



2<sup>nd</sup> March 2026

Louise Milnes/Lauren Cripps

City of York Council

West Offices

Station Rise

York

YO1 6GA

Dear Louise Milnes/Lauren Cripps

**Re: Application 25/02384/REMM ~ Reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access for erection of hotel; new Western Station Entrance building, cycle hub, retail/leisure units, office use; 129 dwellings on Plot E; 502 dwellings on Plots F3 and F4; 368 dwellings on Plots K and L; new central park, public realm including public square at the former Coal Drops, with associated demolition and infrastructure pursuant to outline planning permission (18/01884/OUTM).**

Please find attached York Civic Trust's SUPPORT comment for the above application.

With best wishes,

Andrew Morrison

**Chief Executive**

**E: [andrewmorrison@yorkcivictrust.co.uk](mailto:andrewmorrison@yorkcivictrust.co.uk)**

**Chair:** Dr Delma Tomlin MBE **Chief Executive:** Andrew Morrison

A company limited by guarantee no. 486282 | Registered Charity No. 229336

Registered Office: Fairfax House, Castlegate, York, YO1 9RN



**YORK CIVIC TRUST**

— Established 1946 —

**PLANNING SUPPORT COMMENT**

**YORK CENTRAL: PHASE 1C  
RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION (RMA5 / REMM 1c)**

**25/02384/REMM ~ Reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access for erection of hotel; new Western Station Entrance building, cycle hub, retail/leisure units, office use; 129 dwellings on Plot E; 502 dwellings on Plots F3 and F4; 368 dwellings on Plots K and L; new central park, public realm including public square at the former Coal Drops, with associated demolition and infrastructure pursuant to outline planning permission (18/01884/OUTM).**

**2nd March 2026**

## 1. Executive Summary

York Civic Trust supports the York Central Phase 1c Reserved Matters application and welcomes the clear direction of travel on sustainable transport, public realm ambition, homes and neighbourhoods of quality, and the opportunity to deliver a distinctive new quarter for York.

We recognise the strategic importance of York Central for the city and the significant work undertaken by the project partners to bring forward a comprehensive and ambitious scheme. We encourage the quality and standards established in this phase to be the benchmark for future plans.

Our comment is submitted in the spirit of constructive support: to help ensure that what is delivered is the best York Central it can be, and that the Phase 1c proposals function strongly as community-building places, while integrating successfully with neighbouring communities.

We have refined our comment following liaison with the York Central Limited team – for which we are grateful for their investment in formulating their detailed response to our initial comment and for highlighting relevant documents, including those only very recently submitted, within over 500 relevant documents included in the outline planning permission and the RMA 5 (Phase 1c) application.

Our support comment is accompanied by detailed recommendations and latterly suggested conditions pertinent to the RMA 5 (Phase 1c) application. These are supported by site-wide suggested recommendations, that may fall outside of the scope of RMA 5/REMM 1c but are offered in support of strengthening the York Central as a piece of unified urban design, a community and a place that will significantly contribute to the city's future. The summary below should be read in conjunction with the detailed recommendations set out in sections 3-6 of this comment.

### **Key Priority Matters are:**

- A) **Community Building:** A key test of York Central as a new residential community is how well it connects and ties into adjacent neighbourhoods. This will be reinforced by the extent to which existing communities are involved in the design of the community infrastructure provided by York Central e.g. Central Park & indoor community resources. Well-designed, safe and easy access will be needed by York Central residents to access, church, school, medical and other social facilities these neighbourhoods offer. Likewise existing communities will require high quality access to the community infrastructure that York Central offers. Strengthening and clarifying these connections will support everyday movement between communities and help

avoid the impression of a self-contained enclave. Condition 83 of the Outline Planning Permission requires the creation of a purpose-built free-to-access indoor community space before the occupation of the 750th home (within the timescale of Phase 1c though not included in RMA 5). It is essential that this resource, for use by all communities, is delivered in line with the condition and the design is co-developed as early as possible.

- B) **Housing and neighbourhood creation:** Phase 1c will deliver 999 homes and must therefore be assessed primarily as a neighbourhood-making project. This is particularly important in the context of York's acute need for affordable housing. Phase 1c has the potential for creating a strong neighbourhood with a broad mix of housing type and affordability. The quality, distribution and integration of homes—across tenures, typologies and plots—will be critical to community cohesion, everyday liveability and long-term success. This phase should set a clear benchmark for tenure-blind design, equitable access to amenity, and affordable living costs across York Central. The design and creation of homes and neighbourhoods should support places where people want to live, for both affordable housing residents and those purchasing their homes.
- C) **Affordable Housing:** A key factor in fostering community cohesion will be the better distribution (“pepper-potting”) of affordable housing, which at times appears insufficiently integrated. It is important that the affordable housing is equally distributed between houses and apartments with the same level of access and proximity to amenities and infrastructure as all other housing in order to design out the risk of future segregation. Across the whole site there must be an aspiration to deliver above 20% affordable housing target.

Phase 1c has a significance beyond the site itself. This phase sets out an ambitious starting point with its tenure-blind design, equitable access to public amenity and infrastructure, and affordable living costs across York Central. As the detailed design of Phase 1c develops it is imperative that it informs further RMA's.

- D) **Site-wide cohesion:** The overall site strategy for Public Realm Hard & Soft Landscaping (AOD/22/00093) submitted to discharge Condition 23 of the Outline Planning Permission is a strong document for creating a cohesive base to the overall development and is welcomed. It is imperative that the spirit and the detail of this document alongside the Design Guide, Master Plan and Outline Planning Permission are adhered to in all aspects of the development and over the long period of development in order to create as strong a community as possible.
- E) **Architecture and placemaking:** Strengthen the coherence of architectural language and material quality across plots (including Plot F articulation, and the relationship between the station entrance, hotel and cycle hub), so the Phase 1c outcome reads as a unified piece of city-making.

- F) **Public realm and inclusive design:** Provide clear arrangements for events infrastructure and public realm maintenance at Coal Drops Square and elsewhere, and ensure everyday comfort is designed-in (seating/rest points, toilets, shelter, lighting and wayfinding).
- G) **Landscape and long-term management:** Ensure Central Park and associated green infrastructure are deliverable and maintainable, supported by a robust long term landscape management regime, and that incidental green spaces receive adequate daylight and function for everyday resident use.
- H) **Accessibility:** The proposed Western Station Entrance (including passenger lifts and staircases) offers a strong opportunity to improve step-free access and increased capacity for York Station. The provision of escalators should be considered to deliver an inclusive station threshold capable of handling peak flows. Whilst outside of the RMA5 application the wider York Central stakeholders should continue to press Network Rail to deliver full step-free access to all platforms, ensuring inclusive connectivity.
- I) **Heritage and interpretation:** Minimise further loss of non-designated heritage assets where feasible and ensure that outline-stage commitments to further research and reuse options are demonstrably addressed (including for the Gatehouse building and the former generator/compressor house). Improve the legibility of retained railway fabric (notably the Coal Drops walls) through surface demarcation, interpretation and high-quality public realm treatment, avoiding confusion with modern boundary or buttressing walls.
- J) **Transport:** The Civic Trust believes that managing through traffic, creating an accessible permeable neighbourhood for walking and wheeling, and providing public transport from the outset is key to delivering a strong community in York Central. Recognising this is outside of the application we would encourage York Central Limited and city partners continue to work together to ensure that transport measures outlined in the S106 agreement are implemented at the outset and aspire to control through traffic through a bus-gate in the Leeman Road Tunnel, provide increased bus services (four non-P&R bus services in each direction); secure a genuinely inclusive and step-free station interface and strengthen car-club provision and Travel Plan monitoring.

## 2. Introduction and context

York Civic Trust (YCT) welcomes the York Central Phase 1c Reserved Matters application. We support the application, recognising the strategic importance of York Central for the city and the significant work undertaken by the project partners to bring forward a comprehensive and ambitious scheme.

Our comments are submitted in the spirit of constructive support:

- a. to help ensure that what is delivered is the best York Central it can be,
- b. the quality and standards established in this phase to be the benchmark for future plans,
- c. the Phase 1c proposals function strongly as community-building places, while integrating successfully with neighbouring communities.

The York Central Partnership has been generous with its time in supporting YCT's engagement with Phase 1c, including by providing a pre-application design workshop on the emerging proposals and through subsequent follow-up discussions. That openness has helped inform the level of detail in this supportive comment and reflects the time and resources YCT has committed in turn to reviewing the Reserved Matters submission constructively. The approach and emphasis of this response have also been informed by discussion at York Civic Trust's Environment Committee, reflecting the Trust's wider environmental, sustainability and climate priorities.

This response draws together feedback from a programme of four themed workshops convened by YCT, bringing internal and external expertise across planning, transport, architecture and urban design, housing, landscape and ecology, and heritage. The workshops were also informed by the work of YCT's Transport Advisory Group.

Given the scale and complexity of the Outline consent and the subsequent Reserved Matters submissions, it is unsurprising that some elements would benefit from refinement. In a number of places, we consider that there are opportunities to strengthen design quality, secure the ambition to create neighbourhoods where people wish to live, improve day-to-day functionality, and tighten compliance with the parameters and intentions of the approved Outline scheme and associated design guidance.

We have refined our comment following discussion with the York Central Limited team – for which we are grateful for their investment in formulating their detailed response to our initial response and for highlighting relevant documents, including those only very recently submitted, within over 500 relevant documents included in the outline planning permission and the RMA 5 (Phase 1c) application.

We have structured this comment on RMA 5 to:

- Section 3. Aspects we support and welcome
- Section 4. Areas that in our opinion could be refined

- Section 5. More detailed feedback on specific components of the Phase 1c Reserved Matters proposals.
- Section 6. Matters that may be outside RMA 5 but affect the quality of the development.
- Section 7. Summary

### 3. Summary of aspects supported and welcomed

York Civic Trust welcomes a wide range of the ambition and detail set out within the Phase 1c submission, including (but not limited to) the following:

- An overall housing offer that is broadly well considered and, in many respects, aligned with the Outline consent aspirations, including a stated commitment to tenure-blind delivery and a good distribution of accessible homes.
- The intention for Central Park to be a significant new green space within Phase 1, and the ecological ambition evident in the supporting documentation, recognising that delivery will require simplification and robust long-term management.
- The proposed Western Station Entrance as a new public interface with the station, and the principle of providing step-free connectivity between York Central and York Station.
- The Innovation Hub concept, particularly the ambition for its interior and the use of a timber structure as an expression of innovation and low-carbon construction.
- The employment-generating potential of the Innovation Hub, together with commercial and retail provision, and the contribution to a mixed-use neighbourhood.
- The ambition for Coal Drops Square as a meaningful civic space and gateway to York Central, with potential for events as well as everyday use.
- The Foundry Quarter housing proposals, which read as among the most successful components in terms of articulation, enclosure, and the potential for community-making, subject to matters raised later in this document.
- The Transport Vision, set out most fully in Section 2 of the Transport Impact Assessment is excellent. It shows a clear commitment to low car, sustainable travel, supported by a reduced parking offer compared with the Outline assumptions, and is broadly compatible with the Local Transport Strategy.
- The biodiversity measures embedded within the proposals (including provision for birds such as swifts/house martins), which support wider objectives for nature recovery in the city.
- The commitment to rooftop photovoltaic provision (and, we hope, the implied intention to use generated energy to reduce building running costs/service charges – a commitment which would be of great benefit to those occupying affordable housing), subject to equitable application across all plots and tenures.

#### 4. Areas that, in our opinion, could be improved.

For ease of reference, York Civic Trust’s highest-priority recommendations are summarised below. The detailed recommendations which follow are explained in more detail below, with the priority recommendations highlighted in blue for clarity. (A full list of recommendations is provided in Appendix A).

