

# York Central Community Forum

Date: **Monday 14 November**  
Time: **17.00 – 19.00**  
Place: **Duchess of Hamilton Room  
Conference Centre  
National Railway Museum**

## **In attendance**

- Full list of attendees on pages 3-5
- The Very Reverend Vivienne Faull (VF), Independent Chair
- Katherine Atkinson (KA), City of York Council, Forum Coordinator

**Apologies** None

## **NOTE OF MEETING**

### **1. Welcome & apologies**

Vivienne Faull welcomed the group and thanked everyone for their interest. Other forums in the city have been in existence for many years, e.g. 7 years. Look forward to discussing roles/ responsibilities and sharing our collective knowledge. Role as independent chair, not aligned to any group or the local authority, but common interest, seeking best for city of York and all citizens on the largest brownfield site in York. The site presents challenge and opportunity for this glorious city. Ground rules – small tables, speak and listen. There will be challenges; therefore it is important to build confidence and honesty, and to hear creative ways to move forward. Commit to work together, for the medium to long term, alongside main scheme. This week marks the 4<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Vivienne's arrival in York, good to see city move into new phase.

### **2. Getting to know you**

Paul Kirkman introduced the York Central Partners and their roles. The York Central Partnership comprises the National Railway Museum, Network Rail, Homes and Communities Agency and City of York Council.

### **York Central Partnership Roles:**

- Cultural draw/ Landowner/ Place maker/ Long term custodian/ Infrastructure investor
- Site deliverability
- Prepare masterplan and development framework to guide development
- Prepare and submit planning applications
- Submit information for technical approval (e,g, highway designs)

- Infrastructure works
- Promote site to developers

### **York Central Partners:**

- **Paul Kirkman, National Railway Museum** – want to create a world class museum. Expansion plans. Will drive significant footfall. Aim to grow visitor numbers from 700,000 to 1,250,000 per annum, and grow tourist economy. Want to create a quality place that draw's people into site and contributes to the wider city.
- **Mike Stancliffe, Network Rail** – majority landowner of site, development experience in regenerating land to make unique places. Station Gateway project to reshape the front of York Railway Station, to improve accessibility, and the arrival and departure experience. In process of relocating a number of engineering functions off the site, some to new sites in the city.
- **Chris Kwasniewski, Homes and Communities Agency** – Government housing, land and regeneration agency, primarily involved in building homes. The HCA was involved in half of the homes built in UK last year. Lots of experience locally and nationally of developing large, complex sites. The HCA is likely to have a long term interest in the site as an investment partner in infrastructure and housing. The HCA's ATLAS team also provide national planning expertise in relation to the development of large and complex sites. Provide links to other government departments. Capacity has already been provided to the City of York Council to assist the development of the project..
- **Tracey Carter, City of York Council as promoter** – City of York Council is a complex body, and has two distinct roles within this project. As promoter of the site to deliver economic and housing growth – long term investment in place making, landowner on site, role to promote nationally and internationally, overcome infrastructure challenges, route to public sector Housing Zone, Enterprise Zone and Local Enterprise Partnership funding, ensure place making recognises the special features of York.
- **Neil Ferris, City of York Council as regulator** – the council's other hat in this project is to ensure an open and transparent governance process as Local Planning Authority, Highways Authority, flooding etc. Through the Local Plan councillors have proposed 1200-1500 homes and 80,000sq.m office space on the site. This Forum will enable CYC, Council Members and partners to hear the views of the city, which councillors can use to help inform CYC decision making. Council Members will ultimately consider all evidence, officer advice and broader statutory consultation feedback to make balanced statutory decisions (considering flooding, air quality, social impact etc).

