

Annex 2 - KINGS SQUARE CONSULTATION RESPONSES (04/02/13 - 25/02/13)

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R1	<p>I've got data on delivery activity for some shops in the area so that might help and I'll see what I can do on the courier side. It does often seem that the courier's office staff just plan a route and it's left to the driver to work around the basic considerations so the best way of getting freight industry input might actually be to get on street there and ask a few drivers. I'll check my contacts for you though and I'll get back to you shortly.</p> <p>If someone could ping me a plan of what's proposed that would be really helpful as it's a critical point for deliveries in lieu of the lack of vehicular access to the Shambles. Makes it a quite a pinch point with trucks standing for a little while on occasion and it being a reasonably tight manoeuvre from the corner of Goodramgate in.</p>		Tom Horner, Transport Planner, CYC
R2	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. I have looked at the proposed plans for Kings Square and have just a couple of questions.</p> <p>1. If the proposals go ahead when would work begin and how long would it take? 2. Currently it is possible to park outside our shop (Barnfathers) before 11am and after 4pm - will this still be possible? I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>1: Refer to analysis document under "Timing of construction works(not currently considered)": 2: Refer to analysis document under "Vehicles(not currently considered)":</p>	Business Owner
R3	<p>Many thanks for hosting the event on Friday. It was interesting to see where you and your colleagues have got to in your thinking to date with regards to the Kings Square development.</p> <p>Obviously Friday wasn't geared to take a host of questions and acted as more of an information giving session. You obviously wanted our feed back however once we had time to take on board the initial plans so I thought that I would write whilst things were still fresh in my mind and my points follow below:</p>	Noted.	Business Owner
	<p>1. From the proposed scheme I feel that a mix of the presented ideas would work best for Kings Square.</p>	Noted.	/
	<p>2. Regarding the trees. I would prefer the removal all current trees and replace with two smaller slow growing varieties. I would advocate these trees being placed near to #5 and street trader b. I would advocate full removal and non replacement of the tree near to the Shambles as I believe this would open this aspect up fully. For the regeneration of the square it would be advantageous to install trees which prevent pigeons resting/roosting.</p>	2: Refer to analysis document under "Trees (do not support either option 1 or 2)":	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	3. For full year use of the square and increased capacity for the square I would prefer that the raised (burial) area is removed. The removal of this as well as the tree adjacent will create a new dynamic of how people move around the space. People wont be funneled in to the Shambles from so far away and my view is that people walking away from the Shambles will naturally be drawn into a wider space which is being created.	3: Refer to analysis document under "Raised Area: remove the raised burial area and two raised trees in order to return the space to ground level"	/
	4. The two seats identified on the plans immediately in front of the entrance to Chocolate will create a barrier and again will serve the function of channeling people through a narrow space. We would prefer that people can spread out in the square.	4: Refer to analysis document under "Are there aspects of the design you particularly dislike...seating"	/
	5. Seating in general is a must and I would suggest that back to back seating is provided near to the boundary of shops (Tullivers, To Let and Barnfarthers). This will put back some of the lost seating from the removal of the plinth.	5: Refer to analysis document under "Raised Area: remove the raised burial area and two raised trees in order to return the space to ground level"	/
	6. I would suggest the seating provision is designed to be flexible and movable.	6: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."	/
	7. I like the use of mixed floor material to demark spaces.	Noted.	/
	8. I like the widening of the square.	Noted.	/
	9. I feel that points 4,5 & 7 will still provide clutter to the space	Noted.	/
	10. re the Potential café seating location. I would be interested to gain an understanding as to how this space will be allocated to a business. Process, priority. Naturally there is only the opportunity for one operator to be here however several will be interested.	10: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."	/
	11. Will any power be provided at the location for the Café Seating? Is there space for a small catering unit to serve from?	10: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."	/
	12. Whilst no seating is currently scheduled/proposed immediately adjacent to our facility I would encourage CYC to retain an open mind on this moving forward. The proposed changes to the square and the way people may move around the space may create a whole new dynamic. We clearly understand that this is a public space but that shouldn't stand in the way of providing the public a great overall experience within the square other than eating fish and chips and Cornish pasties leaving their litter behind them and encouraging more pigeon activity. Continuum would be happy comply with any restrictions with the vehicular use of Kings Court and would be happy to support the council in its overall management of the Square.	Noted. We will monitor how well the square functions after the changes and review as necessary.	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	13. It would be useful to understand what and where any 'pop up' power may be provided. Naturally we would be interested to hold events at key points during the year.	13: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."	/
	14. Timing – Naturally this is my greatest concern as is the case with the Street Traders and the Performers. Our business relies upon footfall during the Peak season (April – Sept). Commencing the work in April may have a serious detrimental effect on our performance as a new tourist attraction. Whilst Street Traders and Performers can be moved to other locations we unfortunately can't. I understand that the dates may not be able to be moved due to many reasons however we need to ensure that the square and our business remain welcoming and clearly advertised. We would like further discussion on how the council intend to do this.	14: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...timing of construction works.."	/
	15. Should the works over run from the April – Early July program, what plans will be in place to offset the disruption over the critical months of July & August.	15: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...timing of construction works.."	/
	16. I would be interested to understand further how the lighting will improve. The square at night is quite a forbidding space and can only benefit from an improved lighting scheme.	16: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...lighting.."	/
	17. One of the most interesting pieces of information to come out on Friday was that there were approx 1300 vehicles entering Kings Square and travelling down Colliergate. Whilst I advocate the proposed changes to look and feel of the road surface and the portrayed pedestrianisation of the Square I would be interested to understand how the Council will educate drivers further and prevent drivers using it as a short cut through the city. I regularly walk up Foss Gate and Colliergate and am always amazed at the number of vehicles and speed that they are travelling.	17: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...vehicles.."	/
	I was able to take a handful of leaflets away with me on Friday which have been taken to the attraction to be handed out. I will contact you should we need any more. If I have any more thoughts on the overall scheme or have any feedback from my colleagues I will let you know prior to the end of the consultation period.	Noted. Thank you.	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R4	<p>Thanks for the further meeting on Friday about Kings Square. The project heralds a new era in Kings Square, and it is great to see everyone cooperating and contributing so positively towards this.</p> <p>Here is some feedback from our point of view as stall holders.</p> <p>Stall positions</p> <p>(See attachment)</p> <p>We don't want to be too intransigent about the positions of the Lemonade and Ice Cream stalls, but their current positions have developed over the years due to practical considerations.</p> <p>At present they: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Best serve the natural pedestrian flow. b) Allow us to peacefully co-exist with surrounding businesses. c) Provide adequate spacing between the four kiosks. <p>On the proposed plan the Lemonade and Ice Cream stalls have been moved up towards the head of the square. This puts the Lemonade stall directly in front of Chocolate's entrance doors which is impractical and undesirable to both parties. Their door would be less visible, and our respective queues, on busy days, would occupy the same space.</p>	<p>Many thanks for the detailed observations. Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."</p>	<p>Business Owner</p>
	<p>Moving the Ice Cream stall to outside Millie's Cookies would also be undesirable to both parties. In the past, when their shop was under different management there was some "unpleasantness" between the two businesses. The current position of the Ice Cream stall provides enough space for us to co-exist amicably.</p> <p>The Ice Cream queue can be 5 or 6 metres long on busy days, and this would also be problematic as regards pedestrian flow in the draft position.</p> <p>For the above reasons we would prefer to maintain roughly the status quo in regard to the siting of our stalls.</p>	<p>(As Above)</p>	<p>/</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Seating</p> <p>1. The seating under the two ground trees on the Square is filthy and unhygienic due to the natural pigeon perches provided by this variety of tree. We are regularly called upon to provide paper napkins for pigeon victims. Locals, who are aware of the problem, just don't use the seats.</p> <p>We like the idea of removing these two ground trees and re-planting further outwards to increase the size of the central area. New trees need to be of a variety which discourage pigeons, in order that new seating can be positioned underneath.</p> <p>2. What is the feasibility of a back-to-back seat at the head of the square opposite Millie's/St Paul's boundary wall? It would a good view of the Minster and would prevent large trucks from encroaching onto the square.</p> <p>3. The raised area provides seating for probably 50 or 60 people at the moment. On busy days this is used to full capacity by people eating their sandwiches, ice cream etc and watching the entertainment. If it is levelled this seating capacity would need to be replaced in the new seating plan.</p> <p>4. On the draft plan the two seats adjacent to Chocolate would need to be re-sited because of the position of the Lemonade stall as mentioned above.</p>	<p>1: Refer to analysis document under " Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road"</p> <p>2&3: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...design.."</p> <p>4: Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."</p>	/
