

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

QUESTION 11 – FURTHER COMMENTS

- 7a & 10 should be qualified by having respect for the existing buildings & sympathy for the historic environment of York
- 9 and 10-any additional building must use materials in keeping with existing buildings.cannot see the point of extending pavement area and planting trees outside the Aviva offices.this is a waste of money
- A building like Yorkshire House, 6 storeys high, reflecting many of the pedestrian architectural ideas of the last 40 yrs, a nothing of the cultural and historical past of this amateur city has little to commend it
- A building pleasing to the eye and durable would be ideal. No cost cutting for its own sake
- A city such as York should have council offices that reflects the historical background that we all love and our tourists love
- A city with York's heritage should have offices of the architectural merit of West Offices
- A community building that the future residents can be proud of as other historic buildings in York
- A council HQ is statement of value of city it serves. York is undervalued and businesses moving (or not moving) to York will take this keytone from that set by council
- A flash new building in York would be out of place & not fit in with so many different heritages
- A great deal of York's success depends on its image both to outsiders (eg. Tourists, overseas students) and citizens. It's "keynote" buildings cannot be merely run-of-the-mill.
- A headquarters should impress and be of appropriate appearance in a historic city such as York. Cost should be kept within reason.
- A historic building for a historic council i.e. Old railway station - gives residents pride in their city.
- Aesthetically & architecturally West Offices looks an infinitely better option. Future generations will have to live with result of your decision its important to get it right. Council premises should be in keeping with city's architectural status
- Alas, as it has amply & repeatedly demonstrated, York Council has no idea whatsoever of what "exciting architecture" really is.they simply move 10-20 years behind the times & recycle architectural cliches & errors.
- All new buildings should be in line with old York, new York will not attract visitors
- Although modernisation is a good thing the heart of this city is of an historic nature & should be first consideration.quality in everything.build to last not replace.future generations will thank us for it.we give a much better image
- Although costs should be of paramount importance, the building should be fitting with the historical appearance of the city
- Although I think it is important to promote exciting architecture, its very important that the council doesn't waste money, as they seem to have done in the past
- Although Yorkshire House is probably more appropriate for modern services, I feel it lacks the gravitas and beauty that central services in a city such as York should represent and feel the reuse of West Offices is the better choice
- An exciting architectural contribution to city & long lasting one are important if they can be managed within budget but in present economic climate cost has to be priority with ecological matters equally important
- An exciting architectural contribution to the city does not have to be expensive to be nice and inkeeping with our city

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- An iconic building that the city will be proud of for generations to come. The west offices have been there for 150 years and i want the new council facilities to last as long.
- An interesting building will be an investment as a tourism draw to the city, as well as a good place to work for staff.
- An interesting, exciting but appropriate architecture should be paramount. This doesn't need to cost the earth/ just seek out creative architects that don't charge the earth
- Any city can have hq building like yorkshire house but we are unique in having listed building i.e. West offices which could be used to fit in with our reputation as city of protected architecture
- Any construction undertaken should be in keeping with & sympathetic to heritage & appearance of york city centre. If after that achieved it possible to make aspects of buildings energy efficient & ecologically friendly then it should be done
- Any extensions must not be built of concrete with large glass and steel sections. It must not end up looking like the office building (ryedale house) on piccadilly
- Any new building work should be in keeping with buildings architectural age and style
- Any new council office should be sympathetic to the york cityscape in keeping with its surroundings or improving those surroundings. Don't want to see money wasted on optional extras
- Anyone with half a brain just has to look round out beautiful city to see we don't need a high rise glass house in the centre, this is not leeds or manchester.
- Appearance of west offices has much more welcoming appearance. Building looks elegant and in keeping with character of city
- As a building for a historic city like york then in my opinion west offices should be chosen in preference to yorkshire house - a concrete eyesore
- As a council in an historic city it would be more appropriate for the new headquarters to be located in the historic west offices rather than in the modern yorkshire house
- As long as building does not look like the one on stonebow
- As long as exciting doesn't mean outrageous
- As long as the building is fit for purpose with consideration to its architecture and surroundings
- As things seems to have been unsuccessful in new modern scheme approach perhaps something more sympathetic with city of york & original buildings would be more suited & something that will remain landmark building for years to come - despite the cost!
- As york relies heavily on tourism therefore the council should be seen to be promoting the historical content. Using the west offices would be ideal and getting rid of the horrible stonebwo site should be top of the list!
- Aspiration in design and leadership through demonstrating it is possible to build a well designed, energy efficient, beautiful building for generations to come.
- Aviva option extends on ugly building encroaching onto main hq building next to it. Utilising west offices would breathe life into one well used and beautiful building preserving it for future
- Beautiful facade and setting of this building would make fine new council hq and revitalise area (west offices)
- Beauty should be an important aim
- Because of the building's intrinsic interest and because it represents an important part of the city's history, if the choice is the west offices a priority should be the protection and conservation of the existing fabric

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Believe new building should be one of historic stature such as west offices not non descript building like yorkshire house. York is historic city and its key buildings should be in character
- Believe west offices as an important (recent) historic building offers the scope to be a superb venue for the council. Close the railway station by which means may tourist and business travellers arrive in york. Good access to bus service routes.
- Better to spend more money on a good looking building to enhance the city centre
- Both of these two buildings are part of yorks heritage and cover two different periods of yorks history. It is so important that in this twentyfirst century the council should promote an exciting architectural contribution to the city.
- Both proposals are already part of architectural buildings in city so cost to improve fabric of insides can be functional, practical.
- Both sites are within the city walls, must sit (design and size) and complement the historic city
- Bring back in use a listed building - about time
- Build something that enhances not detracts from york as a city with world-wide recognition,unique history & continuing appeal as a place to visit & in which to live
- Build something that reflects the existing architecture of york for future generations
- Build something to be proud of for york
- Building design should reflect the historic nature of york - no more stonebows! But will you listen???
- Building however needs to be in keeping with yorks beauty. Also people of york should not have any increases to pay for this work
- Building should be sympathetic to good architecture and heritage of york
- Buying cheap in short term is more expensive in the long term, quality of architecture is very important
- By choosing west offices the historical architectural interest of this building will be upheld, symbolic to the council which should reflect the citys history in its location and design
- By using west offices you will be retaining a listed building with much more attractive architecture than most 'current' styles. West offices are more in keeping with our city style and easily accessible by both bus and train
- Choose west offices, a significant part of the history of york. Yorkshire house will only ever be an unsightly 60's tower block
- City of york must give a good impression to residents & visitors - modern ideas blending sympathetically with the historic buildings, keeping characteristics of existing building with modern up to date facilities
- Concentrate on helping the environment and making it an architectural focus for city. Forget building another boring eyesore of a council building!!
- Concerned maltings pub will disappear. Prefer design and architecture of west offices. Don't feel this questionnaire is worded
- Considering historic characteristics of york west offices is by far the best solution
- Cost must be an important consideration. However, the building must also be an architectural credit to the city
- Council buildings should have an architectural contribution that is in keeping with city of york and promotion of city
- Council definitely should make a statement with the building,make it beautiful,user friendly and an asset to our gorgeous city,it should be fully accessible with good public space to be used by all the residents.not an ugly eyesore like the stonebow

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Council has a responsibility to respect York's architectural heritage, any new building should complement existing buildings
- Council has poor record in determining which new building designs are appropriate to York. Most of new buildings it has permitted are wholly inappropriate to character of city.
- Council have never promoted any exciting architectural contribution to city. Stonebow, park hotel, Norwich Union, St John's University, are all dreadful buildings that should never have got planning permission
- Council HQ needs to be fit for our historic city. The council should set high standards in creating a long term strategy. The building should be an example for others to follow.
- Council may wish its new offices to reflect the historical importance and cultural significance of York on the global scene combined with a facility that meets the needs of the citizens of York in an efficient and customer focussed manner.
- Council offices will represent one of York's major shop windows to the world. We must be proud of the result - it will last for generations to come!
- Council should be trying to preserve attractive design of West Offices not add ugly glass extension to plain cement building. Yorkshire House is viewed from city walls and don't want that to be what visitors remember
- Council should listen to the Civic Trust York Georgian Society before making any decisions
- Council should move to West Offices, it needs to occupy and care for a historic building in order to empathise with the task that employees, shops etc in the city face on a daily basis.
- Council should promote an exciting architectural contribution to the city while keeping costs down. Advantage of Old Station is there would be room for parking. This consultation is a waste of our money.
- Council should remember York is a beautiful city and preserve its heritage of lovely buildings. Inhabitants pay taxes to provide money to be used wisely and carefully not squandered but cheap is not always wise. Building & equipment should last
- Create a building that York can be proud of in 100 years not one that needs to be demolished in 20 years
- Depends what is meant by exciting architectural contribution. If it fits well into existing development very good if it is horrible like Stonebow development then please do not commission it
- Design should enhance the image of York while being sensitive to its heritage. We do not want another Stonebow
- Do not build a new ugly building
- Do not underestimate the impact of quality architecture, it is important we have a great city, we need a good town hall and visitor center.
- Don't forget the Old Station theme in West Offices
- Don't spoil beautiful York any more than you have done in the past (think of Stonebow area horror)
- Don't build a fancy techno building York, keep its history alive
- Don't build a Stonebow
- Don't build another Stonebow concrete mess. West Offices look to be in keeping with York is a great building! Thanks
- Don't spoil city with ugly buildings
- Ensure design is workable and not too high tech or way out. York is an old city and shouldn't be used as a shop window for some architect
- Ensure height of building does not exceed that of the Minster

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Exciting architectural contribution to city does not necessary equal increased costs. Missing factor is imagination. Council must use every opportunity including this to lead on climate change issues. It is not enough to be bit less carbon heavy.
- Existing architectural contribution to city well both buildings have been these some time . Think this form is complete waste of time and money. You will do whatever you want regardless of this survey
- Existing west offices has survived the test of time and is more in tune with york architecture and history
- Exterior should be in keeping with york in general. Interior should be modern and environmentally friendly and good place to work for employees
- Feel building should be traditional and in keeping with historical brick work. Should be accessible and easy to navigate round, needs toilets & refreshment facilities for public
- Feel it very wrong to use west offices. The building is of historical significance to the city i wonder how many people have been inside the old station to view the old platform and offices etc. Its part of york's heritage
- Feel west row would be better hq as it will blend history and modern together whereas yorkshire house is too dull
- Finding a use for a listed and historically important building is a major argument for the west offices
- For me it is important that the new building blends into the landscape of the city and makes use of existing materials. I rather the building tried not to be too modern, particularly when viewing the exterior
- For me the marriage between yorks history & future make the wo the best option in the long run. Also i find the external representation of the conversion to be more attractive,welcoming & fit for purpose than the other site
- For my way of thinking i prefer the west offices because it is a beautiful building not a concrete monstrosity and away froma busy area but yet not again in the back of beyond
- Give us something to be proud of
- Given the current climate, the money would be better spent on improving the infrastructure of the city and modernising older properties, i've been told there is no money to spend on a new door entry system but there is money to spend on yourselfs
- Glad to hear it will save £5m as that is what has been 'thrown away' on the 'hungate fiasco'
- Go for west offices - they reflect the nature of york
- Golden opportunity to adapt existing offices and buildings for council hq. In principle prefer west offices as it provides best opportunity to adopt and fully utilise listed building
- Good architechture does not have to be expensive. West offices would have my vote and it mixes old and new.
- Good use of old railway station. It is attractive, stone build 19th century architecture on outside. Rougier st building is bleak reminder of poverty of 60s architecture
- Having looked at both options would prefer west offices. It looks far more attractive and environmentally friendly than yorkshire house
- Historic west offices are much more suitable for a city as great (historically) as york and would make an excellent impression on visitors and locals alike
- Hq should be beautiful building. Should look and feel like a civic centre. Not enough cycle parking for staff at moment. Promotion of cycle to work scheme is putting pressure on existing resources.
- I am keen that the projects are in keeping with existing structures in the city
- I am more in favour of wo as it is an ideal way of preserving a grade ii listed building of the 1840's & in keeping with our city within the walls

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I am strongly in favour of a new architectural contribution
- I am strongly in favour of using west offices: this is an attractive & historic building and the architecture conveys the right mix of respectability, civic pride and historical gravitas. It would be a fine purpose for a central building
- I believe that the scheme should use the 'west offices' location as being a far more attractive building, sympathetic to its surroundings in the ancient city of York. The 1960s Yorkshire House adds nothing to the city except to be an eyesore
- I believe that West Offices are more in keeping with the culture of York and are more representative of the style of building in the city
- I believe the West Offices adds architectural interest for both the people of York and visitors - a visitors centre could be part of the development
- I believe the West Offices are the more suitable location, and the outward appearance is more in keeping with the surrounding area
- I believe the West Offices are the most appropriate for an ancient city like York as they emphasise the history of the city
- I believe we should use West Offices for the council offices - due to the history - but not too much modernisation so it is in keeping with the city
- I don't agree with focussing on "exciting architectural enhancement but instead remaining within the style of "old York" I also don't want to see "new money meaning higher council management salaries"
- I favour the West Office, existing beautiful building which will be in keeping with the architectural surroundings of the city
- I feel that a lovely historic city, like York, should have a historic building for its council and West Offices fits that idea. It looks user friendly, practical and the future plans would make it an ideal surrounding area for worker and user
- I feel that making city buildings architectural innovative will ensure a continuation of the city's great history of strong forward thinking architecture
- I feel that the West Office as an option would be the most appropriate, I say this with the city's heritage in mind
- I feel that Yorkshire House has a more impressive presence and in a better location for a council headquarters
- I feel the West Offices to be preferable as the historic nature of the site is more likely to be preserved. Yorkshire House has always been a bit of an eyesore
- I feel the whole project should remain in keeping with the architectural style of the city of York. No more sites like the Stonebrow and the new extension to Ripon and St John
- I feel West Offices is the best option, it also would reflect the historical side of York and the courtyard could be used for fothering events
- I fully support the West Office alternative. It will add to York's stock of prominent buildings
- I hope the choice will promote civic pride in this historic city & we can hold our heads up among comparable Euro cities (I felt the previous design was an awful let down for this city) I hope the council would continually monitor the budget on this one.
- I much prefer West Offices building as it is of historic value to the city of York. The quiet area outside is an added bonus yet it is still very handy for public transport. With such lovely buildings as the mansion house and guildhall I believe West Offices
I really do think it should be West Offices. The building is far more in keeping with the heritage of the city
- I should prefer to see a good existing building re-used, i.e. West Offices has architectural and aesthetic merit it also means you could knock down the disgraceful "slums" of Rongier Street and give us a bus station worthy of our historic/tourist city!!

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I strongly support the choice of west offices for the new offices. This is a grade 2 listed building, which is of size to incorporate all sections of a new council complex. You have a duty to value our listed buildings. This building would decay otherwise
I tend to agree with john betjeman's view of the yorkshire house building - it isn't very pleasant. Rather see the west offices used, its a good design and would open up pleasant but little known part of the centre.
- I think it should be obvious that if west offices can provide appropriate accommodation, they should be used rather than developing an alternative site
- I think its very important to preserve the cities historic buildings therefore strongly favour west offices
- I think the concepts should be achievable.it is important to have a good civic building that will enhance the city but one must be mindful of the costs already left on this project following the debacle of hugate
- I think the west offices is a more attractive building to house the council. However i think it needs a better name than west offices it doesn't really conjure up an image of a thriving city
- I think they should be beautiful and functional
- I think we should use a building that exists but blends in with the historical importance of the city. My preference would be for the west offices
- I think you should use the nu building as the station one is too architecturally important -it could be of a more public nature eg hotel,arts centre etc aviva is already
- I would like a building that is in keeping with our historic city but is run on energy saving and recycling methods
- I would like to see an 'exciting architectural contribution to the city' but if the rubbish that the council has allowed to be built within the city is anything to go by then i won't hold my breath
- I would like to see the council using an historic building but try to keep the costs down
- I would strongly support the choice of west offices - its a building of character in keeping with the architecture of york
- Idea of exciting architecture worries me - try pleasing to eye, efficient, people friendly, in outward appearance and interior design. West offices would seem to be ideal.
- If a new building chosen important to ensure it is an architectural, energy efficient structure. Foral point
- If existing buildings on site are historic then as much fabric as possible should be retained and reused. Work should be high quality involving local firms
- If new build is answer it should be in keeping with old style architecture not like new st john build which is terrible
- If the decision is to use the west office site it is essential that significant historic features are retained
- If we need a new council building then it should be a landmark that can make york proud of
- If west offices are the eventual chosen site than i sincerely hope all the historic features of this listed building are retained in the entirety
- If west offices chosen consider room w114, above the false ceiling there is some ornate work of original ceiling
- If you opt for west offices do not disguise its original function. York was railway town west offices are part of railway & yorks history. Do not bury memory
- Image of city is retained by continuing use of buildings of character
- Important to find sustainable uses for listed buildings such as the old station - which sounds ideal for conversion in to the new civic centre. York is an historic city so its hq should be in an historic building.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Important to have a building to be proud of but also to have a flexible building to easily adapt to changes in the future and be cost effective.
- In favour of promoting important existing buildings of architectural interest such as west offices for this important historic city! York will maintain its pride in having city council in historic building
- In my view yorkshire house is already an ugly building. The proposed extension will make it even worse, the citizens of york will have to live with an eyesore
- In the case of the west offices option no exterior additions should spoil its character and new materials only used internally any additions to yorkshire house should use the same stone for the exterior
- It can not be built at the cost of other services-but it should fit into the city not stick out like a sore thumb
- It is a perfect opportunity to create a headquarters of architectural beauty & attractiveness, preferably in a classical style to be in keeping with our ancient city
- It is important that building fits with historic architecture in york - already too many buildings which clash. Council should also be role model to community in sustainability & economic use of resources.
- It is important that the council should lead on creating an iconic building of architectural interest for the city.
- It is important that the new hq also regenerates the area it's in.the council has an important part to play in preserving & enhancing the city's historic buildings. Wo seems to provide a win-win for council provided the costs do not escalate
- It is our opinion that it is the councils duty to architectually enhance the city.the west offices development appears to most closely fulfill this
- It is time the council had a 'better presence' in the city with a prestige building
- It must be kept in mind the building needs to fit in with the old town. A new build would look daft. Also the staff need to be in a comfortable work space
- It should be a building that stands out, that the people of york can be proud of.easy to get at and plenty of parking spaces
- It should be a 'flagship' to set an example. I prefer west offices.
- It should be about achieving balance-york needs new exciting building projects to keep it a modern,forward thinking city.as long as costs aren't allowed to spiral out of control
- It should be architecturally modern but essentially pleasing to the eye and having a lively dignity. Not at all like the new york college
- It should be attractive, blending in with yorks architectural heritage, built to last - more stone, less metal and glass
- It should be in keeping with other buildings, not like the one you were thinking of building in hungate
- It would be far nicer and more fitting for york to use west offices and make the classic building for public use. Yh looks like an ugly lump and wants flattening.
- It would be good to have a council hq that the city can be proud of
- It would be good to look after an old building but money should not be spent on overpriced furnishings and fittings. Also, york doesn't need anymore unsympathetic scars on the landscape like the new college
- Its an opportunity for york to have a civic centre worthy of our city
- Its high time we had some striking modern architecture in york instead of boring mock victorian buildings. While i'm happy to cycle or walk to the new hq my partner is disabled and either need a direct and accessible bus service or adequate disabled parki

