

Movement Workshop

18th July 2018

York Central Partnership, in collaboration with My York Central, held a workshop on the subject of 'Movement' on Wednesday 18th July 2018 at the National Railway Museum.

The event was open to everyone who wanted to attend and required people to register their attendance free online using event website Eventbrite.

22 people attended the workshop. Those who attended were either representing themselves as residents or represented local groups.

The workshop consisted of a presentation, led by York Central Partnership, on the following topics:

- context and overall strategy
- car parking and modelling
- connections through and around the National Railway Museum (led by the National Railway Museum, followed by a designing out crime officer from North Yorkshire Police who specialises in Secure by Design and advises the Partnership)

This was followed by a Q&A session, facilitated by Helen Graham of My York Central.

Below is a summary of the key concerns and comments raised by attendees:

Question / comment	Response
Security and inclusivity	
<p>One attendee mentioned that there was a lot of unease about security in relation to some of the proposals for York Central, and were therefore pleased the Partnership had consulted with North Yorkshire Police on the proposals.</p> <p>The same attendee suggested that an Inclusivity Officer should be involved in the project to advise on the design proposals, to ensure accessibility for those with disabilities.</p>	<p>York Central Partnership responded that this was a good idea and they had already received a number of offers from individuals offering to provide advice in this respect, and they would look into doing this.</p>
<p>A question was also raised about which elements of the legislative framework the designs must comply with in terms of inclusivity.</p>	<p>The team offered to check and confirm these details.</p>
Mode shift possibility	
<p>One attendee raised the subject of reduction in car use and noted a recent BBC article which indicated that fewer people were learning how to drive. The attendee also mentioned the notion that if you provide less space for cars, fewer people use cars and would be more likely to use other forms of transport such as walking and cycling. They enquired as to whether this has been taken into account in the traffic modelling presented by Arup.</p>	<p>Arup responded that mode shift (for example cars to bicycles) is assumed as part of the transport modelling. They mentioned that the modelling system also considers what journeys are likely to be made by people based in York Central, and the likeliness of them using cars to make these journeys. It also takes into account the possibility of people choosing to take an alternative route in their car as a result of the road diversion. Arup noted that, although mode shift is considered, their figures are more cautious than optimistic in this respect, and therefore show worst case scenario.</p>

YORK CENTRAL STAGE 4

Question / comment	Response
<p>Purpose of new road</p> <p>Another respondent enquired about the new road through the site, and what its purpose is. They asked whether the Partnership saw it as an arterial road to replace Leeman Road, or if they saw this as a residential street. The respondent raised concerns about it being the former, and therefore having an unpleasant outlook and feel for those living in housing on that street.</p>	<p>The team responded that they believed it would act as both, but that measures, such as regular pedestrian crossings and traffic calming were being introduced in order to prevent the road feeling like an arterial road, even if an arterial function is needed.</p> <p>The Partnership pointed out that consultation feedback indicated a number of people wanted to see a car-free development whilst others noted that people would still need to use their cars and would need to drive through the site. As York Central is being designed to be aspirational, it has reduced the numbers of cars per dwelling, and has looked at the possibility of using bus / taxi gating. Although this option is not being taken forward as part of the planning application, it was noted that there is no reason why this method couldn't be employed in future subject to a broader city-wide discussion and strategy.</p>
<p>Multi-storey car parking</p> <p>One attendee raised a concern about the new multi-storey car parks proposed, and their positioning at the front and back of the station. It was felt that this move favoured visitors over residents, and pulled people into the site in cars. The attendee enquired as to the reasoning for this, as it felt that Network Rail and the National Railway Museum had done this more for profit than to benefit existing residents. The attendee suggested that people should be encouraged to use the Park and Ride instead.</p>	<p>YCP noted that a balance needed to be made between the front and back of the station, and that there were different movement patterns taken into account for those accessing the station. They also had to take into consideration the requirements of the station franchise in providing a certain number of car parking spaces.</p> <p>Another reason for the multi-storey car parking is the desire to consolidate existing car parks in order to free up space for the development proposals. It was also noted that the masterplan retains flexibility for car parking buildings to be converted or developed in alternative uses if they become surplus to requirements in the context of changing transport preferences.</p>
<p>Another issue was raised in relation to the Park & Ride, and the fact this shuts early, limiting its offer.</p>	<p>YCP noted an aspiration to encourage longer operational hours to improve the use of Park and Ride and may feature in wider travel plans for the city's network in future applications.</p> <p>It was noted that the National Railway Museum was giving up some spaces, but most of their visitors currently use the Park & Ride or come by train anyway. Though they do have family groups and less ambulant visitors who come by car, and spaces were needed for them. There is a neat synergy between Network Rail (Tue-Thu term time) and National Railway Museum (weekend on school holidays) peak parking times which has enabled a reduction in parking numbers through a shared parking facility.</p>
<p>Another attendee asked whether Marygate car park could be used to meet station parking requirements from the north, then using Scarborough Bridge to access the station by foot.</p>	<p>Arup responded that their traffic modelling had taken into account a number of factors that will influence car parking use in York in the future and had already taken into account the use of Marygate car park, as it often used by residents already because it is cheaper than the station car park.</p>

