

NOTES OF MEETING

DATE: 12th February 2009

VENUE: Knavesmire Primary School

TIME: 4:30pm

ATTENDEES: See attached list

1. Apologies
 - a. Apologies received from
 - i. Richard Flanagan
 - ii. Ann Cox
 - iii. Steve Davis
2. Notes from last meeting
 - a. The notes were accepted as an accurate record, noting that in item 3 iii the date should be Jan 2009, not Jan 2008
3. Matters arising
 - i. Nothing to report.
4. Urban Analysis Report
 - a. Matt Quayle presented the urban analysis report, explaining in diagrammatic form how the redevelopment scheme had been considered, relating to the wider context of York and the connectivity to the local community. The process was explained confirming that we were at stage 2 (options diagrams and community consultation) and that we would move to stage 3 (development of basic Masterplan and testing of this) following the forthcoming public consultation.
 - b. Questions were raised during the presentation as follows:
 - i. Clarity is needed on the term "Gateway" as this is not readily understood by people that are not familiar with design matters. This was clarified as "a point of change" and an important feature and a "prominent aspect" that provides a focal point.
 - ii. It was suggested that rather than creating these defined points consideration should be given to gradual transitions.
 - iii. The diagrams showed some indication of development on green belt and this was noted as being a problem as there was a presumption against development in this area. MQ noted that as an urban designer it was important to test all options and the redevelopment was focussed not only on the current situation, but would be prevalent for many years. Green belt boundaries did move over time and it was therefore appropriate to consider this. The carpark was noted as a sensitive piece of land.

- iv. Clarity was sought regarding land ownership between CYC and the Racecourse and the rights of way for public access. This was confirmed at the meeting.
- v. Clarity was sought regarding the cross section in the urban analysis report. MQ explained these were purely illustrative at this stage and used to explore the principles of the relationship of the site to the surrounding areas.
- vi. A question was raised over the use of the term urban character, which had been used to describe Bishopthorpe Road as one perception was that this implied a particular development era, however it was explained that hedgerows, trees and buildings of any age on the approach to the City created this urban character, as opposed to a parkland, city or countryside character.
- vii. It was suggested that an important gateway had been missed; the river and the cycle track should be noted as visitors approached from this direction.
- viii. The central park scheme was challenged as to why such a large park was necessary, particularly if family houses with gardens were provided. Some felt more emphasis should be given to traditional streets and not a London Square type layout. MQ responded that traditional family housing with gardens would feature prominently but with that amount of housing a large open space was needed to serve as a focus. Some people welcomed option 3 as the spaces looked planned rather than after thoughts.
- ix. Consideration must be given to ensuring that there is sufficient employment space. It was noted that in all options the employment land was not extensive; this is not an issue providing the right useable space is provided.
- x. Housing to the north of the site was well received, but it was also felt that housing should be able to enjoy the benefits of the memorial garden.
- xi. Overlooking of the memorial gardens is important to create a more secure space. This can be done from adjacent buildings and by allowing views through the wall on Bishopthorpe Road. It was noted that the garden used to extend along the southern boundary of the site.
- xii. The pocket park scheme was noted as being rather bitty and a question was asked as to how this would impact on street scenes, routes and connections. MQ advised that this was not designed yet, but the small squares would be connected by routes and the design of this would be different from the other 2 options.
- xiii. It was noted that the bund is an issue, there was no clear direction on whether it should be removed, retained or perforated. Only one attendee had strong views on it remaining, to act as protection from the road and to allow more creative architecture and eco buildings to

be build on the site. Some people liked the continuation of routes across Campleshon Road and the link with South Bank streets as suggested in option 2.