##### Summary of Priority Recommendations

Masterplan coherence and interfaces	Ensure that the existing site-wide strategy documents are further developed and detailed designs form consolidated coordination and interface across plots (materials, landscape continuity, servicing, lighting, seating, wayfinding and long-term management) so Phase 1c reads as one piece of city-making, not adjacent sub-projects.
Architecture and placemaking	Whilst acknowledging the York Central Design Guide’s recommendation for varied architectural styles across Phase 1c – it is important that there is an overall sense of cohesion of architectural language and material quality across the entire site so that York Central reads as a unified piece of city-making that adds to the internationally renowned quality of York’s architecture.  plots (including Plot F articulation, and the relationship between the station entrance, hotel and cycle hub),
Affordable housing	Ensure affordable housing is ‘pepper-potted’ across the various plots and housing types to secure community cohesion, equality and fairness in a clearly intangible way that designs out future segregation.
Community building and social infrastructure	To provide details of the purpose-built free-to-access indoor community space within the requirements of Condition 83. Provide

	stronger links to existing Leeman Road amenities so York Central integrates with neighbouring communities. (Community building section)
Station interface capacity and inclusivity (Western Station Entrance)	To deliver an inclusive station threshold capable of handling predicted peak flows (including associated public realm co-ordination and escalator provision). (WSE Section)
Coal Drops Square as a functioning civic space	To secure events/public realm management responsibilities, and a public realm management plan that supports day-to-day use as well as events. (Coal Drops Square section)
Heritage legibility and non-designated assets	To strengthen site-wide interpretation (railway and pre-railway histories), protect heritage legibility in the public realm (including demarcation where fabric is removed), and require a robust retention/reuse appraisal (and outline-stage "further research" evidence) for the Gatehouse and Generator/Compressor House before demolition is pursued. (Heritage section)
Central Park deliverability and stewardship:	To ensure the park's ecological/landscape ambitions are realistic, audience-focused and maintainable within the long-term capabilities of the proposed community-management mechanisms. (Central Park Section)
Movement comfort + everyday inclusivity	To deliver a seating/rest-point detailed plan and safe, legible crossings and routes so the place works for all ages and abilities. (Inclusive design / crossings sections)

--	--

## **Detailed Recommendations (Priority Recommendations in Blue)**

### **4.1 Community facilities, social infrastructure and integration with neighbouring communities**

Condition 83 of the Outline Planning Application sets out that ‘Prior to the occupation of the 500th residential dwelling a scheme for on-site indoor community space, shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the occupation of the 750th dwelling. The space shall be retained for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.’ This places the community facility within the timescale of Phase 1C which will deliver 999 homes. It is surprising that details of any location, form and function of this facility are not included within the RMA5 application. Such an inclusion could have informed city-wide conversations about community building at this very early stage of site development.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.1 In order to discharge Condition 83 bring forward details of the ‘on-site indoor community space’ in conjunction with the detailed design of Phase 1c. Any such facility should be co-designed with existing communities, who it is hoped by York Central Limited will use the community infrastructure the development will offer, and new residential community. It is imperative for the development of a strong community that the timetable for Condition 83 is not allowed to slip.

### **4.2 Landscape ambition and long-term deliverability**

We support the ecological ambition and the desire to create a distinctive Central Park. At the same time, there is a risk of trying to do too much within a constrained space, leading to a layout that is over-complicated, difficult to maintain, and less usable for the everyday needs of residents. Supporting documents also appear, in places, to present inconsistent levels of detail or emphasis, particularly around seasonal water features and habitat creation. The long-term success of wet woodland and seasonal pond features will depend on realistic specification and strong, funded long-term maintenance arrangements. In this area, we believe that the principle “less is best” should be applied.

The Landscape and Environmental Management Plan submitted alongside RMA5 (YCIMP-BHE-XX-XX-RP-YE-0003) is welcomed (in addition to the Site-Wide Landscape & Management Plan (AOD/22/00228) to discharge Condition 31 and addendum). The proposed

long-term maintenance and management through a Community Infrastructure Fund and Community Interest Company rooting the management of the landscape, habitats and flora and fauna in the people that will form the primary users is welcomed. The provision of and promotion of such a large free to use piece of public amenity to the existing communities is also welcome. The detail of this long-term arrangement must be robust to survive both financially and socially beyond short term horizons and to be able to adapt to future pressures.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.2 Review the design of Central Park with existing local communities and priority new communities to ensure that it meets their needs from the outset and is maintainable in the long-term by the arrangements suggested in the Landscape and Management Plan submitted alongside RMA 5. Where required simplify the design of Central Park.

**4.3 Community building – Pedestrian permeability**

A key test of York Central as a new residential community is how well it connects and ties into adjacent neighbourhoods. Well designed, safe and easy access will be needed by York Central residents to access, church, school, medical and other social facilities these neighbourhoods offer. Likewise existing communities will require high quality access to the community infrastructure that York Central offers. In particular the application documentation does not yet provide for pedestrian permeability between St Peter’s Square and Carlisle/Carlton Streets and the new neighbourhood. Strengthening and clarifying these connections will support everyday movement between communities and help avoid the impression of a self-contained enclave.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.3 Provide a clear plan for demonstrating pedestrian connectivity through safe, overlooked and step-free links between St Peter’s Square and Carlisle/Carlton Streets, the Salisbury Terrace Underpass and the York Central public realm, including any new access points, surface treatments, lighting and wayfinding, and how the connections will be delivered and retained over time.

#### **4.4 Housing-led neighbourhood delivery (site wide)**

Phase 1c represents the first substantial residential neighbourhood to be delivered at York Central, and its success will be judged not only on housing numbers but on how well it functions as a place to live day-to-day. While many housing-related matters are addressed within individual plot submissions, there is a risk that neighbourhood quality, tenure integration and resident experience are treated as a series of plot-specific technical issues rather than as a coherent, site-wide system. Given the scale of delivery and the long-term implications for future phases, YCT considers it essential that housing and neighbourhood considerations are addressed collectively and consistently across Phase 1c.

##### RECOMMENDATION:

4.4. Treat Phase 1c as a neighbourhood-led scheme, ensuring that housing design, tenure distribution, access to amenity, affordability in use, and everyday operational matters (including waste, servicing and energy costs) are addressed coherently across all plots, rather than as plot-specific technical issues.

#### **4.5 Housing mix and tenure integration**

Overall, YCT is impressed with the housing proposals and welcomes the intention to deliver tenure-blind design. We also welcome the reported 11% accessible housing provision and its distribution across the site. Nonetheless, we consider the housing mix should be tested against what is needed for successful community building, not simply what is most advantageous commercially. We also note that pepper-potting of affordable provision is weakened where certain typologies (for example, terraces and raised houses in the Foundry Quarter) exclude social rent provision entirely.

##### RECOMMENDATIONS:

4.5a. Demonstrate how the proposed housing mix (including the balance of houses versus flats) responds to identified local need and community-building objectives.

4.5b. Secure effective pepper-potting of affordable and social rent housing across plots, blocks and typologies (including houses where feasible), avoiding concentrations that risk segregation and ensuring shared access to entrances, amenity and public realm on a tenure-blind basis.

We agree that the Build to Rent block is the best positioned for intermediate market rent for affordable housing.

In this phase of the development, the residential accommodation is predominantly apartments. Only 17% are houses. Overall, the House provision for the affordable allocation on the site is 18%, replicating the overall allocation. However, the local need is for family houses and therefore it is disappointing to see that only 34 of the 200 affordable housing units on the

site are as houses. Several of the three-bedroom properties which would be used by affordable housing providers to accommodate families are in apartments.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

4.5c. The pepper-potting of the IMR homes in site F should be shown on the plans so that social and community integration can be judged.

4.5d. Re-allocate some of the three-bedroom apartments to three-bedroom house provision in the Foundry Quarter.

This issue takes on added weight in the context of York's significant unmet need for affordable housing, particularly for family-sized homes. Given the scale of Phase 1c and its role in shaping future phases, this is a critical opportunity to make meaningful progress towards meeting that need.

The provision of 20% affordable housing as part of the application is welcomed, however, the aspiration should be for a much higher percentage of affordable housing across the whole site.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

4.5e. *Aspire to deliver above the 20% target for affordable housing.*

#### **4.6 Public realm management, events and maintenance**

We welcome the recently submitted Site Wide Strategy for Public Realm, Hard and Soft Landscaping (YCIMP-GRA-9001-P) to discharge Condition 23. Recognising that this is a strategy level document, several of the principal public spaces proposed in Phase 1c (notably Coal Drops Square and Central Park) will succeed or fail not only on initial design but on how they are managed and maintained. The public realm strategy sets out that the material palette for significant elements of the site, for instance street furniture, will utilise high durability/low maintenance materials. Questions remain about who will be responsible for day-to-day upkeep; how event programming will be balanced with everyday use; and how issues such as cleaning, lighting, safety, toilets, and servicing will be handled without undermining public enjoyment.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.6. *Secure, by condition or planning obligation, a Public Realm Management and Maintenance Plan for the public spaces e.g. Coal Drops Square, including event management principles, servicing, cleaning, lighting, safety, responsibilities, and long-term funding arrangements.*

#### **4.7 Heritage and the legibility of place**

York Central is a site with layered histories: railway, industrial and community associations. We welcome the move away from generic naming (for example, the renaming from Station Square to Coal Drops Square). However, the Phase 1c submission raises concerns about the cumulative loss of non-designated heritage assets and the risk that remaining fragments will become legible only to those already knowledgeable about railway heritage. Where demolition is proposed of buildings previously identified for retention or adaptation within the Outline assessment, the case needs to be robust and to demonstrate that adaptive reuse has been genuinely explored.

We are also mindful of the cumulative effect of removing successive layers of fabric across the site. With only a small portion of the coal drops walls proposed to be retained and Foundry Yard outside the application boundary, there is a risk that future visitors read the place primarily through naming, rather than through visible, intelligible remnants. (And risks the several name associations with 'foundry' and 'coal' leading to an understanding of it having been an iron or other foundry site, not a railway one).

A balanced approach to interpretation should therefore cover non-railway histories as well (including Bishopfields<sup>1</sup> and other pre-railway uses such as the Cricket Field), so that York Central is understood as a specific place with a distinctive sequence of uses and communities.

#### **Gatehouse Building (Foundry Quarter) and the former Generator/Compressor House (Coal Drops Square)**

YCT is concerned that the Phase 1c reserved matters proposals appear to introduce additional loss of physical heritage when compared with the assumptions and direction of travel set out at outline stage. In particular, the proposed demolition of the Gatehouse building on Leeman Road and the former generator/compressor house at Coal Drops Square would remove two of the few remaining structures capable of acting as legible waymarkers and "anchors" for memory on the ground.

Individually, both buildings may be of modest heritage significance, but their value is amplified in context. They provide tangible continuity between the existing neighbourhood and the new development and offer credible opportunities for adaptive reuse—for example as a small interpretation point for York Central, a community room, or public facilities such as WCs that would support Coal Drops Square as a civic/events space. YCT is therefore concerned that both are now proposed for demolition, particularly as the Outline application's Environmental Statement identified them as non-designated heritage assets of low to medium significance and recommended conservation/adaptation and further research before decisions were taken. The Gatehouse (built in 1943 as the office for the former York Engineering Works) was noted for its clean lines, generous windows and prominent

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bishopfields is an under-researched part of York's history. The Borthwick Institute holds papers for it, including as a valuable source a little-known 1729 map of the Fields.*

position on the bend of Leeman Road—effectively a “gatehouse” to the wider development area (ES 4.1.15). The generator/compressor house was also positively described for its crisp early-C20 character and the aesthetic value of its top-lit internal space, with the potential for further research to reveal additional historic interest (ES 4.1.12).

On the evidence submitted, it is not clear that the recommended further research has been undertaken, nor that a robust appraisal of adaptive reuse options has been completed and weighed against the case for demolition. In YCT’s view, retaining and re-purposing at least one of these buildings could deliver an important physical “anchor” between old and new York Central, provide much-needed shared/community infrastructure, and strengthen the legibility of the area’s layered industrial and railway history.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

4.7a. Heritage interpretation strategy (railway + pre-railway): Develop and secure a site-wide heritage interpretation strategy for York Central that covers both railway and pre-railway histories. It should explain how retained fabric and key historic narratives will be made legible in the public realm (signage/graphics/digital), with clear locations/priorities for delivery in Phase 1c.

4.7b. Non-designated assets – retention and reuse options appraisal: Reassess the proposed demolition of the Gatehouse Building (Foundry Quarter) and former Generator/Compressor (Power) House (Coal Drops Square) through a rigorous, transparent options appraisal demonstrating that retention and adaptive reuse have been fully explored before demolition is pursued. The appraisal should test viable end uses (e.g., community/meeting space, interpretation point, public WCs/Changing Places, workspace) and include whole-life carbon, cost, operational, and place-making benefits.

4.7c. Outline Environmental Statement “further research” – evidence and implications: Provide the further research and significance assessment recommended in the Outline application’s Environmental Statement for both buildings, and show clearly how this has informed the Phase 1c proposals. If demolition remains proposed, provide a clear, evidenced justification explaining why retention/adaptation is not feasible.