	<p>Raised area</p> <p>We are ambivalent towards the removal of the raised area.</p> <p>In its favour no other square has such a feature, and it does provide a very good stage area - summer evening plays etc. perhaps?</p> <p>If it stays would it be feasible to widen the path that goes across the back of it by a couple of metres? Currently this area is dingey and not easy to negotiate when busy. As previously mentioned, the plinth also has the function of seating 50 or 60 people during busy periods.</p> <p>On the other hand, dismantling it would create more space and improve the flow of people over the Square. There's also the argument that "if it didn't exist, would you create it?". It's a difficult one to call...</p> <p>We hope these points are useful and not just adding to your decision making dilemmas! If we have any other ideas we will doubtless be in touch.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Raised Area: Do not support either option (4 or 5)"</p>	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R5	<p>The turn into King's Sq from Church St and Goodramgate looks to be very tight for a large vehicle, has this been autotracked?</p> <p>The carriageway looks to be very narrow outside boots. How will loading take place whilst still allowing through traffic? Boots does have deliveries by a large articulated vehicle.</p> <p>2 bollards shown, what are they for?</p> <p>Is the intention to formally regulate the 2 disabled bays, hence the need for signs?</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...vehicular management.."</p>	<p>Alistair Briggs, CYC</p>
R6	<p>Kings Square Development – York Street Performers' Perspective</p> <p>Current proposals</p> <p>1. Widening the square and moving trees – we think this is a great idea. It will make the square bigger and more open.</p> <p>The pigeons are a major problem, so changing the type of tree and any other measures such as anti-pigeon spikes on branches would be welcomed.</p> <p>Removal of the Mulberry tree will create more needed space.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road"</p>	<p>York Street Performers Association</p>
	<p>2. Potential flattening of raised area – Kings Square is a small area; one of the smallest regularly worked street performing pitches in UK. We cannot afford to have the square reduced in size any more. The only concession we do have is the raised area acts as a stage so that we can be seen by more people. We would lose this if the area was flattened. If the square was widened, then that would make up for the loss of the "stage". However, if the area was flattened without widening the Square, we would be at a huge disadvantage and street performing would be severely affected.</p> <p>Therefore we would support the idea of flattening the raised area, but only if the square was widened.</p> <p>If the area does not get flattened, we would suggest removing the Mulberry tree and replacing with public seating. We would suggest not putting benches all the way round the back of the raised section as this will create bottlenecks and obstructions if there is not adequate spacing in between benches for people to move through or stand.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "2a Raised Area: remove the raised burial area and two raised trees in order to return the space to ground level." Refer also to analysis document under "2c Raised Area: Do not support either option (2a or 2b)."</p>	<p>/</p>
	<p>3. Limited Café Seating regulated by the council – As discussed, limiting the space available on the current Kings Square would potentially kill off street performing. This was explained last summer during the Save Kings Square Campaign which was widely supported by the public and local businesses in response to proposed tables and chairs on the square. Therefore we are very much against café seating on the square in the current size.</p> <p>If the Square was extended as per Variation 1 we would accept café seating in the proposed areas. We would appreciate reassurances from the council that this would not then lead to more and more café seating that could lead to the demise of street performances making it unviable.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "(Do you support) Cafe Seating: No." Refer also to analysis document under "(Do you support) Cafe Seating: Yes."</p>	<p>/</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Public seating – our experience tells us that the key to opening up the square and the idea of pedestrians taking the streets is making it easy for people to move around. Benches in the wrong place can cause major obstructions. The proposed plans to have benches next to the crepe stall for example could be disastrous. Performers would not be able to organise crowds effectively as there would be seating in the way. People would stand behind the benches blocking the walkway between the crepe stall and Chocolate entrance which is already very busy with traffic flow.</p> <p>Conclusion – we welcome public seating but would ask that common sense prevail and they not cause bottle necks or obstructions which would adversely affect our ability to entertain the public as best as possible.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."</p>	<p>/</p>
	<p>Seating alternative (see photos) – we have a suggestion that would transform Kings Square into an amazing performance space as well as fulfil the need for extra public seating. We suggest a small tiered seating area. This could be placed where the Mulberry tree currently stands if the raised area was flattened. It could have its back to the electric housing unit and post box which cannot be moved so there would be no extra obstruction.</p> <p>This would provide in ideal place for people to sit and eat their lunch, ice creams, watch the world go by etc. It would also give a whole new presence to the square and, along with the new paving, less traffic etc. welcome people into the square, either to sit at quiet times or enjoy quality performances at busier times.</p> <p>Quebec City is very similar to York – a beautiful vibrant city with rich history and a large number of visitors and locals. It has a public square similar to Kings Square that was previously unused. Consequently a small tiered seating was built and has transformed the square to a performance area with regular community events and fantastic street performers, and the public are able to sit for free without having to go into a café or restaurant.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management.."</p>	<p>/</p>
	<p>I appreciate the obvious "Health and Safety will have a field day" concern, but fixed structures like this are present in other cities, including USA and Canada that are highly litigious, so care would have to be given to the design but this is a completely viable option that would be a fantastic addition to the new look square.</p> <p>Suggested size width – 3m or less, height -1.5m, depth – 1.5m.</p> <p>Please see included some photos from Quebec City Public Square. They have installed 4 bleacher stands, which is too much for Kings Square, but one small stand could fit in place of the Mulberry tree.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>/</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Finally, we would like to point out that there are numerous factors involved in street performances i.e. spontaneous entertainment for the general public. Small things that are not necessarily obvious to someone who is not a street performer can have a huge effect such as benches placed in the wrong place leading to congestion and obstruction, or a flowerbed in the middle of the performance space. Communication is key. Feel free to call me any time and get a street performer's perspective. I have performed on Kings Square for over ten years, as well as over 100 other towns and cities around the world and am happy to help in any way to make Kings Square, a place that means so much to me, as good as it can be for everyone.</p>	Noted. Many thanks.	/
R7	<p>Paul Hepworth of the national cyclists organisation CTC here. I give my personal response below & have copied in my CTC colleague Richard Twigg. He is our local Rights/Planning Officer and may respond formally on CTC's behalf.</p> <p>Pleased to note that the existing cycle racks on Colliergate are to be retained. I represent CTC on the NY Police cycle theft task group. We've noted a recent reduction in theft at this location. I've forwarded your email to my police contact, Tanya Lyon, who may offer comment on whether the changes to the tree layout will impact on any current/planned CCTV surveillance of the racks.</p> <p>I note the proposal for a raised crossroads at ChurchSt/Colliergate junction. LTN 2/08 Cycle infrastructure design supports the principle of raised tables but caution in para 9.5.2 that .."The ramps for the table should be sufficiently far from junction mouths so that cyclists do not encounter them when turning. Buildouts, bollards and parking restrictions, as appropriate, may be needed to prevent parking around the junction."</p>	Noted. The ramps in the raised table will be located so that cyclists do not encounter them whilst turning.	Member of Public
	<p>A further problem that I've noted is of surface water collecting at the base of speed table ramps and freezing in winter. I trust that planned crossfall and drainage arrangements will be adequate to prevent this.</p> <p>I will defer to any advice which CoYC's Andy Vose may give you, during internal consultation.</p>	Noted.	/
R8	<p>The panel were generally pleased to see improvements made to the square however concern was raised about that the removal of the raised burial ground as this would remove the last vestiges of the church that had been demolished in 1937. The panel would like to see that marked in some way, perhaps by reusing the memorial slabs if their condition allowed. There was also concern with regard to the removal of the mature trees. The panel felt that it would be important for CYC to control any outdoor seating in order for it to achieve the outcomes required. There was concern that the surfacing from the Shambles would stop too abruptly and not have the flow as at present.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Historic interpretation.."</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "Trees: Do not support either option (1a or 1b)"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Management & use.."</p>	Conservation Area Advisory Panel