YORK CENTRAL STAGE 4

Question / comment	Response
National Railway Museum proposals	
<p>An attendee mentioned that they had not received a letter from the National Railway Museum inviting them to contribute and share their views on the Museum's proposals, but had instead received a letter which seemed to promote their exciting new plans, rather than inviting feedback.</p> <p>The attendee expressed a feeling that the Museum's process for consultation was disingenuous, and that the Museum had already made their mind up about their plans. They said they were surprised to see National Railway Museum options and pleased to see the canopy option which could join the museum without cutting residents off.</p> <p>The Museum had presented a number of options for routes through or around the Museum when the extension was built. An officer from North Yorkshire police had then explained that he would feel uncomfortable about some of the options being proposed due to safety concerns. The attendee expressed that options had seemingly been opened up to them, but then immediately taken away again.</p>	<p>The Partnership explained the intention was to open up the conversation, and update and involve the community in the discussions. It was noted that it was important to discuss safety and that it would help inform the conversation. The representative from North Yorkshire Police said he would give safety feedback on all of the NRM options presented.</p>
Leeman Road concerns	
<p>A resident of St Peter's Quarter explained that there appeared to be nothing about any of the proposals which would benefit them. They would like to walk home from the train station safely, and they feel this option has been taken away from them. The resident expressed that they didn't understand why the Museum needed an extension, noting that better signage was needed instead. They explained that the museum really needs to think about their proposals and if they are necessary.</p> <p>The resident explained that they had no problem with any other aspects of the York Central proposals.</p> <p>Another resident from St Peter's Quarter expressed concerns that the National Railway Museum proposals would ghettoise St Peter's Quarter, by cutting all access to and from the city, and preventing a safe route home from the station after dark. They explained that they had once been attacked whilst using Leeman Road to get home from the station after dark, but had been saved by the headlights of a passing car.</p> <p>They felt that the National Railway Museum's engagement with the community had been an "opinions collecting exercise" and that the Museum were likely to carry on without any regard for residents.</p>	<p>A representative from the National Railway Museum explained that they did want to gather views and that they were listening and factoring in responses. They also clarified a number of reasons as to why the extension is required, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accommodating a growing number of visitors • improving visitors' ability to navigate around (a common complaint from current visitors) • to better tell the story of railways, as York's national museum. <p>The Museum noted that if they have no support from residents, they will have to consider their plans.</p>

YORK CENTRAL STAGE 4

Question / comment	Response
<p>Another resident expressed concern that the National Railway Museum won't listen, and enquired as to how the decision will be made.</p>	<p>The Museum responded that they are carrying out extensive consultation, and that they had a lot to balance, as a land owner and as operator of York's national museum. They said that they will provide a rationale for whichever option they choose.</p> <p>NRM noted that they do not currently have a design team working on the proposals, and are therefore not in the same position as the York Central team who have had a design team working on the proposals for much longer. They noted that because they do not yet have a design team to devise a solution (will follow when have some certainty/ funding), they are unable to commit to deliver 24hr access. They also noted that they will be holding a competition to appoint an architect for the project.</p>
<p>A resident explained that they would feel more comfortable if they would commit to delivering 24hr access, and if they did, the residents would back them.</p>	<p>The National Railway Museum offered to hold a meeting with York Cycle Campaign in order to review their methodology for producing figures which indicate how much longer a journey would take for residents of St Peter's Quarter with the closure of Leeman Road. The figures varied widely from those produced by the Museum. NRM is keen to agree a shared set of figures with YCC.</p> <p>The NRM invited people to attend their events on 25 and 28 July and discuss to the options.</p>
<p>York Bridge Club</p>	
<p>A member of York Bridge Club expressed concerns about the options presented for the Southern Access, and the option that involves the use of Chancery Rise to provide better pedestrian and cycle access into the southern end of the site. They noted that their property on Chancery Rise already have restricted parking, and are concerned about the impact this option would have on their ability to park in the area.</p> <p>They have a lot of elderly members who need to drive from far away to get to the club, a number of them already operate a car sharing system, and some get dropped off outside the club. The Club are concerned about the impact any works might have on accessibility for members.</p>	<p>The Partnership responded that the options are still being considered, and that no option was being brought forward as part of the application, only the proposal to have an improved pedestrian and cycle access from the south.</p> <p>It was also noted that conversations had taken place with Friends of Holgate Community Garden, but there was a need to hold discussions with the wider community.</p> <p>It was also noted by Arup that a pedestrian and cycle link would have limited impact, and a further application would be coming forward for this aspect at a later date. The details for this aspect of the proposal will come forward in due course.</p> <p>YCP to discuss with York Bridge Club at a 1-2-1 next week.</p>
<p>Another attendee enquired as to what the decision-making process for this aspect of the proposal will be, noting a number of existing buildings in this area (Canteen building and Alliance House) which could be used for community uses. People need to understand the full context to reach a decision.</p>	

Conclusion

Helen thanked people for attending and encouraged people to keep engaged and take the opportunities to continue the conversation:

- Next workshop on Masterplan & Governance 19 July.
- YCP drop-in 26 July.
- NRM events 25 and 28 July.
- YCP will circulate details of the next movement discussion with Tony May when the date is set.