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- It's important for the council to set an example by reusing existing buildings and recognising the importance of York's architectural heritage. It's important not to develop a facility/building that could be found anywhere within the UK
- Keep any new building in line with 'old' York. There is too much modernisation happening. The 'unique' look of York should be continued.
- Keep in mind the city's architectural and historical heritage - no featureless lumps or Tate Gallery art please
- Keep the outside of the building in keeping with York's historic look. Don't pander to stupid architects' ideas, ensure that the inside of the building is practical and user friendly.
- Keeping West Offices preserved and utilised by local residents would be an asset to our beautiful city. Prefer this to development of a plot that would require council approval and of lesser historic importance
- Major opportunity to promote the city's architectural heritage and great care should be taken to do so. Personal preference is for the West Offices option which will have the additional benefit of revitalising the Toft Green/Tanner Row/Micklegate area.
- Make front of building fit in with old style of York :- stone frontage like bar walls
- Make use of West Offices because of its historical architecture. The modern, exciting approach to building is so much horse wind, especially in our historic city.
- Make York proud of HQ by using existing West Office building - civic buildings should reflect York railway history and is major walking route to town centre - no Barbican fiasco
- Many Victorian-built council buildings still look beautiful today. Hopefully the council will avoid a concrete-block monstrosity. Invest in something bold and visionary. Go for it!
- Maximum use should be made of existing buildings i.e. West Offices. Keeping Victorian façade rather than modern building i.e. Yorkshire House. This is in keeping with York City as historical tourist centre
- Minimum possible change to the external appearance of the building. No way must the citizens of York be expected to subsidise non-professionalism
- Must be in keeping with our city and be practical also to be pleasing sight to visitors by train. West Offices would be much better and more in keeping with the area
- My preference is West Offices as this is an attractive building, linking today with the past. It has room to landscape and create space in front of it, it's well sited for access.
- Need to keep with the city's unique building - walls - need parking space yet not too costly while visiting. Need more toilets in them.
- New HQ should be a building which adds to the streetscape - one that York residents should be attracted to and proud of - it should be capable of being used for a variety of community events for example
- New HQ should reflect the historic character of York as well as providing a new public building rather than just a short-term architectural building that isn't fit for purpose in 10 years time.
- New offices should be in the tradition of civic buildings set in pleasant accessible surroundings. Access for public is paramount and within easy reach of parking space and public transport. West Offices is my preferred option
- Norwich Union building will look ugly and squashed in with the extension will look too high alongside the five star hotel next door. Old railway buildings will look more pleasing and will make use of an old architectural pleasing building.
- Not a modernist glass box to be kept in harmony with York
- Obviously refurbishment must be in keeping with city - but no futuristic or concrete eyesores like Stonebow etc please
- Please do not build an eyesore even if it is more efficient

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Please invest in the best possible design using top quality architects. York needs quality modern design to complement its heritage. don't waste money on short term solutions
- Please keep as much of the period features in the old station as possible. It would be lovely to see the old station back in public use, a great idea
- Please keep the building in keeping with old york or enhance what is there now. I can see why having everything in one place can be useful
- Please keep york in its original look if possible we love our city
- Please lets have a building (like the west offices) which will be pleasing to look at and fit in with the york atmosphere not another concrete and glass box like monstrosity surely cost effective doesnt necessarily have to mean cheap rubbish
- Please lets have building that reflects 21st century. We have city with rich architectural heritage yet where is modern reflected
- Please use existing west offices as these buildings are part of our victorian heritage. Yorkshire house offers nothing and should be demolished.
- Please use the old station, this would regenerate a lovely old building and very important part of the city's heritage.
- Prefer older traditional buildings with character rather than modern ones, provided the former can be made energy efficient and not wasteful
- Prefer the look of the west offices plan rather than the tall imposing looking yorkshire house. The level access is much better than going up and down lifts.
- Prefer the look of west offices building and fact that it has a green traffic area in front of it
- Prefer the west offices scheme. not only it looks in keeping with yorks historic buildings it opens up a new dynamic area in the interior
- Prefer use of historic building but with innovative internal design/technology. Plus external area much more attractive than yorkshire house
- Prefer west offices - represents yorks past. Good use of historic building. Excellent setting for modern council offices
- Promise to achieve a minimum of £5m over next 30 yrs is misleading, £5m has already been wasted on hungate site plans. Woud like to see a promise not to waste more of taxpayers money. Would prefer west offices
- Renovation of west offices will be valuable to the city as it's a magnificent building that should be preserved. so using west offices would kill two birds with one stone.
- Shoot any architect who attempts to create modern building - see appalling yorkshire house as an example
- Should be a building york can be proud of , an icon
- Should be building that city can be proud of and it should be long lasting not cheap and nasty. However money shouldn't be wasted unnecessary
- Should be building that york can be proud of built by people of york
- Since west offices is a beautiful building in its own right and it is only the interior that would need restructuring, surely this would keep costs down
- Since york has 2000 years of visible history we need to be represented by buildings with recognised class and some history! Not a concrete or glass block.
- Striking key note building showing off best of |yorkshire design/workmanship would be overall contribution to city and environment. City council should word cheap and cheerful as well have to live with decisions reached
- Surely an architectural city such as york must ensure new council hq contribute aesthetically & not another eyesore that although cheaper will be regretted in years to come. Local developers/contractors must be used for this job

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The building is supposed to represent York & needs to have a better public face than the current appalling affair, dirty, grubby, shabby, cheap skate rabbit warren
- The building is the face of York City Council and of York itself. It should reflect the heritage and historical importance of York. West Offices would seem the best option to achieve this
- The building should and must blend into what York is and old city. Please please no modernistic rubbish!
- The building should be an interesting and very attractive design, which adds an architectural contribution, rather than an unsightly distraction. This should be done with costs minimised.
- The building should be attractive to visit and use. It should be built for the long term and deliver a high quality environmental building i.e. Low CO₂ in materials and in use, being as sustainable as possible. It should be customer friendly and recognise the building should be designed to keep in with the history of York, not too modern.
- The building should be sympathetic to York's architectural heritage or a high quality exciting & modern design (eg Richard Rogers style) we don't need another Stonebow
- The building should blend in with York architecture we don't want an eyesore that promotes innovation, technology and creativity!
- The building should retain as far as possible the architectural heritage of the city in a prominent city centre site
- The buildings should be in keeping with the historic architecture of the city, however this must still take account of the need to keep costs down. It doesn't need to be 'showy' on the inside. It's more important that it's functional rather than luxurious
- The buildings should reflect the historic element of our city
- The chance to secure a historic building should be considered important
- The cost of projects such as this invariably escalate out of control, the final cost being very much more than the original estimate
- The cost of the project is too high, we should not be building new offices in a time of austerity. I strongly disagree with the proposal to fund a new HQ
- The cost of the project seems rather large to say that buildings are already structured. Are you really getting value for money?
- The Council Offices should be of an architectural standard that we as residents of a historical city can be proud of.
- The Council building should be in keeping with historical York
- The Council buildings should in some way reflect York's heritage i.e. The Railway
- The Council has already had the opportunity to make a significant architectural contribution to the city and blew it, unfortunately. With that complete waste of money in mind any further developments should strive to save as much money as possible.
- The Council Offices should reflect the historic buildings of York not some new modern monstrosity
- The Council should build architecturally 'adequate' HQ while concentrating on value for money and genuine environmental sustainability for the future.
- The Council should give you something to be proud of
- The Council should lead the way on new and exciting architecture, the Council should encourage other buildings to be of good architectural quality
- The Council should support re-use of listed buildings and local architects/developer who have stake in future of city. Landscaped courtyard has potential to be of benefit to all
- The Council's new HQ should be in a landmark building that celebrates the city's cultural heritage and history and the character of the local area/neighbourhood
- The design should fit in with York's traditional buildings and heritage

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The existing building is a disgrace and must look dreadful for visitors. It needs to be a building in keeping with the architecture of York and the walled city
- The finished building should be the architectural legacy of York. Should be user friendly but externally blend in with its surroundings. A building to be proud of
- The headquarters should have dignity and be symbolic of an ancient city which West Offices would represent. Top design can be costly and date quickly - solid design doesn't really date and keeps costs under control
- The history of York is so important to the city and the community. The West Offices would be an alternative and dignified headquarters and the information indicates that preservation of the history of the building is guaranteed
- The HQ should reflect York architecture and not become a modern eyesore in years to come. Incorporating sustainable features in a classic building would best reflect York and make a better impression to the public and importantly business workers/potential. The lessons learnt from building the monstrosity of the Stonebow should be born in mind.
- The new building must help express York's developing civic identity. A 1960's building would be totally inappropriate for this. York trades on its historic past, to forget this would be to impoverish the city culturally
- The new building needs to be in keeping with our older architecture.
- The new building should be innovative, and flexible and provide a comfortable working environment. It should be a pleasant place to be whether an employee or visitor. However the building should also meet the highest BREEAM specifications and be as energy efficient as possible. The new council offices should be a "flagship" building to reflect the city of York. It should be a building that we can be proud of now in the future
- The new headquarters should be of the highest architectural quality and should be sustainable. Concentrating on low costs can lead to poor quality and future problems with the building, and are likely to lead to high maintenance costs in the future.
- The new offices should be housed in a building of quality & architectural appeal. There should be no skimping on cost. West Office site is my preference. Yorkshire House is ugly and refurbishment will not alter that
- The offices should be an outstanding example of excellent architecture which aims to create the lowest possible carbon footprint. They should be a tourist attraction. This is an opportunity to go for the best.
- The old railway station looks the part and does not stand at a busy road junction with no green corridor for access
- The old station is a fantastic building - very appropriate for HQ. Great open space and historic building
- The old station is preferable because of its historical importance to the city and aesthetic impact
- The old station site is an opportunity for the council to show its conservation and heritage credentials, especially in view of the World Heritage site bid - this objective should figure as importantly as the need to reduce costs.
- The older building reflects 'York'!
- The opportunity to create a civic centre of which citizens could be proud must not be jeopardised through short term economic considerations
- The options are central & will be seen by visitors. It is very important that the building represents York to visitors & investors. A cheap solution will be very negative to people. We offers opportunity to showcase York
- The project should encompass a building that is in keeping with the historical city of York. Should utilise all latest tech within the project latest bid management systems.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The project to use in a new and exciting way a part of York's history and heritage in the form of the old station is an excellent one
- The projected West Offices development seems more worthy of York's architectural heritage than the unimaginative Yorkshire House project? The latter needs re-examination by a good but sensible modern architect?
- The restoration of the West Offices site seems to me the best option by far. It would re-invigorate this area and architecture. It also offers easy short-term banking facilities in soft green
- The reuse of heritage buildings would be excellent and the chance to make a real architectural addition to the city's attractions should not be missed
- The soft green site might be harder to access for public transport. West Offices would give an historic continuity & emphasize York's heritage. I applied every effort to promote sustainability - York could lead the way in the county on this
- The use of a 1960's building is incompatible with an authority responsible for one of the UK's most historic cities
- The use of our existing buildings while keeping the historical element is important. My preference would be West Offices
- The building should fit with the character of the city, be built to last but also giving customers the facilities they wish to see. It should also provide facilities to allow council officers to do their jobs effectively!
- There are already too many buildings in York that have been allowed to be constructed without any consideration for future generations or blending it with existing historical buildings
- There are few exceptions in this country of authorities who do not suffer from the disease "goldplating" a virus which goes under the guise of "exciting architecture" eg "the Barbican Centre" beset by disease. Just get it right OK
- There are many lovely older buildings within York not fully in use or even empty - surely those would be better used if cleaned and updated as necessary instead of some of the horrible modern buildings in places.
- There is no point in moving to a new building if it is going to look and feel cheap and nasty it should be credit to the city
- There is no reason why modern materials could not be used and still retain a historic look to the building
- There's enough old in the city, let's have something new and innovative
- Think it is important that any HQ for the council fits in with other key buildings architecturally in York. Opposed to any building which is modern and not in keeping with historical York especially if it is near the wall
- Think the building should reflect some of York's cultural and historical heritage
- Think the building needs to fit in with other buildings in York but doesn't have to be a great architectural wonder.
- Think your vision for Yorkshire House is breathtaking of something York residents could be proud of. York needs to move with the times in architecture and vision while being consistent with the past, your vision for Yorkshire House really does achieve this
- This is a chance for York to show innovation and inspiration in new architecture to redress some of the dull and common buildings we have
- This is a traditionally built and historic city, let's keep it this way. Very many "exciting, novel, etc" buildings look very tired and old-fashioned remarkably quickly.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- This is an opportunity for city of york council to create an innovative modern facility which will be usable and adaptable for many years to come. A building the people of york can be proud of. west offices are ideal
- This is an opportunity to ensure the facility is sympathetic to an historical city in design and appearance and set a precedence by being somewhere near budget
- This is beautiful building which should be put to maximum use. Railway history connected to building plus its beautiful appearance should be preserved
- This is york! We need a building that has history, architectural value and class
- This plan will not achieve building excellence. Development on barbican site with leisure & entertainment facility and council offices would be convenient and allow creative new architectural design
- This should be a "flag ship" building for a high profile highly design conscious city
- To enhance image & impression that council office gives of historic york, historic building would be better solution. This would better last over time than already unfashionable building or modern design out of keeping with york
- To have an attractive architectural building in keeping with yorks history is better than re-using horrible 1960s building which should not have been built in first place
- Traditional architecture to tie in with the historic city
- Try to create/build/use a building that is in keeping with yorks overall beautiful architect, don't ruin city with modern new builds that look so ugly and out of place
- Use historic buildings. Invest for future. Don't be afraid to pay for quality
- Use what is already there - york has beautiful buildings that need to be put to good use
- Very few architectural contributions are truly innovative & inspiring. York council are unlikely to succeed. steel & glass do not = wonderful architecture
- Visitors are shocked at the citys dilapidated state. Before you become comfortable in new buildings why dont you actually walk this city and see its sad state
- We do not want another concrete monstrosity ie stonebow and hillary house
- We feel that west offices are the more attractive buildings and more appropriate for the council in this historic city. The norwich union building is ugly and may not last as long.
- We must be proud of this development and want it to remain for very many years. It must be in keeping with york and its image as whole
- We must not end up with brutalist concrete box because of lack of vision. York deserves better
- We need a building we can be proud of, this is a once in a generation change
- We really like the west offices proposed site as it will involve the regeneration of a beautiful historic building which fits well with the character of york. The other building is horrible, a real eyesore
- We should build a structure that reflects the status of york as an important historical city without squandering money
- We should consider not just keeping costs down, a building should contribute to the beauty of the city
- We want council hq which we can be proud of without going over top with cost. In comparing costs of alternatives whole life cost to carry more weight than short term
- West offices appear to present an opportunity for developing a council appropriate to this historic city & which will bring to life a building well worth developing. Also west offices present an opportunity to develop an attractive /landscape/ green appro
- West offices is in keeping with the city of york, yorkshire house is an eyesore
- West offices should be chosen site. Use of historic building with character rather than 60s flat faced monolith. Gardens and open space already available