4.7d. Public benefit and stewardship (if retained): If either building is retained, secure a delivery and management plan demonstrating meaningful public benefit (e.g., accessible toilets supporting Coal Drops Square, community space, interpretation), including fit-out, access, opening arrangements and long-term stewardship/maintenance.

4.7e. Legibility of removed fabric (coal drops walls and other losses): Where historic structures or fragments are removed (including sections of coal drops walling), ensure their former footprint/alignment is clearly marked in the public realm and supported by interpretation, so that the historic form is understood rather than erased.

4.7f. Mitigation if demolition proceeds: If demolition is accepted, require a strengthened mitigation package comprising (i) full historic building recording (Level proportionate to

significance) and an interpretation plan, and (ii) replacement provision of the displaced public/community function within Phase 1c (e.g., WCs/Changing Places and/or a community room), so that civic/event capability is not diminished.

#### **4.8 Street hierarchy, play streets and kerb-free design**

YCT supports the aspiration for child-friendly streets and a genuinely pedestrian-first neighbourhood. Some documents refer to Play Streets (Section 1.2.1 Design and Access Statement for Plots K & L and section 6.3.9 Play Streets of YCMP-gra-9001-p) whilst there is little definition as to how these will be achieved. Greater clarity is needed on how play streets sit within the overall street hierarchy.

The Foundry Quarter is the part of the site best suited to a strong play-street and “home zone” character. However, the current proposals rely more heavily on internal terrace areas for play, rather than embedding play within the street network itself. YCT would support the provision of additional play streets here and, where on-street parking conflicts with this objective, recommends exploring reductions or alternative arrangements.

In the Foundry Quarter in particular, a stronger home-zone character would be reinforced through kerb-free or very low-kerb detailing, consistent with inclusive design principles and low vehicle speeds.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

4.8a Clarify the intended operation of play streets across the site, including how they function within the “tertiary street” hierarchy, and demonstrate that street layouts, parking provision and surface treatments genuinely support play and social use rather than residual traffic space.

4.8b. In Plots K and L, pursue kerb-free streets or very low kerb upstands (e.g. a maximum of 30mm) where appropriate, to reinforce slow-speed, shared-surface “home zone” character and inclusive movement.

#### **4.9 Green and brown roofs: management and urban wildlife**

Green and brown roofs have clear benefits for biodiversity, attenuation and climate resilience. However, in York there is a known risk that such roofs can attract herring gulls and other nuisance species if not carefully designed and managed. This is both an amenity issue and a maintenance/fouling issue.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

4.9 Ensure that green/brown roof specifications and the associated management plan explicitly address urban wildlife risks (including herring gull attraction), with design measures and maintenance protocols to minimise nuisance while retaining biodiversity value.

#### **4.10 Amenity space for social rent provision**

YCT is concerned that access to private gardens and/or nearby usable green amenity space appears limited for occupants of the social rent homes. In particular, the social rent allocation within Block E1 is shown as having no dedicated outdoor amenity space and limited convenient access to a suitable shared alternative. The proposed social rent provision within plots K+L also appears to have restricted adjacent amenity space. This concern is compounded by the apparent concentration of social rent homes within the back-to-back and level-change units, which—on the information submitted—also have the least access to gardens or green amenity.

This would benefit from review and adjustment, and it also links directly to the point made above regarding “pepper-potting” and ensuring tenure-blind quality and access to shared amenities.

##### **RECOMMENDATION:**

4.10. Review the distribution and typology of social rent homes to ensure equitable access to usable outdoor amenity space, either through (i) providing private gardens/terraces where feasible, and/or (ii) ensuring convenient access to high-quality, overlooked shared green space. This should include reconsideration of the concentration of social rent units within back-to-back/level-change typologies, and demonstrating how the scheme achieves tenure-blind access to amenity.

#### **4.11 Photovoltaics and benefit to residents**

YCT welcomes the commitment to provide photovoltaic (PV) solar panels to each of the apartment blocks. While the supporting text does not explicitly state how the generated electricity will be allocated, the implication is that it would help to reduce residents’ service charges and/or communal energy costs. YCT supports this approach, but it should be applied consistently across the development parcels and should include the blocks containing social rent homes. If delivered equitably, PV provision could represent a meaningful enhancement to affordability and the overall housing offer, particularly for social rent tenants.

YCT also notes that, where feasible, the benefits of PV could be strengthened further through the inclusion of battery storage to maximise on-site use of generated electricity and improve resilience.

##### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

4.11a. Secure photovoltaic provision across all residential blocks, including those containing social rent homes, with a clear commitment that generated energy will be used to reduce communal energy costs and service charges for residents.

4.11b. Explore the feasibility of incorporating battery storage alongside PV, and provide a brief statement of the outcome (including any constraints) and how on-site generation will be optimised for resident benefit.

#### **4.12 Resident amenity: Storage**

YCT notes that, as different parcels have been designed by different architectural teams, there is a risk that consistency of housing offer and resident amenity is not maintained across the wider York Central development. A clear example is provision for mobility scooter storage and charging.

At Site F, the submitted material includes an explicit commitment for mobility scooters to be stored and charged within lobby areas (p.378). Subject to appropriate fire safety design and management arrangements, YCT welcomes this recognition of residents' needs. However, equivalent provision is not clearly set out for the apartment blocks within Sites E or K+L. YCT considers that mobility scooter storage/charging should be addressed consistently across all apartment blocks, with provision that is safe, convenient and accessible (and, where necessary, located within suitably designed secure storage areas rather than lobbies).

##### RECOMMENDATION:

4.12. Provide a consistent strategy for mobility scooter storage and charging across all apartment blocks (including Sites E and K+L), identifying the location, capacity, access arrangements and management measures. This should demonstrate compliance with relevant fire safety requirements and set out whether provision will be in lobbies or within suitably designed secure storage areas (e.g., cycle/mobility stores).

#### **4.13 Waste management & contingencies**

The proposed innovation in waste management for Plots F, K and L is of interest. However, the submission would benefit from greater clarity on contingency arrangements if the preferred approach were not adopted by the waste authority, or if a communal/underground system is temporarily out of service. The submitted servicing strategy which details the vehicular access arrangements for emptying such a system contain little detail on the management of waste on the site. Key practical questions including where individual bins would be stored and presented for collection including a robust back-up plan are not detailed. Without such plans there is a real risk of ad-hoc storage and a "sea of bins" in the public realm, undermining the quality of streets and squares.

##### RECOMMENDATION:

4.13. Provide a clear waste strategy in addition to the submitted Servicing Strategy (site-wide, with plot-level detail) that covers storage locations, access and servicing, and sets out contingency arrangements for Plots K and L should the preferred system not be adopted or be temporarily unavailable, so that public realm quality and resident amenity are protected.

#### **4.14 Inclusive design, rest points and everyday comfort**

From the documents submitted it is unclear to YCT whether the submitted plans comply with the Local Transport Strategy Policy 1.5 expectation of “seating at 50 metres intervals within the footstreet area and in all district and village centres and the routes to them, to allow people to rest during their journeys.”

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.14. Provide a site-wide seating and rest-point strategy for primary walking and cycling routes (including Hudson Boulevard and key connections to the station and bus stops), demonstrating that rest opportunities are frequent enough to support inclusive movement and dwell. The strategy should confirm spacing, location (including at decision points and near crossings), and inclusive design/placement consistent with BS 8300-1 and relevant City of York Council guidance.

#### **4.15 Traffic Impact Assessment / Travel Plan: targets and monitoring**

Section 2.5 of the Travel Plan sets targets for maximum levels of car use (10.5% of hotel trips, 34% of employee trips and 37% of residents’ trips). YCT welcomes these ambitious targets, which are substantially lower than those assumed within the outline planning application. However, they necessarily imply that most trips will be made by sustainable modes. It is therefore important that sustainable transport provision is sufficient for the forecast demand, including bus service capacity and frequency, cycle parking, and (ideally) car club provision.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.15a. Introduce complementary targets and/or performance measures for key sustainable modes (e.g., bus use, cycling, walking, car club), so that the adequacy of provision can be monitored against the travel mode assumptions underpinning the Travel Plan.

4.15b - Increase car club provision. As a starting point, provide at least three dedicated car club spaces serving Plots K and L, and a similar number to serve Plots E and F and the Hotel and Innovation Hub, with locations that are visible, convenient and supported by membership incentives.

Section 2.6 of the Travel Plan proposes annual monitoring arrangements. In general, the approach is acceptable. However, for residents the monitoring is limited to the “main activity”. This is likely to capture employment or education trips, but these do not typically represent the majority of all journeys. YCT considers that monitoring should also cover other significant journey purposes, particularly leisure and retail, to provide a more accurate picture of travel behaviour and to ensure that mitigation and management measures remain effective.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

4.15c. Expand resident travel monitoring beyond the “main activity” to include other major journey purposes (including leisure and retail), and set out how findings will trigger review or additional measures if targets are not being met.

## **5. Specific Aspects of the Phase 1c Reserved Matters Application**

### **5.1. Western Station Entrance**

#### **5.1.1 Access and amenities**

The Western Station Entrance (WSE) is a crucial piece of city infrastructure. It will shape first impressions of York Central and is expected to accommodate very significant pedestrian flows, including people with luggage, mobility aids, buggies and cycles. YCT welcomes the principle of step-free connectivity and a clear public interface. Whilst, recognising that York Central Limited has engaged a range of stakeholders, including YCT, in developing the submitted design – we have concerns about the practicality of relying on stairs and lifts alone to address a substantial level change, and about the absence of key supporting evidence (notably the pedestrian flow analysis) from the submission.

Paragraph 2.2.1 of the Design and Access Statement identifies the objective of “facilitating a continuous accessible route” between York Central and York Station. This ambition is welcomed. However, the documents make clear that full step-free connectivity across all platforms remains dependent on Network Rail, and outside the scope of RMA 5, who currently have no immediate plans to provide direct accessible access to platforms 1–3, 10 or 11. We therefore urge the York Central Partnership (including CYC) to maintain pressure on Network Rail so that comprehensive step-free access throughout the station is delivered as an essential part of the York Central vision.

The proposed access arrangement—comprising a staircase and two lifts—raises two linked concerns:

1. Capacity and passenger experience. The application refers to the lifts and stairs being “sized to pedestrian flow analysis” for the WSE, but that analysis is not included in the submission. Given the significant level change (c. 7.8m) and peak conditions associated with train departures, YCT considers there is a real risk that many able-bodied passengers will opt for lifts in the absence of an escalator, leading to queuing, delay and crowding. This is particularly problematic where passengers may be rushing to catch trains, and where lift congestion can become a safety and management issue.
2. Design standards and compliance. A long stair ascent of this scale needs to demonstrate compliance with relevant Building Regulations and inclusive design standards, including appropriate landings, safe geometry, and arrangements that

avoid over-long uninterrupted flights and associated pinch points. The current submission does not provide sufficient detail to confirm this.

Comparable contemporary station entrances at Leeds and Reading commonly provide a triad of stairs, escalators and lifts, distributing flows, reducing lift pressure, and improving the experience for passengers with luggage, buggies and cycles while maintaining step-free access for all.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

5.1.1a. Provide the pedestrian flow analysis used to size the WSE stairs and lifts, including assumptions about peak passenger volumes, proportion of passengers using lifts versus stairs, expected queue lengths/wait times, and how peak crowding will be managed safely.

5.1.1b. Include an escalator alongside the stairs and lifts at the WSE, recognising the significant level change and the likelihood of lift queuing if no escalator is provided. A feasibility statement should be submitted and, if an escalator is not progressed, a clear justification provided. Best practice also supports grouping lifts together rather than placing them either side of a staircase, as this avoids users—particularly those with mobility impairments—having to cross pedestrian flows to reach the most convenient lift.

5.1.1c. Provide sufficient detailed design information to demonstrate that the WSE staircase arrangement complies with all relevant inclusive design and safety standards applicable to railway infrastructure, including the Department for Transport's *Design Standards for Accessible Railway Stations* (2015). This should address landing provision, flight arrangement, widths, avoidance of pinch points, and safe movement during peak station conditions, recognising that conventional Building Regulations may not apply to railway infrastructure.

5.1.1d. The York Central Partnership (including CYC) should continue to press Network Rail to provide direct accessible routes to all platforms, as full step-free connectivity across the station remains a core aspiration for York Central and is essential to delivering a genuinely inclusive station interface.

