

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>General</b>	<p>Support – agree with the preferred approach in Policy YC1 and believe in principle the city centre boundary should be expanded to incorporate a wider area to ensure an appropriate surrounding context for the city centre to be maintained and preferably enhanced.</p> <p>Comment – it is not demonstrated that the proposed new boundary is appropriate to maintain and enhance the city centre so more explanation is needed.</p>	59/12635	Dunnington Parish Council
	<p>Comment – whilst the Council has made efforts to improve the aesthetics and environmental quality of the city centre certain areas still need urgent attention including the whole of Castle Piccadilly which has been allowed to deteriorate for decades, the western section of the inner ring road and its traffic and pollution problems, the rail/bus interchange, access roads such as Walmgate, Bootham, Station Road and Nunnery Lane.</p>	2416/6595	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre</b>	Support – the county council supports policies that seek to promote the redevelopment of sustainable central sites including those within the city centre.	11/11675	North Yorkshire County Council
	Support – the university supports this policy. Objection - Education and sport are not mentioned as City Centre uses. With 2 universities and 2 schools represented, this needs be added. For criterion vii) add: 'including promotion as venues for water sports' Comment - in the supporting text, it is considered that it needs to emphasise the universities growth agenda in terms of student numbers and physical estate, e.g. redevelopment of buildings on Lord Mayor's Walk campus. On contributions, the University provides the Ebor Lectures in the Minster (ref recent visit of Desmond Tutu) and an annual programme of public lectures with high profile speakers.	38/12913	York St John University
	Comment - Criterion vii). Both the River Ouse and the River Foss are important regional wildlife corridors supporting protected species such as otter. Enhancing the river frontages needs to be carried out with due regard to protecting biodiversity. For example the recent improvements to the open space next to the Castle Museum and the River Foss has been designed for both people and wildlife rather than creating a paved area.	42/11706	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
	Objection – the policy should include an environmentally sustainable consideration in the developmental principles, e.g. encouraging green space and actively increase biodiversity in the city centre. Criterion xiii) should focus on environmental sustainability in the context of climate change since all other points cover economic and social sustainability.	90/12828	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	Objection – the policy describes the city centre as the 'social and cultural heart of York'. Whilst it is appreciated that planning classifications may define them under a variety of use classes, would like to see the facilities provided by voluntary, community and social enterprise (VSCE) organisations more clearly identified in the policy list of development types. These types of developments fulfil a crucial role in heart of the city and should be reflected and listed as 'acceptable' in principle alongside the current list. Comment- believes that several of the principles (especially i –vi and x) could be supported through a co-ordinated effort to development a 'voluntary and community quarter'. This could include more VCSE-led retail, leisure, heritage buildings, city greenspace and community space as well as more traditional VCSE office and service delivery points. Obvious starting points could include Mickelgate and Monkgate/Goodramgate as they already have established co-located VCSE tenants.	178/13895	York Council for Voluntary Service

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – add a criterion xii) 'to encourage the upkeep and conservation of historic buildings'.	188/13938	
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre Continued</b>	Support – support the aim to enhance the River Ouse and Foss and their frontages, turning them into attractive, vibrant and bustling environments with improved access to the riverside and linkages to the city centre. City centre is currently disconnected from the rivers and many visitors miss the opportunity of accessing and enjoying the river front. Improved signage and access points should be encouraged to help direct people to the rivers. Existing and new moorings should be promoted to enable visitors to arrive and stay in York, helping to boost the local visitor economy.	210/14026	Canal & River Trust
	Support – overall would endorse the strategy set out for the city centre and welcome the recognition given to the need to ensure that its heritage assets are appropriately managed. Support the development principles, especially criterion i – iv, vii, viii and xi. Together these principles should help to safeguard and enhance those elements which contribute to the special character of this part of York. Objection – the policy should also include an intention to improve/enhance those elements which currently detract from its character. Suggest amending first paragraph line 1 to read 'its special qualities and distinctiveness will be conserved and enhanced whilst...'	238/14066	English Heritage
	Support – Yorkshire Water support the inclusion of Policy YCC1 criterion x. , which states that community and recreational facilities, including green space, should be provided to help combat the effects of flooding.	295/14158	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Objection – disappointed that the plan does not mention city centre theatres. It is usual in policy documents for UK cities to recognise the benefits of having theatres that provide the basis for the evening economy, important for city centres. The bullet points for development types omit theatres which are sui generis even though this category is listed in the Glossary and is mentioned in other policies. Suggest that the leisure bullet point includes arts and entertainment which are use class D2 (assembly and leisure) and sui generis (theatres and nightclubs). The evening economy should be included to ensure that a range of leisure and cultural facilities are provided which offer jobs and entertainment for visitors and residents.	299/14144	The Theatres Trust
	Comment – disused shops/buildings in the city centre should be used for affordable housing.	837/16924	
	Support – the preferred approach covers all the relevant issues.	943/16950	
	Support – the expressed intention that the city centre will remain a focus for a number of development types is supported in principle. The emphasis on accessibility and	1264/17152	Highways Agency

