and possible remodelling of the Nunnery Lane car park. However, describing the ramparts next to the inner ring road as little more than “glorified verges” [p.48] has an unfortunate tone to it. As they exist at the moment from Jewbury to Lord Mayor’s Walk I think they are truly glorious –but the phrase as it is usually used seems to imply they should not be valued as they are, though it was probably intended more to suggest they are currently an opportunity for “enhancement”. Viewing them mainly as an opportunity may have good effects but it also has dangers.	perhaps think about the wording although in many places grass verges is exactly what they function as. Maybe make the point more forcefully in the various sections?	Text reviewed. Although the ramparts are glorious the impact of traffic on the extent to which they are used as a public park
87	Clir Merrett	3rd para: ...and seek the removal of Ryedale House and a low rise replacement	From across the road by Tower Gardens Ryedale house rises above the Women's prison. A low rise replacement will certainly help this view. Amend	Agreed - corrected
89	Railway Heritage Trust	I agree with all of this short, but totally accurate section. I fully support the proposed enhancements.		No action
90	Railway Heritage Trust	I agree with the description, significance and, partially, the enhancement. However, this part of the document does not bring out the changes in the original station that are currently taking place to convert it to Council Offices. I believe this conversion removes most of the poor features identified against this structure at a later stage of the report.		Agreed - corrected
93	Clir Merrett	Agree with paragraph 2 referencing St Wilfrid's.		No action
93	Clir Merrett	4th para: ...and demolition of St Wilfrid's	Slightly controversial and at odds with the views of English heritage who stress it is a listed building.	It is a listed building and therefore there is a strong presumption against demolition. Nevertheless its impact on the setting of the one of Europe's greatest buildings cannot be denied
97	Clir Merrett	last para: four or five storeys	is this more in line with what is said elsewhere?	Checked and amended. Cobbles on eastern side, paviers on west.
98	Railway Heritage Trust	we support this section, and the need to minimise the intrusion into the skyline.		No action
105	Clifton Ward Planning Panel	...(the) Planning Panel welcomes the preservation of, and any necessary measures to improve the Bootham Park Hospital site as a very important green space. Greater public use is to be encouraged.	Can we strengthen this? Maybe as a recommendation under green space? This does seem underused and could it be a place for kicking a ball about for instance? Can't do that in Museum Gardens!	The text already suggests increased public use but it is NHS land and the grounds of a mental health unit
108	Clir Merrett	Where is Bootham School assembly hall as a building of merit?	amend graphic	Its actually grade II not BoM. Corrected text
109	Clir Merrett	4th para: replace cottages with terraced houses. Not a word Yorkies would use!	amend	Agreed - corrected

118	Janette Ray	I would however like to draw your attention to the boundaries of the Conservation Character Areas in relation to the last 100 metres or so of Bootham as one approaches the Bar and suggest these be redrawn here. I observe the photograph on the front of the "Character Area" section uses the view towards Bootham Bar on the introductory page as if to suggest its significance and yet, the area of the street between Bootham Row and Gillygate taking in buildings on both sides of the road has been included in the Gillygate character area rather than as part of Bootham. This results in this part of Bootham being consigned to the edge of three character areas Bootham, Exhibition Square and Gillygate. Probably as a consequence of the boundaries is not mentioned in any of the texts as having problems. And yet this area, which forms the final moments of the key approach from the north into the city suffers from standing traffic, masses of signs, transient shop uses and blocked out and ugly facades. In appearance it looks exceptionally run down. The report refers to people not wanting to "dwell" ie live here and yet all the upper floors are occupied. I would like to suggest that the conservation character area for Bootham be redrawn to include Bootham to the point where it meets with Gillygate. Perceptually this seems to me where the area fits within the city and would give an opportunity for this area to be prioritized for improvement whether through the enforcement of Article 4 directions or by some street co-operation led by the Council officers. If the area is not seen as part of the main approach but consigned to an edge of centre place for Bootham, Gillygate and Exhibition Square, I fear as it was when Esher did his report, this approach will be forgotten.	This comments seems to misunderstand the nature of character area boundaries. If the city wanted to make improvements to this area, the character area boundaries make no difference. They are just useful ways of packaging information. We have decided not to change the boundary. The character area boundaries are perceptual and subjective, but they have already been agreed by the stakeholder group. However, the entries are now better cross-referenced so that the linkages between these character areas are more clearly expressed.
141	Clr Merrett	final para: should mention disabled access.	?
144	Friends of York Walls	Para 5. Henry III rather than Henry II	Agreed - corrected
144	Friends of York Walls	"not much remains from the medieval city defences in this area" [when the area referred to seems to include Bootham Bar, substantial stretches of unwalkable city wall both directions from the multangular tower as well as the Lendal water tower and the city wall north from there];	Agreed - corrected
144	English Heritage	Historical development: This section could be expanded a little, eg: Excavations adjacent to the Library have discovered the remains of the Roman defences and significantly revised their dating. Standing remains of the medieval fabric survive inside the Theatre Royal.	Agreed - corrected
150 - 161	Friends of York Walls	Unintentional and possibly misleading omissions eg. around p.150 [when describing the uses, value, strengths, opportunities etc. of Exhibition Square] the use of the square as a pavement café by the Art Gallery and numerous waiting circular-tour-of-York buses.	Agreed - corrected
150-151	English Heritage	Streets and Spaces: Exhibition Square: - We suggest some reference is made to the importance of the present City Council car park as part of the open space and the desirability of its retention as such. It has views across it of the city walls in both directions. It includes not only a fragment of the Roman fortress wall but also the line of the demolished section which should remain free of buildings	Agree - Stated in spaces text and strengths 'The open quality of this space adjacent to the city wall and around the wall fragment (which remains in Council ownership) provides them with a setting and views that would be diminished by unsuitable development'.
151	Friends of York Walls	describing the pedestrian/vehicle separating railings around the outside of Bootham Bar as "unnecessary" when many might think them vital for safety	The removal of railings is agreed by many parties as integral to improving the functioning of the street. Indeed research suggests that removing barriers does not lead increased safety issues. However, removed the word 'unnecessary'.

154	Friends of York Walls	Picture caption. "right" and "left" are transposed but, more importantly the picture said to be of the main doorway of King's Manor is of the doorway a little to the west of the main doorway and the picture said to be of the 16th & 17th century Kings Manor seems to be mostly of the headmaster's house [c.1900?] to the right of the Manor.		Agreed - corrected
159	Clir Merrett	important views of the Aviva building and other lg buildings west of the river.	amend?	This view is picked up on Lendal bridge. No action.
160	Yorkshire Philosophical Society	We agree that: The northern area of the Gardens should be developed. That Access to this area should be opened up from the top of Marygate, but that the thematic of this area should be looked at differently from the current amenity area in the south of the Gardens, and should not draw people to simply use it as a short cut into the city, as this would unbalance the footfall on the already overused paths at the Museum Street end of the Gardens.		See below
160	Yorkshire Philosophical Society	The YPS is concerned that talk of development of the northern River Bank at the foot of the Gardens, and a possible opening up of this area of the Gardens would completely change the ambience of Museum Gardens. We believe that this ambience is the key feature of the amenity that is Museum Gardens and which gives the Gardens their uniqueness. We also believe that an excellent but very delicate balance has been reached there during the past 3 years between man, nature and our heritage in York making the Gardens a real therapeutic experience for both York citizens and tourists, the like of which is not to be found in any other city centre.		Disagree - We do not see that opening further access points will cause fundamental change in use or scale of use, but will simply improve access to the groups who already enjoy the gardens. We have amended text to note special ambience of gardens and that it is important not to upset this balance in the 'strengths' section.
160	Yorkshire Philosophical Society	This unique amenity is probably not appreciated for what it is, but it does have a huge impact on those who visit it. In our view that impact will only be retained if: a) The Gardens are entered by the public as somewhere special or at least 'different'. b) The Gardens can be securely locked at night. c) Increased footfall does not turn them into an all-purpose thoroughfare. d) Any improved access routes either from the riverbank or from the northern area do not jeopardize this 'balance'. e) Management strategy recognizes the current therapeutic value as the Gardens' principal asset and priority; a place where people can connect with the past, without thinking about it, and where they can do it in surroundings in which nature plays a dominant and revitalizing role. Any new development of the north of the Gardens should not be allowed to alter this integral characteristic of the current Gardens area - otherwise York will have lost a truly unique asset.		Included most points in the 'Opportunities' section.
160	University of York	The University occupies King's manor within Character Area 4. We note the ambitions to create a legible public/semi-public area around Exhibition Square. The gates, although correctly noted as lockable, are in fact never locked to ensure 24 hour access for fire tenders. The public can and do use the front lawn area. We have recently completely refurbished the railings and gates, which are listed in their own right as Grade II. We have discussed better use of the area with the York Museums Trust.		Agreed - corrected
160	Clir Merrett	Council car park - check facts. Not appropriate for development - opportunity to restore the setting of the walls?	The car park has been sold along with St Leonard's Place. Worth mentioning this. We have very little control now other than through the normal planning controls.	Agreed - Corrected text - 'It should be noted that the small section of Roman wall within the car park is still under Council ownership and any new setting needs careful planning.'

161	English Heritage	the walls around museum gardens are shown as a barrier to pedestrian movement. We question what point is being made here. Surely this is a positive quality as it maintains the sense of Museum Gardens being 'a place apart' in a busy city centre and maintains its security out of hours	This is a comment that has come up before from EH and others. I think this point needs addressing. The walls are a barrier to movement certainly but also provide a sense of enclosure that reflects the historic importance of the walls. The Bars then have greater significance as entry points. This reinforces why improvements to the Bars and their approaches should be prioritised.	Partial agreement - Changed graphic keys. The point remains that the walls are a barrier but only from urban design perspective so we have now said they 'define' movement.
163	Janette Ray	I noticed that in the cases of the Blossom Street approach and Hull road approach, both which are similar in function to Bootham as it meets Gillygate, that they are included in areas dubbed "priority for public realm improvements". I would be very happy to help in anyway I can toward co-ordinating visual improvements to the city end of Bootham. The old Jackson's shop with its fabulous cast iron shop front, has blanked out windows and has been empty for a year, there is a blanked up shop opposite used as the Private shop. The City Council own the gaudily painted Bodrum take away shop which is one of the poorest maintained in the group which backs onto St Mary's Abbey Wall and most recently have let slip below the radar the repainting in "post-it note yellow" highlighted in bright orange of the Tandoori Nights opposite. Small improvements to keep privately owned shops painted up and looking nice are marred by the condition of these buildings. (see above entry 14)	Perhaps a rethink of how this might be resolved (see entry 14)? amend	Agreed - expressed issues of secondary shopping streets in text; amend plan pg 491 by increasing 'priority for public realm improvement' up to Marygate Tower. (check character area plan) Agreed - corrected
163	Clir Merrett	2nd para: and air pollution and has inadequate footways.		
174	David Randon	Gillygate. A similar problem to Bootham and again a radical; solution is to demolish the property on the east side to create volume and space and open up views of the City walls. This action could also make sense if the Union Terrace/Clarence Street car/coach park was closed because there would be reduced foot fall and retail business.	??	Disagree - No action
177	Peter Goodchild	In the Baxter Report, the road known as 'Lord Mayor's Walk' is divided between 3 components areas, namely: 5. 'Bootham Bar and Gillygate'; 6. 'Lord Mayor's Walk'; and 7 Monkgate. This three-fold division does in fact reflect the character of the Lord Mayor's Walk but if the separateness of the 3 character areas becomes too firmly entrenched in people's thinking, it will lead to Lord Mayor's Walk being treated as if it is (1) only a component of the one character area that bears its name, or (2) that it is divided into 3 separate and isolated experiences rather than also being one overall experience made up of the 3 parts as one moves along it. The two perceptions of Lord Mayor's Walk as being on the one hand made up of 3 components and on the other of being one united entity can co-exist and are not mutually exclusive. Together they represent a landscape and townscape way of thinking. From the point of view of improving Lord Mayor's Walk, it is necessary to think of it as a whole. It is also necessary to think of it as being the link between Gillygate and Clarence Street at one end and Monk Bar, Goodramgate and Monkgate at the other. This is the approach taken by the Minster Quarter's study. The basic idea of the significance of the relationships between character areas is present in the Baxter Report, but it needs further development when the concept of character areas is used in practise.	Comment noted. Perhaps a reference to the report, 'Lord Mayor's Walk: Enhancement. A feasibility study for the Minster Quarter Committee' (8 February 2011) that was prepared by Peter Goodchild and funded by The City of York's Guildhall Ward. Also perhaps to note that Lord Mayor's Walk extends outside the character area?	Noted - amended text in character area introductions. Emphasised that LMW is longer than a single character area and has a role as one significant space. Referenced the feasibility study in 'opportunities section'.
177	Peter Goodchild	One aspect of the natural and historical heritage of central York is the fact that in the Middle Ages and into the 17th century, the Royal Forest of Galtres came right up to the city walls along Gillygate and what is now Lord Mayor's Walk. (i) Prior to it being formally declared a Royal Forest, Galtres may well have been a forest in the sense of an extensive area of largely uncultivated and well wooded land, rather like the present New Forest in Hampshire. One link that still connects Lord Mayor's Walk with this aspect of the history of York and its landscape is the natural and semi-natural vegetation and the rural character of the city ditch and ramparts.	I don't think this is quite correct. The City's administrative boundary was much further to the north. The landscape would have been farmland throughout the medieval period.	No action