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- West offices would be the most suitable building and site for the historical city
- West offices would fit the York ethos
- West offices would promote York's heritage & be a fitting use of one of our landmark buildings. Forecourt area would provide excellent regeneration of dreary area. This development would make excellent use of local consultants and developers
- What is exciting to an architect is usually a carbuncle on the landscape to the man in the street. You have just to look at "Stonebow House" (that architect wants shooting)
- Whatever else, don't build another Stonebow. We need something in keeping and in sympathy with the city centre as a whole not something modern for modern's sake
- Whatever you plan to build don't replicate that awful monstrosity on Tadcaster Road. That building not in keeping with architecture of York!!!
- While I accept the need to build a 'green' building the city of York deserves a traditional classical design at least in appearance. It does not want some modern blot that will stick out and age without decorum.
- While it is important not to waste money any work should be of high quality and things made to last. In such a lovely city any building should be an enhancement not detrimental to the overall effect on the neighbourhood
- While the new HQ need not be an iconic building, it should be an attractive feature of the city as well as pleasant to work in. The council made a mess of the Hungate project, resulting in a glorified box design. Please get it right this time.
- Whilst I would like to see the HQ in a historic building fitting of York's heritage, the Yorkshire House site is a very important focal point for many people entering the city. Refurbishment and redevelopment of that site will help present York well
- Will be an important building so should look good although clearly providing services & funding these should be financial priority. Shortage of houses for me to move to. This is what matters most to me, prefer money was spent on that
- No option is in keeping with local architecture - the council must set an example in low carbon, energy efficient sustainable building as well as aesthetic when designing - no high rise, even need lifts & stairs
- Would have liked more information about the costs of both options. Why you haven't asked which location is preferred? This document is just a box ticking exercise with no real use, another waste of money. Why not use plans for Hungate offices?
- Would like new offices to be West Green. More suitable building to represent city of York and much more attractive building for people to visit than Yorkshire House. Surroundings also appear to be more satisfactory at West Offices
- Would like the HQ to reflect the character of York, not to be a modern design that would look dated in five years. If the money were invested in the design we would be able to keep it longer, no Thatcher designs please
- Would like to see an inspiring civic centre that we can all be proud of. Would like design to be based on efficiency for use not just fancy stuff that will date badly
- Would like to see traditional/sympathetic structure with modern functionality
- Would like to see West Offices chosen, best location, better exterior of building, a listed, none busy roads, restful garden
- Would like York to set high standard in exciting new architecture which promotes green issues without losing opportunity for innovation
- Would prefer to see the West Offices development chosen. Preserving our heritage and giving a customer friendly, accessible building.
- West Offices has much more in its favour, because of its historical and architectural importance to York, plus outdoor garden which is good for employees and visitors

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- York already has many architectural gems and there is no need to detract from these with council office. Focus should be on fitting in with surroundings and being carbon neutral
- York citizens should have a sense of pride in the building that represents them
- York council needs a hq in a building with some history and a façade more fitting to an ancient city. Something like the town halls which most other large towns in yorkshire. West offices are, i think, the most appropriate.
- York council pay not slightest attention to planning buildings that are in keeping with all historical city. Allow & build monstrous buildings out of keeping with ethos of city. Internal buildings can still house modern facilities.
- York has enough 'exciting' architectural buildings, the 'west offices' building is an architectural treasure in itself and my concern would be that the integrity of the facade would be preserved. Both are accessible
- York has the most boring,dull,cheap architecture in the uk. You are wedded to medieval churches & 1960s brick. Dull, dreary,drab,horrible.please lets have better modern design & not just toy town building blocks.try edinburgh as an example to follow
- York is a beautiful city & its civic hq should be an aesthetic asset & continue the city in regeneration & improvement
- York is a beautiful city with an emphasis on history & shouldn't be ruined by creating new over priced, 'modern'buildings
- York is a city that has responsibility for some great pieces of our national heritage.the west offices are a good example and we should use opportunities such as this to demonstrate our commitment and leadership in this area
- York is a city with a strong historical element, the council offices should reflect this. The west offices would breathe life back in to this great building
- York is a heritage city and cannot afford to put up cheap - jack buildingsin salient positions - particularly one so near the station, where many visitors get their 1st sight of the city
- York is a historic city and any building must be sympathetic to its surroundings. No glass or steel construction.
- York is a historic city, predominantly dependent on tourism, apart from the obvious benefits of west offices the re-introduction of this beautiful building can do nothing but good for the impression of our city. Using york companies will help economy
- York is a historical city and all the buildings in the city centre should be made to fit in. A longer lasting facility could have money in the long run
- York is a very old city with a great deal of history so i think that whatever building/renovation that is done needs to be in keeping with the city
- York is a very special unique city and deserves a very important hq-we have all waited a long time for this building so it's got to be something to be proud of
- York is an ancient beautiful city - bear this in mind and don't do anything too moder
- York is an ancient city with much character and architecture
- York is an ancient cultural centre for visitors and residents alike. The new building must not stand out like 'stonebas' as a new innovative concrete block. Hopefully local stone would be incorporated in to the facade
- York is an historical city and the council offices should reflect this while demonstrating york is innovative, forward thinking and budget aware.
- York is historic city & we should look after our buildings. West offices is grade ii building & converting it to council hq will conserve it. Yorkshire house should never have been given permission inside city walls

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- York is pleasant city but needs to come into 21st century but building should be traditional in exterior appearance. Build offices out of town for employees and customers to use cars if necessary
- York is rich with all architectural-period buildings, q10: is 2012 going to have one, or a second rate one?
- York is such beautiful city with amazing history that any building should be carefully designed and no short term expense spared as city needs to look to its long term future
- York is tourist city. I would be embarrassed as a York citizen if most exciting architectural contribution to city was council offices
- York is truly beautiful city boasting many architectural gems therefore any new building should also be aesthetically pleasing in addition to being very fit for purpose
- York needs an accessible building of real quality, which is fit for purpose for those who work in it & gives value for money for those who pay for it
- York should have a council building which reflects its historical surroundings creating a building that is not an architectural contribution would be disappointing for all
- York should reflect its strong architectural heritage through civic pride & this should be paramount in development of new hq. Feel West Offices would achieve this aim and hope this option will be chosen
- York is beautiful city. West Offices is beautiful building and should be kept alive. Current offices on St. Leonards look rather shabby from outside. Has the council negotiated to maintain the outside of the building so that it enhances the city?
- Yorkshire House extension is horrible. West Offices are much more attractive in a quieter area and are so in keeping with the city's ambience. Forget modern - leave that to Leeds, keep York different and attractive spacious place to live and work.
- Yorkshire House is a drab dingy shapeless building, unwelcoming and unsuitable for a main civic building and in a very unsuitable position. West Offices is a classic building of character and style
- Yorkshire House is a terrible, ugly building whereas West Offices is a handsome building more in keeping with the image of York. Please do not develop Yorkshire House, knock it down instead.
- Yorkshire House is an eye-sore. Much better to refurbish West Offices
- Yorkshire House is an ugly, soulless blot on the built fabric of York and should be demolished.
- Yorkshire House is ugly from the outside and plans for inside are little better, trying to look modern but seems tacky and unimaginative. West Offices look wonderful and the inside is open and pleasant, seems much more appropriate
- Yorkshire House is very unattractive and should be demolished, not used as the hq for a city with York's architectural heritage
- Yorkshire House looks like a building out of keeping with the best architecture of York - return to concrete monstrosities of Stonebow. Please, let's have a thing of beauty to look at. West Offices look much more architecturally sympathetic and in keeping. Yorkshire House may be a 'prominent' building but it is not a 'fine' building, whereas the historic background of the other site and the courtyard space are very attractive points in its favour
- Yorkshire House more in keeping with plans for new hq giving style and forward looking design to bring up to modern standards, with plenty of room for all services under one roof.
- Yorkshire House scheme looks uninspiring. Make it lasting and inspiring architectural addition to city cutting edge even. Don't give us yet another nothing nondescript or even ugly addition to this beautiful city. Be bold but do it well

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Yorkshire house should be demolished, its such an eyesore, along with the architect. are we allowed to know who designed the thing?? And york city planning department?
 - Yorkshire house should be knocked down and not revitalised. It should never have been built so close to the railway offices. The contrast makes it look ugly. I suggest a proper city bus station. It is a disgrace that the city hasn't got one
 - Yorkshire house was & remains a blot on landscape and on one of most congested streets. Old railway station has an altogether pleasanter setting, more open aspect & more in keeping with york's image as historic city
 - You don't need to compete with york minster for architectural quality, its just an office
 - You have to incorporate the graceless yorkshire house by a really good european architect. Tourists pass these buildings and only the best will stand the test of time
 - You should not have cheap and nasty architecture- this is a historic city- no one visits to see cheap and bland concrete. west offices would be preferred option
-
- £166k per year saving is minimal and I wonder how much this exercise has cost! You will go with what you want do a European Tender and no one will benefit in York - either as workforce to create building or in future.
 - £43.8 mil should be invested in building new council houses, flats, maisonettes to accommodate those homeless, living in expensive private rented accommodation. In today's climate of people losing their homes and jobs this money should be spent on York
 - £43.8 million is a vast amount to spend for such a small long term saving in view of all the cuts in services each year. The amount should be nearer £20 million.
 - £43.8 million seems excessive in today's climate
 - £43.8m to rehouse 1400 staff is an obscene amount of money, surely most of them can be relocated to cheaper out of city locations and only front line staff need to be located in City Centre offices. A disgusting waste of tax money in cash strapped times
 - £4m has already been spent. Please give this project the necessary consideration without spending huge amounts on various enquiries and consultations
 - £5 mil is a minimal saving and over 30 years equates to approx £166K a drop in the ocean compared to the overall council budget. Perhaps priority should be given to providing a building that is a flagship for both the image of the city and energy sustainability
 - £5 million over 30 years is not a big cost benefit and would be wiped out by cost of project escalating, as these things tend to do
 - £5 million saving in 30 years, less than 200k per year on average, in today's prices in an establishment as large as this it is negligible.
 - £5,000,000 in 30 years is a small amount to save.
 - £5,000,000/5 yrs = £166,660. This divided by council tax payers in York no doubt, less than £1 per year saving, great one!
 - £5m over 30 years doesn't sound like big saving - it sounds like it's going to be 29 years before savings outweigh costs. Maybe it would be better to say "it will cost a fair amount but here are benefits..."
 - £5m over 30 years is only £100,000 a year- less if £5m is a nominal rather than present value. This is not much perhaps 4 or 5 staff. I suggest you look at desking staff at a lower value site perhaps adjacent to park and ride rather than expensive premises
 - £5m over 30 years is only £166,666.66. Perhaps a fat cat chief executive could go. Would be same savings. Surely these are enough empty office building at Poppleton Park etc
 - £5m over 30yrs doesn't sound like a big saving when compared with £43.8m budget

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- £5m over 30yrs is equivalent to about £170 over a year, this will barely cover 2 senior employers pay and is an irrelevance
- £5m over the next 30yrs meaningless number even when inflation is disregarded. 12p per copy - £23,409 could have been put towards a worthier use
- £5m saving over 30 year period does not seem to be worth shouting about. Perhaps a £5m saving over 5 year period would have been better target
- £5m saving over 30 years! Explain detail of how this can be achieved. Unlikely that project would deliver to time and more importantly budget. What is payback in terms of years?
- £5m saving over next 30 years is target that will never be met. Target that should be set is to reduce rates over coming years by cutting out duplication of jobs and council waste
- £5m to be saved over next 30 years has already been wasted. It is going to take much longer to realise any savings. Costs should be kept to minimum to protect council taxpayers
- £5m/30 years is £166,666 savings per year does not seem a big saving after spending £43.8m, Both sites look very good but I think Yorkshire House has the edge
- 4million wasted on Hungate yet the present options were available another waste of rate payers money
- 5M ALREADY GONE JOBS MUST GO
- A cheaper building, say at Clifton Moor, would be far more effective and provide room for free parking.
- A complete waste of money, spend your £43.8m on road mending!
- A council in total disarray, and wasting council tax payers money. No more false statements and white elephants
- A financial saving of £5m over 30 years on an investment of £44m is not going to be very impressive. I am not a "customer" of the city council - a local citizen certainly
- A good quality building is needed without being too expensive
- A long time has elapsed, costs have increased & wasted. I think a definite attempt should be made by all parties to make a final decision to get this new council building sorted. Costs could have been reduced in producing this leaflet in black & white.
- A lot has been happily wasted on so called participation. 5 million will be saved over 30 years who has made this estimate. This appears to be lot of waste of resources. Hence would like council to be wiser
- A low cost HQ is essential - our money should be spent on upgrading leisure services, social services
- A saving of £5 mil over 30 years is pitifully small given the cost of the project. Why is there no question about which scheme is preferred? I prefer West Offices. Don't forget that council staff won't be miraculously made more efficient by new offices
- A saving of £5 million is not much when spaced over 30 years
- A saving of £5 million over 30 years sounds like a lot but is actually very little over such a long period
- A sensible balance between cost & design should be achieved, if possible
- A total waste of money. (£5 million is nothing over 30 years) NB so is this circular!
- £5 million is not a great saving over 30 years when considered in the light of the councils recent mismanagement of major projects. They should go for the cheapest option expecting that even then it will be a massive expense for the rate payer.
- Absolutely vital that cost is the major criteria for deciding between 2 options. Having been associated with West offices for over 35 years I believe the Yorkshire house option to be easier and hopefully cheaper to deliver

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Afraid that have very little confidence that York City Council can make balanced, sensible decisions. Recent Waterend Road improvements is a prime example. Have you sat in the much extended queue??
- After all the money wasted by the council, like with the Barbican, the plans for the new HQ, I think, whatever the public suggests will be ignored anyway.
- After Barbican re-development debacle view everything including this latest proposal from council with high degree of scepticism. Of the 2 I like West Offices plan best
- After having wasted 4-5 million on this, by being wasteful, does it really matter what the TAXPAYERS want
- After so many years and much wasted money (Hungate) I think now the council should only spend essential monies on this new HQ
- After the enormous amount of money wasted on the Hungate development I would like some evidence of wise and sensible use of public money
- After the fiascos of Barbican(York the only city in the country without a central baths-even the Romans had them)Hungate, do not spend our money for no point
- After the well-publicised sagas surrounding Hungate & Peasholme centre the council should be looking to carry out this project for the best value possible
- After wasting 4.9 million pounds of taxpayers' money on Hungate scheme hope that council fully liaise with all parties before commencing work
- Aim to achieve best quality and serviceability for least possible cost. Green projects normally least cost efficient
- All of this is very well and good but will we actually see a saving ourselves, or will the costs continue to rise
- All plans to build or remove, should be shelved until a more financially stable time. Being seen to spend large sums of council tax payers money, when in a recession would appear crass
- All projects should have penalty clauses if targets aren't met & a maximum agreed spending, which will not be exceeded. Most people don't care about the HQ, we just want value for money
- Although it can be cheaper for York Council Tax payers when £4,000,000 has already been wasted on the Hungate fiasco, then you have the audacity to put some of the blame on the council tax payers. In my opinion the council are totally inept
- Although producing a sustainable building is important, is changing the buildings necessary. Surely the millions of pounds spent could be put to better use for all residents. Such as swimming provision for all school children etc
- Although the intention is to find this from existing budgets, there are surely better ways of using £43.8m. In these days of increasing taxes and pressure on public services I fail to see how you can justify this
- Am surprised that you even need to ask if we want to keep costs down
- Another waste of money
- Another waste of taxpayers' money, what happened to all the money spent on Hungate? As an ex council employee I know the cost of this. I notice there is no car parking space at either site.
- Any chance of contracts that are fixed prices otherwise cost will rise and any savings will evaporate as usual and no gold plating!!
- Any decision made should consider its costs coming out of their own fortune and not act accordingly not regard expenditure as a bottomless pit.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Any means to keep council tax bills at reasonable or reduced level must be considered. Past efforts have not succeeded and fear that some of additional costs will rather than reduce will increase our bills
- Any move should not cost tax payers extra - I would prefer my council tax payments went towards providing facilities for York FC & to replace Barbican centre rather than new council offices
- Are the quoted costs of the build up to be adhered to ? Or will it be yet another case of public bodies getting it drastically wrong
- As a council you have already wasted money regarding this project
- As a council you have wasted so much time, effort & money that you should just get on with it & accomplish a functional office area with minimum cost
- As an OAP think council tax should be looked at with view of cutting it for oaps
- As both proposals are in the same area it should not be difficult to provide approx costs before all this can be decided. Surely YCC employees are capable of processing them. Are printers in York not capable of printing this
- As considerable amount of money has already been wasted including this survey I consider Yorkshire House be used with minimum alterations to this 1960s building
- As council tax payer am disgusted at amount of money wasted on Hungate. Council incompetent at best, does not have integrity to resign. Stay where you are stop wasting money
- As is usual with council overall cost will be twice as much as estimate. Why can't Yorkshire House be used as it is without paying millions for flashy fittings. It's a council office not 5 star hotel
- As long as we the tax payers get value for our money and it is going to get everything and everybody under one roof it should also be the last move for the next 20 yrs
- As per previous projects it is bound to cost twice as much as estimated - so stay in present building and modernise
- As the council have already wasted our money on the Barbican site & the ridiculous new Hargate site then you have a duty to keep any future costs as low as possible
- As the public were blamed for the fiasco and waste of money so far on this project why ask them again. Councillors are elected so have a mandate to make decisions
- As with all government and local government, projected costs always seem to over-run into millions. Please get a fixed cost budget before starting work. Council tax is already high enough!!!
- As York council has wasted enough money already, the cost must be kept low, to reduce further council tax bill
- As you have wasted time and money, the fast, cheaper and more central site would be the best way forward.
- As you should be keeping all costs down and reducing all costs, this move by the council should be scrapper. To only save £5m is pathetic, commercially this is not a viable proposition, scrap it!
- At 87 years old & disabled I very rarely get into city so whatever scheme is cost efficient and benefits all York residents I go along with
- At a cost of £44m a saving of just £5m over the next 30 years is only £160k per year which is a poor return on investment?
- At this point of time and with care, social services medical needs so desperately short of money, resources & staff, I consider it appalling that so much money should be spent on project such as this
- Balance between cost and architecture not too exciting and extravagant