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sustainable transport is also supported.		
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre Continued</b>	Support – welcomes the spirit of paragraph ii in the hope that the error of placing bus stops immediately in front of the prime view of the Merchant Adventurers Hall is not repeated elsewhere and that in the light of this policy these bus stops may be removed.	1422/17377	York Merchant Adventurers Company
	Support – agree with the preferred approach.	1457/17392	
	Objection – whilst the policy does provide a local approach it appears to be missing the sequential approach, one key element of planning for town centre development. Paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Authorities to apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses. Whilst Policy R3 includes reference to the sequential approach it is considered essential that it is cross referenced or referred to specifically under Policy YCC1.	1592/17594	York Civic Trust
	Support – broadly support policy and welcomes recognition given to importance of a car free environment and value of place. Especially pleased to see provision of green amenity space and their multifaceted value being recognised. Comment – should add statement appreciating roles of green infrastructure generally, not simply in amenity spaced but all around the city including gateway streets.	1665/12934	York Environment Forum
	Objection – major retail development of the city centre Castle Piccadilly site is no longer deliverable, not now or in the long term. Continue allocation of ST20 for retail led development is unsuitable and will prejudice the much needed sustainable regeneration of individual sites coming forward. ST20 is objected to and all references to it should be excluded from the plan.	1785/9862	
	Comment – are the Council looking enough at keeping York City Centre populated, vibrant and lived in by turning empty shop spaces (above shops) and making flats for young people to own/rent? If they don't this on board then York centre will be lifeless and a museum soon.	1948/148	
	Comment – quality of the city centre environment should be improved with more seats in Parliament Street, moor toilet provision condition of roads and pavements regularly checked and repaired as necessary and getting rid of unnecessary advertising. Should not give permission for inappropriate use of buildings in city spaces e.g. supermarkets opening on the 'high street'. Lendal Bridge should remain open and what about a proper bus station?	2470/6752	
	Comment – the space where the toilets were in Parliament Street is a wasted space. It could be utilised more.	2654/7031	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre Continued</b>	Comment – there should be more seating in Parliament Street for visitor and older citizens.	2659/7039	
	Comment – the streets are never cleaned, as a tourist visiting would be disgusted.	2676/7092	
	Support – Agree with the preferred approach that provides detailed local criteria and site allocates to guide development in York City Centre.	2846/7540	
	Comment – character of the city centre is changing as a result of the constant development of more and more shopping centres.	3353/8555	
	Support – generally supportive of this policy.	3356/8565	
	Comment – should concentrate on filling the empty shops in the city centre. Not everyone walks to the shops at large characterless out of town shops. York’s small individual shops make it unique.	3729/10045	
	Comment – hopefully the proposed new business near the railway station as reported will also incorporate a coach and bus station. York must be the only place in the UK with no facilities for people using coaches.	4359/11301	
	Support - Support for need to have local criteria. Support the idea of having a wider range of functions for these streets, with the example of Edible York’s edible beds. Comment – Edible beds enhance the appearance of streets, encourage people to walk down the streets and stay longer in the general area, they become talking points and encourage conversations between people and provide new habitats for wild life. Such gardens are the focus of community activity and volunteering. Edible beds can be on public or private land, and private developers in gateway streets could be required to install gardens and have the minimum of paving i.e. only the amount required for safe access into their buildings.	5124/12232	
	Objection - The comments in the draft policy reinforce the importance of pedestrian visitors to central York, both tourists and residents. Access for pedestrians to central York, unencumbered by the presence of private cars would be, self-evidently, of great economic benefit to the city. Despite the grand words in the policy it is difficult to find any commitment in the draft Local Plan to preventing private cars from parking in the city centre, particularly in the areas designated as pedestrian zones. De-conflicting pedestrians from cars looking for parking spaces in York City centre would make the area less polluted, probably safer and certainly more attractive to residents and tourists alike. There should be some firm commitment to this measure.	5126/12241	
	Objection - The other approved uses for Hungate granted as part of the planning permission should be identified within Policy YCC1.	5167/12900	Hungate (York) Regeneration Ltd
Support – agree with preferred approach.	5178/12334		