### **5.1.2. Western Station Entrance: architectural expression and long-term durability**

The Western Station Entrance will be one of the most visible and heavily used elements of Phase 1c, shaping first impressions of York Central and acting as the hinge between the station, hotel, cycle hub and Coal Drops Square. The archway concept set out in the Design and Access Statement is strong in principle and has the potential to create a memorable civic “gateway” moment. However, the current resolution appears weakened: the number and irregularity of arches has been reduced from the stated design intent, and the profile reads as a more standardised, minimal gesture rather than a robust, monumental piece of city infrastructure. YCT therefore considers that the arch should be strengthened and given

greater depth, relief and material weight so that it both performs as a clear station threshold and helps unify the composition of the station entrance, hotel and cycle hub.

Material choice matters here as much as form. The proposed use of cement board (as understood from the submitted information) raises concerns about long-term durability, repairability and whole-life carbon, particularly for an element intended to read as permanent civic infrastructure. The entrance is also north-facing and exposed, so wind comfort, leaf build-up and night-time security warrant careful consideration in the detailed design.

Given the prominence of the hotel in new views (including towards the Minster) and its role in first impressions on arrival by rail, both the corner articulation and the rear elevation need to feel resolved and welcoming, avoiding any sense of a back-of-house façade facing one of the city's primary arrival points. The rear of the hotel currently lacks delivery against the stated concept and should be strengthened so it does not read or function as a "back door" elevation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

5.1.2a. Provide a clear material and façade specification for the Western Station Entrance (including justification in whole-life carbon and maintenance terms), and ensure that key gateway elements use durable, repairable, long-life materials appropriate to a major station entrance and civic threshold.

5.1.2b. Refine the architectural expression of the Western Station Entrance so that the archway reads as a confident, civic gateway and a unifying element within the station-hotel-cycle hub composition (including appropriate depth, relief, rhythm/irregularity and visual weight), rather than a minimal applied motif.

5.1.2c. Provide a coordinated night-time strategy for the Western Station Entrance and adjacent public realm (lighting, passive surveillance, security shutters where necessary) and demonstrate that microclimate issues (wind, shelter, leaf/fouling management) are addressed.

5.1.2d. Treat the hotel's rail-facing elevation and corner articulation as a principal public façade: refine massing, material hierarchy and detailing so it reads as welcoming and "front-of-house" when viewed from the station platforms and arrival routes, avoiding blank/servicing-dominated edges and strengthening the sense of arrival.

5.1.2e. Provide an integrated "arrival sequence" plan for the Western Station Entrance, showing coordinated wayfinding, accessibility, and public realm treatment from key desire lines (station platforms, Cinder Lane crossing, Coal Drops Square, cycle hub and hotel) so the gateway works as a legible, uncluttered and cohesive piece of urban design.

### 5.1.3 Hotel: arrival and inclusive access

YCT welcomes the hotel’s active ground-floor relationship with Coal Drops Square and the broader intention to frame the civic space. However, the accessibility experience should be scrutinised. The Blue Badge parking/servicing access at the rear currently appears to involve a tortuous route to reach the station deck, and the ground-floor plan risks reading as a “front” for pedestrians and a compromised “rear” for disabled access and servicing.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

5.1.3. Provide further evidence (plans/sections and access narrative) that Blue Badge access to the hotel and station entrance is direct, intuitive and dignified, and that both the public-facing and rail-facing elevations are designed as “fronts” rather than back-of-house façades.

### 5.1.4. Hotel – elevations, internal planning and legibility

YCT considers that the hotel elevations would benefit from a clearer architectural hierarchy—particularly a stronger articulation of “base, middle and crown”—to give the building greater legibility and civic presence. As currently presented, the repeated rows and columns of near-identical window openings risk creating a monotonous façade that could read as generic. This could be improved through a more pronounced hierarchy and variety, for example by introducing changes in material and tone, increased relief and depth, stronger bay articulation, and occasional subtle shifts in window proportions or detailing. Collectively, these measures would add texture, break down perceived scale, and help anchor the building more convincingly in its York context.

YCT also encourages further consideration of internal layout to enhance everyday quality and inclusive access. In particular, there may be opportunities to introduce natural light to circulation areas (including corridors) through carefully placed windows and/or “borrowed light” from stairwells, improving orientation and comfort. In addition, YCT recommends confirming that accessible bedrooms are located as close as practicable to lifts (and other key facilities) to minimise long corridor travel and repeated fire-door thresholds. This should be considered alongside the strategy for refuges and assisted evacuation, to ensure that inclusive access is supported not only at arrival but throughout the guest experience.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1.4a. Hotel elevations – hierarchy and articulation: Strengthen the hotel’s architectural hierarchy (base/middle/crown) and reduce façade monotony by introducing greater variety and legibility through calibrated changes in materials, depth/relief, bay articulation, and occasional subtle shifts in window proportions/detailing, to better anchor the building in its York context.

5.1.4b. Hotel internal quality – daylight and wayfinding: Review opportunities to introduce natural light to circulation spaces (including corridors), for example through carefully placed windows and/or borrowed light from stairwells, to improve orientation, comfort and everyday user experience.

5.1.5c. Inclusive layout – accessible rooms and evacuation): Confirm that accessible bedrooms are located as close as practicable to lifts and key facilities to minimise long corridor travel and repeated fire-door thresholds, and provide (or cross-reference) an assisted evacuation/refuge strategy demonstrating how inclusive access is supported throughout the building.

### **5.1.5. Cycle hub: design quality and visibility**

The cycle hub is a key piece of sustainable transport infrastructure and a visible signal of the development’s priorities. The current architectural treatment risks reading as generic and dated offering a 1970s vibe, rather than as a civic-quality building that supports the ambition for York Central to be nationally leading in sustainable travel. The hub has limited changing, showering, toilet and locker provision. All of these will mitigate against its use.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

5.1.5 Revisit the architectural design of the cycle hub so that it provides sufficient facilities to function and reads as a high-quality, contemporary piece of public infrastructure (in material, form and detailing), aligned with the character of Coal Drops Square and the wider York Central design ambitions.

### **5.2 Innovation Hub**

YCT welcomes the Innovation Hub as an employment and identity anchor for York Central, and particularly welcomes the ambition for its interior and the use of a timber structural solution. However, some of the least engaging elevations are those that will be experienced by many daily users, including along Cinder Street and at the rear where station servicing, drop-off and circulation occur.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

5.2a. Strengthen the rear and Cinder Street-facing elevations with active frontage, lighting, and public realm interventions (including public art where appropriate) so that these routes feel safe, legible and interesting during evenings and in quieter periods.

5.2b. Review the station drop-off and servicing route at the rear of the Innovation Hub to ensure it is intuitive, well overlooked, and designed as a safe, attractive place despite heavy movement and servicing demands.

Additional comments: the Innovation Hub’s simple industrial “box” typology sits well with York’s history of mills and factories, and its environmental aspirations are welcomed. To strengthen the façade composition and reduce any sense of flatness, the detailing of the glazed elements between the primary front bays could be further refined (for example by recessing glazing to increase depth and shadow).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.2c. Refine the Innovation Hub façade detailing (including consideration of recessed glazing between primary bays) and ensure that the rear/service-facing elevations and the station drop-off route are designed as safe, attractive, legible spaces with appropriate lighting, active presence and (where suitable) public art.

## 5.3 Coal Drops Square

### 5.3.1 Landscaping design

YCT notes a risk that the proposed landscape, surface treatments and planting could inadvertently shift Coal Drops Square towards a hotel forecourt/piazza character, reading as an extension of the hotel rather than a space anchored in the coal drops heritage. This makes it especially important that, where coal drops walls have been removed, their former alignment is clearly marked within the public realm so that the remaining wall sections remain legible as railway heritage and are not misconstrued as generic boundary or buttressed retaining walls. In particular, extensive planting within the bays and paving patterns aligned primarily with the hotel façade could dilute the historic narrative and confuse the reading of the retained wall elements.

There is also a strong placemaking and wayfinding case for integrating Coal Drops Square more clearly with the National Railway Museum’s Museum Square. These spaces will function as a sequence of major public arrival and gathering points, and a coherent relationship between them would strengthen legibility, movement, and a sense of civic continuity, helping Coal Drops Square read as part of a wider cultural and heritage landscape rather than a hotel-adjacent space.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.3.1a. Ensure that Coal Drops Square’s surface treatment, interpretation and planting prioritise the heritage significance and legibility of the coal drops structure. Clearly mark the footprint/alignment of removed walls within the square. Avoid aligning paving and detailing primarily with the hotel bays. Ensure that planting and street furniture do not obscure, diminish or confuse the significance of the retained wall fragments.

5.3.1b. Strengthen the spatial and visual relationship between Coal Drops Square and the NRM’s Museum Square through coordinated surface treatments, alignment of key routes and consistent wayfinding, reinforcing legibility, cohesion and the wider placemaking role of this part of York Central.

### 5.3.2. Pedestrian route alignment and traffic clutter

YCT welcomes the overall transport vision and the direction of travel on parking restraint, but identifies several priority matters for refinement, particularly in relation to station access and the delivery of safe, direct and legible pedestrian and cycle routes.

The submitted plans indicate a dog-leg in the primary pedestrian route to the Western Station Entrance (e.g. DAS Section 9.2 and referenced again in Section 4.1.1). The same area also appears to include elements that could further constrain or obstruct pedestrian movement, including a line of trees (Section 4.2) and benches (Section 5.3.1). Given the expected pedestrian volumes and the role of this route as a key desire line from the signalised crossing, YCT considers it essential that the approach is straight, wide and free of unnecessary clutter, with clear sightlines and sufficient capacity for people with luggage, mobility aids and buggies.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

5.3.2c. Refine the approach route from the signalised crossing to the WSE to provide a direct, generous and legible pedestrian line, with clear sightlines and adequate width/capacity. Confirm that planting and street furniture are positioned to avoid narrowing, pinch points or clutter on the main desire line.

### 5.3.3 Event management & public art

Coal Drops Square has the potential to become one York's defining public spaces: a civic threshold between the National Railway Museum, the station, and the new neighbourhood. We welcome the ambition for the square as a flexible space that can host events, and the move towards a naming that reflects the site's history. At the same time, several issues require further attention: how the square will function on a normal day (not only during events); how it will connect and relate to adjacent spaces (including Museum Square and George Square); and how the remaining heritage fabric will be read and interpreted.

In addition to its role as an events space, Coal Drops Square should function well on an everyday basis as a destination in its own right and as a clear "gateway" between the station, the NRM and the wider York Central neighbourhood. At present it remains unclear how the space will be animated outside of programmed events (for example in terms of dwell time, comfort, shelter and orientation).

There is a strong opportunity for high-quality public art and interpretation that draws on the site's railway history and strengthens wayfinding between key destinations.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

5.3.3a. Clarify the intended everyday function of Coal Drops Square when not in event mode, including what will encourage dwell time and a sense of destination, and how the space will be animated outside programmed events.

5.3.3b. Clarify long-term stewardship and maintenance responsibilities for Coal Drops Square public realm (including the coal drops walls and planting), so that upkeep, cleaning and repairs are adequately funded and clearly managed.

5.3.3c. For major events, provide a clear temporary facilities plan (including the likely need for additional WCs, their location and servicing arrangements), to complement permanent ground-level provision and to avoid ad-hoc impacts on the square and adjacent routes.

5.3.3d. Strengthen pedestrian crossing points and desire lines between Coal Drops Square and Museum Square (and onward to the National Railway Museum), to ensure the square functions as a true gateway rather than an isolated set piece.

#### **5.3.4 Public toilet provision for Coal Drops Square**

The Group also raised concerns about the adequacy and accessibility of public toilet provision associated with Coal Drops Square. The current proposal appears to comprise the WSE's wheelchair-accessible WC, a single standard cubicle, and a Changing Places facility, all located at Level 01. For a major civic space capable of hosting large events, YCT considers this quantum and location insufficient, incompatible with design standards, and potentially difficult to access quickly from the square at peak times. The available guidance recommends between 10 and 12 toilets per 1000 people involved in public events. This suggests that between 15 and 18 units will be needed.

##### **RECOMMENDATION:**

5.3.4. Expand public toilet provision associated with Coal Drops Square, ensuring that the principal provision is at ground level and directly accessible from the square. The quantity of provision should be increased to a level that is realistic for peak demand.

#### **5.4 Build to Rent blocks (Plots F)**

The Build to Rent (BTR) blocks are a prominent component in the middle of the Phase 1c sequence and play an important role in how the neighbourhood reads and feels. YCT supports the principle of BTR as part of a mixed-tenure neighbourhood and notes that discounted rent provision is appropriately located within this typology.