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R9	<p>Have had a look at the information board on PDF. Proposals generally look good. Comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go for removing the raised area - keep it all level and hence more usable • Include more seating around the outside - it's what makes a public place. Make sure it's flexible so it can be used from both sides - could just be raised pads rather than formal benches. • The sheet doesn't say much about lighting - it'll need to be interesting to make the space work well after dark • If you remove the raised area have you considered re-routing the vehicular link through to the markets across the south side of the square - it would then be shorter, leaving more space for pedestrian-priority surfaces. 	<p>Refer to analysis document under "2a Raised Area: remove the raised burial area and two raised trees in order to return the space to ground level" Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Historic interpretation.." Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Lighting.." Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design.."</p>	Member of Public
R10	<p>1 b) leave them positioned where they are 2 b) retain but refurbish the raised area (in particular, retain the trees on it) 3 c) no 4 Yes: improving the paving surface 5 Yes: losing any trees 6 Its relation to Colliergate. I'm in favour of the road surface between Boots and Barnitts being made to look as if that piece of road is part of the square, rather than a route for traffic. The whole area is usually heaving with trucks when I walk through at 10:00 am, which is unpleasant and unnecessary. 7 I am a) a York resident (I walk through King's Square on a regular basis on my way to work), and d) employed in York 8 b) no</p>	<p>There are formatted under structured questions. Please refer to analysis document for CYC comment & refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Vehicular management.."</p>	Member of Public
R11	<p>Firstly we would say that the mapping as reproduced is most unhelpful to people trying to understand the new scheme. It is too small and the shading too dark which renders the numbering etc illegible. Answers to questions 1 a then b 2 a 3 a yes and we approve of the extra bench seating too 4 Keen on encouraging pedestrians over traffic (see 6) therefore keen on widening pavements. Keen on reducing street signage etc clutter. 5 We're keen on trees and hope that any new trees will be as mature as possible. 6 We fail to understand why vehicles need to pass through the city centre, apart from deliveries within certain times and those bringing people with disabilities. Yet there seem to be ordinary vehicles frequently using the city centre. Is there interpretative material in the scheme about the history of the square? 7 a 8 b</p>	<p>There are formatted under structured questions. Please refer to analysis document for CYC comment & refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Vehicular management.." Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Historic Interpretation.."</p>	Member of Public

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R12	<p>I would like to be involved. Is there a meeting or are we just supposed to fill in the form? I'm particularly concerned with traffic / road markings. When is 'Highways' report due to be published?</p> <p>Currently there is no clear right of way for single lane traffic from Goodramgate meeting with two-way traffic on Church St. This was exacerbated by the change from a Stop order at the end of Petergate, when it became a 'GiveWay'. The end of Goodramgate ought to also be a GiveWay.</p> <p>During (soon to be even more limited) access hours there is a great deal of congestion at this junction caused by the existing poor thinking / marking and poor parking control enforcement and limited space to make deliveries.</p> <p>The 'drawing' shows no sign of improving this – only making it worse because delivery trucks have even less room to manoeuvre with the narrowing of the road and disabled drivers are being encouraged to park. This is a much needed 'loading' area such as at the end of Colliergate.</p> <p>Further, it is not clear if bollards have been removed on St Andrewgate. It shows two-way traffic. If Bollards were placed right at the end deliveries to Barnitts could come that way – so alleviating congestion. Indeed Disable bays could be placed all along there.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Vehicular management.."</p> <p>Re Bollards: these are not going to be removed on St Andrewgate</p>	Member of Public
R13	<p>If trees are to be removed... then remove the mulberry and one of the lime trees, whilst retaining 2 limes and crown lift one of these – see the attached annotated image.</p> <p>Reasoning: the mulberry has a limited contribution to the area. Retaining one of the roadside limes will maintain canopy cover on the east side of the square, balancing with the canopy of the lime in the SW (as viewed from the north of the square looking south), and the square will be opened up. The loss of the northern most lime tree will be noticed as viewed from St Andrewgate, but unlikely to have too much of a detriment as viewed from Low Petergate/Colliergate/Kings Court.</p> <p>Planting trees any closer to the road than the existing trees would be inappropriate in terms of establishing roots, a balanced canopy and keeping clear of services and other potentially damaging influences. If the intention is to restrict vehicles parking at the side of the square, street furniture (benches) could be used instead of trees.</p> <p>(See suggestion jpg)</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1c Trees: Do not support either option (1a or 1b)"</p>	Dan Calvert CYC

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R14	<p>I am very supportive of the projects aim's and suggested solutions. A thorough decluttering of excess street-furniture and signs etc would be welcome. A bit of uncertain caution by drivers / pedestrians etc is not such a bad thing sometimes in my view and tends to keep users alert.</p> <p>Although always reluctant to remove mature trees, i can see the benefit of doing so to open up the Square area, with new trees planted at the periphery. I have no strong views either way regarding the future of the raised area.</p> <p>My only comments would be a request that the 'ramp-ups' to the junction(s) are ideally done using sinusoidal profile blocks which tend to give a smoother transition for vehicles and cyclists as well as having a tendency to be more robust in terms of load-bearing and water-egress etc. Aesthetically, I personally think they give a neater finish to the appearance of road-humps / raised-tables too.</p> <p>(See photos)</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there aspects of the design you particularly like...Design Intent"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	<p>Richard Holland CYC</p>
	<p>Just a personal opinion would be to push the 'core design' materials a bit further into St. Andrewgate (possibly up to the start of the cycle parking) so that the termination point of the high quality surfaces doesn't look too stark. Also the existing cycle racks closest to King's Square are looking a bit shabby and new replacements would definitely improve the look of the area. Possibly the first rack (the one most visible from Kings Square) could be of a heritage style (i.e. similar to below, or bespoke), with normal standard racks thereafter.</p> <p>Although i like the traditional postbox where it is, it's a bit of a shame the adjacent phone box and cash machine can't go somewhere a bit less conspicuous. If they must stay put, could we at least have the phone box with no advertising panels? Or thinking outside of the box (no pun intended!), to truly enhance the feel of the Square (and also compliment the traditional red postbox) could we get a replica traditional red phonebox adjacent? It's certainly the type of thing a tourist city like York should have - foreign visitors would love to get the pics taken outside of it!</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	<p>/</p>
R15	<p>I think the trees should be left and the raised area retained. I strongly oppose cafe seating. I am a local resident with no disability issues.</p> <p>I strongly feel that the large York Chocolate Story permanent advert attached to the bicycle is an eyesore and is unnecessary so close to the actual premises. That can and should should be removed immediately without waiting the King's Square scheme to be finalised - other commercial premises would not be allowed to do it. The fact that it is fixed to a bicycle does not make it picturesque- the bicycle may give the impression that the advert is there temporarily but it is in fact permanent.</p>	<p>Refer to CYC comments in analysis document under structured questions Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R16	<p>After looking at the proposals for the transformation of Kings square and realising York historically has always been a centre for religious worship here are my ideas. IMHO</p> <p>There should be a level area throughout the whole of the city within the CBD, York will become more pedestrianised so the need for kerbs will diminish. York should be twinned with Rome and borrow some of their thoughts on city ideas and grandeur. The trees in Kings square do need spacing further out, three trees should be used, preferably fruit trees to highlight gods providence. As for the raised cemetery area a water feature would be a good addition, one incorporating a steady flow of water down a naturally looking rocky surface and an arch that pedestrians can walk under to depict the washing away of any sins. The problem York has is the weather, a glass canopy to allow greater use of the space even during the cooler months may make this space more attractive. I believe limited cafe seating should be allowed.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>
R17	<p>I am concerned that at point 12 on the Kings Square development consultation plan that you have included outside caf? seating area at the caf? Nero site. As a small Independent trading business owner in the immediate area near kings square at the top of the Shambles that offers similar caf? services we have already had to accommodate completion from the caf? at the Chocolate factory attraction in Kings Square. More additional outside seating in addition to the seating outside offered by the mobile van facilities all around us on the perimeter of the market will continue to affect our margins, income and business forcing us to leave the economy. We are a family business supporting local families, apprentices and school work experience placements.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No"</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>