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Barbican, Hungate, ftrs, Bendy Buses, incompetence in spending our money Water \Lane pelican lights I suggest you go to outer Mongolia as I don't think any of you know York
- Be far more open on the financing and contracting arrangements than you were on the Barbican. Provide opportunities for engagement with the community. Cycle parking.
- Be realistic about how much you spend and on what. Nothing winds the electorate up more than gross wastes of money by their council
- Be realistic we would all like to have the best building and facilities possible but at an affordable price - do not burden us tax payers with extra costs at a time when you should be reducing costs where ever possible. It's not a bottomless pit!
- Bearing in mind amount of tax payers money already spent on this project, aim should now be to get project completed with no more wasted cash involved to do job properly without cutting corners which might cause problems long term
- Before city goes ahead with such projects we (the citizens of York) require full public enquiry into failed Hungate and Barbican projects
- Being mindful of the present financial/economic crisis it must be incumbent upon you to get the best value for money available and not get carried away, therefore over running original costs
- Budget is never what you say - it will end up 2-3 times more. Be honest at start. Need new consolidated building - just don't try to deceive us that you are saving us money
- Budget remains too high for such times of financial difficulty. How about raising funds (or some) from other sources (lottery money)?
- Building projects are historically difficult to cost so £5m savings should be taken with very large pinch of salt. Council tax payers may find it difficult to reconcile work with increasing tax bills
- Building should be value for money providing an easy accessible service that can be used by people of York. Current buildings in wrong place not accessible or easy to use due to parking restraints.
- Building should not include gimmicky glitzy unnecessary facilities and office equipment should only be replaced if existing goods are unusable
- By all means make an attractive building, but don't waste public money on things like plants and fancy furniture
- Can the council justify the loss of so much money with the Hungate Project. This was an obvious move
- City of York council should plan to save money, not spend it on unnecessary state of the art buildings. This project is a complete waste of public/central government money. I give this project a definite NO GO
- Comments are subject to cost evaluations. Every development of this magnitude must be supported by information on the immediate cost and any future ongoing cost to the good people of York
- Common sense should prevail in planning to keep costs to minimum bearing in mind waste that occurred over Hungate
- Complete farce and waste of council tax payers money
- Complete project to be completed for well under original £43.8m & completion date set. If not completed on time & cost developer to compensate for every day over to York
- Concerned about council's financial ability, take care of listed buildings when redoing interior
- Considering council have already wasted £6m council tax payers money think project should be completed as cheaply as possible. Savings should also be made within council workforce

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Cost and efficiency should be primary objective. Innovation and creativity are good but not if costs taxpayer more money. Private industry would aim to be as low cost as possible. Priority should be given to the local economy (contractors)
- Cost cutting would only be short term gain, not something that would lend itself to a sustainable building with a projected long life
- Cost effective re-use of existing buildings is far more important than providing "unique views across city". York City Council is supposed to promote the City - not itself! Stop having such grand ideas about yourselves
- Cost for tax payer should be minimal
- Cost is very important but the cheapest is not always the best. A quality building is needed for staff and customers alike
- Cost issues are important and efficient management of the project should make costs one of its priorities but not to the extent the HQ looks cheap and needs early refurbishment
- Cost of new building is stated as £43.8m and these projects very rarely meet the budget against a %m savings over 30yrs or are you saying £5m per year?
- Cost savings and efficiency claims will never allow you to recoup build - moving & disruption costs - even taking into account potential sale value of existing buildings.
- Cost should be kept at a minimum but not at the quality of the work. Extra money should not be spent on architectural statement. All required is a functioning office.
- Cost should be paramount with changing time and technology, and possibility of the need to reduce staff
- COST VITAL WITH INITIAL CONSTRUCTION
- Costs are important and the previous box shape at Hungate was not in keeping with York and its appearance. Designing a building incurs costs so using West Offices site should minimise costs
- Costs need to be kept down. Far too much money as been wasted already
- Costs should always be considered-constantly-as building project costs always appear to spiral out of control
- Costs should be as low as possible but not enough to result in a building that will last a very long time, as long term it will work out cheaper. If the building lasts a very long time before need refurbishment or upgrading
- Costs should be kept to a minimum and fixed price agreed so no additional costs incurred and timescale agreed beforehand where penalties can be occurred
- Costs should be lowest you can do. Enough money has been wasted but when have planning office ever listened to what we say. Don't let it be another shambles
- Council has wasted enough money on Hungate. Council tax payers having to foot bill
- Council has wasted so much money at great cost to city eg Barbican. I don't have much faith in them and doubt they listen to anything said/written. How about "cutting your cloth according to your own needs"!
- Council must be cost conscious as it's the citizens money they are spending. Spend it wisely and cut waste of money it is spending now
- Council need to become efficient. Councillors expenses are disgusting. Westfield Ward close £100,000 for 2 family members and their friend
- Council needs to ensure that the project moves forward cost effectively. It seems a huge amount has been wasted on consulting and planning for the Hungate site already. This makes the council look profligate
- Council should concentrate in reducing total costs and stop wasting time and effort on grander HQ. Better facilities for population are needed not for council employees whose job is to serve population

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Council should concentrate on value for money best build and quality. You can balance keeping cost down and achieving long lasting facility. Should not be looking for exciting architectural matters given Hungate fiasco
- Council should consider costs of the building, not anything too modern but attractive to look at and to last for many years to come. I favour West Offices
- Council should consider renting buildings rather than spend £32m on purchase
- Council should definitely look at costs & try to keep them very low. Don't waste thousands of pound in name of design. Acomb library spent needless thousands on wooden children's shelves in name of aesthetics - pointless and wasteful.
- Council should do like real industry and set budget about 60% to 70% of initial proposal then work out how to do it
- Council should keep costs to minimum by using existing building and upgrading it in an environmental and cost effective way.
- Council should stop wasting money, enough has already been wasted on this project
- Council should use our money carefully they should not waste it on unnecessary extensions to give views of the minster. They should concentrate on the job we are paying good money for them to do
- Council should work on administering the city-not squandering public resources. There was no reason why the existing buildings could not have been refurbished where necessary. Most people do not visit the offices
- Council will never spend money wisely as it is not theirs, only have to look at the Barbican, the previous council building and road improvements, none of which worked.
- Current financial climate is rare chance to invest in long term projects since construction industry is anxious to obtain contracts at comparatively low costs
- Decision on site ought to be made asap to avoid duplication of costs.
- Despite your euphoria, this looks like a huge burden on the tax payer for years to come, it seems to be an exercise in covering up the financial disaster of the failed hungate site and the premature sale of St Leonards-for which no one seems accountable
- Disagree on extensive re-development as both proposed sites previously used as office buildings
- Disgusted at waste of money of previous scheme when these 2 schemes must have been able to have been considered earlier. Too many 'green issues' when other countries such as USA & China, India have far greater impact than us
- Do not believe this will save costs. Council should concentrate on cost cutting to put a stop to the practice of increasing council taxes by 5% year after year
- Do not go on any free loading junkets to foreign lands at expense of York tax payers - internet is pretty good for giving information
- Do not repeat Hungate - ugly building do not destroy buildings that are perfectly viable. Do not spend money unnecessarily - extra levels of admin which are not required.
- Do not repeat the fiasco of the Barbican Centre
- **DO NOT WASTE ANYMORE TAX PAYERS MONEY**
- Does the total budget for the new headquarters of £43.8 billion include the bill for the failed project? If not, why not?
- Does this really mean what it says namely you will spend 44 million but save 5 million? Over 30 years an average of 170k per year!! Poor deal 9 year break even
- Don't believe it will only cost the amount quoted if building costs go over target the 5million over 30 years. It is a joke at our expense.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Don't care where offices are and I'm sure the majority of York residents feel the same - however do care that £23,409 was wasted on sending out this leaflet. I am also disgusted at the state of the old offices in exhibition/opposite Theatre Royale
- Don't forget the history of the building. York is where it is today because of its heritage and the railways. It's about time York put something back into its railway heritage
- Don't make mess of this. Hungate was shambolic. Remember it's our money you are spending. Best option West Offices
- Don't spend tax payers money on making this building look good. Its what's going to happen inside that is the most important thing
- Don't throw away any more ratepayers money
- Don't waste money on features and "arty" extras. The buildings must be good places to work with ample room for staff and infrastructure. There is potential for difficult moments in combined waiting room. I am impressed by the bias of council questions.
- Don't forget you have already wasted millions of pounds on Hungate fiasco
- Don't let this be another Barbican fiasco and waste of our money. Your ideas of exciting architectural contribution to city may be others ideas of abomination. West Offices please
- Don't think too much should be spent on over luxurious offices for staff. Some people still living on streets!! Would be lovely to have magnificent modern building but times in 2009 not conducive to this
- Don't waste taxpayers money by producing such documents when our opinions seem to have little or no influence!!!!
- Don't pay over the odds for "cutting edge design" concentrate on making it a functional building out of town with parking would be preferable! Like the idea of using an existing empty building and refurbishing, don't waste money
- Due to the amount of money wasted over the last 5 years, the council should beware as in the real world they would all be out of work
- During a recession a over costly project would be a disaster, the public perception needs to be the project was necessary, good value for money
- Each generation will become more involved in technology therefore people will use computers, phones etc and therefore never need to visit council offices, therefore no need to accommodated huge premises just provide easier comms and eco friendly buildings
- Economy is in a horrendous mess under new labour, it's the predictable boom and bust approach anticipated. Council should remember they're spending our money not theirs, if it's well organised and justified you have my support
- Either location should suit needs - no huge sums of money should be spent refurbishment - road layout does not need changing - York residents have had to use it for years
- Either of these 2 option should be completed as quickly as possible & as cheaply as poss., enough money has already been spent on this subject, the rate payers have to foot the bill and other options have to be cut
- Enough money been wasted already. Costs should be kept to minimum. Practical ideas which will work must be implemented.
- Enough money been wasted. Important to consider future development/growth of services and accommodate this now as far as possible.
- Enough money has already been wasted
- Enough money has already been wasted on NUT building new hqs. This survey is another waste of money - you'll do as you please
- Enough money has already been wasted on this project

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Enough money has been wasted already on Hungate. It is disgraceful in this current climate. Time should be spent ensuring this project is right before more money (public money) is spent
- Enough money has been wasted already. How do you "lose" £1m? Don't waste any more
- Enough of our money has been wasted on Hungate, moving the hostel for homeless and continual discussions. If the council is moving it should get on with it.
- Enough time and money has already been wasted on this. Get off fence and get on with it
- Everything you do should concentrate on keeping cost down any idiot can spend money - our money
- Extremely difficult to formulate a view with no real indication of fiscal implications - developments, budgets, running costs etc
- Far too much money been thrown away by ill equipped hobby politicians. Council needs functional building not another Barbican failure
- Feel benefits to clients and staff could be achieved more cheaply, cant rate q8 because no indication of relative costs. Potential saving doesn't seem much of a benefit, strong risk project will overspend, where will the money come from if this happens?
- Forecast costs of £43.8m seem excessive, considering the two proposed sites are already extant structures. Councils are notorious for not keeping to budget. One hopes this project is not going to be another drain in rate payers. Only time will tell!
- Forecasting costs and savings over 30 years is ridiculous. Hope rest of your deliberations are not so fanciful
- Get it right. Too much waste i.e. Hungate, Barbican, Peasholme Centre etc.
- Get on with the job, you have wasted a lot of our money. What about disabled parking? If there is none how do disabled people access the buildings?
- Give the loss of money thus far the minimum saving seems poor over a 30yr period! The new hq needs to be able to fulfil its brief over the long term and not become an innovative white elephant within a couple of years
- Given that the £5 million saving that would have been saved over the next 30 years has been wasted on an aborted attempt to deliver this project, the resulting project should attempt to recoup these losses
- Good idea to move to one location but keep costs down without going over top. Can still look smart & updated without loads of extras - be sensible
- Good return an investment be paramount. A saving of £5m in 30 years would require 270 years to recover the initial outlay
- Have a nice friendly office environment but try and keep the costs down as there has been enough of our money wasted in the last fiasco
- Have no faith in this council completing this project or any other without wasting time and money to justify their own political existence
- Have spent enough already on the other possible site
- Having worked for the council I feel a lot of paperwork could be reduced and the money spent in a more sensible way
- Hope council will not waste our money as per Hungate fiasco. Has council sacked employees who cost residents money regarding checking on size of building, planning and heritage
- Hope it doesn't mean an increase in council tax
- Hope money will be spent wisely we all want good service offered in pleasant surroundings but luxury is not necessary. Keep costs down where possible otherwise might see rise in council tax
- Hope the council don't waste any more money like they did before without getting proper approval its out money to be spent wisely, not wasted. Hope you do a better job

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Hope the council listen to people, as so much money has been wasted on lots of projects, on two occasions I know people who have not been listened to
- Hope this will not be a costly disaster as the Hungate project-total waste of money ie:no need for new Peashole Centre!!! How much have you spent on these questionnaires?
- How can all this planning save the tax payer money, where ever it is the council tax will still increase by 5%so the council will do as they please no matter what the public opinion
- How can saving £5m over 30yrs repay £43.8m upfront
- How can we trust the estimate as so often in the past estimates have offered no accurate guide to the final cost of schemes? I favour the West offices as they already offer an exciting architectural statement so costs can be kept down
- How come the council can manage to move offices and spend money but not improve any services in the Lulford area for the community, i.e. Barbican, and leave this building shut now for some time!
- How much more are you going to spend on this building as you have spent far too much already
- How much more money do CYC propose to waste on redesign, relocation etc. Are we all not sick of the ongoing waste of public money
- How much will scheme cost. What will be impact of council tax.
- I'd be interested in consultancy cost, how effectiveness of consultancy will be evaluated and how long contract is for
- I'd like to see the finished new building within the budget allocated. Also I would want it to be comfortable, practical and a good working environment but not luxurious-using expensive materials when cheaper would do the job & not providing face for staff

- I'm a little concerned about the projected cost of this undertaking. The savings are minimal. Where is this money coming from? I feel you should make this clear
- I'm old enough to know fairy tales don't come true this will cost twice as much before its half way
- I agree but I am thinking of its budget because of the recent economic situation this means raising of taxes
- I and everyone I know not only think that you are all an absolute disgrace over the wasted £4 million. Just get it right this time
- I did not understand the business case:£5m savings in 30 years? It will take 150 years to pay for itself! Any project like this needs to have covered its costs in under 10 years. This does not seem good value for money in the current climate
- I feel costs should be kept down as much as possible, there has been enough waste of public money on various projects.
- I feel enough money has been wasted on drawings/plans etc for the Hungate project which has not come to fruition
- I feel that the priorities should be keeping costs down whilst providing an environmentally friendly, long lasting, sustainable building and services. It's important for councils to take a lead in environmental issues
- I feel that you have wasted another £23,400 on this leaflet which will produce very little helpful information
- I find it hard to believe that £43.8 million costs will not add additional expense to York residents, or take away other services and resources we already have
- I have every confidence that this project will be: badly managed, a waste of money, late & over budget. The least the council does the happier I am because it always makes a mess of everything

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I haven't answered the questions as I don't really visit the council offices. I do feel that a lot of our money has already been wasted on this project along with 'Barbican' escudo you think the public are a bottomless pit in funding mistakes?
- I hope the public aren't going to be blamed for changes to the cost etc. As per Hungate and Barbican fiascos. Is this why we're being asked our views - so we can be the scapegoat at a later date?
- I hope when it comes to finding York City FC a new ground it will be better thought out than the council offices fiasco.
- I realise it might be difficult to strike an appropriate balance between keeping the cost down and renovating an existing building in an environmentally friendly and sustainable way but do hope this can be achieved without having to compromise too much.
- I sincerely hope the council will not waste time and money this time
- I think a saving of £5 million over 30 years sounds a very small amount to save when considering the overall council budget. Also nothing compared to the £2 million already lost on previous plans
- I think all public bodies should be careful of all expenses since the review of parliament expenses
- I think costs should be kept to a minimum but not at the expense of reducing energy efficiency and use of sustainable fuel. In the long run these will provide further savings. West Offices are already architecturally appropriate for the city.
- I think it is a disgrace that money has already been wasted on the Hungate shambles. Why were we not consulted on the £5 million no-go? As a result council tax has increased too much to an already high base rate
- I think it should cost as little as possible whilst still remaining a centre for the council, it should not look out of place in 10 years time
- I think it's an absolute disgrace that taxpayer money has been used to buy Hungate. I think that those involved should be sacked for their incompetence to avoid any further waste.
- I think that the building if required should be made to last but cost effective as a high priority. Cost should be low as possible, if architecture in place can it be enhanced
- I think the council has wasted enough money already & should have decided in the first place whether to build a new building or renovate an old one
- I think the council have wasted too much money already
- I think with cost and the current financial climate cost needs to be watched but sustainable and energy efficient will reduce costs in the long term. Disabled access is important
- I think you are clutching at straws if you claim to be able to save your 'customers' £5million over 30 years. York Councils record over the Barbican fiasco and Hungate leaves me totally depressed over this councils ability to manage any scheme of any size