However, there is a risk that material palette and uniformity here weaken the overall cohesion of the Coal Drops Square to Foundry Quarter progression.

YCT is concerned that Plot F’s architectural rhythm, massing and materials remain overly uniform relative to the parameter plans’ aspiration for a more irregular, “York” grain. Given the very long frontage along Cinder Street, the current elevations risk reading as bulky and relentless, with insufficient breaks, depth/relief or tonal variation—particularly where lighter/yellow brick and repetitive window grids create a monolithic character. YCT also notes that the upper “crown”/parapet treatment appears thin in proportion in places, and that some elevations lack a convincing top or “finishing” detail, further reinforcing a generic, out-of-scale appearance. In addition, it is important that the BTR blocks contribute positively to street animation and safety, avoiding blank edges and overly repetitive ground-floor conditions and ensuring active, legible entrances and communal interfaces that support passive surveillance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

5.4a. Review Plot F’s external materials palette, roof/parapet “top” treatment and overall articulation so that this central portion does not read as the weakest link between Coal Drops Square and the Foundry Quarter, and so that it delivers a coherent, place-specific expression rather than a generic BTR block.

5.4b. Strengthen Plot F’s façade articulation and material variation—introducing meaningful breaks in massing, greater depth/relief, and tonal changes—so that the long Cinder Street frontage reads as a sequence of varied elements rather than a single bulky elevation, better reflecting York’s characteristic grain.

5.4c. Ensure that Plot F’s ground-floor interfaces (including entrances, communal spaces and any active frontages) are designed to support street life, legibility and passive surveillance, avoiding blank edges and overly repetitive elevations, particularly along key routes to the station and through to Central Park.

### **5.5 York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)**

Plot E is central to how residents will experience York Central as a neighbourhood rather than a collection of development plots. The plot should help transition movement between Coal Drops Square, Central Park and the Foundry Quarter, and should contribute to a clear hierarchy of streets and spaces. YCT’s workshop feedback highlighted the need for stronger cohesion and stitching across this portion of the scheme, and for clarity on how adjacent squares and routes will be connected and animated.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.5a. Strengthen the spatial and architectural stitching between Plot E and adjacent public spaces (including Coal Drops Square and Central Park), ensuring that key pedestrian routes are direct, legible and feel continuously animated and overlooked.

On detailed design issues: YCT considers that Plot E would benefit from further refinement to improve elevation interest, coherence between building elements, and the quality and usability of the public realm. In particular, the roofscape and massing transitions (including the relationship between the 5-storey and 3-storey elements) currently read as unresolved in places, and some façade details risk appearing flat or repetitive. YCT also notes that the curved edge treatment shown on certain corner blocks (e.g., Plot 6E) appears at odds with the predominantly angular language elsewhere; while the act of “turning the corner” is welcome, the gesture would benefit from clearer hierarchy and consistency in how it is expressed at ground and upper levels.

At ground level, YCT is concerned that Plot E appears overly dominated by hard surfacing and car parking, with comparatively weak provision of green space and community-focused amenity. This is particularly sensitive around the social rent block (E1), where the external space is likely to function primarily as a movement corridor for pedestrians and cyclists accessing Wilton Rise bridge, rather than as the usable amenity suggested by CGIs—especially once the adjacent later-phase office block is delivered. Operational details also require clarification, including mobility scooter storage/charging (to avoid fire-risk in lobbies), bin store accessibility (notably at E2), and whether the absence of any parking provision for E1 is realistic and appropriately mitigated.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

5.5b. Roofscape articulation and elevation relief): Introduce greater roofscape articulation for the 3-storey flat-roof elements (e.g., parapet depth, coping detail, set-backs, or other proportionate relief) to reduce monotony and add visual richness, while remaining consistent with the site-wide design code.

5.5c. Massing transitions between 5 and 3 storeys: Refine the 5-storey to 3-storey transition to achieve a more comfortable rhythm and coherence, potentially through roof design, set-backs, intermediate elements, or façade modulation that ties the parts together and improves the overall silhouette.

5.5d. Corner articulation and consistency of design language: Clarify and strengthen the architectural approach to corner buildings (e.g., Plot 6E), ensuring the curved/rounded edge treatment is either more convincingly expressed as a deliberate feature (including at ground level) or adjusted to align with the prevailing architectural language elsewhere. Provide comparative elevation/3D views demonstrating how corner turns are handled consistently across the plot and adjacent parcels.

5.5e. Rebalance the Plot E public realm to reduce the dominance of hard surfacing, car parking and rear access roads, and to increase usable green space and community-focused amenity. Review the alignment and number of access roads—particularly behind the mansion blocks—to release space for landscape, trees and places to sit, meet and play, not solely routes through the site. Provide a clear plan showing landscape quantum, quality and function.

5.5f. E1 amenity realism and future adjacent development: Provide an updated assessment of amenity space serving the social rent block (E1), demonstrating that it will remain usable and of adequate quality once the later-phase adjacent office block is delivered, and that it is not primarily a movement corridor to Wilton Rise bridge. If necessary, revise the landscape/public realm design to secure meaningful, overlooked resident amenity.

5.5g. E1 parking strategy and mitigation: Clarify the parking strategy for the social rent block (E1), including whether zero on-plot parking is realistic for this tenure and typology and, if so, what mitigations are proposed (e.g., car club provision close by, accessible drop-off arrangements, servicing/blue badge strategy, public transport provision and travel plan support).

5.5h. Mobility scooter storage and charging: Provide a compliant mobility scooter storage/charging strategy for each block (including Plots E and F), avoiding storage in lobbies where it could compromise escape routes or increase fire risk. Identify secure locations, capacity, access arrangements and management measures (e.g., within dedicated mobility/cycle stores).

5.5i. E2 – bin store access and operation: Clarify and, if necessary, redesign the bin store access arrangements for Plot E2 to ensure safe, convenient access for residents and waste operatives. Demonstrate that bin stores are not constrained by adjacent parking, and that access/turning and collection operations can occur without conflict.

## **5.6 Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)**

The Foundry Quarter reads as among the most successful elements of Phase 1c in terms of enclosure, articulation, and the potential to create a strong sense of place. It functions as a set piece of community-making and benefits from a robust red brick character that also ties back to other areas around Coal Drops Square and the Leeman Road community. However, we are concerned about (i) long-term delivery of the Foundry Yard buildings and associated community functions, (ii) the degree of uniformity in some residential blocks facing Central Park, and (iii) parking arrangements that could undermine streetscape quality and adversely affect the emphasis on play, recreation and social interaction space.

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

5.6a. Provide greater assurance on the delivery of community-supporting uses and spaces associated with the Foundry Quarter, including how interim community needs will be met if Foundry Yard buildings are delivered later than the residential blocks.

5.6b. Introduce greater variation and irregularity in the three blocks facing Central Park, so that the Quarter embraces a richer rhythm and avoids a sense of repetitive massing in a key park-facing frontage.

5.6c. Relocate sufficient non-blue badge spaces currently proposed to be on-street within Plots K and L to avoid on-street parking dominating the public realm and enabling the streets to provide the play space for over-fives, recreational and social interaction space to which the application is committed.

In Plots K and L, the intent to create a varied streetscape and a distinctive “home zone” character is welcomed. However, some of the detailed access arrangements for the raised/upper houses (including stepped metal structures serving small groups of dwellings) appear over-complicated and visually fussy, with limited grounding in York precedent. A more streamlined, robust approach could simplify maintenance and improve the overall character.

There is also an opportunity to embed everyday community-building functions within the residential quarters, for example through small allotment or community growing provision (building on the railway tradition of allotments), or ‘edible borders’ within suitable public realm edges.

RECOMMENDATION:

5.6d. Revisit the access/stair detailing for raised houses in Plots K and L to simplify the design, improve robustness and maintenance, and ensure the solution is grounded in York precedent or demonstrably appropriate contemporary best practice.

5.6e. Explore the inclusion of community growing space (allotments and/or edible borders) within the residential plots, with clear management arrangements, to support community formation and everyday use of the public realm.

On detailed design points:

5.6.1 Apartment Block B (G) – proximity between blocks

YCT notes that the spaces between some elements of Apartment Block B appear very tight (c. 3m). At this distance there is a risk of poor residential amenity (notably overlooking and reduced privacy), and the applicant should also demonstrate that the arrangement is appropriate from a fire safety perspective (including how any external fire spread risk is managed).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.6f. Provide a clear assessment of separation distances between facing elevations within Block G and demonstrate how privacy/overlooking is mitigated (e.g., window alignment, screening, obscure glazing where justified, or re-planning). Confirm that the external arrangement is compliant with relevant fire safety requirements and does not introduce avoidable external fire spread risk.

5.6.2 Apartment Block E – elevations, legibility and entrance hierarchy

At ground floor level, a repetitive elevation rhythm with similar openings risks reducing legibility; in particular, entrances should be clearly identifiable and given appropriate prominence in the façade hierarchy.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.6g. Strengthen entrance legibility at ground floor level through clearer hierarchy and architectural cues (e.g., recess/relief, canopy/porch treatment, material change, lighting and signage), so entrances are easy to locate and read as “top tier” elements of the elevation.

**5.7 Central Park**

Central Park is intended to be the principal green space for Phase 1 and will play a central role in shaping place identity, supporting daily recreation, and delivering ecological value. Our workshops strongly supported the principle of a distinctive, biodiverse park. However, they also highlighted risks associated with over-programming and over-complication, which can undermine legibility, flexibility and long-term success.

A clear understanding of primary users is essential. In YCT’s view, the day-to-day needs of new residents should be the anchor, with the park also functioning as a generous and welcoming space for wider visitors. Design approaches should therefore prioritise simple, adaptable spaces that support informal play, relaxation and community life, rather than relying on an accumulation of fixed features or tightly programmed elements.

Given Central Park’s role as the principal shared green space for the new neighbourhood, its success will also depend on meaningful engagement with residents—both existing neighbours and future occupants—during detailed design and early operation. Involving the community in shaping how the park looks, functions and is used day-to-day can help ensure it meets real needs, builds a sense of ownership, and adapts over time.

Long-term management and maintenance should be a fundamental design consideration from the outset. This is particularly important in relation to ecological and water-based features, including any seasonal or variable water proposals, which can add interest and biodiversity but also introduce maintenance, safety and usability challenges if not carefully designed. The success of Central Park will depend on landscapes and features that remain attractive, functional and resilient over time, across seasons and changing patterns of use.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.7a. Avoid over-complicating the design of Central Park. Prioritise legible, flexible green space that supports everyday play, relaxation and community formation for residents, with ecological and water-based features integrated in ways that are robust, safe and maintainable over the long term, including across seasonal change. At the moment, the overcomplication of design limits diversity of use.

5.7b. Incorporate community involvement in the detailed design and early management of Central Park, including opportunities for existing neighbours and future residents to inform its layout, features and everyday use, so that the park functions as a well-used, locally valued space rather than a purely designed landscape.

We note interest in features such as ponds, seasonal water and allotment-style community growing. These could, if well designed, add to community building and biodiversity. However, there is a risk that Central Park is being asked to do too much on its own. The wider York Central green network—including Millennium Field, Millennium Green and the proposed green routes through the Foundry Quarter—should help share the load, offering distinct but complementary experiences and supporting wayfinding and everyday use. Seasonal ponds in particular can raise practical issues (for example, drying, odour and habitat management) and must be supported by realistic specification and maintenance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

5.7c. If seasonal ponds or wet woodland are retained within the design, provide a clear technical and management rationale (including water supply, drying scenarios, odour control and maintenance), and ensure the Ecological Landscape Management Plan is sufficiently specific and not overly generic.

5.7d. Strengthen connections and legibility between Central Park and nearby complementary green spaces, including Millennium Field within the Foundry Quarter and Millennium Green in the neighbouring community, so that the network of green routes and spaces feels coherent and mutually supportive.

5.7e. Provide a clear design and wayfinding approach for the green route through K+L (including sightlines, lighting, passive surveillance and landscape character), ensuring it reads as a safe,

legible connector and offers a distinct but complementary experience to Central Park rather than duplicating it.

The 'Wander Wilds' are described as 'arboretum-like'. YCT questions whether that is the right association for this setting, particularly given Museum Gardens' established role in the city centre and the potentially artificial connotations of an arboretum. A clearer emphasis on open woodland character, native species and a varied canopy (with a mix of open and closed areas) would likely provide a more authentic, resilient and legible landscape experience.