R18	<p>Whilst broadly supportive of the proposals if the concerns of Councillor Jefferies are addressed with regard to disabled parking provision, and especially supportive of the use of better quality paving materials, I do not think it appropriate to progress this scheme at this time.</p> <p>The proposals would improved Kings Square but the general condition of paving and the highway in this vicinity do not warrant spending scarce council resources when the condition of roads and footpaths in many residential areas is dire. Sorry, I cannot be more positive but I hope you appreciate my view, the council needs to deal with the basics of highway maintenance before committing to schemes like this, however good the proposals are.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Priority/cost"</p>	<p>Cllr. Wartens</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R19	<p>As an ex horticultural/businesses in York, a committed person to improve York's Green infrastructure, member of YEF and Treemendous and attend YEPB, I wish support the aim to Reinvigorate York and to improve Kings Square</p> <p>But not to fell 75/100 year old trees in the square. How grey and not green it will be.</p> <p>Far to many mature trees have been taken out recently, Museum Gardens 3, Water End many, A59 several large trees and removal of mature tree/shrub landscape on A59/outer ring road roundabout. Askham outer ring road roundabout, horses eating trees, no enforcement control</p> <p>With the low level of trees in York and tree canopy reducing, we cannot continue keep felling mature trees. Replanting young trees takes 20/30 years to start to become a true value and still does not compensate for mature tree removal.</p> <p>Trees compliment buildings and create a greener, more sustainable environment, see attachment p40 for multiple benefits, climate change mitigation, well being, heat island effect, pollution filtration and absorb CO2,see Treemendous York (leaflet) for benefits</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are"</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>
	<p>Solution Option 1, leave two trees next to roadway, add seating and in ground low energy flood light to add value to branches Pic 134 (no need for (08) seating. This is a way of controlling traffic also remembering the burial area. Leave tree next Shambles. Take out Mulberry tree, replanting one extra large tree (see method below) nearer roadway</p> <p>Solution Option 2, Leave, do not disturb mature tree near Shambles. Take out Mulberry tree and two other trees alongside road and replant extra three large trees Compensation cost, prepare tree pit see p 54/67, crane in and plant/protect three extra large trees at a cost approx £1000 per tree, plus tree pit inc utility service cost and then extra cost to look after them p 73/77. Total cost could be £20K</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1c Trees: Do not support either options"</p>	<p>/</p>
	<p>Other evidence, on p20/21 embed trees into policy and other plans, COYC does not appreciate the benefits of value of tree canopy</p> <p>It is necessary to have a 'Manage & Monitor asset management approach's in York - CAVEAT provides a method for managing trees as public assets rather than liabilities p69/72</p> <p>These tree issues would be easier to solve if green infrastructure strategy and tree strategy were part of the local plan</p> <p>Evidence source - Please read (all page number references for guidance) are from Trees in the townscape 'A guide for decision makers' which the council leader endorsed p5, see attachment (see attachments)</p>	<p>noted</p>	<p>/</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R20	<p>I was at a meeting with blind and partially sighted people yesterday and the planned improvements for Kings Square was looked at. Although the group really wanted to help shape these developments we found it very difficult to get a grasp of what the actual plans were proposing (going by the attached leaflet).</p> <p>One of the group members had been to the exhibition at the library but found the information presented there inaccessible and no one was available to discuss aspects of the development with her.</p> <p>I know the deadline for the consultation is drawing near, but I wondered if someone could contact Mary Fairbrother, she is copied into the e-mail, to discuss the proposal and go through the options with her.</p> <p>maryfairbrother@btinternet.com</p>	<p>Further to this email we met Mary Fairbrother at the library (21.02.2013) and talked through the scheme in detail</p>	<p>RNIB (Yorkshire and Humber)</p>
	<p>In addition to this, I understand that The City of York Council are undertaking a number of improvements across the city centre, similar to Kings Square. It is vital that blind and partially sighted people are able to participate in the subsequent consultations, this may include talking through proposals with groups.</p> <p>Could you keep me informed when these consultations are taking place and make adjustments so that blind and partially sighted people can participate independently.</p>	<p>noted</p>	<p>/</p>
R21	<p>No means to complete the form on line -- why not?</p> <p>answers</p> <p>1 trees a</p> <p>2 d</p> <p>3 c</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 performers add a lot to life in the sq we need to help keep them</p> <p>Choc Story must NOT be allowed to take over - they are new to the area and have little to offer to residents - they may make money from visitors but CoYC does not HAVE TO aid them</p> <p>7 a</p> <p>8 b</p>	<p>Yes this is a good idea but we do not currently have this facility, so we rely on people visiting the web site downloading the form & returning it by post or simply emailing the responses as this person has done.</p>	<p>Parish Councillor</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R22	<p>A DISABILITIES campaigner has raised concerns about proposals to reduce the number of disabled parking spaces in a York square during a revamp.</p> <p>York Independent councillor Lynn Jeffries, who is herself disabled, claimed the plans for King's Square seem to fit into a pattern of a gradual tightening of restrictions on disabled motorists in the city centre. She said City of York Council had already scrapped some disabled parking bays outside the main library, and decided to restrict access to Davygate, and she wondered if there more such proposals now in the pipeline. She said she fully understood the desire to reduce the number of vehicles in the city centre to make it safer for pedestrians, but claimed there did not seem to be an understanding that more severely disabled motorists needed to be able to park right in the centre if they were to be able to go shopping.</p> <p>The Press reported yesterday how the council is planning a major investment in the square, which would increase the amount of space for pedestrians and street performers, and might also include the introduction of new cafe seating areas. But the extra space will partly be achieved through a narrowing of the road at one end of the square, which it is believed will result in a reduction of three or four disabled parking spaces.</p> <p>A council spokeswoman said the central objective of the King's Square project was to make more of the space feel like a 'pedestrian-focused environment.' She said: "The language of roads, such as asphalt, road signs and parked cars, make it currently difficult to achieve this objective, because people don't feel safe to wander in some places, so we are investing in the square to change this. "The whole of Colliergate, including Kings Square, is and will remain a blue badge parking zone, ie we will not be changing any traffic orders, and we have designated two disabled spaces specifically to encourage blue badge holders to park in this location."</p>	<p>Reply in the press: A council spokeswoman said the central objective of the King's Square project was to make more of the space feel like a 'pedestrian-focused environment. The language of roads, such as asphalt, road signs and parked cars, make it currently difficult to achieve this objective, because people don't feel safe to wander in some places, so we are investing in the square to change this. The whole of Colliergate, including Kings Square, is and will remain a blue badge parking zone, ie we will not be changing any traffic orders, and we have designated two disabled spaces specifically to encourage blue badge holders to park in this location."</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Priority/cost"</p>	<p>York Press 01/02/2013</p>
R23	<p>Can you please confirm - are you saying because the application for an outside cafe by one of the attractions on the square caused such a fuss that it had to be withdrawn, we as a council should apply next time for a licence for that area and then hire it out in an equitable fashion ?</p> <p>If this is to happen, I would suggest if we go that route we only allow a 1 year lease for anyone so that we can review their impact on the street traders, ambience and free flow of pedestrians in that area.</p> <p>Also it now appears that accessible parking was removed, i believed, to make a larger more aesthetically pleasing pedestrian area when in fact it is now suggested that that part is to become a cafe area - Im not sure how that sit in with it being more open.</p> <p>It clearly isn't an economic decision as we get next to nothing for on street cafe areas but receive far, far more for the street trader pitches. It would seem more financially prudent to have 2 street traders pitches at that point or just leave it openwhy do we always have to fill up every space we create in the city centre.</p>		<p>Cllr Crisp</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Happy with most of what you've said except the last sentence as I am actually suggesting we increase the income to the council by having street kiosk pitches which pay well, instead of cafe seating which pays abysmal rates and keep encroaching further and further out and along streets and then eventually stick out their A boards at each end.</p> <p>I've already raised the issue of the price of street cafe seating being raised in line with pitch rates but to no avail. I prefer neither in that space but if we have to have something then I was advocating a street kiosk or two which pays significantly more.</p> <p>However, I'm sure it will be an improvement whatever we do.</p>		/
R24	<p>Significance</p> <p>The present layout of Kings Square appears to date from 1937 when Holy Trinity Church (Christ Church) was demolished. The Square is the setting of numerous listed buildings and is an important part of York's Conservation Area.</p> <p>The flagstones which cover the majority of Kings Square form a coherent scheme and are rimmed to the west by sandstone setts with a pair of inset granite wheel tracks. This surface continues into Newgate and the Shambles. The layout of Kings Square is of some age, dating to 1937, though it is possible the flagstones were re-used at that time as they have a slightly more rugged appearance than the smooth stone commemorating the demolition of the church. They are of an appropriate size and scale to sit well in the square and to complement the buildings around it. The raised area of graveyard has stone paving flags and stone kerbstones which also appear to be of some age and inset are some 15 grave slabs, several of which are inscribed. It is not clear what lies beneath this raised area. A tarmac roadway runs along the north-east side of the square, and the paving along its north-eastern edge comprises concrete slabs, as is that on Church Street and Goodramgate to the north.</p>	Noted. The smooth stones referred to are possibly those of the 1975 repaving of the square. Historic photographs indicate that between 1937-1975 the square had a number of layout iterations.	English Heritage