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre Continued</b>	Comment – to improve the setting of Clifford’s Tower and at the same time improving safety for pedestrians and improving air quality it is suggested that the size of the car park by the tower is halved, grassing over the section nearest the Tower. A footpath through this area would allow safe access to the Castle Museum and the steps up to Clifford’s Tower. The remaining half of the car part next to the Foss should be disabled users only. One of the existing Council car parks could be converted to a multi storey for general use.	5419/14719	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach.	5427/14742	
	Comment – lots of good statements about the need to protect the historic core and for good quality shops but why put it at risk by permitting chain coffee shops when there are too many already, allowing retail premises to be changed to pubs/cafes and in general not taking a strong line? There is no point in having a plan but not putting it into practice. Objection – disappointed that there is no mention of encouraging more people to live in the historic core in over the shop rooms. This idea dates back to the 1960s.	5523/14937	
	Comment – queries whether the report indicating the potential for hundreds of homes and/or offices to be created above the shops been taken into account.	5622/13229	
	Comment – more needs to be done to convert properties in the city centre to residential use rather than having a constant supply of empty or under used properties waiting for commercial use. This will impact on freeholders who may see the values of their land drop but this is different to the process which will be seen further out of the city as some land is designated green belt and other selected for development. It is better to calm the values down in the city rather than allowing speculative developers to gain outside the city if the resultant housing is to be truly affordable.	5628/13248	
	Comment – fails to see why the Council are so keen to see previously undeveloped land built on when there are so many empty flats and houses above shops in the city centre	5652/13293	
	Comment – Local Plan states that more people travel into York than travel out, query why the Council do not build more housing in the city centre, on the brownfield sites instead o offices. This would cut down on traffic pollution and improve air quality. Query whether the city centre can be expected to sustain any more business with new shopping centre being built at Monks Cross, added to existing sites at Foss Island, Clifton Moor and the Designer Outlet. Also contend that Next and Marks and Spencer will move out of the city centre as soon as the new development at Monks Cross s built, leaving two massive areas to fill in the centre.	5660/13317	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Policy YCC1 York City Centre Continued</b>	Objection – whilst desirable, the strategy for the city centre may be unsustainable following the implementation of Monks Cross II. The Local Plan should foster more organic change and a greater diversity of uses but housing and conservation are not compatible with a 24/7 leisure economy. Consideration should be given to allocating separate zones for housing and night time uses to guide investors and safeguard residents.	5689/13409	
	Comment – would like to see a planned approach to the city centre area along the Foss which could be transformed into a fantastic public amenity area and provide a more graduated link with the Foss Islands retail area. Feel that York is rapidly reaching saturation point when it comes to hotel accommodation. Support – welcome proposals for the station area, any building should be of exceptionally high quality and complement the listed station building.	5754/13592	
	Comment – there should be more seating in Parliament Street, too much space is given to stallholders, it is out of balance with little room for people to move about in the space and to sit. Too much emphasis on selling and not enough on relaxation, performance and well being of people. There should also be more waste bins and there should be a limit on the number of shops selling alcohol in the city centre to curb drunken/violent behaviour. The City Centre does not feel safe in the evenings.	5799/15007	
	Comment – interested in sorting out the transport hub around the station, a proper bus station would really help and re-doing the entrance/exit to the station which is urgently needed.	6052/15493	
	Support – agree with the aim to maintain and enhance the viability of the city.	6307/15948	
	Support – no objection to the preferred approach as it could be applied whichever growth option is adopted. Would support the findings of the upper floors study by North of England Civic Trust that showed there was the possibility of providing up to 800 homes in the upper floors of city centre commercial properties.	6516/16323	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Support – generally supportive of the list of principles for considering city centre development proposals particularly iv, ix, x and xi. Objection – in general terms and specifically principles iii and v it is considered important to underline that as well as being a tourist attraction and focal point for everyone in York the city centre is also a place where a large number of people live. This should be made more specific and a principle should be added to the effect that city centre developments should also take account of the needs of and potential impact on nearby residents. For example there is a need on Walmgate for more shops to provide general food and services for residents as well as tourist focussed provision.	6518/16371	York Green Party