179	Clr Merrett	4th para: together form a very distinctive framing view of the Minster	add?	Agreed - corrected
179	Joe Callan	As a resident of St John Street I am content that the street be brought within the bounds of the conversation area.		No action
180	Clr Merrett	as above, add view to graphic	add?	Disagree - views only go on issues and opps plans see pg187
183	Clr Merrett	last para: Bile Beans has been specifically retained as a local landmark. Also does it need formal protection? It certainly needs a refresh.	amend text for first part but not sure on second.	Agreed - Added buildings to the Article 4 direction plan. Also table Management Strategy section (pg 471).
185	Peter Goodchild	is how will 'creating a permanent landscaped pathway' with adequate night time lighting be interpreted in practice and by whom, and what are the implications, particularly as the report has already referred to the ramparts as having been "public parks with railings and gates". Such treatment runs the risk of destroying the historical character and significance of the ditch and ramparts along the best surviving stretch of the ditch. There is no doubt that the ditch and rampart, along with Lord Mayor's Walk as a whole, could be better presented but a deeper and wider knowledge of Lord Mayor's Walk and more careful consideration is needed in order to find a satisfactory way of doing it. The Minster Quarter's study has given thought to this matter and put forward some suggestions.		Agree - Referenced the study. Took out specific reference for permanent pathway but suggested there was potential for lighting
185	Friends of York Walls	The informal path in the ditch by Lord Mayors' walk is mentioned as "informal breathing space" but there is also almost a recommendation to "make more of it" by doing what many would think of as spoiling it -making it a "permanent landscaped pathway" -possibly even with lighting	Noted. Perhaps mention the study?	Toned it down - see above.
185	Clr Merrett	Solar panels are dark which makes them more acceptable.	With LMW I think there is a case for the kind of interventions suggested in the report.	Listed buildings are already controlled so it is only the unlisted that have no control. The number of Article 4s suggested represents a tiny percentage in the context of the whole housing stock of the city. Wider objectives regarding energy efficiency can still be met.
189	Peter Goodchild	The location, on Lord Mayor's Walk, of the site of the Roman gateway, the 'porta decumana', is described in the Baxter Report in connection with the character area 7, 'Monkgate'. The report states that "'Monk Bar lies 100 yards south east of the porta decumana of the Roman legionary fortress, the line of Monkgate running close to that of the Roman Road to the north east.'" (BRcd,140. BRpdc,189). This is true but misleading because it suggests that there is a closer visual and historical connection between the porta decumana, Monkgate, and Monk Bar than there is. Clearly they are not unrelated but both visually and historically they are distinct. It must also be noted that the site of the porta decumana is actually within character area 6 'Lord Mayor's Walk' and not in area 7, 'Monkgate'. Monk Bar, itself, which is a key feature of Monkgate and an important landmark in relation to Lord Mayor's Walk is located by the Report in character area 10, 'The Medieval Streets' and not in character area 7, 'Monkgate'.	worth adding to text.	Partial agreement- corrected fact about the porta decumana. Monkgate is still within Medieval Streets character area due to its stronger spatial relationship with Goodramgate.
190	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	2 <sup>nd</sup> para. In 1977 the hospital became the headquarters of Yorkshire Water.	amend text?	Agreed - corrected.
190	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	The former hospital is now privately owned residential flats	Source was very keen to ensure that the area was recognised as predominantly residential.	Agreed - corrected.
190	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Para. 3 mention development of St Wilfrid's Court - very good.		Agreed - corrected.
191	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Area 1 is now almost entirely residential and there are no offices in area 3	As above.	Agreed - corrected.



192	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	2 <sup>nd</sup> para. Add Tap and Spile Pub to buildings of merit	This is listed Grade II. So no need.	No action
192	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Last para. How will any future redevelopment of Sainsbury be controlled to ensure that it did not detract. But happy for the boundary to be altered	Proposed views and building height policy will help.	No action
193	Clir Merrett	Retain the bridge in the conservation area and get rid of the hideous concrete railings	need to give this some thought	Disagree - it is not listed and has no architectural or historic merit (1960s). We appreciate the point but in the context of the purpose of designation there is no justification for including it.
194	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	2 <sup>nd</sup> para. Query whether cobbles survive on both sides of the road and query where the brick paviers are.	Will check.	Checked and amended. Cobbles on eastern side, paviers on west.
194	Friends of York Walls	The beauty of the wide rampart grassland by Jewbury is noted but it is also said to be "not used for any particular purpose", as if this is sad -but in warm weather I usually see several groups of people sitting there [reading, sunbathing or chatting], in snow this last winter it was a toboggan run and it helps create great views of the walls and the city inside from the road, pavements and wall	Amend text?	
195	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Picture of churchyard very out of date and needs changing. It is totally overgrown now.	Will take new photo.	Agreed - corrected
195	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	1 <sup>st</sup> para. Delete 'of'.		Only if supplied locally. We cannot change pictures every 6 months!
195	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	2 <sup>nd</sup> para. The mature trees are along the city wall side of the road and so do not screen the carpark from road or pavements. Need to clarify this in text.	Agreed, the trees screen the carpark from the wall but will check.	Not sure what this refers to
195	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	5 <sup>th</sup> para. Mention security concerns. Area used by drunks and drug addicts	Need to check but seems that this should be mentioned.	Agreed - corrected.
196	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Photo of Middleton House – can there be a new one without the To Let sign	Maybe?	Agreed - Mentioned anti-social behaviour.
196	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	1 <sup>st</sup> para. Non of the ground floors have been converted into shops and only one building has been converted into a pub – The Brigadier Gerrard, extensively rebuilt C 25 years ago. Shops are only at the Bar end of the street apart from former post office which is now a kitchen shop.	Will check.	Only if supplied locally. We cannot change pictures every 6 months!
196	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Please note as part of character, a series of archways reflecting former access for carriages. Some blocked but some still in use.	Good point and worth amending the text. Photo of Middleton House shows an example.	Agree - corrected
196	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Caption to photo – add that Manchester College was located at no 13 Monkgate (demolished 1939)	Need to check.	Agreed - corrected.
197	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Add reference to the Tap & Spile pub, formerly The Black Horse, rebuilt in 1897 with a fine Victorian façade.		Not sure what point is being made
197	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Monkgate Cloisters designed by David Crease not built by them. Built by Wimpey Homes.		We are not mentioning every building. They are grouped by type where there are a sufficient number of them.
197	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Add reference to St Wilfrid's Court – sensitive redevelopment of former men's accommodation (?)		Agreed - corrected.
197	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Add reference to restoration of nos 42 – 46 in last 5 years – formerly Garbutt & Elliot.		Not sure where this is
197	Clir Merrett	1st para: last sentence add, "and marred by inappropriate signage"	agreed	Not sure how this fits with text
198	Clir Merrett	add to end, "and its removal would be welcomed"	amend	Agreed - corrected.

199	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	1 <sup>st</sup> para. Incorrect. There is a one way system which means one side of Monkgate has a lot of traffic as cars have to travel down Monkgate to access Foss Bank and Foss Island.	Need to clarify how this system works. Lord Mayor's Walk is two way; St Maurice's Road is one way but two lanes of traffic. Monkbar therefore gets the right turn from St Maurice for traffic heading on to Heworth and New Earswick/Haxby and the left turn from Lord Mayor's Walk heading for the same locations as well as Foss Island and beyond. See my illustration of system. Generally though, Monkgate is not that busy out of peak times. St Maurice's Road is very busy as is Lord mayor's Walk.	Agreed - corrected.
199	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	2 <sup>nd</sup> para. There are plenty of pedestrians between Monk Bar and Sainsbury car park and Love Lane.	This is all relative. Compared to other bars this is light footfall.	No action
199	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	3 <sup>rd</sup> para. The popular pedestrian cut through to Sainsbury is actually via Monkgate Cloisters between Monkbar and Love Lane.		Agreed - corrected.
199	Clr Merrett	2nd para: add very busy and unpleasant stretch.		Agreed - corrected.
201	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	iii) add..removal of bushes to give better visibility of the area.		Agreed - corrected.
201	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	iv) add danger for pedestrians and cyclists at the north east end and the roundabout.	Yes, this is a poorly designed traffic management feature that is very difficult to use as a cyclist.	Agreed - corrected.
202	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Need to highlight the York enterprise site as a development opportunity.		Agreed - corrected.
202	Clr Merrett	need to show Love Lane on the graphic key	agreed	Agreed - corrected.
202	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	Please note that Jewbury and Lord Mayors Walk has a high volume of traffic at significant times of the day. Note Foss bank is one way.		Agreed - mentioned in text.
204	Dr John Gough	But when I read on page 204: "Aldwark is a pleasant place to live and surprisingly quiet considering it is so close to the bustling city centre. Well organised traffic restrictions and off-street parking make it a haven for pedestrians and cyclists." I find myself beginning to have doubts. Bedern - the part of the Aldwark area in which I live - is indeed quiet and pleasant during the day. But did the reporters ever visit in the early morning or during the evening when it is anything but quiet and peaceful? On three mornings each week the City Council ensures that one is awakened around 5:30 a.m. (usually a little earlier) by industrial waste collections carried out with the maximum of noise and thoughtlessness by council staff. On a fourth morning at the same sort of time a newspaper deliverer uses an extremely noisy trolley to carry his wares, and this has the same result. A good night's sleep is not something to be had in this "surprisingly quiet" residential area! And in the evenings the city council allows unrestricted use of the area by the various Ghost Walk operators, who bring often large crowds of people around, keep them standing directly outside houses, and talk to them at the tops of their voices. The operators block the roadways, allow their clients to trespass, and make not the slightest effort to vary their routes, so it is always the same group of residents who are plagued by them. (And now there seems to be one at 22:45 in the evenings -- surely far too late for a quiet area!).		Agreed - Amended character area text to explain the areas is a good example of the challenges of managing of city centre living

206	Clr Merrett	St Crux sits better in Area 10	review	Disagree - It was thought important to have the whole of St Crux and Whip Ma Whop Ma and outside Stonebow House in one character area for management reasons (Similar to Bootham Bar)
206	Clr Merrett	Add Black Swan to this area	review	Disagree - it is an isolated building but listed therefore protected. There are no others in the Hungate area that meet criteria for the designation of a conservation area. It is mentioned in the introduction along with information about the woolmarket/Peaseholme Green.
207	David Randon	Stonebow. I think that everyone is of the same mind:- "whatever possessed the City Fathers/Planners to allow this monstrosity to be built." One can imagine the huge benefit its removal would bring and allow the magnificent frontage of the Methodist Church to be revealed. Again it would remove the "canyon" effect and enable a pedestrian massive gain as well as creating space for the bus stops.	The Methodist Church was never designed to be seen beyond the opposite side of St Saviour's gate which was until the 1950's built up on both sides. Stonebow House has actually revealed views of the Methodist Church and St Saviour's Church that previously never existed.	
208	Clr Merrett	Need to comment on areas facing this zone which aren't in the conservation area but affect it. The BT building as a significant detractor. Also the hideous view of the BT building down Stonebow. Also should the areas of the zone which take in Stonebow be a separate fringe area, quite different in character.	I wonder whether it is worth creating a new character area for Hungate specifically to deal with, and capture a number of comments about setting and the Foss etc. Although outside the CA we have asked for it to be considered.	Partial agreement - We have included some information about the setting of character and conservation area. However, it has been agreed by all parties already that the Hungate area does not qualify for designation.
209	Clr Merrett	Need to be careful here. Cycle racks serve a useful function - the planters were put in to brighten up a dreary corner. If we take out cycle parking ...we end up with sterile elements of conservationist purism creeping in when you have previously recognised York as a living city not like Bath!	Rethink this and the language used	Agree with the need for cycle provision in the city. Amended text to state that design and siting (city wide) must be carefully considered
214	Clr Merrett	1st para: last sentence, in comparison to the south side bus stops. Bus congestion at busy times	need to reword this. The bus stops on the north side of the street create narrow pedestrian passage and prevents this side of stonebow house having an active frontage. The bus stops on the south side are different. There is more room and no need for active frontages.	Agreed - corrected.
214	Clr Merrett	last para: offset by bus fumes!		Not sure what point is being made
215	Clr Merrett	3rd bullet <b>largely</b> successful...add about fumes?		There may be fumes but what can be done about this apart from moving the bus stops or using electric buses?
216	Clr Merrett	6th bullet: including the inadequate bus-stop footprint situation. Also, how can you comment on this place and ignore the monstrosity behind! (BT exchange)		Agree - we have mentioned the BT exchange as a detractor