In the Sky Fields area, the relationship between native woodland and the proposed ornamental tree character could be refined so that each reads as a coherent space rather than as competing or fragmented landscape ideas. Simple, robust moves are likely to age better than over-complex layering.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

5.7f. Refine the Central Park woodland concept so that 'Wander Wilds' reads as open native woodland (rather than 'arboretum-like'), with a clear rationale for canopy structure, species selection and long-term management, and with the Sky Fields / ornamental tree areas designed as coherent, legible sub-spaces.

## **6. Further recommendations**

This section highlights matters that may be outside RMA 5 but affect the quality of the development.

### **6.1 Delivering the transport vision from the outset**

YCT strongly supports the overall transport vision for York Central: a place where sustainable modes are the default and car use is genuinely restrained. However, the credibility of this vision depends on early delivery of attractive public transport alternatives, alongside robust monitoring and timely intervention if targets are not met. Best practice is clear that public transport enhancements should be available from first occupation, rather than introduced later in response to travel patterns that may already have become embedded.

The S106 agreement with City of York Council includes additional public transport provision (including at least four non-P&R bus services per hour in each direction). As further discussions take place it is crucial that the early provision of high quality public transport at the first possible opportunity is included. This is critical to achieving the low levels of car use assumed in the Traffic Impact Assessment and to embedding sustainable travel behaviours for residents and employees from the outset. (For YCT's detailed assessment of bus provision,

see Annex 1.)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1a. Secure and prioritise public transport improvements from first occupation, including a minimum of four non-P&R bus services per hour in each direction, with funding and delivery secured through the S106 and linked to delivery and occupancy rather than later review.

6.1b. Increase the #59 P&R service to four buses per hour in the morning peak from the outset, and reroute the #2 P&R service via York Central in both directions as soon as the access road is complete. All services should serve stops for Plots K and L and Plot E (G).

6.1c. Include clear, measurable modal share targets in the Travel Plan for bus, walking and cycling (not solely overall car use), with monitoring across all major residential trip purposes and a defined escalation process where targets are not being met.

**6.2 NRM Corridor**

The Design and Access Statement for Central Park indicates that the rail corridor design is excluded from this application and may come forward under a separate approval, with the potential for a reversion to a more standard ballast-based solution if agreement on embedded rail is not reached. Given the rail corridor’s significance to Central Park’s spatial and experiential quality, YCT is concerned that a key element of the public realm could be left contingent on later decisions. YCT also notes a risk that safety requirements along the NRM railway line could result in extensive railings and a “fenced corridor” effect, undermining the intended character of the park and its relationship with the museum and adjacent spaces. Any boundary treatments should therefore be minimised and designed to feel integrated, generous and consistent with the park’s design intent.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

6.7f. Provide greater certainty on the rail corridor design through Central Park, including how design intent will be secured if elements are subject to separate approval. The submission should confirm the intended rail solution (including embedded rail, where proposed), demonstrate how safety will be achieved without creating a “fenced corridor” effect, and set out an integrated approach to boundary treatments, maintenance and long-term management.

**7. Summary and conclusion**

York Civic Trust supports the York Central Phase 1c Reserved Matters submission, recognising the substantial progress made and the strong ambitions evident in transport strategy,

employment space, public realm and housing delivery. Our RECOMMENDATIONS focus on strengthening the scheme's day-to-day functionality, inclusivity and long-term performance: ensuring the transport vision is delivered from first occupation; creating homes and neighbourhoods which will successfully deliver equality of opportunity – via proper “pepper potting” of affordable housing –through addressing the provision of amenity and other facilities create places where people will thrive, providing safe and direct access to the station; securing sufficient bus, car club and toilet provision; improving cohesion and quality across key frontages; simplifying and safeguarding deliverability of Central Park; and strengthening heritage legibility and interpretation.

We hope these points are helpful in refining the scheme and in securing conditions or obligations that will support excellent delivery. YCT would welcome continued dialogue with the applicant and the Council as the proposals progress through determination and into implementation.



## Appendix A: Table of Recommendations

The table below summarises the recommendations made within this comment. It is intended to assist officers and the applicant in identifying actions and their rationale.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
<b>SITE-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS (apply across multiple plots / the overall masterplan)</b>				
<b>Community facilities, social infrastructure and integration with neighbouring communities</b>				
R1	4.1	Community facilities, social infrastructure and integration with neighbouring communities	In order to discharge Condition 83 bring forward details of the 'on-site indoor community space' in conjunction with the detailed design of Phase 1c. Any such facility should be co-designed with existing communities, who it is hoped by York Central Limited will use the community infrastructure the development will offer, and new residential community. It is imperative for the development of a strong community that the timetable for Condition 83 is not allowed to slip.	To support social cohesion and integration with neighbouring communities.
<b>Housing Allocation</b>				
R4	4.4	Neighbourhood-led housing delivery	Treat Phase 1c as a neighbourhood-led scheme, ensuring that housing design, tenure distribution, access to amenity, affordability in use, and everyday operational matters (including waste, servicing and energy costs) are addressed coherently across all plots, rather than as plot-specific technical issues.	To secure coherent neighbourhood creation, equitable living conditions across tenures, and a robust benchmark for future phases of York Central.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
R5	4.5a	Housing mix and tenure integration	Demonstrate how the proposed housing mix (including the balance of houses versus flats) responds to identified local need and community-building objectives, and confirm the proportion of Plots K and L that are houses compared with flats.	To support social cohesion and integration with neighbouring communities.
R6	4.5b	Pepper-potting of affordable and social rent housing	Secure effective pepper-potting of affordable and social rent housing across plots, blocks and typologies (including houses where feasible), avoiding concentrations that risk segregation and ensuring shared access to entrances, amenity and public realm on a tenure-blind basis.	To promote social integration, avoid segregation, and support long-term community cohesion.
R7	4.5.c	Housing mix and tenure integration	The pepper-potting of the IMR homes in site F should be shown on the plans so that social and community integration can be judged.	To support social cohesion and integration with neighbouring communities.
R9	4.5d	Housing mix and tenure integration	Re-allocate some of the three-bedroom apartments to three-bedroom house provision in the Foundry Quarter	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R10	4.5e	Affordable Housing	Aspire to deliver above the 20% target for affordable housing.	To aspire to above target affordable housing.
<b>Masterplan coherence and plot-to-plot coordination</b>				
R11	4.2	Masterplan coherence and plot-to-plot coordination	Review the design of Central Park with existing local communities and priority new communities to ensure that it meets their needs from the outset and is maintainable in the long-term by the arrangements suggested in the Landscape	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			and Management Plan submitted alongside RMA 5. Where required simplify the design of Central Park.	
<b>Landscape ambition and long-term deliverability</b>				
R12	4.2	Landscape ambition and long-term deliverability	Simplify the Central Park concept so that it prioritises everyday usability and community-building for residents, and secure a detailed, plot-specific Landscape and Ecological Management Plan that is consistent across the Design and Access, ecology and landscape documents, with clear responsibilities and resourcing, and scope for community involvement in shaping and adapting the park's use over time.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
<b>Public realm management, events and maintenance</b>				
R13	4.6	Public realm management, events and maintenance	Secure, by condition or planning obligation, a Public Realm Management and Maintenance Plan for the public spaces e.g. Coal Drops Square, including event management principles, servicing, cleaning, lighting, safety, responsibilities, and long-term funding arrangements.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
<b>Heritage and the legibility of place</b>				
R14	4.7a	Heritage and the legibility of place	Heritage interpretation strategy (railway + pre-railway): Develop and secure a site-wide heritage interpretation strategy for York Central that covers both railway and pre-railway histories. It should explain how retained fabric and key historic narratives will be made legible in the public realm (signage/graphics/digital), with clear locations/priorities for delivery in Phase 1c.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R15	4.7b	Heritage and the legibility of place	Non-designated assets – retention and reuse options appraisal: Reassess the proposed demolition of the Gatehouse Building (Foundry Quarter) and former Generator/Compressor (Power) House (Coal Drops Square) through a rigorous, transparent options appraisal demonstrating that retention and adaptive	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			reuse have been fully explored before demolition is pursued. The appraisal should test viable end uses (e.g., community/meeting space, interpretation point, public WCs/Changing Places, workspace) and include whole-life carbon, cost, operational, and place-making benefits.	
R16	4.7c	Heritage and the legibility of place	Outline ES “further research” – evidence and implications: Provide the further research and significance assessment recommended in the Outline application’s Environmental Statement for both buildings, and show clearly how this has informed the Phase 1c proposals. If demolition remains proposed, provide a clear, evidenced justification explaining why retention/adaptation is not feasible.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R17	4.7d	Heritage and the legibility of place	Public benefit and stewardship (if retained): If either building is retained, secure a delivery and management plan demonstrating meaningful public benefit (e.g., accessible toilets supporting Coal Drops Square, community space, interpretation), including fit-out, access, opening arrangements and long-term stewardship/maintenance.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R18	4.7e	Heritage and the legibility of place	Legibility of removed fabric (coal drops walls and other losses): Where historic structures or fragments are removed (including sections of coal drops walling), ensure their former footprint/alignment is clearly marked in the public realm and supported by interpretation, so that the historic form is understood rather than erased.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R19	4.7f	Heritage and the legibility of place	Mitigation if demolition proceeds: If demolition is accepted, require a strengthened mitigation package comprising (i) full historic building recording (Level proportionate to significance) and an interpretation plan, and (ii) replacement provision of the displaced public/community function within Phase 1c (e.g.,	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			WCs/Changing Places and/or a community room), so that civic/event capability is not diminished.	
<b>Green and brown roofs: management and urban wildlife</b>				
R20	4.9	Green and brown roofs: management and urban wildlife	Ensure that green/brown roof specifications and the associated management plan explicitly address urban wildlife risks (including herring gull attraction), with design measures and maintenance protocols to minimise nuisance while retaining biodiversity value.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
<b>Street hierarchy, play streets and kerb-free design</b>				
R21	4.8b	Street hierarchy, play streets and kerb-free design	In Plots K and L, pursue kerb-free streets or a maximum kerb upstand (e.g., 30mm) where appropriate, to reinforce slow-speed, shared-surface “home zone” character and inclusive movement.	To improve inclusive access, comfort and everyday usability.
<b>Amenity space for social rent provision</b>				
R22	4.10	Amenity space for social rent provision	Review the distribution and typology of social rent homes to ensure equitable access to usable outdoor amenity space, either through (i) providing private gardens/terraces where feasible, and/or (ii) ensuring convenient access to high-quality, overlooked shared green space. This should include reconsideration of the concentration of social rent units within back-to-back/level-change typologies, and demonstrating how the scheme achieves tenure-blind access to amenity.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
<b>Photovoltaics and benefit to residents</b>				
R23	4.11a	Photovoltaics and benefit to residents	Secure photovoltaic provision across all residential blocks, including those containing social rent homes, with a clear commitment that generated energy will be used to reduce communal energy costs and service charges for residents.	To strengthen sustainability and reduce whole-life carbon and running costs.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
R24	4.11b	Photovoltaics and benefit to residents	Explore the feasibility of incorporating battery storage alongside PV, and provide a brief statement of the outcome (including any constraints) and how on-site generation will be optimised for resident benefit.	To strengthen sustainability and reduce whole-life carbon and running costs.
<b>Waste management &amp; contingencies</b>				
R25	4.13	Waste management & contingencies	Provide a clear waste strategy (site-wide, with plot-level detail) that covers storage locations, access and servicing, and sets out contingency arrangements for Plots K and L should the preferred system not be adopted or be temporarily unavailable, so that public realm quality and resident amenity are protected.	To ensure workable, consistent waste storage and collection without public realm harm.
<b>Lighting and the night-time environment</b>				
<b>ISSUE-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS (cross-cutting technical matters, movement and servicing)</b>				
<b>Community building – Pedestrian permeability</b>				
R27	4.3	Community building – Pedestrian permeability	Provide a clear pedestrian connectivity plan demonstrating safe, overlooked and step-free links between St Peter’s Square and Carlisle/Carlton Streets and the York Central public realm, including any new access points, surface treatments, lighting and wayfinding, and how the connections will be delivered and retained over time.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Traffic Impact Assessment / Travel Plan: targets and monitoring</b>				
R34	4.15a	Traffic Impact Assessment / Travel Plan: targets and monitoring	Introduce complementary targets and/or performance measures for key sustainable modes (e.g., bus use, cycling, walking, car club), so that the adequacy of provision can be monitored against the travel mode assumptions underpinning the Travel Plan.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R35	4.15c	Traffic Impact Assessment / Travel	Expand resident travel monitoring beyond the “main activity” to include other major journey purposes (including leisure and	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
		Plan: targets and monitoring	retail), and set out how findings will trigger review or additional measures if targets are not being met.	accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Car clubs and shared mobility</b>				
R36	4.15b	Car clubs and shared mobility	Increase car club provision. As a starting point, provide at least three dedicated car club spaces serving Plots K and L, and a similar number to serve Plots E and F and the Hotel and Innovation Hub, with locations that are visible, convenient and supported by membership incentives.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Street hierarchy, play streets and kerb-free design</b>				
R37	4.8	Street hierarchy, play streets and kerb-free design	Clarify the intended operation of play streets across the whole site (including how they sit within the “tertiary street” hierarchy), and demonstrate that street layouts, parking arrangements and surface treatments are compatible with genuine play/stay functions rather than residual traffic space.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Resident amenity: Storage</b>				
R38	4.12	Resident amenity: Storage	Provide a consistent strategy for mobility scooter storage and charging across all apartment blocks (including Sites E and K+L), identifying the location, capacity, access arrangements and management measures. This should demonstrate compliance with relevant fire safety requirements and set out whether provision will be in lobbies or within suitably designed secure storage areas (e.g., cycle/mobility stores).	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Inclusive design, rest points and everyday comfort</b>				
R39	4.14	Inclusive design, rest points and everyday comfort	Provide a site-wide seating and rest-point strategy for primary walking and cycling routes (including Hudson Boulevard and key connections to the station and bus stops), demonstrating that rest opportunities are frequent enough to support inclusive movement and dwell. The strategy should confirm spacing, location (including at decision points and near crossings), and	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			inclusive design/placement consistent with BS 8300-1 and relevant City of York Council guidance.	
<b>Construction traffic and contractor parking</b>				
<b>SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS (by plot / place)</b>				
<b>Western Station Entrance and station interface</b>				
R41	5.1.1a	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide the pedestrian flow analysis used to size the WSE stairs and lifts, including assumptions about peak passenger volumes, proportion of passengers using lifts versus stairs, expected queue lengths/wait times, and how peak crowding will be managed safely.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R42	5.1.1b	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Include an escalator alongside the stairs and lifts at the WSE, recognising the significant level change and the likelihood of lift queuing if no escalator is provided. A feasibility statement should be submitted and, if an escalator is not progressed, a clear justification provided. Best practice also supports grouping lifts together rather than placing them either side of a staircase, as this avoids users—particularly those with mobility impairments—having to cross pedestrian flows to reach the most convenient lift.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R43	5.1.1c	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide sufficient detailed design information to demonstrate that the WSE staircase arrangement complies with relevant Building Regulations and inclusive design standards (including landing provision, flight arrangement, widths, and measures to avoid pinch points), and that the design supports safe movement during peak station conditions.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R44	5.1.1d	Station West Entrance and Hotel	The York Central Partnership (including CYC) should continue to press Network Rail to provide direct accessible routes to all platforms, as full step-free connectivity across the station	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			remains a core aspiration for York Central and is essential to delivering a genuinely inclusive station interface.	accessibility from first occupation.
R45	5.1.2a	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide a clear material and façade specification for the Western Station Entrance (including justification in whole-life carbon and maintenance terms), and ensure that key gateway elements use durable, repairable, long-life materials appropriate to a major station entrance and civic threshold.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R46	5.1.2b	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Refine the architectural expression of the Western Station Entrance so that the archway reads as a confident, civic gateway and a unifying element within the station-hotel-cycle hub composition (including appropriate depth, relief, rhythm/irregularity and visual weight), rather than a minimal applied motif.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R47	5.1.2c	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide a coordinated night-time strategy for the Western Station Entrance and adjacent public realm (lighting, passive surveillance, security shutters where necessary) and demonstrate that microclimate issues (wind, shelter, leaf/fouling management) are addressed.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R48	5.1.2d	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Treat the hotel's rail-facing elevation and corner articulation as a principal public façade: refine massing, material hierarchy and detailing so it reads as welcoming and "front-of-house" when viewed from the station platforms and arrival routes, avoiding blank/servicing-dominated edges and strengthening the sense of arrival.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R49	5.1.2e	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide an integrated "arrival sequence" plan for the Western Station Entrance, showing coordinated wayfinding, accessibility, and public realm treatment from key desire lines (station platforms, Cinder Lane crossing, Coal Drops Square, cycle hub and hotel) so the gateway works as a legible, uncluttered and cohesive piece of urban design.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
R50	5.1.3	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Provide further evidence (plans/sections and access narrative) that Blue Badge access to the hotel and station entrance is direct, intuitive and dignified, and that both the public-facing and rail-facing elevations are designed as “fronts” rather than back-of-house façades.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R51	5.1.4a	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Hotel elevations – hierarchy and articulation: Strengthen the hotel’s architectural hierarchy (base/middle/crown) and reduce façade monotony by introducing greater variety and legibility through calibrated changes in materials, depth/relief, bay articulation, and occasional subtle shifts in window proportions/detailing, to better anchor the building in its York context.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R52	5.1.4b	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Hotel internal quality – daylight and wayfinding: Review opportunities to introduce natural light to circulation spaces (including corridors), for example through carefully placed windows and/or borrowed light from stairwells, to improve orientation, comfort and everyday user experience.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R53	5.1.5c	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Inclusive layout – accessible rooms and evacuation): Confirm that accessible bedrooms are located as close as practicable to lifts and key facilities to minimise long corridor travel and repeated fire-door thresholds, and provide (or cross-reference) an assisted evacuation/ refuge strategy demonstrating how inclusive access is supported throughout the building.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R54	5.1.5	Station West Entrance and Hotel	Revisit the architectural design of the cycle hub so that it reads as a high-quality, contemporary piece of public infrastructure (in material, form and detailing), aligned with the character of Coal Drops Square and the wider York Central design ambitions.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
<b>Innovation Hub</b>				