The Forum then introduced themselves as follows:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Who represent</b>	<b>Your interest in the site</b>
<b>Table A</b>		
Chris Kwasniewski	Homes & Communities Agency	(see page 2)
Rep for	Resident Bishophill, Professor health and wellbeing	Watching brief on health matters e.g. air pollution, stress. Positive and exciting scheme, beacon. P Nuttgens Continuing City.
Rep for	Saint Pauls Square Association	Favour development in principle. Concerns – community garden, access at The Fox junction, prefer multiple access points, congestion A59, parking
Rep for	Pedestrian, York Blind & Partially Sighted Society	Detail of movement on foot. Mix of housing types. Excited about project.
Rep for	York Chamber of Commerce, private sector	Exciting opportunity to grow economy and provide housing, concerned regarding viability.
Rep for	Carleton Street & business owner Leeman Rose Pub	How interact with community
Cllr Julie Gunnell	Micklegate Ward Councillor	Impact on residents of Micklegate and all citizens of York. Ensure get development righty for the whole city.
<b>Table B</b>		
Paul Kirkman	National Railway Museum	(see page 2)
Rep for	Chair York Railway Institute	Queen Street site, major provider of sport facilities, 2800+ members. Wish to maintain status of YRI facilities.
Cllr Fiona Derbyshire	Holgate Ward Councillor	Interests of Holgate ward
Rep for	Chair York Property Forum	Impact on city of any potential scheme, opportunity for member groups
Rep for	York Older Peoples Assembly	Proportion of population over age of 75 is growing, majority of whom are owner occupiers. Opportunity for older people's accommodation on site.

Rep for	Friends of West Bank Park & West Bank Heritage Project	Meet needs of local people – traffic, air pollution concerns
Rep for	Commercial property consultancy	Moderate conduit of information, private development sector, promote conversations with inward investors, provide type space businesses want, ensure commercial space for SME's, bring jobs

### Table C

Mike Stancliffe	Network Rail	(see page 2)
Rep for	Chair, York Civic Trust	Creating quality environment in the city for citizens. Exciting prospect. Ensure the standard and quality befits York.
Rep for	Poppy Road Poppy Project	Wild flower meadows in memory of World War 1, some of which may fall within the bounds of the development.
Rep for	Friends of Holgate Community Garden	Access Route, Holgate Community Garden, successful application for asset of community value, current application for village green. Environmental impact. Not against development.
Rep for	York St John University	Civic university, interested in cultural and economic activity within the city
Rep for	Nether & upper Poppleton Parish Council	Completed parish plan. Impact on traffic.
Cllr Lars Kramm	Micklegate Ward Councillor	Impact of new housing and offices on infrastructure

### Table D

Tracey Carter	City of York Council (as promoter)	(see page 2)
Rep for	Churchwarden, St Barnabas Church	Aim to serve current and new residents
Rep for	York Environment Forum	Architect, sustainable development, resident Holgate Road, My Future York project, engagement of population, environment
Rep for	Conservation Area	Architectural historian, did

	Advisory Panel	inventory of buildings and architecture for site, below ground archaeology, historic environment
Rep for	Chair of York@Large	Culture in the city, economy, residential, distinctive sense of place
Rep for	Friends of Leeman Park	One way system, green projects, nature conservation, bridge new and existing communities
Rep for	Micklegate Business Initiative & Artful Dodger landlord	Finally chance to do something big in York. Make sure all groups get fair say.
<b>Table E</b>		
Neil Ferris	City of York Council (as regulator)	(see page 2)
Rep for	Wilton rise, Number of Holgate community groups	Families, excellent development potential, existing community don't suffer, access/ traffic flow, 2 way consultation process
Rep for	York Bus Forum	Enhance public transport and interchange. need wider forum membership – disabilities, young, parents
Rep for	St Peters Quarter	Long term resident. Excited prospect, concerns viability and effect on St Peters Quarter
Cllr Sonia Crisp	Holgate Ward Councillor	Represent Holgate residents, eye on development, pro development, ensure any negative impacts are offered mitigation. Site should not be compared to Kings Cross.
Rep for	South Bank Multi Academy Trust	Neighbouring ward, raising family, ensure development continues to improve city for families and children of York. Schools in south bank are at capacity now. Must ensure provision of community and school facilities.

## Exercise 1) What would you like the forum to achieve?

### Priorities listed by table groups:

- A – no tick boxes, clear terms of reference
- A – direct relationship with lead people on Local Plan
- A – proper masterplan linked to whole planning process
- B – want to manage expectations
- B – enable transparency, share key information, including current occupants
- B – concern forum able to help deliver jobs and homes
- C – chance to influence
- C – help and transparency in establishing values to guide site forward
- C – taking a balanced view
- D – desire to help deliver achievable vision
- D – compromise/ mitigation, collective consensus
- D – open data access to question and challenge, achieve high level of vision
- E – evidence that forum is listened to (2 way)
- E – how is forum going to listen to voice of York (special hearing youth, and difficult to reach groups)