224	English Heritage	1st Paragraph – There seems to be a contradiction in the following sentence: 'No detractors are identified, though the tower of St Wilfrid's Catholic Church detracts from one of the finest views in the city – up Duncombe Place to the Minster.' This statement about St Wilfrid's is open to question and we suggest it is omitted altogether...	See also 226 below. Perhaps this should read something like, "Although St Wilfrid's Catholic Church resonates with particular groups and is a grade II listed building, it detracts from one of the finest views of the Minster..."	It is a matter of balance - as explained in a comment above, the building detracts from the view but nevertheless there is no reason why it should delisted
224	Clir Merrett	St Wilfrid's Church should be shown as a detractor on the graphic.	And see above.	Disagree - no action
225	Clir Merrett	5th para: and is used by cyclists and horse drawn tourist carriages.		Agree - corrected.
226	English Heritage	reference to St Wilfrid's as 'a sadly lumpen and uninspiring intruder into the superb view of the west front of the Minster...' Again we suggest this reference is omitted. The church is listed Grade II and the Roman Catholic Church is committed to looking after it. We would not wish to see it demolished.	See above. I don't agree with taking this reference out but perhaps the language could be toned down.	See above.
227	Clir Merrett	last para final sentence: How did this happen?	Do we know?	Check - ask Janine - a bit of pressure on the Minster wouldn't go a miss. Strengthen text
228	Clir Merrett	pedestrians and cyclists		Agree - corrected.
229	Clir Merrett	Graphic should include more well enclosed streets surely. Petergate, Ogleforth, Chapterhouse Street and Precenters Court.	amend	An error - remove 'enclosure' from graphic key
233	Clir Merrett	Add st Crux to this zone	Agreed	Disagree - See above
235	Clir Merrett	add detractor off Kings Square - the modern building shown in photo on pg 238		Agree - it is the gateway to the shambles so has been made a detractor on plan. Also Kings Sq labelled.
236	Clir Merrett	word jumble at bottom of page.		Not sure what point is being made
238	Clir Merrett	add, and replacement of detractor modern building on west side	This is being put into use as a chocolate experience/museum. I think some work will be done to improve its appearance.	See above
243	Clir Merrett	Opening line: No, the north end of Goodramgate is outside the foot streets.	amend	Agree - corrected.
243	Clir Merrett	end of last para: Access and car parking remain issues in the two parts of Googramgate.	amend	Agree - corrected.
244	Clir Merrett	mention possible extension of footstreet further up Goodramgate.		Information added to section 6.9
244	Clir Merrett	Weaknesses and opportunities 45th bullet: No. Too rigid. Look at rear of Borders Bookshop.	??	Not sure what point is being made here
247	Clir Merrett	4th para: add & Micklegate (area 21)		Agree - corrected.
248	Clir Merrett	3rd bullet St Michael's church & churchyard		Agree - corrected.
250	Clir Merrett	add Area 8 to the location plan. Add St Martin's church and the admiral clock to landmark? Under 5 on the key it is redevelopment.	okay	Agreed - updated graphics.
252	Clir Merrett	Rear of M&S in Newgate market should be a detractor as well as M&S entrance on Pavement. Also Woolwich building fronting onto Parliament St on corner with Pavement should also be a detractor.	Agreed. Mention should be made of the M&S roofscape - too high by far and containing inappropriate structures. Also, the Woolwich building is shown as listed grade II which it isn't. Amend.	It is the Halifax building, not the Woolwich. Corrected listing error. Disagree with M&S as detractor but two other buildings facing marketand toilet block have been added. Updated plans and text to reflect this.
253	Clir Merrett	Query Betty's Tea Room as landmark - only to the middle class?	Well, it is one of those iconic businesses that everyone knows. No change.	To visitors it is a major landmark. No action.
269	Rupert Scott	The building on the North-East corner of Ouse Bridge currently occupied on the ground floor by Coalers Estate Agents is a major eyesore and a disgrace to the city. Would it be possible to make a compulsory purchase order and demolish it. Almost anything put in its place would be an improvement!		
271	Clir Merrett	Add local view from M&S tea room on top floor?	??	It is already a detractor. No action.
				Disagree - it is not a public place. No action.

280	Clr Merrett	2nd paragraph: The road is traffic dominated & inadequate footpath widths at bus stops.	I am not convinced the road is traffic dominated through the day but the pavement widths are an issue that has cropped up elsewhere. Need to reflect this. The FTR and P&R buses in particular are too long for the spaces allocated on the pavements.	Partial agreement - Corrected to reflect pavements being too narrow at bus stops in the 'traffic' section. Otherwise traffic is relatively light.
280	Clr Merrett	4th para: & the scale of the buildings over dominates with the elevated Piccadilly and the Merchant Adventurers Hall opposite.	Yes, need to mention this.	Agreed - corrected.
284	Clr Merrett	penultimate para: east? Not south?		Agree - corrected
285	Clr Merrett	Add well enclosed streets to the key. Beginning of Castlegate should be shown as well enclosed. White Swan should be shown as building at risk. Pavement bus stop improvements should be shown on Clifford Street.	agreed	Agreed - corrected text and graphics. Extend junction improvement colour down Clifford Street.
287	English Heritage	William constructed two castles, one on either side of the river	amend	Agreed - corrected.
289	English Heritage	clarification needed regarding whether or not the whole castle destroyed by fire or just the keep.	Just the keep was destroyed. Amend	Agreed - corrected.
289	Clr Merrett	1st sentence. "...and is extended to what is now Tower Street...		Agreed - corrected
296	River Foss Society	We welcome the initiative of the York Museums Trust in opening up access from the Castle Museum to the river bank under the Castle walls beyond the Rainham Water Mill. We hope that in future it might be possible to link this extension with a continuous footpath to the Castle Car Park, accessible at all times. The future of the Castle Car Park itself provides a once in a thousand years opportunity to make an outstanding contribution to York's heritage. The Draft notes that "public spaces are few in number". Here is an opportunity to create a public space that would enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower and "the grandest group of 18th century public buildings outside London" while providing a thrilling venue for events such as markets, open air music and theatre, son-et-lumiere etc. as well as a space where people could just sit and absorb their history		
296	Monica Nelson	The vast crowds in Parliament Street, many of them looking for somewhere to sit down, point to the need for a city centre area (grassed), a view of the river, and plenty of benches...new civic park in New York City Beautiful... (the Castle Area) should not be seen as a significant riverside development area...this is an historic and sensitive area, and could be a real asset to the long overdue redevelopment of Piccadilly...a large commercial development is not appropriate in this conservation area (the castle/eye of York).		RP to look into
296	Castle Area Campaign	The Castle Area Campaign group believes that there should be no development on the Castle Car Park which would separate Clifford's Tower from the River Foss.	Well, there is an adopted planning brief that sets out the principle for development. The planning brief has set the principle of development and the appraisal carefully avoids making excessive judgements.	Agree with CYC planning brief. No action
296	Castle Area Campaign	Redevelopment of the Castle Car Park as a public open space, a new park which would enhance the setting of Clifford's Tower would be welcome.		See above
297	English Heritage	top bullet point - The route between Castlegate and the Eye of York is not lost – it is entirely capable of being walked. The issue here is the need to clear it of cars in order to reveal it better make it more pleasant. Suggest it should read 'This would create a more legible, direct pedestrian route	Well, I would disagree. Although it is capable of being walked you pass through and around rows of parked cars. The concept of a 'street' has indeed been lost for over 150 years. Agree to the suggested wording though.	Partial agreement - corrected using suggested wording
297	Clr Merrett	4th bullet. Add that this is an historic green space/common/and a fair site.	??	Agreed - corrected
298	Clr Merrett	add on key additional public space and amend the graphic?		Agreed - St George's Field is outside the conservation area but text has been amended to include it as 'setting' for the Castle

300	Cllr Merrett	The boundary of Piccadilly needs to shift up to avoid the castle surely.	agreed.	Agreed - amended graphic
301	Cllr Merrett	Under ambulance. Ryedale House dominates the east side of the castle.	agreed. Need to mention.	Agreed - corrected
303	English Heritage	is it a reasonable assumption that the future opportunities to enhance this area will be 'predominantly based on retail'?...	Amend to "are likely to be predominately..."	Agreed - corrected
304	Cllr Merrett	Tram depot is a complete mess and is a detractor	See comments from others and Richard Taverner. Will re-examine.	Disagree - 1) condition is not an issue for designating BoM as explained in section 6.4.3 2) historically the garage is interesting as it reflects former light industrial uses in the area and is associated with well known person 3) designation as a BoM does not preclude demolition or reuse.
306	Roger Jennings	There is a building which has a notable heritage a the south end of Piccadilly on the east side . This is known as the tram shed (Reynards Garage) and this probably dates from the days of horse or electric trams, early 1900. In more recent times during the 1939-45 war it was an aircraft component factory. For years the building has deteriorated and no action has been taken to preserve its exterior. This building is surely due some recognition and probably as it is in a development area as well as in a conservation area.	It is highlighted as a building of merit.	No action
309	Cllr Merrett	2nd bullet> Disagree with comment on need for continuous walkway. There has been previous potential for a walking and cycling route. This should be flagged up at least south of any bridge to west bank path.	Agree. The Foss study and other studies has always aspired to a continuous access. Better might be if the report stresses this aspiration.	Disagree - Referenced Foss Walkway Strategy concerns of ecological damage caused by intensive use of footpaths
310	English Heritage	last sentence add to 'concrete bollards, an over-wide roadway and ...'	agree	Agreed - corrected
310	Cllr Merrett	Should the tram depot be retained at all!	see other comments. Maybe need to redefine on graphics. B@R certainly but maybe not BofM.	See above
312	Cllr Merrett	Graphic should so potential walk/cycle rout from new bridge along Ryedale House bank through under Castle Mills Bridge.	agree	Agreed - corrected text and graphic by adding green arrow.
316	Cllr Merrett	Graphic needs key for orange buildings.	What are the orange buildings? Rowntree	Agreed - added 'historic warehouse' label to key
317	Cllr Merrett	final para: wrong. There is one detractor on the map on pg 318. Also there should be a second next to building of merit on fossgate.	Warf is not at risk so???	Agree with first point - amended text
319	Cllr Merrett	in fact not in tact.	agreed. Amend.	Disagree - it is actually 'intact'
323	Cllr Merrett	last para. <b>Partly</b> one-way route		Agreed - corrected
324	Cllr Merrett	weaknesses <b>and opportunities</b>		Agreed - corrected
330	Cllr Merrett	2nd para. There are two buildings of merit shown on the graphic on page 331.	amend	Agreed - corrected text. Added BoM to key.
330	Cllr Merrett	What about the Navigation Road estate as buildings of merit? Somewhat special council house design - semi-classical.	From our walk about we did comment on this and admired the space and design. Worth proposing.	Discussed with Bob and decided it was slightly below level for BoM. Amended text to reflect its positive qualities.
331	Cllr Merrett	buildings of merit to add to key.		Agreed - corrected graphic for this. Also wall has been recoloured.
331	Cllr Merrett	suggest more logical boundary for area includes the barbican and rampart.	Thoughts?	Disagree - there are significant issues for the barbican as part of the highway outside. Historically its function was to control flow from outside to inside the wall. Amended text to explain decision to include it in Walmgate Bar character area.

335	Cllr Merrett	1st para. Arguable, then the buses would litter the ring road all along Fishergate Paragon Street sections of Bar Walls!	Okay but this has emerged as a real issue for residents exacerbated by tour buses, a pet hate. Residents have complained of an increase in standing traffic since the central gate was closed. Need to add about tour buses and state more forcefully that this needs to be resolved. This is a predominately residential area.	Disagree - Explained in text the concerns of local residents relating to tour buses in particular
337	Cllr Merrett	1st para. Is this really a weakness?	Agreed. The text suggests this as a strength. Amend.	Agreed - corrected
338	Cllr Merrett	extend wall barrier graphic across George Street down.		Disagree - no action
342	Cllr Merrett	The wall and bar is logically in area 16.	Thoughts?	See above
345	English Heritage	the Scheduled Monuments are not marked on the map	amend, two to add.	Agreed - corrected graphic by adding designations for wall and grass.
346	Cllr Merrett	1st para. The very narrow pavements are only at the bar - widens eastwards.		Agreed - corrected
348	Cllr Merrett	last para. Damage not as much as when traffic used to go through! Only a few years ago.	need to mention this. But reflect that the down side of closure has also been increase in standing traffic that affects residents.	Agreed - Amended text to explain risk has been lowered but residents say that closing central archway causes traffic to back up
353	Cllr Merrett	Is this really city centre? - don't see the case.	I am happy that the 1st para on pg 352 explains why this is being proposed.	Disagree - no action
356	Cllr Merrett	listed building on Fawcett street/Paragon St. Is wrong	Yes, the listed element is shorter. Needs amending.	Agreed - corrected graphic for this plus added SAM. Key also rearranged.
356	Cllr Merrett	Are the buildings on Fishergate/Paragon detractors?	We could amend - they are not brilliant!	
361	Susan Towle	Reading through your leaflet, I find it ironic that following recent road works in the Fishergate/Fulford Road area, the multiple signage, shaded road areas, additional lines and patchwork pavements have anything but improved the look of the locality - quite the opposite. The view of the road when approaching from town is now one of confusing and abundant markings, and certainly not what would be expected in an area covered by "conservation of heritage". I won't mention the ugly, mismatched bollards at the top of Grange Garth, nor the completely unnecessary speed restriction signs - anyone driving down Grange Garth would be hard pressed to reach 20 mph given the narrowness and curved nature of the road. What next - speed bumps?	Amend the text to take this new development into account. This is the 20MPH traffic calming. There is more to follow connected with improving the gyratory for cyclists!	Disagree - The Festival Flats were part of design competition to celebrate Festival of Britain  These works have taken place since our report was written and we cannot re-write retrospectively for all small changes. We have amended the plan key to make it clear there is still room for improvement. Rearranged key to put 'junction improvements' under opportunities heading.
362	Cllr Merrett	local view down Fishergate. Barriers to pedestrians around the corner Escrick Terrace Fishergate.	agreed.	Disagree - no action
366	Cllr Merrett	Bishopgate street would be better fit in area 20	Thoughts?	Partial agreement - it is indeed an awkward street to characterise but it forms the entry point to the Skeldergate area and is therefore part of the management issues there. It is totally divided from Bishophill by the wall. No action.
367	Cllr Merrett	last para. Nor do the higher level Lady Ann Middleton's ones. Also these need adding as detractors on the graphic on page 368	Need to check.	Not sure what point is being made here