	<p>There is a mature tree on the raised area, two semi-mature trees towards the roadway in the paved area (perhaps 50 or 60 years old?) and a smaller, less mature paper mulberry tree donated by Lewis Tree Surgery and planted in 2001 (noted on the associated plaque as having been planted by a former resident of the square and replacing a weeping ash).</p> <p>In its present form this place has high communal value in its role as a much frequented public square along with associative historic value for its role in commemorating the former Holy Trinity Church and its graveyard and evidential value for its archaeology.</p>		/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Impact</p> <p>The paving</p> <p>It is not clear whether the proposal and its variations would be based upon the retention of the existing paving, or whether alternative stone paving would be used. We would advocate the retention of all of the present York stone paving and stone cobbled surfaces, along with the granite wheel tracks and the kerbstones (relayed where necessary to provide a level surface). It would appear to us that the incorporation of the roadway area into the square could best be achieved by sourcing more natural stone cobbles and flags to match the others (i.e. preferably old ones) rather than by changing the existing paving to any great degree. We note that 'Directional paving will be used to border the road and hazard paving will be used to identify transition points into the level area'. We would wish any paving within the square to re-use the existing paving materials where possible and to be of natural stone which is visually compatible with them where it is not. We would encourage a design which has the present breadth and robustness rather than being broken up by an excess of visually intrusive details.</p>	<p>It is proposed that nearly all of the surfacing of Kings Square will be replaced. In this instance it is not practical to extensively reuse existing worn and damaged material, particularly where this surface causes mobility problems for some users. Recutting is also not practical. Where materials are of specific historic interest- such as gravestones or inscription plaques then we would seek to incorporate aspects of these where possible. It is proposed that taken up stone is reused elsewhere in the city centre for repairs, subject to finding suitable storage. The best way to create an accessible level surface executed with high quality workmanship with even surfaces, neat tight joints and robust enough to withstand vehicular overrun is to use new sawn quarried stone of known provenance/standards.</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...historic interest"</p>	/
	<p>The raised area</p> <p>The proposed removal of the raised area would remove an important visual clue to the former presence of the church. It is not clear what would become of the grave slabs if the raised area was lowered. English Heritage considers the continued presence of these in the square is important, in order to maintain the historical link with the former church and its graveyard. However, if they were laid in the general paving rather than being set aside in an area with less footfall, as at present, we have concerns that this could lead to unnecessary and undesirable erosion, which would reduce their readability and historic interest. Their retention as part of a retained raised area may reduce such harm.</p>	<p>Whilst this is not completely clear we interpret this as recommending the retention of the raised area. Refer to analysis document under "2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area"</p>	/
	<p>Trees</p> <p>The present trees help to give liveliness, scale, interest and shade to the square. We question the feasibility of successfully moving the two ground level trees which are of some size and maturity. We also question the necessity and desirability of doing so and suggest any scheme instead works around them. We suggest that the views of the donors of the paper mulberry tree are specifically sought before any decision is made to move or remove this. We would wish the mature tree on the raised area to be retained in situ. The trees are presumably protected in their present locations, being within the conservation area. Presumably the views of your Council's Tree Officer will be sought.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are" Yes, the councils tree officer has been consulted. Please refer to R13</p>	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>Street furniture and potential for café seating The present selection of street furniture is generally of low visual quality (particularly the large black plastic bins) and we suggest the potential to introduce better quality street furniture is considered.</p> <p>We welcome in principle the potential for some café seating, if this is achievable without undue clutter. However we are not clear whether this would entail screening of the areas in question, which would constrict the appearance of space within the square</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design.."</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "3a (Do you support) Cafe Seating: Yes, in the location shown on the plan"</p>	/
	<p>Recommendation We recommend that the above comments are fully considered in order to maintain the significance of this part of the conservation area and the settings of the listed buildings within it.</p>	noted	/
R25	<p>See Dementia Design document. Thank you so much for your reply and your encouragement to us to contribute.</p> <p>Time is tight and I don't claim in any way to be an expert on this issue. However, I have put together a list (see attached) of some of the general points relating to the physical environment which have come out of the York Dementia without Walls project, as well as some more specific guidance from 2 or 3 other sources of expertise.</p> <p>I do hope these can be passed on to those responsible for finalising the Kings Square scheme, and will prompt them – if they haven't already done so – to think about the plans in relation to people with dementia.</p> <p>If the York Dementia without Walls Action Alliance can help you in any other way – either on this or on other stages of the ReInvigorate work – please do not hesitate to ask. As I mentioned before, I am sure we could help to broker a meeting with one of the experts in this field, if only to comment on the proposal in the light of the latest knowledge about what works for people with dementia in terms of physical environment.</p> <p>It would be terrific if these developments can reflect and demonstrate York's ambition to become a truly dementia-friendly city.</p>	<p>We have read the general guidance and agree with the findings. Please note: The design proposal current holds Wayfinding proposals in abeyance, pending a wider city review. We also welcome the involvement of York Dementia Without Walls and have corresponded to agree to meet and coordinate input on the wider Reinvigorate York programme</p>	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
R26	<p>On behalf of myself and Graham Terry (who is on leave this week, so unable to contact you directly), can we also give our support to Philly's offer to arrange a meeting with an expert on dementia design, in order to contribute to the consultation, potentially after the consultation period if it's not possible to do this within the timescales.</p> <p>Graham and myself are on the Dementia Without Walls Steering Group with Philly, so can provide a link from the council. We're pleased that you are keen for the groups involvement with the wider series of Reinvigorate York Schemes.</p>	Refer to R26 comments	Catherine McGovern, CYC

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R27	<p>In principal I do not have any objections to the proposed make over for King's Square as I have for many years felt that this well used Square (by both residents and vistors) was in need of some improvements. However, I would not like to see it lose it's special identity as a designated space for people to sit and enjoy the street theatre etc.</p> <p>Please ensure that the facility for these activities are enhanced, not removed or reduced.</p> <p>As one of the main pedestrian routes to the Shambles it is also a very special location in the City and any improvements must ensure this remains.</p> <p>In the 1970's I owned Sound Effect Records at 5 King's Square and paid for a street bench with plaque as my contribution towards the Council's re-development of the Square at that time. This bench is still located there and still acts as a landmark to many people who shopped/visited Sound Effect during that period. I would like assurances that the named bench will be retained.</p> <p>Please contact me should you wish to discuss my views/suggestions further.</p>	<p>We agree that this should feel a special and unique place. We will be in touch regarding the bench. We have not made detailed decisions on benches at this stage. It is however likely that the existing bench will be replaced.</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R28	<p>From what I have seen on web site and the exhibition, it would appear that the idea of an amphitheatre has been shelved, I think this is a great pity as it would have been in keeping with the City's history as well as being a novel concept for street performers to ply their trade, it would appear also there is a strong influence of a street cafe, whereas at present we have 2/3 stalls selling small items of food that gives a certain tone to the square I fear a more commercial venture would be detrimental.</p>	<p>Concerning the cafe, please note that the option that includes this locates it in the reclaimed space of the current lay by. We feel that this is the best place for it, if it was to go ahead, given the constraints of the site (ie not in the middle of the space as was suggested by the withdraw planning application for cafe seating last year). We also feel that the provision is modest. Out of interest, the feedback of the public on the consultation so far about the desirability of this proposal is currently pretty spit (for or against this). This is considerably more favourable than it was for the planning application, which was overwhelmingly against it. We are also going to suggest that if this went ahead the best way to manage it would be for the council to apply for planning permission, as we have done for St Sampson's Square. This way we can be more equitable with the allocations of licensing. We also feel that to omit an option at all at this stage exposes us to the danger of potential further planning applications for cafe seating (anywhere in the square) in the future that we have no way of immediately refusing (albeit that they would go through a planning process). This way we can say we have considered it already and it makes it much easier to turn down such approaches in the future.