### Additional notes from tables:

- help develop achievable vision, brave and comprehensive
- collective consensus between stakeholders/ balance, mature discussion, compromise and mitigation, not the lowest common denominator
- welcome creative tension
- shape it even though no economic stake
- ask open questions, open data access surveys
- have enough information to enable sharing with groups they represent
- input from forum members into the debate
- avoid digression
- question and challenge professional advice
- how do we reach youth
- the Forum must have influence and not be a tick box exercise
- clear Terms of Reference
- the Forum needs to be involved early in the process of devising a strategy for the development of the site as well as site specific issues
- good communication between the Partners and Forum is essential – this needs to be a two-way process with the Forum given adequate time to comment on issues and respond to key discussion points
- can one agreed objective be that the Forum won't achieve consensus on the site
- how will different agendas be dealt with?
- endless red-tape – will this defeat the Forum?
- don't want to just get sucked into a talking shop
- how will voices be heard?
- need to try to pick up what could be unforeseen consequences

- transparency and provision of information
- if there are impacts then need to show mitigation measures
- set values and criteria to inform Masterplanners

## **Exercise 2) What would you like to see from the site?**

### **Priorities listed by table groups:**

- A – see housing development as a community, not just housing – public space, amenities, health, education, provide facilities community around, not self contained site to encourage citywide ownership
- A – brings city together, hub new bus station
- A - community planning – doctors, school etc.
- B – housing and commercial provision must be mixed and appropriate
- B – public realm to enhance city
- B – not impact negatively on environment
- C – deliver benefits to York as a whole
- C – solve some traffic problems, not create more
- C – affordable housing
- C – how development can use Micklegate as access to city and not Lendal Bridge
- D – mixed use site, range of visions for office/ residential, mix tenure and affordable
- D – good infrastructure across-piste
- D – quality of life built in – blending residential and office space, zero carbon etc.
- E – community centre/ multi faith
- E – housing not for elite
- E – transport, minimise additional congestion/ air pollution, access should not add to already congested city

### **Additional notes from tables:**

- good infrastructure
- mixed development (residential, business and cultural), mixed housing tenure (affordability and age), commercial space (small SME and large)
- quality of life built in, green space, blended with existing communities, zero carbon, arts centre, exhibition centre
- more attractors than National Railway Museum
- city setting
- considered by CABI urban design review panel
- York Central needs above all to be a good place to live, with a blended mix of development and housing types and incorporating social infrastructure – the comment was made that if transposed, the size of the site would cover the city centre
- York Central needs to be an integrated development - we must avoid past mistakes where development has been ad hoc and inward looking.

- need family homes on the site and must avoid it being dominated by high value apartments
- must ensure that the development on the site links to and benefits residents in adjacent areas
- overall the feeling was that that York Central was an exciting opportunity that could have a positive impact on the City. Phrases like 'be bold', 'have a Vision for the site' and learn from high quality developments in other European countries such as Denmark were used
- concerns were expressed about the access onto Holgate Road and the impact that this would have on traffic congestion
- the creation of public space within the development is vitally important
- must be aware of and guard against Planning Blight
- the importance of linking into the Local Plan process was stressed.

### **3. Setting our Terms of Reference**

Table based discussion regarding the draft Terms of Reference - comments/ have we missed anything?

#### **Table A**

- group as a whole felt strongly that they needed more time to consider and comment on the Terms of Reference – although generally it was felt that they were generally ok as drafted
- strong views were expressed that more representation was required from the health and voluntary sectors and that the project should be led by a broader partnership than CYC, NR, NRM and the HCA
- need to more clearly define the role of the four main Partners and what they will bring to the project.
- 3.2 Substitutes - OK as long these substitutes were properly briefed and came to meetings with an understanding of the project and key action points
- feedback role – yes, but we need to have a strong communications plan to disseminate information quickly. Developing a website was mentioned
- share names and contact details – ok in principle as long as this was not personalised too much with addresses and mobile numbers etc. However, the majority view was that this required much more thought and consideration in terms of Data Protection issues

#### **Table B**

- concerns about timeliness of information coming to the forum
- concerns about assurances that information would be free flowing and that the concerns of those affected be reflected
- wanted to be sure that environmental impact would be considered as well as traffic.
- concerns about viability and need



- generally felt the forum would be effective and give a voice to vested parties and could be a good mechanism for compromise as all want the development to go ahead and did not want unresolved issues to bury it