368	Virginia Shaw	Tuke House (2 1970s blocks of flats, built by Tuke Housing Association using public grant funding called Housing Association Grant made by the Housing Corporation through the 1974 Housing Act) is labelled a "Detractor". Whilst certainly not of any particular archaeological merit, this label ignores the voluntary effort contributed by trustees and the synergy of the whole site, Tuke House and the Burial ground together, both of which are important aspects of the area's history. It is proposed to be excluded from the character area boundary. Considering the above, I request that it is included....Please delete Tuke House as a Detractor. The suggestion that funding could be acquired in the current economic environment for replacement or indeed any changes to the appearance of these two blocks shows a complete lack of understanding of the financial realities of providing decent homes to rent for people in need.	In architectural terms it is nevertheless a detractor? Is this in the Bishopphill character area? Not sure.	Disagree - the relevance of the label 'detractor' is based on contribution of a particular building to the character of an area. The special interest of a conservation area is architectural and/or historic so in this instance, the label is justified since the architecture of Tuke House is not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. The burial ground is wholly within the Queen's Staith and Skeldergate character area already. No action.
370	Virginia Shaw	...Quaker Burial Ground in Character Area 19. It is referred to as "a rather hidden space - a small walled garden once used as a Friends' Burial Ground". In fact, the land is owned by York Area Quaker Meeting and is maintained by the Tuke Housing Association, a charitable housing association run by voluntary trustees...	Slight amendment to the text	Agreed - corrected
370	Virginia Shaw	Another feature whose character seems to be more a matter of opinion than fact is the triangular area at the southern end of Cromwell Road. Though its present state does not allow views of the castle from the position of the photographer, its overgrown trees could be seen as a more natural and attractive habitat, improving the bio-diversity of the area, compared with the historic photo which is arguably over-formal (and possibly prohibitively costly to maintain in that state given the city council's current budget and responsibilities).	Okay but the report is making an historic point. Not a judgement on biodiversity.	Disagree - there is another comment in this grid which remarks on this and has a contradictory opinion. No action.
371	Cllr Merrett	last para. <b>an</b> not and		Not sure where this comment refers to
372	Roger Jennings	The proposal to enhance the riverside area on the west bank of the Ouse to the north of the road bridge (Skeldergate Bridge) is welcome. The most prominent feature of this area is the Bonding Warehouse...with modern techniques it must be possible to re-employ this prominent structure to the advantage of the riverside area with plaques and mention in guide books...It would be a pity to ignore the building as it could be the focal point of the development.	The warehouse is listed and is a landmark building. Ownership has changed	
373	Cllr Merrett	1st para. So put them in different section!	see comment on entry 205	No action
375	Rupert Scott	Some 20 flagstones have recently (i.e. within the last 6 months) been replaced on Queen's Staith in front of the Queens Hotel car park. These are quite the wrong colour and stand out like a sore thumb. They should be replaced.		See above
378	Cllr Merrett	1st para. Mention the gaol by the old Norman motte.		This is a matter for Highways. The emerging Public Space Strategy will address these sort of issues. No action.
378	Bishopphill Action group	With regard to the section on 'character areas' - there was initially some confusion about the area designated in the plan as Bishopphill. For example we would have included Dewsbury Terrace, Priory Street and Skeldergate within Bishopphill. Perhaps this could be reconsidered or explained within the text.		It is already in the text - see page 379.
379	Cllr Merrett	2nd para. Main Buckingham House had burnt down.		Disagree - The character area boundaries were agreed with the stakeholder group. They are necessarily subjective and are explained as far as possible. Lots of elements were taken into account when drawing notional boundaries - geographical, historical, architectural elements, as well as use and ambience. No action.
379	Cllr Merrett	final para. ...around the edges as a <b>result of closing through routes towards the city in the 1990's and controls at the Bars.</b>	amend	Agreed - corrected.
380	Cllr Merrett	check area boundary. Albion street is in Skeldergate!	amend. This does seem slightly wrong.	Agreed - corrected graphic
382	Cllr Merrett	last bullet. However, the conservation area has stopped the ripping out of Nunnery Lane island gardens for parking!	see EH comments on continuing to include this area. It probably needs to be kept.	Agreed - cut out text related to boundary changes here. corrected all drawings to show original boundary. Re-named character area 23 as Blossom Street and Nunnery Lane

383	Bishophill Action group	There was concern that both Smale Street and Prospect Terrace were not included within the buildings of merit designation. George Pace's 1974 study of Bishophill for the Civic Trust describes these streets as – 'fine Townscape'. We tend to agree and request that these areas are included.	At the time of surveying it was thought that these streets were slightly below the architectural quality of the others designated as BoM. However, we have included those facing Bishophill Jnr for setting of church. We are also recommending Article 4 for consistency. Text and graphics corrected.
384	Tim Gates	some conservation measures should be applied to surviving York stone pavements in Bishophill (as originally identified by George Pace in his 1974 report)	The Public Space Strategy and Streetscape Manual will be the mechanism for this. No action.
384	Clir Merrett	last para. As does the retaining wall along the north eastern side of the former churchyard and inner portions of Lambert Court.	Agreed - corrected
387	Bishophill Action group	Traffic calming measures including street closures have created artificial dead ends which are unattractive and a poor use of space. We would be enthusiastic about creating a well designed space around the bollards on Lower Priory Street.	This is a specific local issue but this document cannot contain this level of detail. The Public Space Strategy can deal with this.
388	Bishophill Action group	The views from the City walls are greatly appreciated by residents and tourists. It was felt that consideration be given to including streets overlooked from the walls within the conservation area.	Noted - no action.
388	Bishophill Action group	The significance of attractive views within the city is greatly valued. Unfortunately some of these views are now obstructed by trees that have vastly outgrown a size in keeping with their situation. The area by Skeldergate Bridge is a good example.	See above comment 370. The management of trees is an issue. It will be dealt with by the Council's forthcoming Tree Strategy. No action.
391	Clir Merrett	Shouldn't Toft Green & Tanner Row (even Rougier Street) be moved to Area 22 as much developed....	No, because current area boundary makes sense historically. Toft Green was back plots to Micklegate properties etc. Amend last part.
392	Clir Merrett	arguably North Street and area around All saint's should be in Skeldergate because of river character. Also add to key under 2, previously linked to railways	Disagree - no action. See other comments on this.
393	Dr D M Chalmers	It should be noted that this area of Micklegate is becoming increasingly residential	Noted - no action
394	Clir Merrett	Priory Street should go into Bishophill because of its 19th century character...	Disagree - different phases of historical development, architecture, building type and use. No action.
395	Clir Merrett	Toft Green. Northern side being the site of....station, <b>much of which was redeveloped.</b>	Agreed - corrected
395	Clir Merrett	Toft Green last sentence. Disagree - go behind Toft Green buildings - which are better linked to the railway than Micklegate for the reason you state.	No action
401	Dr D M Chalmers	I would agree that 69-71 Micklegate has been poorly maintained (page 401) and a building at risk - it clearly could be converted to residential use.	Agreed - corrected graphic
401	Clir Merrett	Weaknesses and opportunities. Also flag up potential long term pedestrianisation and short term eg cafe build outs.	Agreed - corrected graphic to illustrate improvements to subtly draw people across the river. Text indicates increased activity is the key to longevity of street; potential to rebalance pavement and tarmac to increase outdoor activity.

401	Clr Merrett	Really should flag up that more could be made of Micklegate's ghastly junction with George Hudson Street - the traffic is too dominant. Potential for more pedestrianisation from there to the Micklegate Bar Junction.	mention?	Agreed - corrected text and graphic
402	Clr Merrett	add buildings at risk eg 69-71 M'gate	?	Agreed - corrected text and graphic
404	English Heritage	statement 'Significant levelling of the land next to the city wall removed all vestiges of its history'. This is not true, as attested by the very recent finds in the West Offices archaeological excavations that have uncovered parts of a Roman bath house. It needs updating in the light of these finds.	Yes, update the text. Press release is available but no report exists yet. Remains of Roman bath house in better condition than previously thought.	
406	Clr Merrett	Rougier St is busy and polluted.... Also add to photo caption, " with small sections retained for posterity. " and was largely demolished		Agreed - corrected
407	Railway Heritage Trust	I would agree with the paper about the height of George Stephenson House relative to the City Walls: it is most regrettable that such a tall building obtained consent so recently		Agreed - corrected
407	Clr Merrett	disagree that GSH is a detractor - looks rather fine above walls like a Japanese castle...Also, so what if GSH is higher than the walls so are NER HQ and other buildings.	GSH is hard up against the walls unlike other buildings so makes the over height more obvious and detracting.	No action
409	Railway Heritage Trust	I support the extension of the Conservation Area, subject to recognising that the railway must be allowed to develop as the needs on it vary. The inclusion of the rest of the station in the conservation area allows such developments to be discussed in a heritage way, which I support.		Disagree - See above. No action
410	Railway Heritage Trust	The map on page 410 does not make mention of the recent demolitions in the old station, which has removed most of the building labelled Detractor at the old station, and exposes the remainder much more satisfactorily.	Update text	No action
410	Clr Merrett	Add Norwich Union and riverside bit to Skeldergate area.	thoughts?	Agreed - corrected drawings
411	Railway Heritage Trust	I also agree that the substantial amount of open and green space is a benefit, but that benefit is limited by the inner ring road dominating the area. If this traffic flow can be moved then it might be possible to improve access to the green areas, and to improve mobility between the station, the green areas, and the town. This desirable outcome is also referred to in the Traffic and Movements section of this chapter.		Disagree - see above. No action.
412	Clr Merrett	last para. Add about ugly intrusion of the rowing club building.		Noted - no action
414	English Heritage	referring to City Wall: 'it can be disorientating to visitors as it is the first thing they see on leaving the station'. We disagree with this and suggest this is omitted – why should it be disorientating to them? Do we have evidence that it is?	I think the whole experience is disorientating from my own personal experience but it is true that we do not have empirical data to support this. It is not the walls themselves but...How do you get onto the walls?	Agree - corrected.
418	Railway Heritage Trust	– I find it sad that the report does not recognise the railway to move people into York in large numbers, both workers and tourists. However, I strongly support any move to remove traffic from the current inner ring road in the vicinity of the station.	Amend the text?	Partial agreement - the forecourt, trees and walls are disorientating and it is not intuitive to find the way into town. Amended text to suggest better wayfinding would be helpful.
418	Clr Merrett	1st para. Add, "...and the area outside."		Agree - Amended text to illustrate usefulness of railway
419	Clr Merrett	3rd bullet point. " And the opportunity taken to improve...."		Agree - corrected.
420	English Heritage	referring to the landscaping around the NER war memorial: 'A scheme for re-surfacing in natural materials has been agreed.' We have not seen such a scheme at LBC stage, or is this meaning the repaving of Station Rise which will form part of West Offices?	I believe it is Station Rise.	Agree - Amended to 'A scheme for re-surfacing in natural materials has been agreed as part of the Council's new West Offices within the former railway station'.