- I think you should stop wasting money after the Hungate fiasco, you will do as you like whatever we say. No cost to us - Piffle
- I trust that as the hungate site is now not to be used, there will be no need to pull down and transfer the Peasholme homeless shelter thereby saving of any more wasted money
- I wish you to get it right this time and not waste tax payers money
- I would expect the council to look for value for money & a building that is in keeping with the history of York
- I would expect the sum of 5 million pounds saving to tax payers over 30 years to be a lot greater than this. I think this estimate is far too low.
- I would like to know how the previous millions were wasted on the Hungate project. How can we be confident our money won't be wasted again?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I would like to see a higher return than saving £5 million over 30 years. More must be achievable
- I would like to see an accurate business plan showing the full costs and savings of the intended relocation together with the environmental effects of the existing and proposed sites.
- I would like to see verification on a monthly basis of costs incurred during the changeover to new premises. Saving doesn't seem to be a substantial amount when the cost of change will far outweigh this figure!
- If I proposed a cost benefit analysis of a saving of only £5m over 30yrs I would be laughed out the room, this appears on paper a very weak argument. It's also incentive given the current economic climate where many people are losing their jobs.
- If only saving 5 million over 30 years does not sound cost effective against cost of new building
- If project costs £43.8m and may save £5m over 20 years that's actually a cost to tax payer of £38.8m which smacks of empire building and feathering your own nest. Why not stay put.
- If the move will save £5m over 30 years that equates to £167k per annum - I wouldn't really call that value for money.
- If the two proposals offered are available now why was so much money wasted on the Hungate project? Or did they just appear out of the blue? Buy West Offices.
- If there is budget for work and time frame developer should stay within those constraints. If he goes over budget or over scheduled time frame he should be penalised
- If this project goes ahead how will £166,666.66 saved each year be used to reduce our council tax bills?
- If you can cut costs without it having too much effect on the building, then hold back on some fanciful ideas. Otherwise go ahead with the architectural contribution to the city.
- If you had used one of these buildings in the first place we would all have been saved the disgraceful waste of money on the Hungate scheme!
- If your proposed sites are already there the cost would be far less than building on a new site and as so much money has been wasted at Hungate
- I'm amazed at how much it's going to cost for this prospect, surely it's time to save money, overall I'm happy with the way things are. Should be important to use existing buildings for now and see how economy goes
- I'm disgusted with the money YCC waste every time I pass the barbican centre I pay a fortune in council tax and myself, family and friends all feel the same. The barbican could be the new offices. This booklet is very wasteful
- In favour of using an existing building however money will have to be spent to ensure quality finish with green energy efficient systems
- In my view you are spending other people's money so you should err on the side of caution, by doing a good job but not add silly effects.
- In the current economic climate costs to the rate payer must be kept to a minimum
- In the current economic climate I believe the priority should be to minimise costs. It is not the place of the council to be architecturally innovative. Rearranging the building does little to improve services, investing in services improves services
- In the current economic climate the council should think about how they can operate without increasing council tax. If this means delaying the project then this should be considered
- In the current economic climate, it should be a "sensible" choice sign in keeping with other low profile York buildings, environmentally friendly, but not pioneering.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- In the current recession the council should seek value for ratepayers money-by all means try to build in sustainable savings by using recycled materials but sources locally and where easy access means less cars needed to get there
- In the organisation I work for, if I suggested a £44m spend that would save £5m over 30 years I would get the sack. The financial justification is a nonsense-but you'll spend our money anyway
- In this economic climate I think the council should be trying to save money to enable them to help the many unemployed with courses and retraining. Most people don't want to wait 6mnth before courses become available to be back to work asap
- In this present economic climate the cost is proactive
- In view of the money wasted on this scheme up to the present time keeping down cost is a must if you wish to be re-elected
- Instead of wasting millions of our money use Portakabins on James St this would promote a local business and jobs and save vast sums of money
- Investing £43,000,000 wisely over 30 years would generate more than £5,000,000 Or spend the money on services e.g. Police, Education, flood defences
- Investment of 43m when people are experiencing economic difficulties seems excessive. A 30 year horizon for the benefits is to o long.
- Is it worth going through all this-will this project actually go ahead or will the council just throw away more of our money like on Hungate & the Barbican
- Is this 5 million saved over 30 years on top of £43m to move. We should be looking to schools and hospitals not new buildings when old ones are good enough
- Is this going to put our council tax more bearing in mind we are not council tenants who seem to play less and we wouldn't be using the facilities as much
- It's so easy for cost to go up during construction this should not happen. Fix price should be fixed. It wants to be built as cheaply as possible
- It's to be hoped that the £5m minimum save is over and above the money already spent/wasted on this project
- It has been suggested that the general public have contributed to a higher proposed cost due to high expectations on the council to deliver on things like innovation, technology and creativity(eg Hungate) I think this is passing the buck.
- It is always important that publically funded bodies keep a strict eye on costs. Buildings should blend in to the existing scene. Pleasant surroundings are important for staff morale
- It is great source of regret that £5m has been squandered to little effect. We hope that this time council will get it right
- It is important that the push for innovation/technology is not at too great a cost. It is very important that the history aspects of the building be worked with sympathetically and are not ripped out/lost
- It is important to finalise decisions quickly and not to waste money changing plans. West offices much more appropriate for the status of York and is in keeping with the architecture of York
- It is time the elected council considered when spending our money, how each tax payer has to budget their household accounts. We have no choice to how much tax we pay and our pension does not rise at the same level
- It may save £5m over 30yrs but how much will it cost? Higher grades of employees should not be given higher quality accommodation - they don't need it to do their work, it's a status thing only. You can reduce costs by ceasing activities such as this quest.
- It should be a function able building that minimises tax payers money

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- It sounds an exciting project as long as costs are kept down by not letting the time limit of building it run out & therefore like a lot of the proposals-they begin to cost more money
- It would be fantastic to have the council offices all under one roof but I think considering the present financial crisis it would be ludicrous for this project to go ahead at £43.8m even considering that it may save money in future
- It would be good for city and its residents if project was kept within budget. Increased costs come from bad planning at start of any project
- It's not clear if proposed saving is £5m per year or £5m over 30yrs. If it is £5m/30yrs that not enough, surely we can aim for at least £1/1 yr savings??
- It's not clear where the money is coming from to fund this project
- Just don't waste my money. I want it well spent
- Just get it right - your expertise costs us a lot of money - use it!
- Just get on with it! Further delays will cost the public even more. So far the council have only proved how poor they are at decision making. Pushing the blame for all the delays onto the public
- Just stop wasting our money
- Keep cost of project under constant review
- Keep costs down! Keep buildings as they are externally
- Keep costs down, but not a cheapest option, you can have it all without it being a statement building costing the earth
- Keep costs down, so it does not backfire on the general public in their needs from the council and lack of service because you find you've over spent on this development.
- Keep costs down. Use existing office facilities. Reduce staffing costs by employing less jobs paying high salaries
- Keep costs low as possible and promote a good architectural design
- Keep costs to a minimum and don't waste any more money. 'Spring Water' facility in waiting area, plenty of toilets on the lower floor.
- Keeping costs down could mean facility would require modernisation earlier and cost more long term. In current financial crisis would be good if council could help local people by utilising skills from in and around York
- Keeping things basic and lowering council tax is more important than spending money on a state of the art building
- Keeps costs and council tax low
- Lets hop the council doesn't waste anymore rate payers money. What's happened to the Barbican Centre? Wasn't it the only decent venue to attract business in York? Wasn't it properly manager? Why doesn't the council think before closing premises/selling off
- Let's hope this is the last time the council needs to expend such funds on working environments.
- Let's not waste money like we did before on Hungate, it's our money your playing with
- Lifelong York residents 70 plus council has already wasted enough of our money, hard earned at that. We don't need elaborate buildings, functional will do. Business is what it's all about NOT GRANDEUR
- Like most things the council do I imagine the project will end up costing allot more than initially predicted
- Longer it drags on more expensive will be just get on with it. Pity form backs on to information about project - would have preferred to keep information
- Look to the future without unnecessary expenditure. It is usually the poor sods who don't use the building who have to pay for it, while those that use the building are on benefits

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Main benefit of this project should be seen as saving costs especially in current climate. Not convinced of benefits of bringing depts. Together as only reason for doing it.
- Maintaining a grade 2 listed building seems like it may cost more in the long run than a more modern building
- Make sure budgets are adhered to and all aspects are covered. Most projects end up costing far more than budget
- Make sure whoever gets the contract to build the council HQ has a realistic quote and part of their contract says they cannot exceed over 10% of the original quote.
- Massive spend for little long term. Financial benefit (5m over 30yrs is very little per head) save and spend our money now on providing service not your offices
- Minimum saving of £5m over 30 years seems rather low in relation to overall cost of project however it makes sense to have one location that is easily accessible
- Money already wasted on Hungate - agree that should look good but not waste any more money
- Money has already been wasted, perhaps this time instead of meeting after meeting, a decision is made and carried through without wasting tax payers contributions
- Money should be put toward general things now i.e. Refuse collection more often like before. Instead of wasting money on new offices and managers salaries
- Money wasted on this questionnaire when cars are being vandalised and CCTV requests turned down
- More expensive ****. Stop wasting our money. £23,000 would pay for a teacher for a year!
- More info on how £5 savings are going to be made would be useful. Not clear how this will be funded except by cutting services
- More than £5m can be saved by sacking inefficient councillors from all parties and City Executive, this can be achieved in lot less than 30 years. New council office is only required when we have worthy council fit to occupy one.
- Most large projects nationally before completion seem to have escalating costs. Can you assure us all that this problem has been addressed and will not happen here. If it could happen, let us know now, this will help to soften the blow
- Moving to new HQ appears to be done deal. Surely citizens should be asked whether council should be spending this sort of money when if this money is available could be spent on better things.
- Needs to be more savings on price of Yorks new accommodation. Recycle as much as possible from council offices, We don't need any more ridiculous money that was wasted on Hungate project
- Neither q9 or 10 ask the right question it's about value for money in the long term. Reuse existing building ensure they are maintained for the future
- New HQ should make best use of existing buildings keeping costs down
- New/refurbished offices should be keeping with yolks heritage, savings of £5m over 30 years appears minimal, does it take into account inflation
- No info about budget breakdown this would help. Believe west offices are best
- Not to waste public money. Like what's happened with the Barbican which was an utter disgrace. Also the money and time wasted on the Stone Bow council plan. Let's hope this one is a success
- Not wasting council money is important but York is a historic tourist city which should have a fitting council building to match. Important to employ local contracts and suppliers.
- On top of all the money wasted so far by this council, I find the issue of this document an amazing waste of money. Why can't the council offices, new stadium,, swimming bath etc all be on one site? We waste too much money on staffing

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Once a price has been given, keep to this agreement & not let us have trouble that the Barbican Centre has, also of the said date for moving in, is not completed the contractor to be fined a sum of money
- One point this time get right and don't spend unnecessary amounts of money where its not needed, it's my raters money your spending
- Our council tax is already too high and difficult for all wages are not good in York. Money already wasted by you. Present arrangements are ok
- Our council tax money should not be wasted on fancy entrances. Costs must be kept to a minimum. I would not like my council tax to be increased just for the sake of a posh looking building
- Overall cost = £43m - Return = £5m over 30 years, if this was my business it would not cost in. Why not stay where you are and build a new hospital wing?
- Planning so far has been very poor with a consequent huge loss to the citizens of York. Whoever is responsible should be dismissed. West Offices is preferred option.
- Please do not burden York residents with more expense than necessary
- Please do not spend council tax payers money furiously
- Please don't waste any more money on trendy furniture or expensive statues or works of art. These are hard times - hard wearing and practical are the things to bear in mind
- Please don't waste any more of our money going out to external consultants - you are given our mandate to make the final decision. Use it wisely!
- Please don't waste our City's money. Make it appealing to eye ensuring money is available to maintain its upkeep - just look at current building - YUK!!
- Please don't waste public money on fancy statues and expensive décor, make the service quick, easy, free flowing and helpful, avoid repetition and bureaucracy. Make the building chosen safe and purposeful
- Please don't allow this proposal to become a lost cause. We have seen too much money wasted in York over the years e.g. Barbican developments
- Please don't waste any more council taxes for a building that will not be used efficiently. Residents with no computer are being totally let out as regards access to info
- Please don't waste money
- Please ensure that any decision of the interior of the new premises is geared to minimising the cost of administration going forward
- Please keep costs down
- Please let me know how much has been spent on Hungate -> ruth@cantrell.org.uk
- Please reduce council tax, our pensions lose value but you persist in jacking up our tax!
- Please spend our money wisely, cutting costs can be expensive in the long term
- Present economic disaster has of course influenced the answers I've given
- Present structure should be utilised at lowest possible cost. Including stopping sending out questionnaires/surveys with loaded questions encouraging answers you want. Where in this document is choice to be indicated.
- Project will be funded from existing budget?? Money you have scrounged off the tax payer over the years more like, you can't even give a reduction to oaps for residents car parking at home cause you can't afford it! Don't make me laugh!
- Proposed costs versus possible savings don't make sense £43.8m for return of £600,000 per year - how long to get that back!!? Make do and mend at moment
- Prudence is essential, it is our money. Efficiency is very important
- Publish approx. Costs of each project before firm decision made.
- Q's 9&10 are leading questions. The principle guiding factor is optimising savings. This is tax/rate payers money.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Q10 implies that an exciting architectural scheme is de facto more expensive. This is not necessarily the case
- Q10&11 are badly worded. I'm interested in the council keeping costs down whilst also aiming to invest in a long lasting facility & promoting an architectural contribution to the city
- Q9&10: without knowing initial cost & ongoing annual cost it is impossible to make a meaningful judgement i.e. cheap initial outlay but high annual costs may be more expensive than high initial outlay & low annual costs
- Question 9 difficult to comment on without cost benefit analysis on possible lost savings vs. Life of facility
- Quoted £5m savings over 30 years is less than £170,000 and peanuts compared with budget of council and money wasted on Barbican and other projects. Are you sure you have your figures correct?
- Rather cost kept low & council focusing more on lowering council tax & improving services (public transport) as other cities such as Leeds, Hull, Manchester etc. Charge less overall and provide better services all round
- Really disgusted in this council. Feel they should be investigated for throwing massive amounts of money away. What about Hungate, York City's new stadium, swimming pools, barbican, care homes
- Remember whose money it is! You are building a work place - not a showpiece! Pay back your bonus money!
- Residents are resentful of how their money is being spent, has been thoughtlessly spent on worthless schemes.
- Return of £5m in 39 year on expenditure of £43m is joke. Reducing 1400 staff by at least 20% would save lot more and reduce size of building required
- Save £5m as projected and remain in existing office with same refurbishment. Zero cost net
- Saving £5m over 30 years doesn't strike me as much of saving
- Saving 5 million over 30 years means the building will take 270 years to cover its initial capital costs. I don't think this is a good use of money. Currently if you need to use a service you find out where it is and go, unlikely to visit multiple services

- Saving 5 million over 30 years. This project has cost the council tax payer 4.4 million in 2 years a saving over 30 years !!! Already cancelled out
- Saving is less than £200,000 a year. It is impossible to justify the project on such grounds given the risk of cost over-runs and uncertainty about future running costs.
- Saving money should not be the driving force of this project. It should be part of the project and balanced alongside the opportunity to be innovative and make an architectural contribution to the city.
- Saving per year suggest project is not very ambitious for the cost/disruption of doing it. So much is to be centralised as suggested surely there would be a greater level of service. This level is only a reduction of a small handful of people
- Saving the council & local council taxpayers a min of £5m over next 30 years is a joke. The council have just wasted that amount of money in the last 1-2 years. This booklet is costing us money, when does it end!!!
- Savings are negligible look for proper savings
- Savings only 1070k pa could be generated by other means
- Savings over 30 yr period seem inconsequential when compared to overall projected cost. Experience tells us these estimates generally inaccurate. Find it astonishing money can be found from existing budgets when seems to be shortage for other services
- Scared this new premises will bump up our council tax which is extremely high to begin with

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Shame you didn't do this before wasting millions of pounds of our money on ridiculous schemes
- Shocked that only £5m can be saved over 30 years - surely far more than that can be saved. It is such small amount why bother? Offices should stay as they are
- SHORT STAY CAR PARKING
- Should be carried out at least possible cost to the tax payers
- Should be lowest cost over the long term, in this sense "lowest possible cost" is entirely consistent with "longer lasting facility" £5m saving each year would be more reasonable
- Should be Yorkshire House site. Other site part of Grade 2 listed building. Too much money would be spent on keeping to restrictions. Yorkshire House is extremely easy to find and near rail and bus routes
- Should do what everyone else is doing, tighten its belt. After all its public money its spending that could be used to improve local services instead of cutting them
- Should have made correct decisions first, not wasted all our money
- So much has been wasted on this fiasco that I feel that reality must be the key. No more palaces just a practical office system for a fairly small council
- So much money has already been spent on aborted designs etc.
- Some money should be recouped from all the mistakes on this so far. If this had been thought out properly maybe your staff wouldn't have to take cuts in wages and maybe the people who have been left out of the tokens this year could get them back
- Source cheapest quality services to stay in budget or beat it. Reduce operating costs, improve efficiencies, serve your public with correct priorities. Pass on savings
- Spend £43.8m to save £5m over 30 years...GOOD PLAN! Now I understand why the Country is in the s**t!
- Spend as little as poss.! Money has been wasted in past planning and building work
- Spend tax payers money on services not fancy buildings which public enter for short periods and visits only
- Spending £44 million is not serving people when the likes of facilities like the Barbican has been mismanaged and left to rot
- Stick to budget we don't want another London Wheel or Olympic over cost project
- Sticking to a pre-agreed budget is key. Not wasting money, then burdening council tax payers with the cost would also be favourable
- Stop dictating and spending money that is not yours! Ask the people the right questions and not the ones that enable you to deceive them without them knowing your doing it
- Stop time wasting and council tax money on these pointless surveys. Just do what elected for and stop waste!
- Stop wasting council tax payers money for your convenience not ours
- Stop wasting millions of pounds that could be used on services in city
- Stop wasting money on consultants. If the council staff cannot do their job without consultants find some that can
- Stop wasting money on these questionnaires! Decisions will be made on other criteria anyway
- Stop wasting money with paper exercises the council will do what it wants anyway
- Stop wasting our council tax on this rubbish you will only do what you want no matter what we say this document is a disgusting waste of money
- Stop wasting our money
- Stop wasting our money and do the job you're voted in for - to make decisions
- Stop wasting our money with phony surveys. Use local tradesmen and listen to what you are being told and not what you want to hear