</p>	<p>Cllr Watson</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>As you would expect I am rather disappointed that the amphitheatre idea seems to be a no go maybe the bleacher seating could be in a bench style to give a stone appearance.</p> <p>In another scheme the raised area with the gravestones could this area be tidied up and possibly made larger to accommodate the performers ?</p> <p>As to the cafe area I still feel this will detract from the " casual" ambiance that the square emits, the stalls have a certain attraction to visitors and residents supplying something of a change to an organised set up. And on the financial side they give us a far larger income – a point we need to take into consideration in the economic climate of today</p>	<p>I am aware of the amphitheatre suggestion – Cllr Watson's idea was forwarded a while ago by Ron Cooke. An earlier iteration of the design proposals for Kings Square had a curved continuous bespoke seat creating an amphitheatre type effect, albeit not tiered. We did therefore think along similar lines for a while. We also investigated the idea of using the topography of the site (a fall from top to bottom) to introduce a slightly sunken tiered seat but there are far too many services in the area to make this feasible. In addition, when looking in detail at everything we need to accommodate in the square, including a considerable amount of delivery vehicles for part of the day (which we do not have the remit to change), we found that there wasn't space for this arrangement without anticipating pedestrian congestion in places. It is also worth mentioning that our discussions with the street performers have also introduced the idea of introducing bleacher seating if the raised platform was removed (tiers of removable seating) and we are currently considering if this is possible/practical.</p>	<p>Cllr Watson</p>
<p>R29</p>	<p>The YOPA Executive Committee members discussed these proposals at a meeting on the 11 February 2013. There was not an overall view held in terms of the detail contained in the proposals for Kings Square, i.e. Where and how many trees there should be, with each member expressing their own particular preferences about the various detailed proposals. It is likely that the consultation approach you are taking will result in similar varied individual responses from the general public and this approach in our opinion could lead to a disjointed set of developments across the City. Therefore, we believe that the approach taken by CYC to consult separately in detail for each of the six different areas of the City Centre is wrong and an approach that addresses the main issues across all six areas should be adopted. The issues that affect Older People are well documented having been addressed many times in previous CYC consultations. These issues should be given a high regard in any final decisions that are made in all six developments taken together to ensure that the City Centre as a whole is accessible in all respects for Older People.</p>	<p>Before we began thinking about designs for the six projects we commissioned specialist consultancy organisation "Centre for Accessible Environments" to consider access issues for a range of communities of interest, including older people and I believe members of the YOPA were involved in this study. Their findings were then documented in an audit and recommendations report. These documents then informed the development of specific projects. We feel this is an appropriate starting point and that a specific consultation is necessary for the different sites because of their differences.</p>	<p>York Older People's Assembly (YOPA)</p>
<p>R30</p>	<p>Options 1 and 2 - see sketches. My only other comment would be that on examining the floorscape for indications of underground utilities I feel that to move the sites for new trees towards the road would be difficult if not impossible.</p>	<p>These options mostly concern the trees and raised area. NB. Awaiting option 2</p>	<p>Member of Public</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R31	<p>I was given a flyer from the Library on Kings Square Improvement Project. I would like to add that some money could go on improving the pavement on Colliergate on Tulliver's side. It slopes badly and too near the road to be safe, especially for the handicapped. One foot is uphill and the other downhill. With regard to the plans shown, it is very difficult to see exactly how it will be without a clear drawing in colour. I am opposed to the Chocolate Factory having tables outside for their own benefit. It would also be their territory and our weather does not permit an outside cafe culture. We have plenty of cafes around and they can service coffee inside their own premises. I would like to see proper drawings of the plans if possible. However, I do feel strongly about the Chocolate Factory having their tables set outside in Kings Square. This is also not fair to other cafes in the area. I hope my letter to you will mean something.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Priority/cost" Refer also to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: Not"</p>	Member of Public
R32	<p>(Link L45) We have no objections to the scheme, and indeed believe it will enhance this area and encourage more people into the city centre. We have two points which we would like you to consider:- 1) There is a large traffic control sign situated outside our Thomas the Baker shop on the Church Street junction. Would it be possible to re-position this sign within the scheme, as it currently obscures our shop frontage? We plan to give our shop a major re-fit in 2014, which will enhance this area, and we feel the re-positioning of this sign would be of clear benefit to Thomas the Baker, and the general appearance of the area.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	Business Owner
	<p>2) As identified in the questionnaire, we would like consideration to be given to deliveries during and after the works. We are dependent, more than many other retail trades, upon the frequency of delivery. The deliveries have to be made at frequent intervals during the morning, in order to preserve the freshness of the products which are to be retailed. The success of our business has been built up on the daily fresh products we provide, and we would obviously like this to continue. We hope you will give consideration to these points, but if you need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...timing of construction works"</p>	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R33	<p>I have responded to the City of York Council's consultation (ref C23). Under question 6 "Are there any other factors to be considered", I have responded as follows:</p> <p>"The raised area of Kings Square is, of course, the site of Holy Trinity Church and is, as such, consecrated ground. The lowering of the raised area, which I support, will have to be done sensitively with regard to the archeology of the site and the reverent disposal of any human remains that are found. Set in the raised paved area are about 12 ledgerstones that were presumably part of the floor of the church. These survive in more or less legible condition and are of importance. Consideration must be given to their future. Discarding them or destroying them is really not a possibility."</p> <p>I find it difficult to understand why, in the public consultation, there is a stated incorrect identification of the raised area as the 'burial ground'. The bigger area of the square is the ancient churchyard.</p> <p>In fact, I would assume that the whole of the paved 'island' of Kings Square is historically consecrated ground which may or may not have been formally deconsecrated.</p> <p>Has any consideration been given by the City Council to this aspect?</p>	<p>We will consider this- yes a very sensitive area. We are aware that the graveyard extended beyond the raised area and that the former church footprint could also include graves (we currently think the raised area is likely to be a construction of the church demolition process). Normally we have referred to this raised area as a "burial area" for simplicity of description (where as it is more likely to be a charnel pit- but we don't know for sure), but don't normally refer to it as the "burial ground" This would have been a grammatical mistake. Apologies if this has been in any way misleading. We need to do lots more investigation- this public consultation is to gauge public opinion on a range of design directions and dependent on the outcome we will do more technical work. Refer also to analysis document under "Are there any other factors to be considered...Archaeology/Consecrated ground"</p>	Member of Public
	<p>I have since found online the 1852 map of York. This is quite informative <http://www.york1852.org/>.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there any other factors to be considered...Disabled Parking"</p>	
	<p>Can the ledgerstones be raised and relocated in an appropriate building? One can only assume that these historical artifacts were originally part of the flooring inside Holy Trinity Church, King's Square.</p> <p>They vary in condition from poor to good. One is unfortunately seriously cracked, but possible to repair.</p> <p>A national survey of ledgerstones is now under way <http://www.lsew.org.uk/> and I have already made the Honorary Secretary, John Vigar, aware of these in King's Square.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "Are there any other factors to be considered...Disabled Parking"</p>	

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R34	<p>Since I consider the response form for the above consultation flawed, as was the case with the earlier Davygate one, and lacking what should be expected from proper consultation I would like to make the following observations on the proposals: As a York resident and regular user of the area I believe that removing the existing double yellow lines and replacing them with two disabled parking bays is a major reduction in disabled parking availability in York. As far as I am aware there are no 'official' blue badge bays in York outside of those within car parks (none of which are truly city centre) and the two now labelled something like 'Library Users only' outside Explore.</p> <p>Any tree work should consider the current absence of trees in York and rather than reducing the number should attempt to increase it.</p> <p>The burial area is a historic feature and should be improved to make people understand its previous usage.</p> <p>Given this proposal and the planned pedestrianisation of Davygate, it is about time the Council and its officers made proper efforts to consult with York's residents with disabilities, particularly those who have to handle a wheelchair from vehicle to destination across a range of obstacles.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "4 Are there aspects of the design you particularly like...seating"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No"</p> <p>Refer also to analysis document under "4 Are there aspects of the design you particularly like...design"</p>	Member of Public