421	English Heritage	Plan on page 421 (showing issues and opportunities) shows the City Wall as a barrier to movement. This is untrue. It is a good conduit for movement in a NE/SW direction. Furthermore, it is not impermeable as the diagram suggests. Indeed this is recognised elsewhere in the document, contradicting this diagram: - The plan on page 405 contradicts that on page 421, showing 'punctuation' in the City Walls. Also, on page 404 it is described as being 'highly permeable' whilst page 414 notes that 'there is a sense that both sides of it are linked'. Therefore the plan on page 421 needs amending to break up or remove the barrier marking on the City Wall. We have commented in the letter that the Walls as a barrier is an issue which runs through the document and needs clarification/amendment.	See above entry 50.	Agree - corrected
421	English Heritage	Queen Street presumably counts as a 'barrier to movement' as far as pedestrians crossing it are concerned. Should this be shown on the diagram on page 421?	Interesting point. Perhaps it should because it acts quite differently from other roads.	Agree - definition of barriers changed. 'Define movement'.
423	Clir Merrett	1st para. electric tram or now <b>bus or car</b>	agreed	Agree - corrected.
424	Clir Merrett	need to touch on Nunnery Lane car park and setting of the walls as well as Bar Convent grounds.	agreed	Agree - corrected.
425	Clir Merrett	Treat whole of Bar Convent as 2, important historic green space.	agreed	Agree - corrected.
426	Clir Merrett	3rd bullet. No uglier than side of bar convent and back of M'gate buildings, though too high. & what about the CAB building next to bar or shop on corner of Blossom St & East Mount Road or much of All Saints School? Also should not the car park be shown as a detractor?	It is a question of degree and to some extent personal preference but I agree with the definition of Old Priory Court as a detractor through both design and height. Nunnery Lane carpark as a detractor is interesting. Perhaps this should be.	Disagree - these buildings are detractors rather than others because of their sensitive locations. The car park is already a detractor. The school is hidden from view of the street. No action.
428	Clir Merrett	Type C. South Parade is actually a public right of way exiting at the end so not a dead end. Also Type D, Moss Street not Terrace		Agree - corrected.
429	Clir Merrett	graphic shows landmarks in key but not on map? Also Moss Street not Terrace in key.		Agree - corrected graphics
430	Clir Merrett	1st para. End with, "...if not reduced or removed."	agree	Agree - corrected.
431	Clir Merrett		amend text. The following should help: "The community took its inspiration from the ideas of Mary Ward (1585-1645) who created the 'Congregation of Jesus and the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary'. Mary Ward was a pioneer of women's education and the Convent ran a school for Catholic girls, known as the 'Ladies at the Bar'... Even in the 1760s, when the present elegant building was constructed, Catholic places of worship were illegal. The nuns flouted the law and built a beautiful chapel, but one hidden from the outside. In preparation for raids by magistrates the chapel was complete with eight exits and a priest hole, in which to hide. The school was taken over by the Church in 1985 but the community is still active and the Chapel is used every day. It is open to visitors, as is the Museum that opened on the site in 1987."	
		3rd para. Are you sure. Catholicism was still illegal then and for some considerable time after.		Agree - corrected.

433	Cllr Merrett	1st para. 5 lanes not 6, 2 out 3 in.		Agree - corrected.
434	Cllr Merrett	3rd bullet. The street has lost the trees <b>back to</b> The Mount and <b>some of</b> the attractive cobbled margins of Bootham.		Agree - corrected.
434	Cllr Merrett	4th bullet. Add to end: ..., if it can't be reduced or removed. Also note Moss Street not Terrace.		Agree - corrected.
438	Cllr Merrett		review.	Disagree - St James Mount is not in the boundary anyway. Handful of buildings adjacent are behind historic wall and therefore boundary has been left as it is.
439	Cllr Merrett	no logic to including st james mount in the CA - take out.	The garage on the mount is surely an original 1920'/30's structure? Still being used for its original purpose. Good vernacular? Holgate road garage is I think Holgate Road Tyres. Not a good building but low impact I think in the context of this study. Ditto, shop front which I think is Cameo Engraving. No change.	Disagree - no action
439	Cllr Merrett	Detracting buildings - The garage on the Mount & the hotel? Also garage in Holgate road adjacent to Mount Elphrain & the hideous 1960's shop front about 6 buildings along towards town...	They certainly don't fit but are they significant detractors? I don't think so.	Disagree - they are a good Edwardian group in the same way as Bishophill is a Victorian planned development. It is true they are unlike anything else in the area but that does not mean they cannot be included.
440	Cllr Merrett	2nd para. Suggests that none of the semi's along Scarcroft Road really fit, ditto in Park Street. They do detract.	I think the consultants have made a good case. Also the buildings of merit on Albermarle Road are particularly fine and very visible from the Little Knavesmire.	
440	Cllr Merrett	Not convinced by including Scarcroft Hill and Telford Terrace etc in the conservation area. Also not convinced by buildings of merit on Albermarle Road.	Agreed that this group of 1960's houses offers very little to the conservation area. Can they be removed without creating issues for the existing and proposed boundary?	See above - no action.
440	Cllr Merrett	Exclude St James Mount from conservation area.		See above.
442	Cllr Merrett	Doesn't adequately cover problems of traffic & associated street clutter & air pollution issues at the bottom end of Holgate Road.	agreed. Need to bring this out. It is a serious issue.	Agree - but this junction is actually covered in character area 23 - see page 433. Cross referenced it on this page.
443	The Mount residents (30 signatories)	We are proposing that the green space enclosed by Mount Parade and The Mount is the subject of an article 4 Direction. Our specific objective is to protect the character and appearance of the rectangle of green enclosed by the front building walls of 1-18 Mount Parade; the rear building walls of 136-144 The Mount; the curtilage walls of 146 The Mount and 1-3 Dalton Terrace; and the building walls of 20-21 Mount Parade. We note that this area has not been included as a green space in the maps on pages 438 and 449 of the Appraisal and urge that this be rectified. This area, consisting almost entirely of gardens, forms a green oasis, of significant size in comparison with many others within the central historic core conservation area. Effective safeguards are in place to protect buildings and curtilage walls within the historic core from undesirable developments; we are writing to ask that protection from inappropriate developments is extended to these gardens...(see full response)	I think this is a good point. The green space they are referring to and Mount Parade perhaps should be included on the map pg 438 and the text on 443 added to. Also think about the article 4 issue	Agree - Described as charming space significant to character of area in the text. There should be a presumption against development of this space. Updated plans on 449 and 438.
443	Cllr Merrett	1st para. Some negative features at the town end.	could mention clutter etc. Domination of traffic?	Agree - mentioned the decline in condition of buildings and townscape. Traffic junction in area 23.
445	Cllr Merrett	caption for photo. Not homogenous!	Agreed.	Agree - corrected

447	Cllr Merrett	1st para. It is arguable that traffic does not dominate the street. Also add that Blossom St junction is also a big problem and an air pollution hot spot.	agreed to both. Blossom street is very car dominated for much of the day.	See above
447	Cllr Merrett	2nd para. The busiest periods are commuter peaks.	agreed. Amend.	Agree - corrected
448	Cllr Merrett	5th para. This is actually the least busy of the three junctions in the area.	Agreed. Need to amend text.	Agree - corrected
453	K Richmond	This is fine provided that the World Heritage Site status (if achieved) allows flexibility and does not become a millstone around the neck of the City of York as a functioning city. It is to be hoped that CoYC has been taking advice from other European cities that already have WHS status based on their experience.	noted - no change proposed	Noted - no action
455	K Richmond	There are elements that can be adopted from other European cities, especially with regard to the design of the foot streets area (present and future extended).	noted - no change proposed	Noted - no action
455	English Heritage	include a comparison with an historic city such as Chester as well as Leeds	okay...?	Agree - included reference to Chester
456	K Richmond	This should link in with the promotion of tourism: (a)to create among the local population a culture of empathy and appreciation of and respect for visitors to York and what they bring to the city; and (b)to avoid duplication of some activities. After all, tourism is an educational as well as a leisure experience	Wayfinding link?	Action as per CYC comment
456	English Heritage	suggest that in Recommendation, the school curriculum is included as part of the outreach/education role and it should state who would do this	okay but I am not sure who would deliver this. We do not have such a person in the Council. Perhaps another recommendation?	Noted - no action
457	River Foss Society	It is proposed to remove the small triangle of riverside between Foss Bank and Monk Bridge, currently managed by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, from the Conservation area. This area is an important staging post in the River Foss wildlife corridor and we would not support its exclusion if the consequence were to be to remove a level of protection.	?	Noted however, legally, Conservation Area boundary must be defined by architectural or historic special interest special interest. Wildlife is important but not relevant to designation.
457	K Richmond	The boundary changes are broadly acceptable. There is no point in keeping Sainsbury's (Foss Islands) in the conservation area. The boundary has to be relevant especially where large buildings are concerned or the whole CA concept would lack credibility.		No action
457	English Heritage	We support the boundary review process and its Recommendations with the exception of No 7 Prices Lane and consider it should be retained in the Conservation Area. We consider that although many cottages within this island group have been altered, their collective character is positive, contribute to the setting of the City Walls and thus should remain within the CA.		Agree - see above. Table and text amended.

	457 Edward Freedman	<p>Proposed boundary extension to include St John's Street: I support the intention to extend the boundary in this area which clearly has high townscape quality. I would like to see the boundary slightly extended to a) include the former Ann Harrison's Almshouses site (now also Groves House) which faces the St John's Crescent terrace as well as Penleys Grove Street. The site has significant historic interest due to the fact that this was the first site in the vicinity to be developed in the nineteenth century, and was developed as almshouses on what appear to be gardens and garths. The Royal Commission book gives further information about the development of the area, Penleys Grove being a corruption of Payne laithes crofts. I believe. Penleys Grove Street was the next street to be developed, in typical piecemeal fashion, through the nineteenth century, with St John's Street following and St J's Crescent last in the 1880s/90s. Although the Almshouses site is considerably marred by the 1970s Groves House it retains valuable characteristics that contribute strongly to the character and quality of the area, in the form of the undeveloped grass surroundings and the mature trees. The site is vulnerable to redevelopment in the future in the light of changes in social care and disposal of Council assets and the open nature of the site and mature trees which survive from its layout as charitable housing would be at risk if the site is not included in the conservation area because there would be pressure for pavement-edge development to maximise the value of the site. If the physical assets of the site were all that it contributed I realise that preserving the setting of the CA would be a material consideration but in this case the fact that it has its form because of its almshouse origins also means it has a contribution to make in terms of the historical character of the area and hence I feel this could justify inclusion...</p>	Amend the boundary?	At the time of surveying it was thought that Penley's Grove was slightly below the townscape quality of the others designated. It was not as coherent as St John Street and there was modern intrusion. The best buildings are already listed therefore protected. A possible candidate for future boundary reviews.
	457 Edward Freedman	<p>... b) I imagine that Penleys Grove Street has been considered for inclusion but would comment that the terrace facing down St John's Street dates from the 1840s, prior to construction of St John's Street, and has significant architectural quality, incorporating two listed buildings, and although built separately most if not all of the terrace was designed by JB &amp; W Atkinson (see RCHM book). The terrace, particularly 29 &amp; 31, contribute very strongly to the character of the St John's Street enclave, and it retains elements of similar quality to St John's Street in the form of forecourts, railings, bay windows and quality architectural detailing.</p>	Response?	See above
	459 Peter Goodchild	<p>It would appear from the plan on page 53 of the Consultation Draft of the Baxter Report that the area that was removed from the 'central historic core' Conservation Area in 1975 was large and included the site of the King's Fish-Pond. Apparently it is now considered to be "devoid of historic character or buildings". This line of reasoning is very questionable and particularly from the perspective of 2011. This is because it would appear to have been based only on a narrow conception of architectural heritage. It seems not to have taken the archaeological, natural, or landscape dimensions of the heritage of this area into account. It would also seem that it did not address the issue of any addition that the 20th or 21st century might have been able to make to York's heritage in this area. Nor does it address the idea of improving the setting of the remaining Conservation Area. In terms of World Heritage Sites, the setting of the Conservation Area is called the 'buffer zone'. The King's Fish-Pond was a major historical feature of York of which traces survive in the form of the River Foss, Wormald's Cut, and the general landform of the area and its surroundings. Had it remained as part of the Conservation Area, perhaps the redevelopment on the eastern side of Foss Island's Road, between Layerthorpe Bridge and the Red Tower might have achieved an interesting 20th or early 21st century addition to York's heritage.</p>	No action	Disagree - The point is noted, however. The area does not meet the criteria for designation as a Conservation Area because of the lack of special architectural or historic interest. The below ground significance is protected by virtue of the Area of Archaeological Importance designation. A This has been discussed and agreed with stakeholders. No action.
	459 Friends of York Walls	Agree, Sainsbury multi-storey car park should be excluded from the boundary.	Check	No action
	459 Friends of York Walls	the boundary from Love Lane to behind the old nurses home should be extended to include the listed building on St Murices Road.	Check	It already is - no action