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Stop wasting public money and get on with it, you must have wasted £5 million on the Hungate fiasco.
- Suggested savings appear derisory. Scheme objective should be to minimise costs and maximise savings for taxpayer
- Surely costs can be kept down as well as investing in a long lasting facility and being architecturally acceptable
- The £5 mill saving over 30 years is laughable when compared to what the councils building antics have cost us to date
- The agreed cost should be the final cost not a starting point
- The amount of money already wasted on this project is ridiculous costs should be kept to a minimum
- The budget must be open to question, staff to be accommodated must be a major consideration
- The budget stated earlier is £42.8m yet above states a saving of only £5m over the next 30yrs. This doesn't seem a particularly compelling business case
- The building can be as cheap and possible and still last, it is not 1890!
- The building should be done on a whatever is cheapest basis because there are plenty of empty offices already in York but you still want to build a new one
- The costs can be kept down by good strong negotiations. This is an opportunity to create a building for generations to come & as such should set an example of excellence in cost and quality for York
- The costs involved in refurbishment to deliver the so-called advantages suggested can be huge. Do they result in a better overall environmental profile taking account of the environmental costs of the work?
- The council already wasted large amounts of tax payers money on its HQ project without any tangible results. It is evident that the council is seriously lacking in abilities to plan and control expenditure on any project which will benefit York citizens
- The council are already suffering from bad PR from Hungate fiasco. They should minimise all future expenditure to save public funds
- The council can still keep costs down and have a building that is beautiful to look at. The actual building is there. It was built in the 1960's and still is imposing to look at
- The council exists to serve taxpayers as efficiently as possible on least excessive budget, regardless of perceived architectural merit of an expensive white elephant.
- The council has spent a lot of money so far with nothing to show for it and seems to be starting at the beginning again! Very disappointing!
- The council has wasted far too much money already & cannot afford to waste any more - they should be as economical as possible
- The council has wasted millions of our money already on Hungate and the Barbican and I do not have any faith in them getting this right either. The council is a total waste of space
- The council have allot of ground to make up having invested money on previous projects
- The council have wasted so much money on abortive schemes, you MUST get this right. It is vital that this scheme is ecologically sound. Discouraging staff car use i.e.: encouraging bus, bike & walking to work is imperative
- The council needs to balance upfront costs with ongoing costs. Also need to balance design and appearance with functionality and the relative costs of achieving these desirable features
- The council needs to make a decision and stick by it. Get on with it and stop wasting ratepayers money with no guts to make a decision.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The council offices should be built without costing the citizens of York more expenses and shouldn't be another white elephant
- The council only spend money when it gains themselves or to waste it like £4m wasted on Hungate. If any business wasted that sort of money the responsible people would be fired but because it's our money and not their they are not bothered
- The council seem to waste an awful lot of money on senseless and non-starter projects for non-starter buildings!
- The council should always be acutely aware of cost to the citizens of York
- The Council should always put value for money first and resist the temptation to waste money on marketing schemes; which sometimes never come to anything e.g. Coppergate, Barbican. The public is interested in the quality of the services you provide; not the

- The council should be seeking to avoid wasting further tax payer money, by navel gazing on its own offices. I do not trust any castings or timescales the council gives. Failure seems to be a habit and the default modus operendi
- The council should concentrate on keeping costs down, existing architectural contribution will not help you do your jobs any better. What you need is the right people on the job and efficient service.
- The council should focus on the economics of the situation. Council tax, people losing their jobs and homes, should be the top of the list. You have already ruined the York I grew up in
- The council should give some of its savings back to the citizens i.e. Reduced council tax. I believe that people should not be footing the bill for what is irrelevant to them. I would like it to be West Offices, but would this cost allot?
- The council should look for a building that is cheap to run and not spend money on looking posh. Take with them all existing furniture and spend as little as possible
- The council should not be seen to be wasting money as they have done with the Barbican Centre fiasco and their original planning to relocate to Hungate
- The council should stop wasting public money on this project, it shouldn't be railroading public to chose only on the 2 city centre building which will necessitate excess money spending. Council should have new HQ out of town
- The council shouldn't go for a low cost project that will be outdated in a few years, but should go for a long lasting facility, well designed but still aware of cost
- The council tax not to go up because you want new offices. If the building goes way over budget the council to foot the bill and not the taxpayer
- The council tax should develop a plan to stop wasting tax payers money
- The council waste so much money on ridiculous projects i.e. Selling St Leonards Place then renting it back. Get it right don't waste York citizens money & consider all options first.
- The councillors should stop taking wages until they have repaid the £5m they wasted on the last building
- The councils desire to spend money is way above its value
- The COYC has wasted enough money on this simple straightforward project, other sites where facilities of COYC complete fit : Holgate Old Carriage Works, Terrys & Rowntrees. Both former railway properties were state owned and would have cost nothing
- The danger is, in present recession, of trying to save money in short term, whilst increasing costs in the long term
- The days of creating beautiful buildings are gone. In these very difficult times prudence is essential.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The Hungate debate must not happen again with these two options. A considerable amount of money has been completely wasted to date. Which makes the anticipated savings negotiable and estimated costs will no doubt be several million over budget as usual.
- The last few years YCC has been very foolish in the way it has wasted money on projects. No-one seems to be accountable for the massive waste & no-one seems to listen to what the citizens want & at the end of the day, pay for
- The lowest possible cost can still encompass a longer lasting facility, exciting architecture need cost no more than bland architecture. Q's 9 & 10 are clearly biased and should be worded differently
- The matter should be finally resolved in under 6 months, not dragged on as council costs will increase
- The money spent on the proposed Hungate site - how has this been funded not that it has been rejected?
- The move should concentrate on cost efficiency and minimising tax liability on residents
- The move will save £5m over 30yrs but that is a guess and is a saving only if you ignore the cost of building this white elephant. If you already have the money to build it then stop griping about having to cut services and why have you got all of this money

- The move, whatever is chosen, should be done with the minimum expenditure
- The new headquarters should be kept low as the people like us will pay for it out of our taxes. Not the people on social security benefits or housing benefits or council tax benefits
- The new offices should be functional and be brought into service at as little additional costs as possible
- The priority should be to save money so other important issues can be addressed i.e.: making the bypass around the city dual carriage way causing less congestion
- The project currently seems to waste resources deciding what they are going to do with lots of false starts. The building needs to be sympathetic to the unique.
- The project should be cost neutral, the money you are spending is mine it should be subjected to financial priority
- The proposed saving is relatively small, and in the private sector would be unlikely to qualify as a realistic business case, given the risks of cost overrun.
- The proposed saving is very small per annum. It ought to remove problems of split office locations. Both these options could put extra pressure on car parking space in local area, much to the disadvantage of current users. What are the plans to avoid this?
- The public can't judge these plans until the costs are known
- The saving appears to be minimal so why do we need to bring all these buildings in to one?
- The saving on 5 million should be explained figures as to where and the amount of saving per location.
- The savings need to be a minimum to restore and sustain a Barbican facility of the corresponding period. At what point does the benefit case fail? What is the current annual spend on accommodation? Does the design consider the future growth/expansion?
- The statement that the cost of the project will be at no additional cost to our customers is negative-let's have a solution which will be a saving to your customers and pass it on to council tax payers
- The suggested pay back of £167,000 is very low considering the effect of inflation over 30 years.
- The sums of money already spent as well as the time taken is shocking. Not a good way to spend money from the tax payer

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- There appears to be no indication as to where the funds for this project come from. Something should be published to that effect. I note the estimated cost £43.8 million, I can see the cost rising by at least ten percent annually to 2012.
- There is no point in wasting OUR money on these questionnaires as you do not listen to the public, if you did we would still have a Barbican & city pool, facilities for learning disabilities would not be in decline
- Think that costs should be kept to bare minimum. There has already been disgraceful and scandalous huge waste of money as result of the Hungate fiasco
- Think you have wasted enough money already. Please make sure someone competent overseas this exercise
- Think you should keep building costs down and running costs low. Like modern building but thin they have to be in right context and don't suit the centre of York. Think West Officers site is far pleasanter to look at and lifts spirits. Don't trust council
- This and any other move should be as cheap as possible-forget all this fancy green stuff. Get on with the job. We taxpayers are hard set to keep and maintain our own places. Why should we pay for your posh workplace that doesn't even have a car park for us
- This building which house admin staff and provide a place for the public to visit on a highly infrequent basis. As such, it should be built for that purpose along and for the lowest possible cost
- This council has wasted billions of pounds on Barbican & new council HQ. Council should not be political but group of people trying to do their best for citizens of York. Claim for expenses they didn't have. Very disillusioned citizen of York
- This has the scent of a white elephant. I'm very sceptical of the expected savings and that the existing buildings will be released for better use.
- This is a total waste of my money. I and the rest of York have elected you to represent us so please use that to make decisions - that is your duty
- This is a waste of £23,409
- This is a waste of council tax payers money as you will have already decided which place you are going for - you are just following protocol
- This is huge waste of time and money when you know that any proposals are fait accompli before it is even put into print and our only input is at ballot box
- This is poor value for money you have not explained what you plan to do with the existing council buildings and how much (if sold) they will raise to affect the proposed new office
- This is public money & should be spent with that in mind. Will be freed up buildings be sold to provide monies for new improved services esp. cleaning of city.
- This project should be moved forward with no more taxpayers money wasted on advisors fees, public enquiries etc. Please get on with it
- Time country revolted on government. If I had fiddles tax expenses I would be in prison. I think half current government employees should be in prison
- To be able to put some effort into good building without spending money that they can't afford
- Too much money has been wasted on ill-conceived schemes in the past
- Too much money spent on it too far ahead
- Too much money used already
- Too much money wasted on this already. York is historic city. Contemporary architecture is out of place.
- Too much public money has been wasted already and I hope you will appoint a new chief exec at a substantially lower salary, more committed to the long term development of our

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

City rather than his own pocket. Having written on a number of occasions no reply

- Too much waste of money on Hungate site and on silly leaflets about services I don't need why bother consulting CYC never listen to our views anyway
- Total expenditure to date appears wasted. £5m saving over 30yrs paltry especially considering an expenditure of nearly £44m. Better to spend no more than half that amount, build better facilities for community and still save say £10m for hard up rate payer
- Try not to waste anymore of our money on architects
- Try spending money on things we do need and not on crap we don't i.e. Sanitation (all areas), more litter bins, better policing, dog waste bins along track to Hob Moor, ditch cleaning next to Hobmoor school, recreation for teenagers etc
- Try to be tight on budgets and negotiate well with supplies and builders. Do not waste a penny as often as this happens. Let the community have an input!
- Understand West Offices to be Grade II listed; conversion would appear to be both costly and difficult and probably inappropriate. Proposed extension at Yorkshire House appears to be unsightly and unnecessary.
- Up to date you have done nothing but waste money what about saving it for change. Unfortunately I have absolutely no guarantee that you will
- Upset to point I'm struggling to continue my work due to fact that my hard earned money which have handed over in taxes has been used to take care of councillors personal expenses and for personal benefits
- Very ambiguous question. Councils never round down its always up, it must be kept low and think of the future generations that are going to pay council tax for the next 30 years
- Waste no more money and move forward in a quick and positive way, promote all services to be housed together, an eco friendly building with colour and light
- We do not want multi million pound white elephant costing us tax payers good money
- We don't need "show" council offices. Please don't waste our money e.g. You have used a huge envelope for a reply to this survey, what a waste of paper and cost
- We have already been charged for the Hungate debacle & now we will probably get ripped off by this new project!
- We have already suffered the Hungate fiasco and the arrogant waste of public money this involved. Using the newer Yorkshire house building would be our preferred option
- We hope there will not be another vast waste of money in deciding where the new building should be
- We need a building fit for purpose at the lowest price. You are spending our money not yours. It is not an excuse to indulge in extravagance
- We need proper value for money. Which ever location is chosen I hope there is at least 3 quotes published in full so we can see what we are getting for our money, the winning quote to be firm to complete with not extras
- We need to get it right, no recurrence of the Barbican project which seemed very good but wasted money being short lived. I could have done with keeping this brochure but couldn't detach it from the feedback
- We want a building that is cheaper to run and pleasant to work in, is user friendly and easily accessible. Doesn't cost too much and is fit for purpose
- What a complete and utter waste of money. How much did this document cost? You have lost my vote with this
- What a waste of money!
- What about the £5 million already wasted - no savings anywhere.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- What about the money wasted on Hungate?
- What are the comparative costs for each proposed location? Adequate visitor car parking is essential free of charge
- What happened to all the money wasted on previous site and what is proposed for site now
- What services are going to be lost spending all this money - our money not councils
- What we want as tax payers is lowest possible cost with longer lasting facility not one or the other. We also want the council to stop wasting our money, all these millions spent so far and no decision, it's a disgrace! Yorkshire house is good enough
- Whatever is chosen do not make it an excuse to put council tax up again, don't waste public money on the project like the Hungate fiasco
- When are you going to stop the appalling waste of York Council Tax Payers money? This has been delivered in Whitby Avenue. Your inefficiency is unbelievable
- When this project goes ahead, keep us informed of the actual savings made in relation to costs overall
- Where is money coming from to pay for new hqs. Why not spend money on Barbican Centre instead if we have to have new HQ it should be The Aviva Building in Rougier Street
- Where is the funding for refurbishment is going to come from?
- Whichever building selected should remain paramount to reduce costs no glass or concrete
- While not over running projected budgets the council should look at all avenues when looking for prospective partners and not use companies solely because of their locality.
- Whilst an exciting architectural contribution to city is important feel costs must be priority during these difficult economic times. Costs should be focus but also important that any new HQ are created as long term investment to reduce cost in long run
- Why did Hungate project fall through? Is there no notion of being able to resurrect that site? How much money was wasted on this project?
- Why do you need to spend our money on making your offices so flash? You are all there to work in them, we do our jobs fine in standard boring workplaces, why cant you? Is it because we are all paying for it?
- Why does the council wish to bankrupt the city with this horrendous waste of tax payers money. A much cheaper and efficient facility at Clifton Moor or Honks Cross, where the building would be practical and would not matter if not aesthetically pleasing

- Why has the council wasted so much money so far on the aborted Hungate site?
- Why have you wasted all this money. Have cheaper out of town offices for £5/sq ft at Clifton Moor or Monks Cross and only minor presence in city .
- Why only ask us now - we could have saved us all money if asked sooner. Don't choose Yorkshire House choose West Offices. This is York not Leeds make us proud
- Why wait now to ask when so much money has been wasted already with the new build phrase at Hungate. Try spending time and effort in keeping customers/residents happy and provide us with services we are paying for and not receiving
- Why waste more money on a Grade 2 listed building when a modern office block is available
- Why waste public money on staff are on far to bigger wagers, cut the staff by 50%
- Why were we not consulted on the original scheme? This could have prevented wasting so much public money
- Will the £5m savings mean allot in the long-term ?
- Will the 5m saving off set the 'x' millions already wasted by this "jobs worth" council or can the York tax payers expect a further millions "plus" loss before a final solution is agreed

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- With receipt of this questionnaire I had no idea where offices were. However I cannot believe the cost associated with the production of this leaflet full colour no cost spared and at what cost the the public service - I am appalled
- Would be against this project if it were to lead to an increase in council tax
- Would like to know how saving of £5m has been calculated. Have assumptions used been externally verified. Are sale proceeds from old buildings realistic. 6 story atrium & rooftop extension waste of money
- Would like to see council for once be aware of costs as no matter how we recycle etc to save the council money the rates never go down. It's disgusting the wastage of this project.
- Would like to see money used effectively & not wasted or spiral out of control. Leeds CC moved premises & wasted tax payers money by not effectively using budget, would hate to see York Council having same inefficiency
- Would need to know the costs of conversion of West Offices to accommodate a modern office before making further comment
- Would not like you to start with grand ideas and then cancel them to save money
- Written agreement with contractors to stay within agreed budget. A clause that guarantees finishing all work on time agreed by both parties before work start.
- YCC will spend & waste money just to promote individual councillors-after all-it's not their money so let's waste it & then waste even more
- Yet another total waste of council tax payers money
- Yet another waste of tax payers money, you should be ashamed. York is ruined
- York council get worse. What happened to Hungate & all the waste of money. Both sites should have the cost per site.5 million is not much of a saving over 30 years. Get rid of all dead wood
- York Council have spent enough money messing about with different sites also with Barbican Centre & stupid road humps and chicanes. Also new cycle lane at Clifton had traffic queuing from Borobridge Road through to Clifton last Saturday
- York council wasted tons of money on the Barbican & have already messed this project up once. Don't waste any more of our money! Why are there so many 'partners'?
- York lost 5million on Hungate project. How much more before job is completed. We are in a recession and at what cost to the tax payer
- You've possibly wasted time and money in producing these questionnaires and I doubt you will take any notice of the answers, the council always does what it wants to do
- You are building an office block, not a hospital or a care home, why don't you spend more money on bringing houses up to date if you have £40 million? I'm sure you could make a good job of your offices with half that money
- You are extremely good at wasting our council tax and that is because you get too much. Telling lies you are also good at paying people from failing etc. No one believes anything any of you say
- You can build a decent building without breaking the bank
- You can keep costs down by using A5 rather than A4 envelopes!
- You go on about the £5m saving over 30 years but what about the 43.8m it is going to cost where will this money come from? Also Yorkshire House is just a way to pay off Aviva as they leave a building unused
- You have £60m in the bank, give me it back
- You have already wasted a lot of money on plans for a new HQ. In future it may be advantageous to discuss matters with people in the trade, with good knowledge of costs etc. Council building always seem to exceed private building by an extortionate amount