R35	<p>As a disabled driver I am very concerned about the proposed alterations to the road and parking at Kings Square which will mean the removal of the on-road disabled parking. Replacing these with just 2 allocated bays is definitely not sufficient. Can this be reconsidered please especially as turning Davygate into a pedestrian zone will also deminish disabled parking.</p>		Member of Public
R36	<p>See also C50. The raised area? I have no strong feelings either way on this, although in some ways I feel the clutter in the north east corner of the square will be more noticeable if it is free standing.</p> <p>Trees? I do like the very tall tree at the top of the Shambles, but can see that the other trees could be superseded by ones which discourage pigeons, and stand further towards what is currently the street.</p> <p>I am in favour of more public sitting places. I think the spacious feeling of the Square, and space for the performers are both very important.</p> <p>A street café can be enlivening, but there are already lots of those around York and only one performing Square of the calibre of Kings Sq. If there are tables, they should not take over.</p> <p>I gather the phone boxes will be reduced to 2. If the raised area remains I think they should be alongside it in an east/west alignment, rather than projecting across the foot flow and visual link with the Minster.</p> <p>Also, I am surprised that planning allows the boxes to be used as commercial advertising hoardings in the environs of what surely is a conservation area. I find it difficult to believe that I would be allowed to erect and profit from similar adverts on my building.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are."</p> <p>Refer to analysis document under "2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area."</p> <p>Refer to analysis document under "3a (Do you support) Cafe Seating: Yes, in the location shown on the plan."</p> <p>Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...pedestrian management & use"</p>	Business Owner

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R37	<p>York Festival Trust is the Registered Charity, focused on education through the arts, which has been used for the past 15 years by the York Guilds and Companies to deliver quadrennial productions of York's Mystery Plays.</p> <p>These productions take the Plays in traditional style on to the City streets on pageant wagons. Our comments on the Kings Square proposal therefore centre mainly on the use of the space for performance, but we feel that some of the comments are relevant to the general use of the space. Our next production is July 2014 and we are currently considering which areas of the City to use.</p> <p>We used the Square in 1998 and 2002 as a performance space. In 1998 the wagons performed with backs to Kings Court and in 2002 at the end of the square facing Boots. On both occasions the main issues were over 'taking control' of the space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * road traffic was noisy * despite stewarding and earlier discussions with Highways, the volume of road traffic was at times unsafe * the Square is fed by 7 access points with pedestrians and this turns the square into a thoroughfare with most foot traffic pushing towards Shambles and the Market. The flow of pedestrians needs to be considered in the scheme as it caused us problems in both years. * there were difficulties in dealing with vendors 	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road" Refer to analysis document under "2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area" Refer to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No" Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered....Design" Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered....Pedestrian Management & Use"</p>	York Festival Trust
	<p>Our view is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * the current trees and seating along the road side should remain to provide screening and a barrier between the road and the space. * Placing trees at the 'entrance' to the square near Thomas would restrict access to the space * The current raised area should remain; it provides screening and the existing footpath alongside of Tullivers allow foot traffic to move around the square so that people do not feel they are becoming involved or are interrupting a performance. In addition the raised area provides an historical reference, as well as impromptu seating and staging. It adds character to the Square. Refurbishment is certainly required. * Cafe seating, whilst providing some benefits for the general feel of the space, should be kept to a minimum and CYC should resist attempts by larger business concerns in the vicinity to dominate the space * Protocols should exist to remove vendors and seating from the Square when performances take place <p>We made the decision after 2002 that Kings Square, despite being the only original medieval playing station available to us, was totally unsuitable as a performance space for our productions.</p> <p>We hope that the improvements may change that view.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are" Refer to analysis document under "2c Raised Area: Do not support either option (2a or 2b)" Refer to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No" Refer to analysis document under "Are there things you particularly like...Design" Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	/

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R38	<p>you claim to want to avoid this. Also you imply the tree on the raised area would go completely - if this goes another one should be planted. Three trees are marked on the map.</p> <p>2. b) keep the raised area and use as a stage so refurbish it to this end - better for people watching - encourage performers to use this raised area. So a bit of revamp to the design would be needed.</p> <p>3. c) No area which is currently public should become under the control of a commercial company even if they are paying rent to the council. There could be better facilities for self-catering visitors eg for picnics.</p> <p>4. Hope the different colours for the roads and paths, and the bollards etc do the trick of giving higher priority to people on foot.</p> <p>5. Could become to resemble any other made-over area with concrete, manufactured reconstituted stone, olde worlde bins etc rather than being more imaginative. Not much detail given of the 'natural materials' that are proposed.</p> <p>6. How do the various traders get to use the space? Tell residents about how this comes about. eg cartoonists, lemonade sellers, there were reindeer at Xmas. There could be other local businesses and social enterprises that could have some sessions and there could be proactive support for them.</p> <p>Do not bring in those portable flower arrangements. Work with local traders and</p>		Member of Public

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R39	<p>which is old enough to have developed some character. Established mature trees are increasingly rare in the city centre. I can think of four which have been felled in the last year or so just within the small city centre area I pass through frequently, most recently a tree outside St Crux, not far away. If felling the trees, please don't plant any more in their place, but instead replant proper large trees beyond the centre where they can grow to maturity. It seems the city centre doesn't have the space for mature trees, so any replants would get in the way a decade or so on?</p> <p>2) c) Raised area. Definitely retain, don't refurbish the platform itself as this will remove the character and quirkiness. People should still be able to accidentally discover the headstone including the word 'encomiums' (please don't deliberately make a feature of it, this would remove its charm)</p> <p>3) c) Cafe seating. No, definitely not. There isn't room. Tired of hearing about this. Of benefit only to one business, as far as I can tell, and no one seems to want it but them. All previous objections expressed by residents in response to the planning application still apply. Not practical to have customers carrying hot drinks across a busy narrow space.</p> <p>4/5) Design. In general I like the place as it is, though can see it's a bit scruffy, 'phone box corner' in particular, and the tarmac road could do with a different surface. Like the idea of a change in paving on the road areas to emphasise the pedestrian-friendliness and make vehicles slow down.</p> <p>I really like the present line of worn and characterful cobbles in front of Chocolate Story etc, really think they should be retained. Though also can't see how that could work with the suggested paving which will presumably look more modern.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p> <p>Refer to analysis document under "1b Trees: Leave them positioned where they are"</p>	Member of Public