				Check	Disagree - this is outside the walled city and does not form part of the setting of the City Walls, nor is it an historic approach or early suburb. These are the criteria established with the Steering Group and stakeholders for defining the boundary of the C conservation Area
459	Friends of York Walls	the boundary at the Clifford Street walls should be extended to include St George's Field, both Tower Gardens and the coach & car park. This area has not been identified as a green space and is of historic significance. The Knights Templar chapel foundations are a significant factor, and the whole of St George's Field is of importance to the citizens as a recreational facility as their right by charter.		Not sure here. Surely it was never in?	See above comment 459
459	Friends of York Walls	the Foss Islands should still be included in the core boundary, due to its 20th century history. this area in the future is prime for enhancement as it is close to the walls, red Tower and the grassy ramparts. The Victorian chimney is also a historic emblem of York's 20th century history.		consider	See above
459	Clr Merrett	amend boundary to exclude St James Mount			
459	Clare Baldwin	I agree with the Appraisals' recommendations to increase the boundaries of the conservation area & to better protect the character & history of the buildings.		amend!	No action
461	English Heritage	the text here should refer to locally important assets. What they have written is a slight misinterpretation of PPS5 and is confusing		I think the frontages are mentioned but?	Agree - corrected
462	K Richmond	To those of us who have been fortunate enough to visit Napier in New Zealand (see: <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/dna/h2g2/A293285">http://www.bbc.co.uk/dna/h2g2/A293285</a> ) there may be a case (albeit not a very strong one in the overall context of York) for the Art Deco buildings of Piccadilly (or their frontages at least) to be embraced by CoYC and recognised and protected as Special Interest 'Art Deco' buildings rather than being regarded as 'detractors' (as some of them appear to have been depicted in the map on page 462.) Perhaps the present uses of some of these buildings makes them seem less endearing, but controls like those in Napier (e.g. the requirement for pastel shades for colour schemes) could be applied here (at least while the buildings remain standing). Since the last CA review (in the 1970s) the Art Deco era has receded twice as far into the past and its style has become more highly regarded although some of its buildings do not appear to be very energy efficient. If you are going to remove the Art Deco buildings then the '1960s Ugly' building in nearby Stonebow should also be removed.		Updated plan on pg462 to show garage as BoM. Error on our part.	
463	English Heritage	we suggest that the detractors should be individually named as the map is too small a scale to be able to identify them clearly. We also suggest that this section include spaces which detract. There is scope for CoYC to undertake its own S215 review of street clutter etc... and serve S216 Notices?.		Agreed. This would be helpful. I really do not think that CoYC will be in the business of undertaking a S215 review let alone serve S216 notices! However, audits of street clutter are in the pipeline. The York Civic Trust are driving this.	List of Detractors added to the Supporting Information CYC to send list of detractors' addresses. Cannot see how this comment relates to this page specifically - s215 mentioned on page 468. Public space strategy review of clutter added as comment part of section 5.10.
464	English Heritage	the 1st bullet point is a little erroneous. It should say 'vulnerable to dewatering'. Similarly it is not correct to say that Scheduled Monuments 'cover a substantial part of the City'. This is only true if one accepts that the archaeological deposits are designated – which they are not.		Accepted. Delete "and the Scheduled Monuments which cover a substantial part of the City". And amend 1st bullet point.	Agree - corrected
465	English Heritage	this text is all about Public Value and should be incorporated as part of the key principles		I am not sure I understand the point in the context of the page. But maybe there should be a key principle dealing with public value?	Principles 1 and 5 amended
465	Clr Merrett	final recommendation. As and when resources are available. Could YAT help?		All the recommendations have resource implications in one way or another. The action plan will define this better.	No action
466	English Heritage	1st paragraph refers to maintenance 'burdens' but we prefer maintenance issues. It is a matter of how complex sites are used and managed and we not agree with the assumption that they are expensive to conserve and maintain. Regarding Merchant Adventurers Hall, it does have a conservation plan although it may need updating.		accept the use of issue instead of burden but disagree with the second point. Complex sites are expensive and complex. 3rd point add clarification.	Agree - corrected

			The Wesleyan Chapel building at the junction of Haxby Road and Wigginton Road looks rather tired and run-down, as suggested in the report. This, the first historic building of central York to be seen by tourists in the many coach parties that pass by on their way to the coach park when arriving from the north, has boarded up windows and in its present condition is almost an eyesore. I don't know whether it is in use at all, but it has the potential to become both a striking landmark and a useful community facility, perhaps in connection with the nearby hospital or YSIU. Resuscitating this building must be a priority	Consider including this building?	This building is in the boundary already. No action
467	K Richmond		need to look at the cause of why buildings are 'at risk' – e.g. high rents, short leases, poor general maintenance of shop fronts/streets creating a down at heel look in some surprisingly central locations. these recommendations cross refer with those on see p463. A suggest could be for CoFYC work with the Homes and Communities Agency on upper floor affordable housing for 'at risk' buildings	Another recommendation?	included reference to the need for an additional study. Could be a good research project for Kings Manor.
468	English Heritage		More emphasis should be placed on encouraging people to live in the historic core area - especially as there are such a large number of empty commercial properties which have potential residential accommodation above. I would therefore strongly support the proposal for a condition survey of upper floors etc		See above. Included reference to agency in text.
468	Dr D M Chalmers		under a) would want to support solar panels where appropriate and visually low impact.	yes. The Article 4 directions allow the LPA to determine this.	No action
469	Clir Merrett		The proposal to apply Article 4 directions to control permitted development within the conservation area is welcomed. We feel that support and advice for residents would help to facilitate this change.		Text amended
471	Clir Merrett		not in favour of blanket ban on solar panels. Also Moss Street not Terrace.	Article 4's do not ban. They allow control to be exercised by the LPA therefore allowing appropriate sighting of panels and design of panels to be agreed. Cf.section 6.6 recommendation 1.	Noted. No action
471	Clir Merrett		Recommendation should be subject to reviewing what's covered and in communication with occupants in properties concerned.	Add some suitable words to recommendation?	Corrected street name. Re - Article 4s, in the context of whole housing stock of York, the proposals affect a tiny percentage of properties. As CYC comments state, it gives LPA a chance to be involved in decision making.
472	Clir Merrett		1st rec. Add energy/heat loss/noise reduction.		Agree - corrected
473	Dr D M Chalmers		There should be a coherent approach to the lighting of historic buildings, and there should be a consistent policy on the enforcement of restrictions upon illuminated advertising signs which appear to becoming more and more intrusive.	Should there be a section on lighting generally somewhere?	Agree - corrected
473	English Heritage		this concentrates only on For Sale but general shop A boards etc need to be included for control	There are a number of photographs of Coney Street shops with for sale and to let signs attached to properties with this written submission. The text deals with this matter recommending a robust course of action.	Added to section 5.8 public realm
473	E Johnston		under a) would want to support solar panels where appropriate and visually low impact.		Amended
474	Clir Merrett		3rd bullet in blue box - unclear what is to follow	agreed.	Agree - policy needs to be balanced Amended

			In principle, more energy efficient materials should be allowed if they can be used without changing the appearance of a building. (e.g. Solarcentury solar PV collectors which look like roof tiles. These are available in different styles including slate.) The CA management plan should be flexible enough to accommodate a rate of change in the development of building materials that will probably be faster than what has occurred in the period since the last review. It is possible that more energy efficient replica period fittings (e.g. windows, doors, tiles) will become available. The YCHCCA should be a working, evolving Conservation Area, through which CoYC, a council keen to promote the concept of sustainability, can take a lead and set an example by embracing and encouraging new technologies which (a) help to save energy and (b) fit almost seamlessly into historic buildings (e.g. Solarcentury tiles or similar, or compatible double- or triple-glazing windows), possibly with incentives like discounts from business rates and Council Tax.			
474	K Richmond		I disagree with the proposal that solar panels should not then be installed on the roof slopes which face into the street. On the north west side of the street solar installations would then be unviable, since the rear roof slopes receive no worthwhile solar illumination. Our need to reduce carbon dependence is urgent, and the Council should not prevent residents from making their contribution.		Does this section need beefing up a bit? See below entry 81	Agree - corrected
474	Joe Callan					Disagree - Article 4s, in the context of whole housing stock of York, the proposals affect a tiny percentage of properties. As CYC comments state, it gives LPA a chance to be involved in decision making.
474	Joe Callan		There should be no development on the Castle Car Park if it would obstruct existing views of Clifford's Tower from Foss Bridge, or elsewhere on Piccadilly.		The importance of this view has been picked up by the appraisal. Comment noted.	Noted - no action
474	Joe Callan		My own house is now fitted with solar panels - there's a picture of it in the consultation document - and I consulted my neighbours before I deciding on the installation. All the comments I received at that time and subsequently have been positive		The photo is on page 182.	No action
475	Clir Merrett		3rd bullet. If it strikes the right balance		amend?	See above
476	English Heritage		first principal could read more clearly – there are several major developments with planning permission in the pipeline and several others under discussion;		does it need to say more?	Agree- amended to suggested wording
476	English Heritage		green box P476 – the need for a Design Review Panel should be expressed more forcefully.		agree. Stronger wording needed.	Agree - corrected to 'should' instead of 'may find useful'
476	Clir Merrett		3rd bullet. Add, "and more practical method of determining and guiding development."		Point taken but in development management terms this should be a default position. If a developer wants go above 4 stories they will have to give detailed justification explaining how their structure will not detract but add value. No change.	Agree with CYC comment. No action
476	Clir Merrett		3rd bullet. Add key views			Not sure where this is meant
477	K Richmond		I agree with this, especially the comments about when Magnesian limestone can be used and the Park Inn hotel (perhaps its redevelopment will come soon!)			No action
477	English Heritage		the final two bullet points need to be linked in that the council should compile list of most prominent detractors and produce Development Briefs for them.		disagree. I am not sure that it is right to commit to producing development briefs fort detractors. Maybe when they become development opportunities.	Agree with CYC comment. When there is a proposed redevelopment CYC will act. It is an issue of resources.
477	Clir Merrett		1st bullet. 4 stories too rigid and crude. Some buildings above this are not necessarily bad.			Partial agreement - Checked language and amended
477	Clir Merrett		A note on materials - use of mag limestone comments too rigid and crude.		This is a very important statement in the report however. The mag limestone restriction will greatly assist in maintaining the principle characteristics of York. It should be a default position requiring a developer to make a strong case for departing from this.	Disagree - a 'strong presumption' against its is not the same as saying it cannot be used. CYC still reserves the position to use the material in other circumstances. No action

478	English Heritage	Principle Issues – is it York skyline or roofscape i.e. it is not just height but materials, massing and character.	Principle Issues – these need to be more York specific	Agreed	Agree - corrected
478	English Heritage				Agree - corrected
478	Dr D M Chalmers	.I am surprised that no night views have been included.		Interesting point	Noted - query whether are they fundamentally different (e.g. Minster illuminated)? Added comment in lighting section that this study has not specifically looked at night time views as part of both Views Policy and Lighting Strategy
478	Cllr Merrett	1st para. <b>1830's</b> not 1900 - and advent of industrial revolution...also add to end... " <b>before that</b> ".			Agree - corrected
479	Cllr Merrett	para. 4. "... medieval churches, <b>industrial relics and 20th century offices.</b>			Agree - corrected
479	Cllr Merrett	para 5. No to the presumption.		The presumption, as said before is a default position. This gives architects and developers a clear message and a degree of certainty that the only way to build higher will be through high quality design. It doesn't shut the door entirely. I think it is right to set these clear statements otherwise the whole key views issue because weak and open to too much conflict.	Agree with CYC comment. No action
479	Cllr Merrett	Para. 7. No to the presumption.		As above but note mention of development briefs.	See above
480	K Richmond	The presumption of a maximum of four storeys is a good rule to have. It's a pity it wasn't around when the Park Inn was built!			No action
480	Cllr Merrett	final bullet. Too crude and rigid and could conflict with York Central vision etc.		As above. The default position is necessary to ensure that everyone is clear about the importance of the York skyline and that only high quality design might be an acceptable exception. A presumption only gives weight, it is not entirely prescriptive.	Agree with CYC comment. No action
480	Clare Baldwin	In particular I would like to see stricter conditions on planning in the area with regard to the height of new buildings & their planned use. New buildings on brownfield sites need to be put to suitable use to maintain & protect the character of the city e.g building vast blocks of student accommodation, thereby creating a campus, at Grey's Wharf, has greatly altered the character of the area. Also the height & design of the buildings diminishes the character of the listed buildings nearby.			No action
480	Bishophill Action group	We are in agreement with the recommendation that there be a maximum allowable building height within the City.			No action
484	English Heritage	last line of last paragraph on left – traffic issues still exist within and at its edges.			Agree - corrected
484	English Heritage	Visual – could add parked cars			Agree - corrected and added yellow lines too
485	Roger Jennings	It is agreed that action is required for this (Gillygate) stretch of the inner ring road. The main problem is caused by heavy lorries and large vans being allowed to use the road at peak times. Suggested solutions: 1. Lorries and vans of over 2 tons (A& VW) Total ban on using Gillygate in either direction from 07:30 to 19:30. 2. Deliveries to shops from 07:00 to 08:00 and 19:30 to 20:30 for vans only 1-2 Ton (AVW)...		Should the appraisal be more specific on this point?	Agree - large vehicles cause the problems, especially lorries and vans here: Strengthened text here and in character areas - on the bar junction