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
R55	5.2b	Innovation Hub	Review the station drop-off and servicing route at the rear of the Innovation Hub to ensure it is intuitive, well overlooked, and designed as a safe, attractive place despite heavy movement and servicing demands.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R56	5.2c	Innovation Hub	Refine the Innovation Hub façade detailing (including consideration of recessed glazing between primary bays) and ensure that the rear/service-facing elevations and the station drop-off route are designed as safe, attractive, legible spaces with appropriate lighting, active presence and (where suitable) public art.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R57	5.2a	Innovation Hub	Strengthen the rear and Cinder Street-facing elevations with active frontage, lighting, and public realm interventions (including public art where appropriate) so that these routes feel safe, legible and interesting during evenings and in quieter periods.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
<b>Coal Drops Square</b>				
R58	5.3.1a	Landscaping design	Ensure that Coal Drops Square's surface treatment, interpretation and planting prioritise the heritage significance and legibility of the coal drops structure. Clearly mark the footprint/alignment of removed walls within the square. Avoid aligning paving and detailing primarily with the hotel bays. Ensure that planting and street furniture do not obscure, diminish or confuse the significance of the retained wall fragments.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R59	5.3.1b	Relationship between Coal Drops Square and Museum Square	Strengthen the spatial and visual relationship between Coal Drops Square and the NRM's Museum Square through coordinated surface treatments, alignment of key routes and consistent wayfinding, reinforcing legibility, cohesion and the wider placemaking role of this part of York Central.	To improve wayfinding, visitor movement and placemaking, and ensure Coal Drops

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
				Square functions as part of a legible cultural and heritage landscape rather than an isolated or hotel-adjacent space.
R60	5.3.2c	Landscaping design	Refine the approach route from the signalised crossing to the WSE to provide a direct, generous and legible pedestrian line, with clear sightlines and adequate width/capacity. Confirm that planting and street furniture are positioned to avoid narrowing, pinch points or clutter on the main desire line.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R62	5.3.3e	Event management & public art	Clarify the intended everyday function of Coal Drops Square when not in event mode, including what will encourage dwell time and a sense of destination, and how the space will be animated outside programmed events.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R63	5.3.3f	Event management & public art	Clarify long-term stewardship and maintenance responsibilities for Coal Drops Square public realm (including the coal drops walls and planting), so that upkeep, cleaning and repairs are adequately funded and clearly managed.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R64	5.3.3g	Event management & public art	For major events, provide a clear temporary facilities plan (including the likely need for additional temporary WCs, their location and servicing arrangements), to complement permanent ground-level provision and to avoid ad-hoc impacts on the square and adjacent routes.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R65	5.3.3h	Event management & public art	Strengthen pedestrian crossing points and desire lines between Coal Drops Square and Museum Square (and onward to the	To retain and make legible heritage assets and

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			National Railway Museum), to ensure the square functions as a true gateway rather than an isolated set piece.	strengthen place identity.
R66	5.3.4	Public toilet provision for WSE/ Coal Drops Square	Expand public toilet provision associated with Coal Drops Square, ensuring that the principal provision is at ground level and directly accessible from the square. The quantity of provision should be increased to a level that is realistic for peak demand.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
<b>York Yard South (Plot E)</b>				
R67	5.5a	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Strengthen the spatial and architectural stitching between Plot E and adjacent public spaces (including Coal Drops Square and Central Park), ensuring that key pedestrian routes are direct, legible and feel continuously animated and overlooked.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R68	5.5b	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Roofscape articulation and elevation relief): Introduce greater roofscape articulation for the 3-storey flat-roof elements (e.g., parapet depth, coping detail, set-backs, or other proportionate relief) to reduce monotony and add visual richness, while remaining consistent with the site-wide design code.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R69	5.5c	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Massing transitions between 5 and 3 storeys: Refine the 5-storey to 3-storey transition to achieve a more comfortable rhythm and coherence, potentially through roof design, set-backs, intermediate elements, or façade modulation that ties the parts together and improves the overall silhouette.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R70	5.5d	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Corner articulation and consistency of design language: Clarify and strengthen the architectural approach to corner buildings (e.g., Plot 6E), ensuring the curved/rounded edge treatment is either more convincingly expressed as a deliberate feature (including at ground level) or adjusted to align with the prevailing architectural language elsewhere. Provide	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			comparative elevation/3D views demonstrating how corner turns are handled consistently across the plot and adjacent parcels.	
R71	5.5e	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Rebalance the Plot E public realm to reduce the dominance of hard surfacing, car parking and rear access roads, and to increase usable green space and community-focused amenity. Review the alignment and number of access roads—particularly behind the mansion blocks—to release space for landscape, trees and places to sit, meet and play, not solely routes through the site. Provide a clear plan showing landscape quantum, quality and function.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R72	5.5f	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	E1 amenity realism and future adjacent development: Provide an updated assessment of amenity space serving the social rent block (E1), demonstrating that it will remain usable and of adequate quality once the later-phase adjacent office block is delivered, and that it is not primarily a movement corridor to Wilton Rise bridge. If necessary, revise the landscape/public realm design to secure meaningful, overlooked resident amenity.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R73	5.5g	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	E1 parking strategy and mitigation: Clarify the parking strategy for the social rent block (E1), including whether zero on-plot parking is realistic for this tenure and typology and, if so, what mitigations are proposed (e.g., car club provision close by, accessible drop-off arrangements, servicing/blue badge strategy, and travel plan support).	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R74	5.5h	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	Mobility scooter storage and charging: Provide a compliant mobility scooter storage/charging strategy for each block (including Plots E and F), avoiding storage in lobbies where it could compromise escape routes or increase fire risk. Identify secure locations, capacity, access arrangements and	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			management measures (e.g., within dedicated mobility/cycle stores).	
R75	5.5i	York Yard South residential blocks (Plot E)	E2 – bin store access and operation: Clarify and, if necessary, redesign the bin store access arrangements for Plot E2 to ensure safe, convenient access for residents and waste operatives. Demonstrate that bin stores are not constrained by adjacent parking, and that access/turning and collection operations can occur without conflict.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Plot F (Build to Rent)</b>				
R77	4.4a	Build to Rent blocks (Plots F)	Review Plot F's external materials palette, roof/parapet "top" treatment and overall articulation so that this central portion does not read as the weakest link between Coal Drops Square and the Foundry Quarter, and so that it delivers a coherent, place-specific expression rather than a generic BTR block.	To retain and make legible heritage assets and strengthen place identity.
R78	4.4b	Build to Rent blocks (Plots F)	Strengthen Plot F's façade articulation and material variation—introducing meaningful breaks in massing, greater depth/relief, and tonal changes—so that the long Cinder Street frontage reads as a sequence of varied elements rather than a single bulky elevation, better reflecting York's characteristic grain.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R79	4.4c	Build to Rent blocks (Plots F)	Ensure that Plot F's ground-floor interfaces (including entrances, communal spaces and any active frontages) are designed to support street life, legibility and passive surveillance, avoiding blank edges and overly repetitive elevations, particularly along key routes to the station and through to Central Park.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
<b>Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)</b>				
R80	5.6a	Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)	Provide greater assurance on the delivery of community-supporting uses and spaces associated with the Foundry Quarter, including how interim community needs will be met if Foundry Yard buildings are delivered later than the residential blocks.	To support social cohesion and integration with neighbouring communities.