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- You have already wasted too much of our money on "The Hungate disaster"
- You have got everything wrong so far, think before you spend!
- You have not said which scheme is cost effective. No doubt you will do what you want anyway. If you are going to save £5 million over 30 years we can expect no increase in rates - some hope.
- You have proven beyond reasonable doubt your incompetence in this area - wasting a 7 figure sum in the process. I have no faith in your ability to deliver
- You have wasted millions of pounds(my money)so far. You are our servants and I am not a "customer "Why don't you wind your (brass) necks in & provide the services you were elected to do in a proper & efficient manner?
- You have wasted small fortune of tax payers money on this project. At time of acute financial restraint for most of us you should be setting better example.
- You have wasted tax payers money on a pseudo public consultation exercise. Its time you all lived in the real world. Are these the only two exorbitantly costly options available? A site out of town should be selected
- You have wasted too much money already and no one has been taken to heel about it. It's a disgrace
- You should not have wasted the £4.5m of tax payers money, then maybe the council tax might not have gone up, it is disgusting that the council waste so much of our money?
- You should REDUCE council tax - it is a BAD TAX. Stop spending money
- Your handling of this project to date puts you only slightly behind this disgusting situation regarding mps and their expenses. You would not have wasted so much money if it was your own
-
-
-
- £43.8m spend, £5m saving over 30yrs!! Hard to justify project at all, you have not asked which venue is preferable, for the record - West Offices!
- £43m not only sounds like but is a lot of money and maybe the current financial era is not the right time for this level of outlay. I would be very interested to know how the council intends to dispose of its current properties.
- £43m, are you joking? Where was the money when the Barbican needed refurbished?
- £48m plus is hell of lot of money for this building - no matter which site is chosen. Surely council can cut these costs quite considerably. £5m savings not much as it sounds over 30 years. Surely this amount could be more
- £5 million over 30 years does not seem to be a high reward for taking on this expensive project. Expect the estimate to be exceeded to a great degree.
- £5m over 30 years - why bother? !!!
- A saving of £5m over 30 years is very poor. We are in a recession & should be saving money. Yes the offices are spread out but so are the residents of York
- Another expensive wasteful use of council tax payers money. We can't afford it! This council is a disgrace! What happen to the £5m spend in Hungate?
- Are the new facilities required? The cost is extremely high and not justifiable in the current climate. In comparison, the alleged savings are minute. It feels like the decision has already been taken
- As a council you should renovate your existing buildings rather than building new and leaving the existing empty
- As I said before, there is nothing wrong with the facilities we already have, why not spend the money on more meaningful investments

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Astonished that in current climate it is even being considered. York is a small city. Pensions for public employees a future nightmare - who is going to pay for this?
- At a time of deep recession we have more important concerns. The claimed saving of £5m over 30 years is £167kpa which is chicken feed in a budget of £400m. A formal apology for the money already wasted on the Hungate project would not be amiss
- At this difficult time surely would be much cheaper to keep existing sites/buildings
- Believe that all projects costing further expense should be put on hold until economic situation is in much better position than at present
- Can't see how you can justify spending £43.8mil on moving when it's only going to save £5 mil over 30 years. It should be spent on more worthwhile projects like the traffic that never moves. I am strongly against this move
- Can't believe 43 million to build this. What waste of money. Disgusting
- Can't believe council is progressing with this expenditure under current climate. York is suffering greatly as result of recession. Council not private business & does not need flagship HQ to impress customers or investors
- Complete waste of £43m. Please provide facilities for York residents
- Complete waste of money the use of modern technology should mean you don't have to be in the office next door. £5m return on £43.8m over 30yrs is a very unsound idea, especially in view of the economic crisis!
- Considering the state of the economy & the hardship many people are experiencing, also the fact that the public & members of staff have managed for many years, I suggest that common sense prevail & continue with the present hqs
- Could be a lot cheaper to bring existing buildings up to a modern standard
- Council have already wasted enough of taxpayer cash so why can't existing building be used more efficiently instead of so much incompetency
- Council should spend money on things more needed around York, i.e. public footpath's are a disgrace, roads need resurfacing, kids need more things to keep them off the streets causing havoc, I could go on and on
- Council should stop wasting money and time on this. Stay in current offices. Questionnaire is biased and worded in leading manner
- Current economic climate is not right time to allow exciting architectural contributions to take priority. Architects fees can be exorbitant. Tightly managed budget is essential
- Current premises for CYC are adequate. Do not feel any need to move to alternative site. Council are wasting tax payers money as they often do very well
- Disgusting waste of public money
- Do not agree with the move, council see a saving by doing it, more likely a waste of money
- Do not believe there is need for new HQ particularly in current climate. If it has to be build why can it not be incorporated into new community stadium/swimming pool/public auditorium. This survey loaded - no option to oppose plans for new HQ
- Do not move and save money
- Do not see the point in spending money on another council building in today's financial climate, the council offices are perfectly ok where they are and the millions of pounds it's costing should be spent on building and maintaining new/old flats.
- Do you really need new offices? Why not put the money in to controlling the youth in the city centre and better public toilets in Parliament Street
- Does this have to be done now in view of the economic situation? Can we afford to do it?
- Doesn't make sense to spend £43.8m in order to save £5m over 30 years. This is poor questionnaire. Could ask whether council should relocate at all. Could ask for preference between 2 sites

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Doesn't matter that current offices are spread out because if I need to go to planning then I know exactly where to go. An unlikely to need to do 2-3 council type jobs all at once.
 - Don't build - stay where you are
 - Don't move. How can you save £5 mil when you have to spend £43 mil. The tax payer will see no cost benefit!(esp. as the £5 mill is over 30 years!!!)
 - Don't need new offices, waste of money
 - Don't really feel the need to spend money on new building when 2 suitable building is in operation.£5m saving over 30 years does not seem feasible
 - Don't recall being asked if I want Customer Services Centre which cost £43.8m to save £5m over 39 years. Stay where you are and save £38.8m
 - Don't think the council need to spend the amount of money it's proposing to do. Please do not leave us with another MISTAKE!
 - Don't think the council should be considering spending this amount of money in the current economic climate. How much will our council tax be going up??
 - Don't think should be considering move. In recession more important calls on public money. Savings are minimal and only after investment costs have been recouped - no indication of how many decades this might be
 - Don't agree with spending all this money, York council needs to get its act together. Should be more interested in York as a city and community rather than its offices.
 - Don't move will be wasting my money clean up existing buildings
 - Enough money has been wasted on the council more £5m saving over 30yrs is not worth the paperwork it will use. How will it help the pensioners?
 - Far too much money has already been wasted on this. Leave the council offices where they are. More money wasted on all these forms
 - Feel that in the current financial climate nothing should be spent and existing services should be sustained first!
 - Feel that in the economic climate you should continue with existing offices making efforts to saving money. York residents cannot afford to pay increased rates for this scheme
 - Financial benefits of the project appear to be low, to the point where one questions where it will all be worthwhile. If the costs of the two options are broadly similar then the West Offices are much to be preferred for siting, architecture and greenery
-
- Five million saving in thirty years? Is it worth it?
 - For environmental, financial and cultural reasons it would be far better to stay where you are.
 - Given that Â£4m has already been spent (wasted) on this exercise, and that there will be considerable cost in moving, a simple financial analysis tells us that us ratepayers are already worse off. The Council already provides poor value for money and this
-
- Great Britain's bankrupt! Only SE England and London are or were in credit. The rest of the county has more people working for the council and government than those making wealth. An average city/town in France and Germany spend less than half the amount
 - Has there been case made for need to move to new property & savings of only £5m over 30 years is not return on investment of £48.3m when that money could be used to support industry & employment in York at this time
 - Have no interest in this. As far as I'm concerned the offices are adequate & this money could be better spent on something more beneficial to peoples living conditions. Hospitals, nursing homes with properly trained nurses and carers

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Have you not wasted enough money on this already. Think of how many people you could house with £43 million
- How about something to benefit everyone? We've never visited the council offices so how would we benefit from 10's of millions of pounds being spent on a new building?
- How can council ever think of this project when money could be used on house modernisation, more carers for vulnerable people and charge less for tenants to buy homes they live in
- How can small saving over 30 years justify this expense. Better ways to use this budget I suspect. I oppose this waste of available financial resources
- How can the council justify such gross expenditure on the new building but also on the excess staff to fill them. Most people struggle to pay the rip off council tax to keep the fat cats fat, never mind wasting millions on a civic building
- I'm sure there are better areas to spend nearly £40 million, particularly in the current economic climate!
- I am amazed that during a period of credit crunch, uncertainty in the financial market and huge questions on costs spend that this can be proposed. I am against this
- I am deeply suspicious of such projects. Too often they promote grandiosity and pretence. I doubt whether bringing all activities under one roof is a good idea.
- I am disgusted that spending 43 millionth save 5 million in 30 years is ridiculous at this time when we are all struggling
- I am puzzled as to why York Council feels the need to invest £43m of our money into building and refurbishing a new amalgamated council office when matters are being dealt with reasonably enough in the existing sites.
- I am totally against the council spending £43million of our money on this. This money could be better spent
- I believe that now is not the time to consider any cost in addition to this I think that any investment should be made to improve the weary, shoddy management of all Council services
- I cannot see the benefits of either building over the provision we have elsewhere other than everyone will be in one location. The issues experienced at St. Leonards - i.e. High maintenance costs due to age and layout of old building, will be issues in b
- I consider the proposal to spend £43.8m on a new council HQ to be unjustifiable. The fact that the council is now having to pay rent on its existing offices in St Leonard's place is a disgrace and an affront to York council tax payers
- I couldn't care where your building is. It's about time money was spent on new drainage systems and footpaths. The drains stink in York and footpaths are dangerous. Please get your act together.
- I don't think the council should be spending this amount of money on relocating offices, it would be better spent on servicing the community of York
- I don't consider a new look building for council staff/members priority considering the current situation on housing and amenities for the residents. Great to see our well earned tax money is being put to good use!
- I don't think the council should relocate, I do not think it will come in on budget, I do not believe there will be savings, environmentally it will be more detrimental than staying put
- I fail to see the problem with the current set up. £43.8 mil is a lot to spend (which could be going towards more worthwhile projects) compared to a £5 mil showing. Why not spend a fraction of this making current buildings more energy efficient

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I fail to understand why the council is spending so much money at present. Spending £44 M to achieve savings of £5 M over 30 years is pointless. Saving of £166,666 per year. If it is coming out of existing money it would be better spent elsewhere.
- I feel as the cost of care for myself is now been put too high the council should not waste money on new design but put it were all people can obtain the same level of care and not waste it on new buildings
- I feel council should concentrate on maintaining fabric of city i.e. Roads, footpaths, existing buildings etc rather than wasting money on yet another office building. Road network is falling apart and our taxes are being misdirected
- I feel the buildings the offices are currently occupying are adequate, I also feel the council old be better keeping council tax as low as possible as it is way too high.
- I remain unconvinced about the whole idea of a new HQ. In the present economic situation I think you should "make do and mend" as ordinary businesses do all the time. Â£40 + million is far too much to spend just to give you all the fancy offices you want.

- I see no reason really as to why council offices should be moved from present location
- I strongly consider the projected saving of £5m not worth the outlay of £32m. The operative word in your function is service and I can think of better things to spend money on than a "posh" "trendy" innovative new building
- I strongly disagree with the whole concept and consider it "empire building" at the rate payers expense
- I think in this day and age this very expensive project should be shelved, £43 million is a lot of money. When your customers are having to tighten their belts the council should also.
- I think it is totally wrong to even consider spending this amount of money Suring this time of economic recession. I would like to see more available monies to help the disabled and OAP's of this city
- I think it is wrong to be investing in this prestige, unnecessary project
- I think spending over £40m on new offices is ill-advised & wrong. More local info desks with existing council offices is needed with general advisors having access to forms & providing help & advice. Money should be used to help unemployment
- I think the council should concentrate on sorting out the state of the roads and start spending our council tax wisely
- I think the council should suspend the new designs until the finances of the country is back on track & save money over coming years to help the general public with council bills. New offices cost money
- I think the council shouldn't be considering such a capital - intensive project at the present time
- I think the project is a madness given the present mess the country is in. Concentrate on reducing costs not empire-building. How much did it cost you to produce this leaflet and how many were returned.
- I think the whole project should be delayed for at least 5 yrs until the current economic problems are solved or better understood
- I would challenge the council to do a single question survey. Do the people of York want their 40k spent on council buildings or on care for the elderly etc
- I would like the council to stay in current locations, I disagree with the move - the cost/benefit analysis for the tax payer does not justify the investment
- I would rather the money be spent on purchasing suitable properties for the use of the care of children who are abused and ill treated. There are many older grandmothers who have

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

little to do (like myself) who would be prepared to give their time for free

- I, along with others feel the council have wasted so much money already with the proposed site at Hungate that enough is enough
- If it was my money I would stay where you are
- If you have all this money sloshing around in the budget-use it to cut council tax instead. We are in a recession! You have been charging us too much tax or you are going to cut essential services to keep this thing in the existing budget
- Impossible to understand justification & benefits for new location from poor business case in this document. Would like to see business case in more detail. If it is way forward favour West Offices
- In financial climate should not be spending money - don't mend what isn't broken
- In high current recession I wonder why the council is looking to move when money is tight
- In present financial climate do not think council should be spending these vast amounts of money by moving to new offices
- In present financial economic and unemployment climate you must be joking - proposing this you need your heads read - this is total insult and waste of money. Make do and mend as this is what we are having to do!!
- In the current climate morally incorrect. Council should spend more time in reducing council tax. A total waste of tax payers money. A disgrace
- In the current economic climate should the 'status-quo' be maintained. If not can we trust the council to complete the project on time and within budget
- In the current financial climate is it correct to be extravagant in building palatial buildings when existing buildings exist. We all have to tighten our belts. After all it's the cash strapped residents of York who pay the bill???
- In the current financial climate this is a complete waste of our money, in fact it is immoral!
- In the current financial climate those of us who are struggling now are going to have to pay for this project now whereas investing in a longer lasting facility may benefit those in the future when the financial situation is better. Keep costs down
- In the present economic climate is it sensible to be spending more money this year? I much prefer the West Offices plan.
- In the present financial climate and with the increasing council tax forcing the reduction of more important services this project should be abandoned
- In this day & age savings of £5m in 30 years would be pathetic. Let us stop wasting money in empire building and produce a good, sound and reasonable building for cost that does not get out of hand. Favour West Offices project
- In view of your total incompetence regarding the Barbican, Hungate and the Purple Peril buses, You should leave things as they are until we the electorate can vote you out of office
- Inappropriate to spend taxpayers money to build brand new facilities in economic climate. Questionnaire is biased as it looks like project has been approved. What happens to existing buildings
- Instead of building offices look outside the box because people need more housing. The housing list is getting bigger and you want to spend monies on 1 building
- Is this project a joke. You want to spend £50 million to save us £167,000 p/year over 30 years, your council must have rebranded as a bank. Someone will be getting rich off this project
- Is this really necessary? What is so wrong with your old offices or do you just want to waste yet more of our precious money? What do you do all day anyway? This is a time for efficiency - not frivolity

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Is this the right time for such a financially high commitment
- Is this the right time to be doing this?
- It looks like waste of money to us - but we don't use the offices for anything so it's almost irrelevant apart from having to pay for a new HQ
- Keep everything as is. The city needs to use as little money as possible in the future years. There is not enough industry
- Keep the current council building in use as it is and reallocate the initial £48 million to streamline the current council working and reduce the blatant waste of money currently.
- Kill the project, reduce headcount, reduce all local government
- Leave facilities as they are - £45m is excessive at this time
- Leave things as they are! It's a waste of tax payers money building new site
- Moving the HQ are a waste of money
- No need for new hq. The council is wasting tax payers money, just get on with using our money efficiently and stop wasting it on 'new' ideas. If you produced less leaflets you may save more money for essential services
- No need to move
- No new offices are necessary - waste of our money not yours, other things more important
- Not time to spend £43.8m on new accommodation - should be other priorities. Affordable housing, increase in council housing stock for rent.
- Now is not an appropriate time to spend on new/refurbishment council HQ. Savings could and should be made internally now - and ploughed back into overstretched or failing services
- On this limited info I fail to appreciate the need to spend tax payers money to rehouse council employees and offices. In the age of internet communications I can't understand the need for improved customer access when current facilities are adequate
- Outrageous, arrogant waste of council tax and tax payers money in these difficult times. Savings over 30 years are disingenuous as no one knows future situations. Strongly against this
- Please use budget to rescue Barbican and sports/swimming pool and other benefits for residents instead of Ivory Tower for sole benefit of council employees
- Possibly large waste of money with money loss on last supposedly HQ. Money could be better spent on council housing and improvements
- Present buildings are acceptable. Why waste so much money when other worthwhile work is required. Hungate has already been ridiculed, try something for York instead of yourselves.
- Put the money to better use, it has worked where it is for years. Why waste money?
- Query necessity & cost of project, wonder whether cost of building it can really be compared to increased cost of running less energy efficient buildings? How would price compare against new build if money used to update & improve existing building
- Ridiculous amount of money that is proposed being spent and estimated savings are pitiful. City council should reconsider very carefully if they really do need to move at all
- Save money and stay put
- Save our money! Don't squander it on silly Lib Dem white elephants! Take the purse strings away from the Lib Dems and foolish council officers. Be Frugal! Make and mend!
- Savings are trivial, costs will rise, savings will turn in to extra costs. Abandon move now
- SHOULD NOT BE DOING IT
- Should not have wasted money on the hungate square box, existing building must surely be more acceptable if large enough