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Paragraph 6.03</b>	Comment – York does not need to, nor should it aspire, to compete with ‘smart new city centre investments’ in metropolitan cities that depend on shopping malls and chain stores as their main attraction. The whole of York city centre is an attraction and its offer is a quality one, which is what people come to York for, not a mini Leeds.	1665/12935	York Environment Forum
<b>Paragraph 6.05</b>	Comment – the forum supports the recommendations of the City Centre accessibility and Movement Framework and is keen to see them implemented.	1665/12936	York Environment Forum
<b>Paragraph 6.06</b>	Comment – the final report suggests that the role of city centres is changing and that vacant floor spaces over shops are a wasted asset and should be used for residential and SME start ups as a complement to retail activity. Report suggests that there is potential to develop c.800 flats or space for nearly 4,000 workers. These figures should be used to moderate housing and employment projections given elsewhere.	103/12860	York Tomorrow
	Support – particularly welcome the work currently being undertaken to assess the potential for re-use of upper floors within the city centre. This would appear to have enormous potential for further housing and ‘living over the shop; type initiatives, in particular in providing increased levels of affordable housing, which may help to relieve the pressure on Greenfield sites for new housing.	1491/17447	National Trust
	Comment – can the spaces above shops no be turned into apartments? Would need some creative thinking but it is not impossible and would be better than taking land and reducing pastures which contribute so much to the surrounding beauty of the city.	1582/17544	
	Support- the forum supports the initiative and recommendation to revitalise and use upper floors. Interested to note the findings of the report that upper floors above shops could house between 1,000 and 1,500 people as well as offering a substantial amount of ‘new’ office space. This would offer a more versatile and enduring mix than pure retail and support and stimulate new businesses injecting further vitality and attractive more investment to the city.	1665/12937	York Environment Forum
	Comment - the social disruption caused by the over provision of public house and then extended licensing hours have effectively made large parts of the city centre ‘no go’ areas at night and discouraged residential development. York City Centre has not shown the regeneration of residential communities in the city centre which has been achieved by other European and British historic cities.	2416/6596	
	Support – have long argue for work to be undertaken on bringing back York’s underused upper floors into use and are fully in support of this aspiration.	6518/16372	York Green Party
	<b>Paragraph 6.07</b>	Comment – the university prefer the existing boundary of city centre designation in the area of the Lord Mayors Walk campus i.e. not excluding the small area to the north of the campus.	38/12914