- xiv. The idea of a tree lined avenue from Campleshon Road down to the factory buildings was encouraged. This could accommodate larger scaled buildings benefiting from views over the racecourse carpark D
- xv. It was noted that the HQ building was not an hotel in any option, but it was confirmed that it had not been discounted, just not drawn.
- xvi. Use of the HQ as an office was welcomed as it should allow this heritage building – its interiors in particular - to remain as it was intended.
- xvii. Further comment was made regarding building on the car park and this would damage views from the far side of the river. MQ explained that this issue would be explored in the next stage of the process
- xviii. People were asked to consider why the bunding was there now and based on that rationale was it still required.
- xix. With regard to employment use the view was expressed that the Council may relax its views on the amount and type of employment given current economic conditions.
- xx. Some expressed the view that the general approach of locating housing to the north of the site and employment to the south was right.
- xxi. A mix of uses was supported to avoid creating deserted employment areas after work hours
- xxii. It was questioned whether the direction of the linear park was the right orientation, a diagonal may work better. The current East – West arrangement is not beneficial and creates a separation, leading from nowhere to nowhere.
- xxiii. The southern third of the site has a high proportion of the open space, and a low proportion of residences, yet residential users will use open space more than commercial users.
- xxiv. The importance of the North east corner was recognised, as it is viewed from the length of Bishopthorpe Road, and therefore the future design of this area will be very important. Perhaps community uses could be suitable here.
- xxv. The need for a school playing field near the school was raised. It was noted that the use of the racecourse VIP car park as facilitated by Grantside had been taken up by the School.
- xxvi. It was noted that specific traffic modelling would be done at a later date as this required the accommodation proposals to be identified for it to be meaningful.
- xxvii. It was noted that any Masterplan would need to be tested against the Revised Development Brief and the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and other relevant planning guidelines.



CHOCOLATE WORKS

- xxviii. The design needs to take account of views into the site (The time office rear extension was cited as an example of where this appeared to have been overlooked).
- xxix. Some felt that the spread and mix of uses Option 2 best reflects what happens further down Bishopthorpe Road, but others did not like the scattered effect and mixture of uses throughout the site.
- xxx.

5. Open Floor

- a. The forum was asked to confirm what they liked and what they objected to in each of the options, this was met with mixed feelings. Generally there was no consensus regarding the way forward with the bund, there were objections to any buildings in the memorial gardens, though this was tempered with some acceptance of a park pavilion type community building for refreshments adjacent to the cycle track. Generally it was felt that some connection at the junction of Bishopthorpe Road and Campleshon Road would be beneficial.
- b. People were asked which of the 3 options they felt was best going in the right direction. There was no clear option that was fully supported and people liked ideas from all of the schemes, though generally option 2 was thought to provide the best base, by those who expressed a preference.

6. **NEXT MEETING – To be confirmed, depending on Masterplan progress, but likely to be the first week of April 2009. The next meeting will review the draft Masterplan**



CHOCOLATE WORKS

NAME	INTEREST
Janet Hopton	Independent Chair
Andy Chase	Micklegate Planning Panel
David Meek	St Chad's Church Warden & Church Hall Rep
Carol Weston (Head)	Knavesmire Primary School
Cristina Rivas Graver*	Resident & rep 214-260 Bishopthorpe Road
Glynn Drummond	Bishopthorpe Ward
Linda Hall	Albemarle Road
Neil Hulse	York Evangelical Church student/ pastoral worker
Brian Mellors	Bishopthorpe Parish Council
Ann Gray	Dringhouses and Woodthorpe Planning Panel
Andrew Lindsay	Denison Till Solicitors (large employers within city)
Tony Lee	York Racecourse
Cllr David Merrett	Micklegate Ward
Cllr David Taylor	Fishergate Ward
Cllr Julie Gunnell	Micklegate Ward
Eamonn Keogh	Turley Associates Planning Consultants
Peter Callaghan Grantside	Development Director Grantside Limited
Matt Quayle	Turley Associates Planning Consultants
Alison Sinclair	Resident
Richard Beal	CYC Development Control
Katherine Atkinson	CYC Community Planning
Michael Slater	CYC Assistant Director
APOLOGIES	
Steve Davis	GHT Developments LLP
Janine Riley	CYC Conservation Architect
Richard Flanagan	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
Ann Cox	Church PCC/ Church Hall/ LEA Governors KP School