	<p>6) Other factors I'm concerned about the disabled parking bays, which seem to have been reduced? I don't use them personally but I have friends who do, and I get the impression that there are very few disabled parking spaces in the city centre already. It really wouldn't be acceptable at all to reduce the disabled parking space to fit in cafe tables.</p> <p>I do think an important factor is the 'unselfconscious charm' the place has acquired over the last 70 years or so since the church was removed. I hope this won't be entirely lost, by too much smartening,</p> <p>7) I am a) a York resident</p> <p>8) no, no mobility impairments</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area" / Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R40	<p>The square is an important public open space within the area defined as the “medieval streets” character area by the Central Historic Core conservation area appraisal. The street network close to the square is the most picturesque within the city centre, having an intimate scale formed by a wide variety of historic buildings in informal combination. An important “local dynamic view” has been identified looking from Kings Square towards the west towers of the Minster.</p> <p>I agree with the assessment and aims of the scheme and offer the following comments on the project proposals (though I defer to Esther if comments on trees differ):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The openness of the square dates from the demolition of Holy Trinity Church (or Christ Church) in the early C20th, though the church had already become redundant and reduced in size well before then. Open space is a resource which should be treasured within the city centre (see draft public space manual) and extending the static area would be welcome. However the margin adjacent to the road on the NE side (shown as setts) should be a continuation of the large scale stone flags to signal that it is part of the space rather than the route (the drop off/DDA parking point in setts though should remain) • If there is remaining life in the trees, the ground level ones should not be moved at this stage. Consider succession planting for the future though. It is important to preserve the view towards the Minster which has been identified in the cons area appraisal. The existing line of trees would still work as edge definition as the paving stones run below the canopies. The line doesn't need to move outwards necessarily as they still help to define the triangular shape of the space. 	<p>Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Design"</p>	<p>Janine Riley, CYC Conservation Architect</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the raised area had no historic associations I would be supportive of its removal to make the most of the openness to be gained here. However it is an embodiment of the church remains and it has acquired a role which gives the square a distinctive and successful use as it acts as a podium; so it should be retained. • The raised area has several roles:- as a platform, as a perch, as a place to allow discreet passage between streets (eg Shambles to Colliergate SW side) without cutting through the crowds or across the performance. If it was redesigned to make the edges work better as seats it would become a place of "advantage" for more people when there is no performance. • The dais appears "make shift" and its design should be reconsidered - perhaps lowered with the steps running across the frontage, if not around 2/3 sides. Hopefully the gravestones could be reset in-situ and the cracks grouted up. The existing pinched access is poor and has no other purpose. • Threshold conditions of buildings should be respected at the south side of the square when the paving is relayed. These buildings are listed and hopefully levels could be modified to enable more level access without exacerbating damp problems internally. • Page 234 of the CHCCA appraisal has an image of the Shambles from around 1900. The street surfaces have been re-laid but the choice and layout of materials preserves the character of the narrow street. The former Department of the Environment Circular 8/87 sets out the importance of retaining "traditional floorscapes". The layout and use of materials in the Shambles was copied in the Swinegate area when it was redeveloped. This type of floorscape is now associated with York's historic streets. 	<p>Refer to analysis document under "3c (Do you support) Cafe Seating: No"</p>	<p>/</p>

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sinuous way the above materials flow through from Newgate and the Shambles and into Kings Square is particularly pleasing, especially when it rains and the different materials catch the light. We should not underestimate the value of old or worn materials used in historic towns. People expect to see them whether the experience is subliminal or not. • Petergate runs from Bootham Bar to King's Square and preserves the line of the Via Principalis of the Roman fortress. Colliergate continues the line of the road SE on what is considered to be the alignment of the Roman Road. The tabled crossing seems to undermine the historic importance of the road by marking the area in setts as a place in its own right. The large scale flags should be continued around the corners of the buildings as a threshold space. The raised table should only be introduced if the whole area is being raised to be level, otherwise it interrupts pedestrian. • If Colliergate is reduced in width to deter traffic there would be benefits to pedestrians and businesses. Perhaps the reduction should be centred on the middle of the street so that the pavement running along the NE is also increased slightly. • If kiosks are introduced to provide facilities that cannot be accommodated within the buildings then they should be small and open sided. The closed rectangular unit outside the Chocolate Museum is a large solid obstruction within the area, and it looks poor. 	<p>If we use granite we will not use rounded cobbles. The granite will be machine sawn and together they will create a flat even surface. The granite will have a mechanical treatment to the surface to improve its slip resistance.</p>	/
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary privatization of the public realm should only be allowed where it would not adversely affect freedom of movement and enjoyment of the space. Spaces like St Helen's Square and King's Square are too small to accommodate outdoor cafe areas without inhibiting freedom of expression. There are cafes and pubs around the square already. • Co-ordination of street furniture would be welcome. It was extremely varied and of poor quality until the recent removals. 	<p>Refer to analysis document under "1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road" Refer to analysis document under "2b Raised Area: Retain but refurbish the raised area" Refer to analysis document under "3a (Do you</p>	/
R41	<p>THE CORE DESIGN PROPOSAL 2b Please will you seriously reconsider using GRANITE SETTS for this area because granite is a major health and safety hazard when used as outside paving. As a local inhabitant I use the Kings Square area almost every day and see that many other people both able and disabled have tricky and sometimes painful walking on the granite cobbles on walkways both to and in the market. Granite has the property of being slippery when wet and so is treacherous in such as rain: even a foggy mist can make it dangerous to walk on. A light fall of fine snow increases this danger; deep snow that hides granite from the unsuspecting visitor further increases this danger. Frost and ice especially create a surface on granite that is lethal. Because of the above, I am suggesting that slip resistant coverings are used in York whenever an opportunity presents.</p>	<p>Refer to anlysis document under "4 Are there aspects of the design you particularly like...Design" Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Disabilities"</p>	Member of Public

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
R42	<p>1) Trees - I would be happy to see the existing two trees in the Square removed and young trees placed closer to the roadway.</p> <p>2) Burial area - This area should be retained and refurbished - it forms a perfect stage for street performers raised above the level of the square. It also seems to me to be well used for sitting in when performances are not taking place. Neither of the trees here should be removed.</p> <p>3) Cafe seating - I support the inclusion of limited cafe seating.</p> <p>4) I would be pleased to see the line of the Roman fortress wall marked. I would also be pleased to see some of the clutter removed.</p> <p>5) I believe that the existing materials, York stone paving and granite setts marking Kings Court are most appropriate for York and would be unhappy to see these replaced. The experience elsewhere in York where concrete block setts have been used is disastrous with these proving difficult to clean and apparently impossible lay without coming up again in a few months.</p> <p>6) It is likely that burials and the remains of the church formerly standing in Kings Square will be quite close to the surface. This will need to be taken into consideration when any works are carried out. It is essential that any relaying of stone setts is done properly with an effective base layer to reduce the likelihood of slabs moving after it has rained. This will require proper supervision and snagging on completion of the project.</p> <p>7) I am a York resident.</p> <p>8) I have no mobility impairment.</p>	<p>Refer to analysis document under "6 Are there other factors regarding Kings Square that should be considered...Disabilities"</p> <p>Refer to analysis document under "1a Trees: remove the two ground level trees if we can add replacement trees further out towards the road"</p>	Member of Public
R43	<p>Square. It was most encouraging to note that you had given considerable thought to the needs of blind and partially sighted (BPS) people.</p> <p>From my perspective, the most important factors are to make sure that there are safe crossings places provided for the roads, that there is clear demarcation between the 'road' and the pedestrianised area and that street furniture is suitably positioned.</p> <p>Having looked at the area, I see that there is currently a marked access road to the market through the square. At present, in my experience, this entrance is rarely used. I can only hope that your plans do not make access easier and so encourage more vehicular use. Under these plans this 'road' will be a shared used facility which would become more hazardous for BPS people to use if the volume of traffic increased. I understand you are planning a visual demarcation between the 'road' and 'pavement' but as you stated it also needs a physical barrier. You were discussing using seating to do this which would be relatively easy for BPS to locate and useful to the public. I would be most unhappy to see further use of the bollards, such as those in Coney Street because it is all too easy for BPS people to walk into them.</p>		York Blind and Partially Sighted Society

No.	Consultation Response	Officer response	Address
	<p>It was most encouraging to note that you planned to put crossings with tactile markings on all the roads at the junction and on Colliergate. Personally, I would prefer the Colliergate crossing to be at the end of St Andrewsgate rather than near Tullivers as I regularly walk down St Andrewsgate and across the square.</p> <p>It does seem a pity to fell the long established trees but I think it could make the area feel lighter and more spacious. My only comment would be to position any replacement trees so that the risk of BPS people walking into them is minimised.</p> <p>With regard to the raised area, I do not think whether it was removed or retained would have a significant impact on the mobility of BPS people using the square.</p>		/
R44	<p>I have a few comments regarding cycling.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No mention is made of cycling in the documents I have seen. 2. A good long-term plan would ensure good cycling links across-town in lines parallel to Coney Street. 3. As a step towards this, I suggest that cycle routes should be allowed for along Colliergate (in both directions if possible) up to St Andrewsgate, and possibly up to Petergate also. Cyclists should give way to pedestrians but should not be excluded completely. 4. The image captioned "Tree positions extent the effective size ..." shows two big red barriers. They are not mentioned in the text. I hope they are a printing error! 		Member of Public