			If traffic is to be restricted in Gillygate (thereby severing the inner circular route - what are the consequences for, say, Lowther Street?) and elsewhere in the city centre, it will require cycle access and secure cycle parking provision to be even better than now. It should not be ruled out that, sometime in the not too distant future, installations of "Boris bikes" or similar may be needed at various points in and around the YCHCCA.		action? I think it is fair enough to use this word. The point being that we need to review the locations and density of these bus stops. This might mean removing some altogether. I think the Movt. And Accessibility Framework also mentions this issue.	Agree- amended text to strengthen comments about cycling provision
485	K Richmond					
485	Clir Merrett		para. 5. Uncomfortable with use of the word relocate - reference map pg 491 also.		Agree with CYC	
485	Clir Merrett		para. 7. ...at the junction <b>between Tower Street and Bishopgate Street...</b>		Agree - corrected	
486	English Heritage		we do not support the "building opportunity" at Monkbar but support all other priority proposals; elsewhere in the document there is a suggestion that this space could be more attractive an approach we do support.	Reference pg 200 which talks about potential new development of York Academy and Monkbar garage. Perhaps add the word <i>sensitive</i> before development?	Agree - changed language to say 'enhancement opportunity' - there would be very strict conditions on the site (envelope, footprint, design)	
486	Clir Merrett		top of page (name) <b>Tower Gardens</b>		Agree - corrected	
486	Clir Merrett		Section 6.9.3 1st para. Add at end, " <b>...and long waiting times</b> ".		Agree - corrected	
486	Clir Merrett		para. 5. ...and there is no through route now beyond the Bar during footstreet hours.		Agree - corrected	
486	Clir Merrett		para. 8. not just the southern tip!	change to reflect the whole gyratory.	Agree - amended text here and in character	
487	English Heritage		we agree with the rationalising bus stops and public realm improvements.		No action	
489	Monica Nelson		...during footstreet hours, pedestrians should be able to walk without the fear of cyclists coming up behind them. The York Older People's Assembly have condemned this dangerous decision, to allow cycling in Petergate - both ways - at all times....please make every effort to get this cycling decision reversed.		The issue is management and enforcement, as discussed in the text	
489	K Richmond		If cycles need to be chained to railings it is usually because there are not enough cycle stands. For example, the present cycle parking capacity outside the City Screen cinema is inadequate. Often when I go past the stands are fully used and cycles are chained to the railings nearby.		Agree - inserted word 'insufficient'	
490	K Richmond		I agree in principle, especially the proposals for Gillygate. There should be a long term policy to extend the foot streets area (or have 'semi-foot streets' areas added to it) to include Gillygate, St Leonards Place, Museum Street and possibly Lendal bridge. The surfaces of streets should be consistent throughout the foot streets area (e.g. like that of Coney Street, or perhaps more like those in German cities), and with removed or diminished demarcation of roadways and pavements.		This will be covered in the Public Space Strategy and Streetscape Manual	
490	Bishophill Action group		We feel that there is an enormous amount of ugly unnecessary street clutter and signage which should be removed.		No action	
493	K Richmond		I am glad you intend to make 'tidying up' a priority. The station forecourt certainly needs simplifying to become like some of those seen in continental Europe such as Aachen (as illustrated).		No action	
493	Friends of York Walls		The relative quiet of Deans Park, well used by local people, is noted then it recommends making it more tempting to visitors.	Maybe not recommend increasing visitor numbers?	Agree - amended text	
493	David Randon		The junction of Piccadilly/Parliament/Pavement/Coppergate/Ousegate. This is one of the main junctions in the City. At present it is full of clutter; ie fencing, signs, traffic lights etc. A few minutes of observation will quickly show that the traffic lights are largely a waste of time. Many pedestrians cross on red because there appears to be nothing moving. This causes problems both for pedestrians and drivers. I suggest that this junction is ideal for conversion to an "all users" type ie. Remove all traffic lights except to allow buses to pass on their turns between Piccadilly and Coppergate. Remove all fencing and as much signage as possible. Remodel the road/pavements to promote better and safer use and enhance the appearance. This has been done on the Continent and a few place in the UK with positive results.		Noted - interesting point	

495	Dr D M Chalmers	. The suggestion that Micklegate could become a foot street should be given a higher priority as this would be highly beneficial to the neighbourhood.			See above. Micklegate added into 'long term' options. Also highlighted in character area.
498	English Heritage	suggest that as well as trees, shrub planning is considered as part of a greening campaign as these compete less with the upper floors and roofscape. The Recommendation should include a greening proposal		add a new recommendation? And mention shrubs as well as trees.	Agree - Added in 'The City Council should prepare a Planting Strategy that will identify appropriate locations, types of planting and maintenance regimes.'
499	K Richmond	Many houses inside the walled area can be seen from the city wall ramparts. The permitting of energy efficiency installations on these houses should not be governed by how they look from the ramparts but by how they look from the street they are in.		not sure of the reference here. The comment refers to section 6.11 but?	Agree - see section on sustainable development in the conservation area
499	Friends of York Walls	"though it is possible to walk all surviving lengths of the wall" [in context this seems to imply "walk on" them -when there are 3 small but substantial 'unwalkable' sections], "navigating the gaps [in unwalkable wall] is often confusing and unpleasant" [when there is nothing obviously "unpleasant" in easy or light-controlled road crossings or a walk mainly through parks or by rivers or interesting buildings].		Use "most" instead of "all". I think some of those gaps can be confusing and unpleasant. Thinking of Leeman Road end with lential; Walmgate can be when the traffic is heavy.	Agree with CYC comment - amended text to use 'most' and 'alongside heavy traffic' instead of unpleasant
500	English Heritage	English Heritage should be added to the list of partners please		Agreed!	Agree - corrected
501	River Foss Society	We note that the "potential for new or improved riverside public space" includes both banks of the River Foss in the Castle/Piccadilly and Hungate Development Areas. We urge the implementation of the Foss Walkway Strategy, prepared by RKL-Arup in 1998 and accepted in principle by the City of York Council, which provides a continuous footpath on the Piccadilly side of the Foss between Blue Bridge and Monk Bridge. This would help to fulfil the aim of enhancing the "quality and extent of public access to the rivers". It would also provide a more fitting start/finish to the medium distance Foss Walk footpath which links the centre of York to its hinterland in the Howardian Hills than the present route which has to deviate from the course of the River.			Agree - referenced the Strategy options
501	K Richmond	The Rivers Ouse and Foss are fairly direct routes through the city and there is a good case for improving pedestrian routes alongside them, safety measures permitting. The temporary floating walkway is an excellent idea.			No action
503	English Heritage	include in Recommendation to clean up banks and watercourse generally		agreed	Agree - Added this recommendation.
504	Peter Mills	I think it is a pity that most of the River Foss is excluded from the Core Conservation Area. While I realise the Appraisal focuses on the historical architecture of York, the River Foss is an integral (though apparently not well loved) part of York. Maybe if it were to be included in the Core Area it would receive more of the attention it deserves, especially from the cleansing department			Noted - but see the relevant sections of the report for how the boundary of the Historic Core conservation area has been assessed: the walled city and early suburbs
504	Peter Mills	The Foss riverside walk as outlined in the Appraisal would be most welcome and bring the river back into being a major attraction for tourists and residents of York rather than being a muddy back-street ditch used for rubbish disposal. However, rather than crossing the river before Hungate as the path presently does, I would have it stay on the same side as the Hungate development as far as Layerthorpe bridge. This would provide an attractive walk for the Hungate residents and keep the walk separated from the traffic along Foss Islands road.			Noted
504	Peter Mills	In his book The River Foss from Yearsley to York, Michael Fife in 1973 wrote: For tourists, citizens and countrymen, a little care and maintenance with a dash of imagination will enable the River Foss to become a delightful amenity, and gain an enhanced reputation for its service to man throughout its history. There appears to have been little care, maintenance and imagination in the intervening 28 years but the Appraisal could be an opportunity to correct this omission.			agreed - see section 5.12 of the report
504	English Heritage	at Recommendation add 'promote and enhance etc' to both the Foss and the Ouse		agreed	Agree - corrected

			<p>The role of Highways is referred to once only at (p515) 7.4.9 Traffic and Movement. We consider that they have a vital role also at 7.4.10 Streets and Spaces as well as potentially with the York Renaissance Team which is identified with responsibility for most of the Actions in the Action Table. Joint working to secure improvements to the public realm should be woven into the responsibilities of Highways, City Strategy and Conservation. This is critical as one of, if not the major issue for the future of the City is traffic management and the management of the public realm. Presently they collectively are having a seriously negative impact on the City's historic core.</p>		<p>Agree - highlighted joint intelligent working of teams embedding design consideration in highway planning and execution</p>
	515	English Heritage	<p>We would suggest that some the Principles actually read as issues. We agree with the issues as set out her but would recommend high level principles are drawn out from these five points. Whilst we recognise financial constraints in the current climate the bullet point on Resources needs to be stronger. Resources should be the first thing itemised in that bullet point and not left until the end. Resources will be needed to fully realise the socio-economic potential of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area and will need to be drawn in from a wide variety of stakeholders.</p>		
	519	English Heritage	<p>we support the Local List recommendations, however, at p460 there is inconsistent and inaccurate use of the English Heritage Conservation Principles' at this point in the text.</p>	<p>Principles 1 and 5 amended</p>	
	460 - 461	English Heritage	<p>the topics here are both described (as with previous topics on preceding pages) but they also have an "Issues and Opportunities" section unlike preceding topics. This is confusing and should be dealt with either elsewhere or add "Issues and Opportunities" to the other sections such as Architecture and Townscape</p>	<p>Have replaced with local listing guidance</p>	
	47 -48	English Heritage			<p>Issues and Opportunities removed from Section 2. Now found in character areas and management recommendations only</p>
	5 & 7	Isobel	<p>I think that pages 5 and 7 are good statements. To articulate this vision in such clear and concise writing is admirable.</p>	<p>Good point. Amend?</p>	<p>No action</p>
	76-77	Janet Hopton	<p>incorrect text under View 7, Askham Bryan, which uses Text from View 6, Terry's, and thereafter the text is incorrect for this section.</p>	<p>Change</p>	<p>Agree - corrected</p>
	76-77	Cllr Merrett	<p>as above</p>	<p>change</p>	<p>See above</p>
Monkgate	General	Smith	<p>Correct points of compass throughout the piece. EG. 2nd para. Western not southern boundary.</p>	<p>Agreed, for consistency.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
Monkgate	General	Vanessa Lindsay Smith	<p>Very pleased with the appraisal and find it very accessible and readable.</p>		<p>No action</p>



York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal consultation comments: August/September 2011: Response slip			
Response slip answers			
Source	Has the appraisal got the facts right?	Do you agree with the appraisal's recommendations - in particular the boundary changes and increased protection for certain special streets?	Does the appraisal clearly explain the character of the conservation area?
E. Martha Guenzel	yes	Yes. It is a privilege to live in the city and we must make a real effort to make it <u>easy</u> to have visitors coming into this city. We so love and want to share with others. <b>changes to the boundary?</b> This partly depends on what restrictions are brought in for properties newly included in the YCHCCA. For example, if I owned a house in the Scarcroft Hill area I might be concerned if it prevented me from installing solar PV or solar thermal units on my roof, or uPVC windows or doors. <b>extra protection for certain special streets?</b> There is probably a case for different, more stringent regulations to apply to special streets (e.g. The Shambles) in comparison to those that generally apply to the YCHCCA overall. If regulations are applied equally over the whole area the system may become unwieldy, impractical and inequitable over time.	yes
K Richmond			Yes. I have recommended Part One: Understanding the City to some acquaintances to read as a useful summary of the history of the development of York
Peter Mills	yes	Yes, with reservations:  Please see request in previous item for inclusion of Tuke House and Bishophill Quaker Burial Ground (covered in referenced comments). Otherwise, I agree with the boundary changes and proposed increased protection for certain special streets.	Yes  Again, Yes, generally speaking, though it seems unlikely anyone with less than higher education will be sufficiently interested and motivated to take the time and trouble to read the document sufficiently carefully to make a reasoned response. As a reader I was able to identify the individual character areas I am familiar with and see them in the context of the Conservation Area Appraisal. Breaking the area down into 24 character areas helped to be able to focus time and attention on parts I am most familiar with.
Virginia Shaw	I am wary of the use of the term "facts". Of necessity, the Appraisal has to focus on particular aspects, such as buildings of special merit and area boundaries. Consequently, chunks of York's not-so-recent history are completely ignored...	Yes though being comprehensive it takes some time to get through it Broadly speaking, Yes. The difficulty is having the time to find one's way around the document, then to the areas of personal interest and familiarity so as to be able to make a sound contribution to the consultation.	Yes

<p>Keith Daggatt Geoffrey Williams CPRE, York &amp; Selby Branch unknown</p>	<p>The Appraisal is robust and fit for purpose. The great majority of the facts are right. The worrying thing is the omissions. An attenuation of detail haunts the description of certain sites hedged by 'sensitivities'. Some sites do not appear at all. There is a reluctance to discuss recent and current building, perhaps for reasons of tact. On the other hand, certain 'aspirational' schemes are mentioned too often, and the opinions which are expressed do not seem to be ideally impartial. References to them tend to spread out from the Issues and Opportunities sections into those which should be more narrowly concerned with fabric. The treatment of detractors is inconsistent. Some of the most glaring detractors, perfectly corresponding to the document's definitions, are passed over without comment or illustration, and lesser examples given. Part One's The even-handed approach (Building of Merit/Detractor) is not extended to Part Two: there is a photo gallery of Buildings of Merit but no equivalent gallery or list of Detractors. Though the Appraisal is not a gazetteer, more public and high grade buildings could have been mentioned; they are the attractors. More streets should be identified in the text; we experience Townscape at ground level through the medium of the street and the lack of their identification in will perplex many readers. Some areas descriptions seem uncomfortably generic: Central Shopping Area, for example, finds no place in the text to consider Lendal and Blake Street.</p>			<p>Inconsistencies are inevitable in distilling the Conservation Area – 'one of world's the most complex townscapes', according to Esher – into a mere 450 pages! What is does need is more uniform treatment of detail from one character area to the next.. The overview of the document's organisation should be expanded: There should be an overview of the York palette: page43 is inadequate. Today's materials need to be better represented. The Appraisal flogs the (deprecated) term 'Magnesian Limestone' to the virtual exclusion of other materials: one reference to sandstone; one to Portland; nothing about the dark stones (gritstone,etc.), the city's 'works' materials. The total information given about brick would amount to one short sentence. An overview of materials should include a better overview of street surfaces (p.42). The area contains much good ironwork (not just railings) some of it modern and this is worth mentioning. Justly, York is famous for its rich incidental detail – including the comic, curious and eccentric – the sort of thing which earned the sobriquet 'Minor Pleasures of York' That must be worth a sentence.</p>
	<p>yes</p>			
	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>	<p>yes</p>
	<p>on the whole yes</p>			