### **Table C**

- need meetings to be meaningful
- 3.4 broad commitment on providing presentation where we can
- 3.5 general consensus on publication of some form of contact details
- 2.3 feedback from forum- should be transparent from Forum rather than putting the obligation on the Forum member. Who does this, is it practical for individuals rather than say a website for YCP
- 2.5 to require partners...
- logistics – a snack
- clarity on who is doing the inviting, when, notice etc, how email/ phone
- clear in Terms of Reference that not a forum for public participation, therefore is there an opportunity for webcasting, or is that overkill?
- put an obligation on partners to continue with forum and not fizzle out

### **Table D**

- mechanism for asking and answering questions and sharing answers is not public
- focussing agenda – specific topic(s) for each meeting
- group to be able to identify topics e.g. values or what constitutes good quality of life – heritage
- future plan for agenda items and timetable
- need update of activity since February
- early start – catch up visions and values needed
- advise of changes to timetable
- regulate use of each others emails, no ‘cc’ all users/ spamming, put York Central in subject line
- communication needs strengthening
- agenda management needs populating, 2 way
- otherwise all OK with Terms of Reference

### **Table E**

- flip the purpose so that the forums role is to ensure that
- how will feedback by forum members be given to their constituents “guidance” and support?
- 2.6 new communities and future
- 4.6 emailed not website, and taking into account members suggestions

### **Further comments received from forum members after meeting**

- Invitation to discuss experience of engagement of young people/ families
- Circulate link to Jan/ Feb 2016 Arup brochure as background material:

- Consultation brochure:  
[https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/8798/york\\_central\\_seeking\\_your\\_views\\_to\\_guide\\_development](https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/8798/york_central_seeking_your_views_to_guide_development)
- Consultation report:  
[https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11126/york\\_central\\_seeking\\_your\\_views\\_to\\_guide\\_new\\_development\\_consultation\\_report](https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/11126/york_central_seeking_your_views_to_guide_new_development_consultation_report)

#### 4. What next

Mike Stancliffe presented work taking place over the next six months.

- Executive report will be considered by CYC Members on 24 November 2016, 1) proposing joint venture with West Yorkshire Transport Fund, 2) agree use of West Yorkshire Transport Fund funding for York Central access, and agree to consult on access before decisions made, 3) agree purchase of Unipart site. Reports will be published on CYC website 16 November, and both the scrutiny meeting on 21 Nov and the Executive meeting are public meetings.
- Technical advisors have been appointed to advise York Central Partners:
  - Design and technical advisors (ARUP with Allies & Morrison, Gustafson Porter, Turner & Townsend) will compile a comprehensive evidence base, masterplanning, prepare a development framework document to provide guidance throughout the planning process.
  - Commercial and financial advisors (KPMG with Savills) will look at deliverability and a partnership agreement.
- Findings of the 'Seeking your views' informal consultation in Jan/Feb 2016 (available via [www.york.gov.uk/yorkcentral](http://www.york.gov.uk/yorkcentral)) are being used to inform the next design and technical work.
- Statutory consultations on the Local Plan are ongoing, and a broader consultation will take place as part of the masterplanning/ development framework stage.
- Dates and topics for future Forum meetings will follow this meeting.

York Central tour of the site for Forum members, hosted by Network Rail, on **Saturday 26 November, 10:00-11:30am**

#### Discussion:

- NF: all issues raised will need to be addressed, there will be a record, revisit aspirations, will take many meetings to answer some of aspects, iterative process over e period of time
- FD: dissemination of information and communications? VF: work in progress - partners seeking single contact to coordinate partners comms in new year, currently each partner has own comms lead
- NB: where we are aware of worries, we should reassure people where we can
- Get back to you by a date
- SC: ensure forum updated as timetable moves and shifts

- LK: send document link to Forum when key reports are available

**Actions:**

- Circulate draft note (within approximately 1 week) for agreement at next meeting
- Update Terms of Reference for agreement at next meeting
- Consent form share name/ contact details (KA to circulate)
- Note under represented membership areas in future comms/ consultation strategy e.g. voluntary sector/ health, youth, disability

**Next meeting:**

- Agree notes of previous meeting & revised Terms of Reference
- Feedback from February consultation – storyline so far
- Timeline of crucial decision dates for whole project
- Explanation of Communication strategy

**5. Any Other Business – none**

**Close of meeting**

KA 24/11/16