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Paragraph 6.07 Continued</b>	Objection – boundary change problematic. The extension of the boundary of York Central suggests that the northern section of the site will be considered separately and the area not looked at comprehensively as was the original policy. This indicates a shift in policy and could prejudice the redevelopment of the whole site and would require a re-written planning brief.	103/12861	York Tomorrow
	Comment – the boundary should certainly be revised to take in Micklegate, North Street and Skeldergate. It could include the whole of Bishophill and would then comprise the whole of the walled city.	188/13939	
	Support – the extension of the city centre boundaries, especially south of the river, where some important historic buildings survive in an otherwise unappealing mix of take-aways and rundown shops, is to be welcomed, if it leads to environmental improvement.	2416/6597	
<b>Figure 6.2 Existing And Potential Revised City Centre Boundary</b>	Comment - Believes in principle the City Centre boundary should be expanded to incorporate a wider area to ensure an appropriate surrounding context for the City Centre can be maintained and preferably enhanced. It is not demonstrated that the map is appropriate for this purpose so more explanation is needed.	1457/17393	
	Support – agree with the preferred approach to revise the city centre boundary.	6508/17658	City Of York Council Conservative Group

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Question 6.01</b>	Support - agree with the preferred approach set out in YCC1	188/13940	
	Support - agree with the preferred approach. As the Board has no responsibility and no assets within the city centre it would be unacceptable to make specific comment in regard to issues beyond those relevant to the Board's interests and how issues might impact on concerns either upstream or downstream of the centre. However the provision of housing within the city and comments in regard to flooding are welcomed. The Board has always adopted a partnership approach to such issues especially with the Council and would seek to continue to do so.	190/13961	York Consortium of Drainage Boards
	Support - agree with the preferred approach	1109/17179	
	Support - support the preferred approach, with comments to be taken account. Much more should be done to assess how Green Infrastructure can be incorporated in a planned way to help mitigate flooding and other climate change impacts such as heat waves.	1665/12938	York Environment Forum
	Support - would broadly support the approach taken, provided minority interested and needs are acknowledged and addressed explicitly.	6335/16002	Fairness & Equality Board
	Objection – Site ST20 should be reduced in size to exclude the area east of the River Foss which should be allocated primarily for a mix of retail and predominantly high density housing.	6519/16463	Cllr Jenny Brooks
	<b>Question 6.02</b>	Comment -the boundary should be revised as shown in Figure 6.2 but with the National Railway Museum excluded. The museum is situated on part of the York Central site and it's included as part of the city centre might cause additional complications in progressing redevelopment plans.	188/13941
Support - broadly support the amendments to the city centre boundary. This amended boundary now includes those areas which have a city centre function.		238/14066	English Heritage
Support/comment - city centre boundary should be revised in line with Figure 6.2, however what is the logic to omit land behind Marygate?		1109/17180	
Support - the forum supports the proposed boundary changes to the city centre, including York Central. This will enable it to be developed as a 'new piece of city' but connected to and part of the ancient walled city.		1665/12939	York Environment Forum
Comment - note the proposals to have of the existing boundary outside the new boundary. Why? Better not have the new boundary incorporate sections where the old boundary is outside the proposed new boundary.		2846/7540	
Support - support the inclusion of the York Central site into City Centre area.		5124/12232	
Comment - in principle the city centre boundary should be expanded to incorporate a wider area to ensure an appropriate surround context for the city centre to be		5178/12334	

**York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 6: York City Centre Continued**

**April 2014**

<b>Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	maintained and preferably enhanced. It is not demonstrated that the map is appropriate for this purpose so more explanation is needed.		
<b>Question 6.02 Continued</b>	Support - support including the area to the west of York Station in the city centre boundary.	5427/14742	
	Objection - does not see the rationale for making any changes to the boundaries of York Central.	5740/13525	
	Support - happy with most of the changes to the boundary but the inclusion of the Central Business District of York Central is a bit of a false device as the area still does not sit naturally within the city centre. Particularly concerned by the exclusion of Portland Street and Claremont Terrace and can't see the justification for this. The boundary should be left as it is at this boundary.	6518/16373	York Green Party
	Support - agree with the proposed boundary changes. Residents of York's villages use and value the city centre; they should be regularly consulted on any changes to the boundary.	6519/16463	Cllr Jenny Brooks