York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal consultation comments: August/September 2011: Janine Riley			
Theme	Reference	Source	Comment
			ABA response
	6.1	Janine Riley	6.1 para 5 – repeat sentence could be omitted “The appraisal was commissioned...”
	6.1	Janine Riley	P 454 – box bottom right area – would it be right to add “Conservation Management Plans for complex sites” here? I appreciate they are dealt with later
	6.2	Janine Riley	6.2 some typing errors and lots of “this’s” - first and last paras
	6.3	Janine Riley	6.3 – no comment other than “joined up” working para 5
	6.4.1/ pg 458	Janine Riley	6.4.1 – table and map agree with recommendations though boundary to include Love Lane adjacent to former County Hospital (area 6). 3 & 5 have always seemed anomalous
	6.4.2	Janine Riley	6.4.2 – This marries well with the development of the Local list now. Archaeological significance “which have are ...” “or the form of”. Communal significance – include mention of spaces to reinforce complimentary relationship between space and form. Often the space is under threat and therefore setting. Penultimate sentence is essential. Map p462 buildings at risk (yellow) aren’t clear on electronic map. Could they be starred?
	6.4.3	Janine Riley	6.4.3 – Age: agree, generally massing and materials relate
	6.5	Janine Riley	6.5 – top of p 465 “be is” Is the test suggested not a false choice? Who decides? Draft NPPF could make archaeology vulnerable so shouldn’t we be more robust with means of recording and protection? Recommendations - Importance of the HER
	6.5.2	Janine Riley	6.5.2 – some updating required as plans have been instigated. Museum Gardens/ St Mary’s abbey Precinct has a Conservation Management plan called “St Mary’s Abbey Precinct C M Plan, Oct 2005” and a Garden Development Plan; for St Leonard’s Hospital/Mint Yard/Library Area there is an HLF bid in; a “Conservation Development Strategy” started being developed for the Station June 2011, due for completion soon. De Grey House and De Grey Rooms (St Leonard’sPI) have a Conservation Management Plan
	6.5.3	Janine Riley	6.5.3 – para 4 condn of roofs and rainwater disposal systems not maintained,
	6.5.3	Janine Riley	para 6 “adopted” Local List, we usually use the term “approved” for SPD’s and adopted for the LDF and other overarching plans. Some councillors are piqued by wrong terminology.
	6.5.3	Janine Riley	Examples: Lawrence St Working Mens Club is another key example. Bonding Warehouse is for sale now. There was an approved scheme for conversion to offices and flats but the developer went into liquidation. The approved scheme for 23 Clifford Street is now underway and will be completed soon – it is being handled through the receivers.
	6.5.4	Janine Riley	6.5.4 – para 1 usually small alterations to dwellings such as.... Unsympathetic shop-fronts (security installations/shutters, signage, lighting)
			CYC response
			Removed from text
			Possibly
			Corrected typos
			Corrected typos
			no action
			Text amended pg461. Plan amended on p462
			no action
			BS to check
			Included in text
			Included in text
			Changed terminology
			Text now reflects these changes
			Amended text

			6.5.5 - the new GPDO Pt 40 (Oct 1st came into force with no consultation), which makes it easier to install equipment for micro generation poses a threat to the characteristic roof-scape of the city centre especially in new residential areas such as Aldwark – anywhere contributing to the setting of the Minster. No permission is required for roofs of dwellings (front or back or side), even in conservation areas. Owners are asked to minimize the effect on external appearance of the building and the amenity of the area. Article 4 (2) directions might be required over a wider area in respect of roofs to uphold existing policy objective SP3 (b). I think Members would only sanction this if we extended the survey mentioned p468 Recommendations to include identification of possible locations for micro-generation which would not affect the setting of the Minster – this is a high priority. Map p470 and table might need supplementing, could views analysis be used to illustrate areas?		Interesting. Reference made
			6.5.6 Principal issues inconsistent approach to signage & security measures (where these are justified) Illumination usually not accepted unless night time opening hours – agree need consistent approach. Last para Design Guidance should address colour, material, size, position of signs. Street by street assessment usually required to build up distinctive character as some streets more robust/commercial in nature than others.		Included
			6.6 para 4 Overall objective is conservation of energy, water etc and changing people’s habits. Also “bolt on” micro-generation measures have an environmental cost for a number of years (until pay-back period ends approx 5-10yrs?). Warn that roofs etc must be in good condition prior to installation as maintenance and repair might be made more difficult. Another best practice example is the Bath Centre for Sustainable Energy and Bath Preservation Trust document (compiled with a grant from DCLG £30K +£5,000 for publication). Please see 6.5.5 re recent revision to GPDO.		
			6.7.1 and Barbican Development Brief (just outside cons area), Foss Islands Planning Statement (though mostly landscape), Union Terrace car park is a possibility for consideration (just outside but impact on setting) in view of recent bid by St John’s Uni to expand here (rejected by Cllr reaction to public opinion)		Development outside the conservation area will have an impact on its setting depending on the scale. Therefore design should take the setting issues into account.
			6.7.2 design – other good examples 3 Davygate, early Music Centre off Walmgate. Design of new buildings should – only buildings of high communal/religious/cultural significance should break the guidelines to preserve legibility of city.		noted
			Note on Materials - brick (in variety of colours and textures). Sandstones are typical of some later Victorian commercial buildings such as banks.		noted
			Recommendations – Major projects such as Castle Piccadilly should draw on the Design Council/CABE review service. City of York Design Review panel – EH and CAAP should contribute as we need some anchors as well as people with design ambition, wide experience and expertise.		amended
			Development briefs – should require developers to undertake an urban appraisal of the area prior to developing schemes as well as the views analysis		amended
			6.8 Last para add caveat re importance of roofscape in views and its vulnerability to changes in surfacing due to micro-generation?		amended

6.8.4	Janine Riley	6.8.4 Four storeys in narrow streets maintains human scale. Tanner Row – 7 storeys maximum I thought (Hudson house is 5&7, older Aviva building and Northern House either side of Rougier St also 7max). Also Stonebow House is a candidate mentioned in earlier section. 5 storeys was generally the limit for Hungate so this fits the suggested parameters for outer areas		noted	
6.9.4	Janine Riley	6.9.4 traffic Need to review strategic drop-down locations for buses & coaches & taxi pick up points. Recommendation - Increasing overall motility (nos of people movements) should be the priority for traffic engineers and urban designers rather than helping traffic to flow. What happens in the centre is affected by the park and ride sites and how the aerial routes are used. The two should be connected.		City centre and rest of transport structure inter-dependent	
6.9.4	Janine Riley	(What about servicing of businesses etc? Presumably there is no longer a freight strategy being developed?)		?	
6.10.4	Janine Riley	6.10.4 wall to wall paving of a similar type is discouraged in historic areas (EH advises this too) Carriageway and pavement might need to be distinguished (buildings have a threshold, historic appreciation of scale of road etc) though better if level		Public Space Strategy	
6.10.4	Janine Riley	Recommendations round-up for Streets and Spaces –streetscape/public realm manual, coordinated approaches to street-lighting, floodlighting policy?. Maintenance and standards of workmanship to be improved. Budgets to recognize long term objectives.		intelligent use of existing resources	
General	Janine Riley	Please find somewhere to flag up the importance of retaining and building on skilled craft traditions and the wealth of conservation expertise – ie maintaining a resource within the historic core linked to the Universities and apprenticeship training going on at York College and finding ways in which these skills can be made public – importance of an active tradition within the City Centre as a “unique selling point”		OK	
General	Janine Riley	Is there any way in which the deficiencies in enforcement could be acknowledged (without appearing negative) as we only have one officer for the whole of the city centre and this is equally important?		Its in the conclusion but mention also now in implementation section (5.2)	

York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal consultation comments: August/September 2011: Robert Tavernor Associates			
Theme	Reference	Source	Comment
	Key view 15	RTC	We agree with the CAA that the relationship of the Tower to the River Foss is appreciated in this view, and we would add that this is one of the few places outside of the immediate setting of Clifford's Tower from which it can be seen. However, we submit that this glimpsed and partial view of Clifford's Tower is of lesser quality than other key views (such as View 16: Clifford's Tower which is described on p.87 of the CAA as "exceptional") and that the description and/or classification of the view as 'key' should be reconsidered
	Key view 15	RTC	enhancement of the historically enclosed character of the Foss riverfront could outweigh the loss of this partial and fortuitous view of Clifford's Tower, especially if a new view of the Tower was created.
	key View 16	RTC	The historic and spatial relationship of the Foss with Clifford's Tower is not disputed but the contribution of the Foss - screened by foliage and, historically, obscured by the 19th century prison wall - to the significance of the view from Clifford's Tower is considered to be less than the key factors described in the 'Description and Significance' text
	key View 16	RTC	Development on the Castle / Piccadilly site has the potential to add positively to the City roofscape seen from the Tower.
Eye of York	292	RTC	It should be noted that the shape of the central space has evolved over the centuries and was not originally oval shaped. Further, the three buildings surrounding it were built at different times and are positioned slightly asymmetrically. The 2006 Castle Piccadilly Conservation Area Appraisal notes this disjointed composition and the incongruity of the central oak tree
	Castle CA	RTC	The CAA describes the "poor quality and unsympathetic setting to Clifford's Tower" provided by the car park (p.296). This could be expanded to address the issues also raised in the 2006 castle Piccadilly Planning brief, such as the negative impacts of the rear elevation of the Coppergate Centre (PR3.2, p.22) and the service road to the Coppergate centre (3.20, p.10).
	Piccadilly CA	RTC	The CAA identifies the Red Lion pub as the only Listed Building in Character Area 14 on p.303 but there is no mention of its classification (Grade II) and no description of its past or present character and setting. It is not mentioned at all under the 'Buildings' section on p.306 where former uses of the Banana Warehouse and Trolley Bus Garage are described in detail. It should be noted as the most important historic building in the area and opportunities for enhancing its setting should be identified.
			Agree that the view is partly obscured by the present coppergate centre. Although this is unfortunate, redevelopment offers opportunities to restore the view to the historic view. The partial view does not mean it should be of lesser quality than View 16. There is no scale of significance. They are different views. Agree that the point needs fleshing out a bit. perhaps mention the tension. However, it is up to developers to resolve the tension.
			This is not a fortuitous view. It is an historic view and even when the prison walls were up you could still see the tower.
			The relationship between the Foss and the castle is a strong one. It formed part of the defence, ensuring that the crucial relationship is maintained contributes to better revealing the significance. This could be via the proposed footbridge for instance. No change.
			Agree with this point but it is covered in the report
			I think that the oval was indeed designed. I believe there were several planned options at the time. Add something to reflect comment about phased building. Agree that the tree should be mentioned. The unsymmetrical form of the Eye is part of its character.
			Agree, amend.
			The map on pg 304 states the listing, I am not sure the text needs to. Description of it in detail is not part of the brief but it could be mentioned in buildings section.

ABA response

CYC response

ABA response

ABA response

Banana Warehouse	Piccadilly CA	RTC	Transposed to a local level (and so locally rather than nationally listed), this criteria is not met by the Banana Warehouse: it is evidence of the general development of York City but does not illustrate any important aspects of its history and its fabric has no quality of interest.	A local list is different. It is an important building to local people.	Disagree - for local historical interest (eg as representative of once extensive light industry and commercial uses in the historic core) this meets criteria. Also, because well loved, meets criteria for communal interest
Trolleybus Garage	Piccadilly CA	RTC	Transposed to a local level, the Trolley Bus Garage is evidence of a form of transport no longer in use but not one of particular importance to York City. It is perhaps only the former use of the building for aircraft manufacture in the early 1930s that is of historic interest, but it is understood that this took place for a period of less than two years due to the inadequacy of the premises and there is no evidence of that particular use in the fabric of the building, which was not built for that purpose.	It is very much a part of the character of the area.	Disagree - of significant and unusual local historical interest. Therefore meets criteria as a Building of Merit
Opportunities	Piccadilly CA	RTC	This section of the CAA notes that Piccadilly has significant potential for development but that consideration of views through to the Castle buildings will require "breaking up blocks into a series of small elements" (p.309). It should be noted that this area is formed by reclaimed land and has no burgrave plot history, as there is elsewhere in the medieval parts of the City. The larger scale of buildings serves as a reminder of this later stage of development and contributes to the character of the area and to the view from Clifford's Tower, from where the roof sizes tell the story of the City's historic development. This character of the area should also be considered when forming development proposals.	I don't think burgrave plot is implied in the text. The thrust of the issue is surely to avoid big box retail with uniform frontages to better reflect historic character.	No action
Opportunities	Piccadilly CA	RTC	There should also be recognition of the enclosed character of the canalised river Foss on p.309 (as there is elsewhere in the CAA), and that a continuous walkway beside the river Foss is undesirable (rather than unnecessary, as the CAA states on p.309) if the historic and present day character of the Foss is to be maintained.		Mentioned enclosed historic character making continuous path undesirable.