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
R81	5.6b	Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)	Introduce greater variation and irregularity in the three blocks facing Central Park, so that the Quarter embraces a richer rhythm and avoids a sense of repetitive massing in a key park-facing frontage.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R82	5.6c	Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)	Relocate the 50 non-blue badge spaces currently proposed to be on-street within Plots K and L into a purpose-built off-street facility, to avoid on-street parking dominating the public realm and undermining the low-car vision and streetscape quality.	To enable sustainable travel choices, safety and accessibility from first occupation.
R83	5.6d	Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)	Revisit the access/stair detailing for raised houses in Plots K and L to simplify the design, improve robustness and maintenance, and ensure the solution is grounded in York precedent or demonstrably appropriate contemporary best practice.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R84	5.6e	Foundry Quarter (Plots K and L)	Explore the inclusion of community growing space (allotments and/or edible borders) within the residential plots, with clear management arrangements, to support community formation and everyday use of the public realm.	To support social cohesion and integration with neighbouring communities.
R85	5.6f	Apartment Block B (G) – proximity between blocks	Provide a clear assessment of separation distances between facing elevations within Block G and demonstrate how privacy/overlooking is mitigated (e.g., window alignment, screening, obscure glazing where justified, or re-planning). Confirm that the external arrangement is compliant with relevant fire safety requirements and does not introduce avoidable external fire spread risk.	To improve coordination, quality and long-term stewardship across Phase 1c.
R86	5.6g	Apartment Block E – elevations, legibility and entrance hierarchy	Strengthen entrance legibility at ground floor level through clearer hierarchy and architectural cues (e.g., recess/relief, canopy/porch treatment, material change, lighting and	To improve coordination, quality and long-term

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			signage), so entrances are easy to locate and read as “top tier” elements of the elevation.	stewardship across Phase 1c.
<b>Central Park</b>				
R89	5.7a	Central Park	Avoid over-complicating the design of Central Park. Prioritise legible, flexible green space that supports everyday play, relaxation and community formation for residents, with ecological features integrated in ways that remain robust and maintainable.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R90	5.7b	Central Park	Incorporate community involvement in the detailed design and early management of Central Park, including opportunities for existing neighbours and future residents to inform its layout, features and everyday use, so that the park functions as a well-used, locally valued space rather than a purely designed landscape.	To ensure Central Park meets everyday needs, builds local ownership, and functions as a well-used, valued neighbourhood space.
R91	5.7c	Central Park	If seasonal ponds or wet woodland are retained within the design, provide a clear technical and management rationale (including water supply, drying scenarios, odour control and maintenance), and ensure the Ecological Landscape Management Plan is sufficiently specific and not overly generic.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R92	5.7d	Central Park	Strengthen connections and legibility between Central Park and nearby complementary green spaces, including Millennium Field within the Foundry Quarter and Millennium Green in the neighbouring community, so that the network of green routes and spaces feels coherent and mutually supportive.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R93	5.7e	Central Park	Provide a clear design and wayfinding approach for the green route through K+L (including sightlines, lighting, passive surveillance and landscape character), ensuring it reads as a	To ensure green infrastructure is

Ref. No.	Source paragraph	Specific issue	Suggested recommendation	Reason for recommendation
			safe, legible connector and offers a distinct but complementary experience to Central Park rather than duplicating it.	deliverable, resilient and maintainable.
R95	5.7f	Central Park	Refine the Central Park woodland concept so that 'Wander Wilds' reads as open native woodland (rather than 'arboretum-like'), with a clear rationale for canopy structure, species selection and long-term management, and with the Sky Fields / ornamental tree areas designed as coherent, legible sub-spaces.	To ensure green infrastructure is deliverable, resilient and maintainable.

## Appendix B: Matters to consider for planning conditions / obligations

In addition to the direct RECOMMENDATIONS above, YCT suggests that the following matters are suitable for control through conditions, triggers, and/or planning obligations. The checklist is to help account for the delivery of these items and to also set the tone for other, large scale, developments coming forward.

Ref	Suggested condition / obligation
C1	Public Realm Management and Maintenance Plans for Coal Drops Square and Central Park (including event management, servicing, cleaning, lighting, safety, funding and responsibilities).
C3	A wayfinding and interpretation strategy that strengthens legibility to the station, NRM and surrounding neighbourhoods, and communicates the site's layered history (railway, industrial and community associations).
C4	Materials samples and on-site mock-ups for key elevations and public realm paving, including how heritage lines (such as removed wall alignments) will be expressed in surface treatment.
C5	A detailed, plot-specific Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for Central Park, including water management, habitat establishment, monitoring, and long-term maintenance resourcing.
C6	Bus service provision triggers (frequency, routing and stop provision) linked to occupation, alongside monitoring and review mechanisms.
C7	Car club implementation details: operator commitment, bay locations, membership incentives and delivery triggers.
C8	Inclusive design audits for primary routes, crossings and station access points, including review with relevant access stakeholders.
C9	Construction and operational management for servicing and drop-off areas (including at the Innovation Hub), ensuring pedestrian safety, overlooked routes and coherent public realm.
C12	A detailed waste strategy and contingency plan (including arrangements for Plots K and L should a communal/underground system not be adopted or be temporarily unavailable), to prevent uncontrolled bin storage in the public realm.
C13	Green/brown roof specifications and management protocols that address urban wildlife nuisance risks (including herring gull attraction) while retaining biodiversity value.
C14	Detailed street design principles for play streets and shared-surface/home zone areas (including maximum kerb upstand where appropriate), demonstrating how parking, servicing and speed management remain compatible with inclusive, child-friendly streets.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Suggested condition / obligation</b>
C15	An events and facilities plan for Coal Drops Square, including permanent and temporary WC provision for peak events, and clear servicing arrangements to avoid conflicts with primary pedestrian and cycle routes.
C16	A Western Station Entrance façade/material schedule (with whole-life maintenance and carbon rationale) and an agreed process for mock-ups or sample panels for key gateway elements.
C17	Site-wide "Plot-to-Plot Interface and Coherence Plan" to be submitted and approved, covering: plot edges and level changes; materials palette and junction detailing; continuity of landscape, paving and street furniture; servicing and refuse interfaces; lighting, seating and wayfinding; and long-term management responsibilities. This should demonstrate that Phase 1c reads and functions as a single, legible masterplan rather than adjacent plot-by-plot schemes.
C18	Social infrastructure / community congregation space: secure delivery (via condition and/or s106) of a free-to-access community space within Phase 1c, with an agreed fit-out, access and management plan. This should also set out how York Central will connect with and support nearby existing facilities (e.g., St Barnabas and Leeman Road amenities) to avoid an isolated 'enclave' effect.
C19	Non-designated heritage assets – retention/reuse appraisal and mitigation: require a robust options appraisal for the Gatehouse Building (Foundry Quarter) and the former Generator/Compressor House (Coal Drops Square), including the further research/significance work recommended in the outline Environmental Statement. If demolition proceeds, secure (i) full building recording, (ii) an interpretation and salvage strategy, and (iii) replacement delivery of any displaced public/community function (e.g., WCs/Changing Places or community/interpretation space) within Phase 1c so that civic/event capability and 'memory anchors' are not lost.
C20	Affordable housing distribution and pepper-potting: A site-wide Affordable Housing Distribution Plan showing the location, tenure and typology of affordable homes, demonstrating effective pepper-potting across plots and blocks and tenure-blind access to amenity and public realm.
C21	Solar PV energy use and resident benefit: A Solar PV Energy Allocation Strategy confirming how on-site generated electricity will be used to offset communal energy costs and/or service charges, with equitable benefits across all tenures, including social rent homes.
C22	Travel Plan monitoring and remedial triggers: extend residential monitoring beyond 'main activity' to include other major trip purposes (including leisure/retail), and include reporting on bus service performance, cycle parking usage and car-club uptake. Agree review points and 'step-in' measures if targets are not met.
C23	Mobility scooter storage and charging strategy: for all apartment blocks, submit details of dedicated, fire-safe storage and charging provision (location, capacity, ventilation, management and accessibility), avoiding storage in lobbies or escape routes and aligning with the Fire Statement / Building Safety approach.

Ref	Suggested condition / obligation
C24	Public art and activation strategy for key civic routes and 'back edges' (including the rear of the Innovation Hub and station/service approaches), covering commissioning, lighting integration, funding and long-term maintenance, to support interest, wayfinding and perceived safety after dark.

## **Annex I: Assessment of bus provision**

Section 1.7 of the Travel Plan lists Section 106 commitments, including the provision of at least four non-Park & Ride (P&R) bus services in each direction per hour. However, Section 1.8 of the Travel Plan suggests that this should not be a priority for Phase 1. YCT considers this position inconsistent with the mode-shift objectives underpinning the scheme. Experience from comparable developments suggests that good-quality bus provision needs to be in place from first occupation, so that residents and employees can choose sustainable modes from the outset, rather than becoming habituated to car-based travel patterns. Early delivery is therefore central to the credibility and deliverability of the Travel Plan targets.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Confirm that the Phase 1 Section 106 package secures delivery of the minimum non-P&R bus service frequency (at least 4 services per hour per direction) from first occupation (or earlier), rather than treating bus enhancement as a later-phase aspiration.

### **Baseline service audit and accuracy of the evidence base**

Section 1.5 of the Travel Plan identifies existing services (#10L, 19, 59 and 200). Section 3.5.1 of the Traffic Impact Assessment presents an “existing service pattern”, but YCT considers the description to be unclear and inconsistent with publicly available timetable information. At present there are no regular services in both directions other than the #59 park and ride service. As the baseline service offer is a key input to assessing mode share assumptions, the evidence base needs to be accurate, transparent and verifiable.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Provide a corrected and clearly referenced baseline bus service audit (including weekdays, evenings and Sundays), with sources/date-stamped timetable evidence, and ensure the Travel Plan and TIA reflect the same baseline.

### **Park & Ride services and walking distances**

The Travel Plan (Section 1.5) also references nearby P&R routes (#2, 3, 7 and 9). YCT notes that the nearest stops for these services are a significant walking distance from some parts of the Phase 1c plots (particularly K and L), and that access routes are indirect (e.g., via the station or Marble Arch). YCT therefore cautions against relying on P&R services as a principal mitigation for the residential plots where parking restraint is greatest.

### **Bus stop locations, servicing and operational clarity**

It is currently unclear where bus services are expected to stop and how routes will operate through the site. Figure 8 at the end of the Traffic Impact Assessment indicates bus stops, but the map symbols and key do not appear to align clearly, making it difficult to understand the proposed stopping strategy and interchange arrangements. Given the scale of development and the reliance on bus use to achieve the proposed mode shares, stop locations and operations should be unambiguous. All bus services should have stops for Plots K and L and for Plot E, as well as for the Western Station Entrance.

### **Demand, capacity and the minimum service level**

The Travel Plan does not set an explicit target for the percentage of journeys to be made by bus, although the Traffic Impact Assessment (Section 5.2) applies modal share assumptions. Based on an indicative aggregation of the implied bus trips across the hotel and residential uses, and an appropriate share of public transport trips for the innovation centre, the peak-hour demand could be of the order of c. 60 bus journeys in the AM peak and c. 70+ in the PM peak. These volumes are broadly equivalent to a single bus load per peak hour, meaning that four non-P&R buses per hour is a sensible minimum service level for Phase 1—and should not be diluted.

### **Park & Ride displacement and network implications**

The Traffic Impact Assessment also implies a level of P&R usage for those travelling by car where local parking is not available (noting that this is typically assumed for non-residential uses). Even on the applicant's assumptions, the resulting P&R demand in peak periods appears material and would require adequate capacity and frequency on relevant services.

YCT has previously noted the potential benefits of rerouting service #2 via York Central once the access road is complete, including the opportunity to support York Central directly as well as avoiding congestion on Bootham. This type of network change could materially improve public transport attractiveness and resilience but requires early feasibility work and commitment. We also note that the #59 currently only has two buses per hour in the morning peak. This should be increased to four.