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Should stay where they are in these times when money/finance is a problem and wait until the recession ends!! Council tax will rise when the people of York are struggling most
- Spending £43 million to save £5 million does not represent any sort of sensible practice. No problem for departments to be spread across the city as now, the council should not go ahead with this project
- Spending £43m to save £5m over next 39 years is just not viable proposition & justified saving just to bring all facilities under one roof. Project should be abandoned/stopped immediately & money spent elsewhere.
- Stay as you are to keep costs down. West Offices seem to be better option.
- Stay in existing buildings. Stop wasting money of feasibility studies i.e. The fiasco of Hungate proposals
- Stay where it is, refurbish it
- Stay where you are
- STAY WHERE YOU ARE
- Stay where you are and concentrate on reducing costs, knock Yorkshire house down its an eye-sore, don't mess with an attractive building (west office)
- Stay where you are and save money for new homes for rent
- Stay where you are and save us all allot of money, it will get more expensive as the build goes on
- Stay where you are and stop wasting our community charge money!
- Stay where you are and stop wasting tax payers money
- Stay where you are and use funding for more services. This questionnaire is biased and does not allow this option
- Stay where you are don't waste our money
- Stay where you are save by cutting back on councillors and make sure they don't get their feet in same trough as mps
- Stop wasn't g money, stay put in current offices
- Stop wasting council tax on a building we don't need
- Stop wasting our money. Make do with what you have, we can't afford these big ideas. It's not your money you're spending, its ours!!
- Stop wasting people's money, keep things as they are & save millions & put money where it is most needed like Transport, house modernisation, road surfaces
- Stop wasting public money trying to 'make your mark' on the city. How on earth is this going to cost £43.8 million
- Stop wasting rate payers money, if you want new offices are you prepared to take a 50% pay cut to pay for the offices you require
- Strongly disagree with the project. Budgeting £43.8million to acquire a site with £32 million. £5 million in costs still leaves us £6.8 million out of pocket. Please cancel the move.
- Surprised council can find money for lovely new building to work in. Why don't you spend our money on facilities of some use. Couldn't give damn how nice building is when I come to pay my bills
- The £40m expenditure is unwarranted to say that it is no extra cost because it is from existing budgets is misleading, it is a £40m cost paid for by the public if you don't spend it ,it would be a £40m saving
- The amount of money involved is criminal, the money should be invested in the people of York, not council offices. Housing would be a massive benefit.
- The council building should be left in their present location for now, why spend our money, when we are all suffering with the present financial climate

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The council could not run a multi million pound project. There's no good enough reason to move site, you have given one very poor one
- The council is wasting money on this scheme! Saving 5m over 30yrs is not enough and I also doubt it. Perhaps more could be saved if high ranking offices weren't given pay offs
- The council offices at present are quite good and I feel that money spent on new offices are a waste of good money, as the council tax is already too much.
- The council should always look at using existing buildings first. I hope this time the council wastes no more money as in previous projects and that this is the end of the council office saga
- The council should seriously consider expenditure at this level, at this time or any other with an outlay of £48m and a return of £5m. It's difficult to see any real cost benefit to the tax payer
- The council should stay where they are and spend the money refurbishing. The new offices are out of the way and will cause more traffic entering the city
- The current buildings are fine and the potential savings are very small when the length of timescale is considered. A waste of our taxes
- The current sites are fine (although badly maintained) but if the council have to go ahead with the move they should make YH the new offices. They are already purpose built plus the old station is a grade 2 listed building
- The entire scheme is a total waste of money. Most services could be provided by web/email. Building a city centre office as that expense is an abuse of tax payers money
- The financial justification is non-existent. Savings will not accrue to taxpayers so to imply as such is a lie. A 30 year pay back of £5m does not justify an investment of £43.8m
- The money would be better spent on providing homes for homeless people during the credit crunch, instead of making it easy for yourselves.
- The money you propose to spend on this project should be spent on more important things. I have a long list of things but you will know what they are - the obvious. If this goes ahead I will never have faith again with local council decisions.
- The new developments are a waste of money, the present accommodation is perfectly fine
- The new offices are not needed. Nothing wrong with existing buildings/services. A waste of tax payers money
- The only people to use it are staff or those who want something for nothing. A tin shed will do for that. Stop spending our money on castles in the air, cut our council tax now!!!
- The only question missing from this survey is "do you believe the council needs new offices?", my answer - no.
- The proposed cost I find despicable, highly inappropriate to the needs of York residents, the money should be used to re-open and re-fit the Barbican Centre and not to make a nice, comfy workplace when thousands of York people are losing their jobs and homes
- The savings over 30yrs seem pathetic. Why not spend the money on better IT systems and training for your awful ignorant unhelpful staff - especially in the parking department
- The whole project is a waste of money
- The whole proposal is a complete waste of money. There is no need to change what already is convenient & in the city centre. Money could be better spent in our city
- The whole relocation process has been a farce, appalling waste of rate payers money, same as the Barbican fiasco, still no convenient swimming pool
- There is no need to move to new buildings with all the costs they incur to the taxpayer. When the council buildings in York are fine. This is just a waste of money.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- There are far more urgent tasks to do e.g. Better maintenance of roads and pavements and more police to tackle the escalating crime
- There are other issues/projects with the city, which would benefit from an injection of cash. Spending obscene amounts of money on this is ridiculous, as it would be to a greater advantage if channelled in other projects.
- There is a global recession on - save the money and don't move
- There is absolutely no need for a new premises, a complete waste of tax payers money
- There is absolutely no need for new council offices. The existing ones are more than adequate.
- There is absolutely no need for a new HQ, this is an irresponsible waste of public money which currently is outrageously high. Stay put, cut down on staff and become more efficient
- There is nothing wrong with the current provision
- There is nothing wrong with the way things are, but the council are still going to move. The rates will still increase so where are we going to see a saving?
- There's no need to build a new HQ, use existing unoccupied premises in the city, concentrate budgets on long lasting projects not ones that are dependent on political whims.
- There's nothing wrong with the present building or location, it's not necessary to waste further huge amounts of money and further disrupt traffic flow in the city
- Think £43.8m could be used to benefit citizens of York - not wasted on council buildings and offices. Scandalous waste of money. Hungate was irresponsible & these proposals are even more damaging and must be abandoned now
- Think the council wastes too much of our money anyway and they don't listen. Money could be better spent on improving road surfaces instead of patching them up which doesn't last 5mins.
- Thinks it's disgraceful you're contemplating this in these times and your promotional brochures shows such a modern and lavish design when the councils struggling to make its budgets viable and many people struggling
- This is a waste of money that would be better spent on rubbish and recycling collection, rubbish has not been taken on 4 consecutive dates on Eldon Street
- This is a waste of money. I work for a care company is short staffed we have extra "single calls" that only one person is paid for even though 2 people do the work. Manager says this is because council won't pay.
- This is a waste of time and money. There is nothing wrong with the existing facilities
- This is an obscene waste of money. The CEO should resign immediately. HE is obviously completely out of touch with the difficulties which the people of York are facing. To spend this money on fancy new buildings is beyond comprehension
- This is an unnecessary expense to the public council tax payer. It is not going to assist the public - it is about the council staff having new working conditions
- This is not time to spend tax payers money on buildings/status symbols. Spend it on services instead
- This move will not supposedly save money for the council and council tax payers but who will foot the bill to build and move people? When will the tax payers see and feel the benefits?
- This project is a waste of council tax money and will contribute to the further decline of a busy city centre which for a tourist city looks sad and boarded up! Get your act together! Take an example from Bath
- This project should not go ahead, however by the working of this very expensive survey it's obvious you have already decided so why ask the people who are going to vote you out in the next election?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- This project should not proceed. Money can be put into greater needs rather than giving local politicians new environment to work in. Stop wasting our money. Listen for a change
- This scheme is an expensive waste of money, the present buildings are more than adequate
- This will just be a further waste of money, like the Barbican centre
- To build a new HQ with a view to saving £5 mill over 30 years is ridiculous, to say the building will be constructed within the budget is equally ridiculous. Use the office you have. Think about Rydale House - another white elephant
- Total waste of money, the budget will not be kept and will overrun and the question should be does York need this - no is the answer
- Total waste of tax payers money. No ordinary business would invest without a sensible return
- Totally unnecessary in present financial crisis, this is rate payers money could be used for more urgent needs?
- Trying to promote a saving of £5m per 30yrs is a disgrace, the building will not survive 30yrs without needing moving again within this time.
- Under the present financial climate we feel as York resident this is an unnecessary proposal. This project will be funded from existing budgets. This money should not be spent on a New York customer centre but on more important projects
- Was it really necessary
- Waste of money in this day and financial climate
- Waste of money when so many other projects need attention i.e. Ring Road, York City Stadium/leisure facilities, swimming baths etc
- Waste of money. Keep where you are you make lots of money from York people (cut council tax)
- Waste of taxpayers' money. Money should be spend on improving York's road and public facilities not on extravagant new building and a proper bus station would fit on that land
- We're in deep recession, is this the time to waste more money on prestigious buildings and comfort. Sound like mps, who is feathering their nest?
- We can't afford any more money!
- We could use the money to promote employment and income into York with our money
- We do not believe that our money should be wasted on the unnecessary project. The money would be better spent on providing services for the people of this city. The Barbican is a prime example of how the council has wasted vast amounts of our money.
- We think the council have wasted enough money an should get on and make do with what they've got.
- What a bad idea at this time
- What choice do we have as to you not relocating? The Barbican farce is still in our minds why should you spend this much to move when you can renovate what you have? I would like to see the cost benefit analysis please.
- What has happened to all our money spent on the Hungate project? I can't believe you now want to spend another £43.8 million, it's a farce
- What's wrong with existing council buildings? Why not throw away old paperwork? Perhaps a rebuilding of individual buildings?
- When other areas of the council budget are being squeezed or taken away, i.e. Funding for SNAPPY, the most important thing is to keep services running instead of having some fancy offices to work from
- While we may need a new headquarters in York sometime in the future, I think the whole project is a waste of money at this time, the council should concentrate on jobs for this City not wasting money on flash offices for themselves

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Whilst payback may result in a saving of over 30yrs we feel that the short term cost is not justifiable in the current economic climate
- Whilst you state no additional cost for taxpayer - still our money in budget. You should be using existing empty office space in York rather than considering developing/refurbishing other buildings.
- Why are you moving. Waste of money! No one goes anyway all done by post/phone/internet
- Why build new HQ? Recycle. Spend money on public services
- Why change - if you hadn't sold St Leonard's wouldn't have wasted £4m and there would not now be an excessive cost for new building. How can you say there will be no cost to customer!!!!
- Why do we need to do this? If not, don't move this would the save the council millions!
- Why do you have to spend £43m on offices that are currently, perfectly adequate for a worldwide company, Aviva. If it's good enough for Aviva employees, it's good enough for council employees. Could you inform us whether or not you are purchasing this property

- Why do you need new offices, save our money
- Why do you need to move, what is the cost if you stay put, what happened to Hungate as they are still building there?
- Why has so much money been wasted so far in trying to build new council buildings. Who is going to pay for the huge waste in taxpayers money that has gone into this project so far!!
- Why is there not a selection for WO or YH? If you're only saving £166,000 a year why bother to spend £43.8m. Why not build a new hospital with the £43.8m?
- Why move? I feel this would be a total waste of tax payers money. An unnecessary cost, no doubt the taxpayers will have to fund i.e.: another increase in council tax
- Why new offices, proposed savings are minimal compared to cash outlay. Rougier Street proposal is not building of suitable status for city with status of York.
- Why not leave things as they are and save £43.8m also how about a reduction in your high salaries you pay your top executives
- Why not spend our money on us rather than you!
- Why spend all this money now? Considering the financial position York residents currently find themselves in surely it would be better to wait for three to five years
- Why waste money on something that we have never had a problem with, what we need is more sociable sports leisure outlets
- Why waste our money on Hungate and now these 2 projects when existing buildings have served York very well for over 40 years
- Would it not be more effective expenditure updating existing accommodation. I can't agree with spending 43.8 million pounds
- Would prefer resources to go into social services - more social and care workers instead of posh new offices
- Wrong economic climate to do this. Lack of housing more of an issue
- Yes-abort. Why didn't you show such resilience when you were knocking down the barbican or letting York City go to the docs-is this another rise to sell off prime property and top up your pension funds?
- You've already wasted a ton of money on a building that the vast majority of people will never visit. Please stop wasting public money.
- You've spent too much on your other site already, wasting my money and now you want to waste more.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- You don't need a new headquarters! Your area is financially strapped, spend on services instead
 - You have not produced a cogent argument for the necessity for a move
 - You have wasted millions of pounds of this stupid scheme, don't waste any more, apply Murphy's law, if it aint broke, don't fix it. Leave things as they are!
 - You keep saying how much you are going to save but how much is it going to cost to move everything and do the work on the old NU building? Wasting our money as usual
 - You should be lucky to have a roof over your head. A lot of families have not. To spend all of this money is a sin in the current climate. Wake up!
 - You should not move, costs too much money now and in the long run
 - You shouldn't be entitled to spend £44m to save £5m who has given the go ahead for this disgusting use of public funds. This whole q is a farce, reduce your workforce by half you could them save £3m
 - You spend some money on putting Clifton Green junction back to two lanes. Rather than posh offices for useless councillors.
 - You will make your own decisions! This £23,409 is a waste of tax payers money!
 - You're not knowing 1000s are out of work and you want new place and costing millions
 - What happened to the Hungate Site? Can all these costs really be feasibly accommodated?
-
- 275 cycle spaces in yorkshire house isnt enough,the number of cyclists in the council far exceeds this
 - A reasonable level of car parking for the public
 - A short term parking facility-to allow for drop offs & pick ups-would be very useful. Paying to park in town & walking to the council offices to drop something off or for a 2 minute conversation is very off-putting
 - Absolutely no car parking facilities for public and staff. Limit parking to one or two pre bookable disabled spaces. Parking spaces simply encourage car use. Have secure bike spaces
 - Adequate parking very important. Experts should decide which gives best value for york residents
 - All under 1 roof could be bad.parking, various locations as of now no one knows which office to go to
 - Both buildings are going to cause excessive 'freezing' of parking spaces locally by council office workers. Cost effective to build offices with parking and easy access
 - Build the hq next to the designer centre (a64) with lots of free parking for staff and customers. Staff could then use the park and ride to city centre
 - Car parking for general public who have to visit council hq
 - Car parking must be a consideration
 - Consider car parking to be of importance. You mention cycle parking and disabled access but no reference to car parking. Think how useful car park is in st leonards place
 - Consider possibility of installing a cycle parking system (developer or 3rd party contribution if possible)
 - Employees of the council should contribute towards any use of the park and ride, why should they be allowed to hide this expense to the ratepayer?the west office is more suitable for re-use
 - Facility should have free on site parking and be readily accessible to all. By their nature city centre developments will be hard to access and costly

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Free short stay car parking should be available for those of us who do not have the option of public transport or cycling
- Free substantial parking when using council offices
- Good access & car parking are essential if the city council is to contribute to an efficient & progressive local economy. being 'green' is ok but slavish adherence to its principles can be very inefficient & counter productive
- Good infrastructure and parking needed for public to access the new site
- How about improving our roads instead of turning york into a car park with transport belting fumes out, you are totally anti car and some of the ways you have slowed traffic down "beg's belief"
- I am concerned that parking for customers will be an issue in a city centre location, will make congested roads worse
- I don't feel enough thought has gone in to parking facilities
- I hope there will not be free parking for employees and council members they are not MPs, the building contract should be a fixed price contract to prevent any overspend. why was this document not printed in York by a York company?
- It would be helpful to know where the move is from and the value of those properties. what is the parking provision at the new locations bus routes etc. what are the efficiency savings? What will the old buildings be used for
- Lack of car parking near to these two proposed sites
- Large public car park is needed also for staff - therefore most of staff and facilities should be out of town with only customer contact facilities near York centre which should allow for some car parking.
- Limited free parking should be available. Save some of money and provide more phone contact - it will save us need to visit and reduce carbon footprint
- Main building should be out of town with parking and cheaper running cost. Only a small customer service office needs to be in the city centre
- Make building more accessible by car, have pay and display car park 1 hr max
- Make sure there is parking for more than just disabled visitors. (and/or bus stops very close by from park and rides)
- Make use of park and ride any site near a p& r location. get 2 way traffic instead of empty buses one way
- Many visitors will be by car & new building would be poor for parking
- Need for customer parking (car, motorcycle) not just invalid or pedal cycles, may be facilities for children while parents deal with things. coffee bar while waiting
- Need to be accessible by car as well as by public transport and have car parking nearby
- No car parking except for people registered disabled both for staff and visitors. Dedicated bus stop if not already available. Appropriate facilities for visitors i.e. Baby change and toilets
- No mention of staff car parking/allowances for moving to new site. Not clear if Yorkshire House can be bought, West Offices is an old rabbit warren and is not fit for purpose
- No on site parking for use of council staff. No 'barbican' style fiasco
- No parking
- No swimming baths, no secure parking, wasted money on road junctions. This is the same as MPs expenses scandal. Please bear in mind tourists. Don't use council offices so don't need money spending on it
- Not everyone can use park and ride or other public transport therefore car parking very near to council offices or on site is essential. Older people obviously do not cycle. Not all older people qualify for blue badge for parking

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Offices should be sited with adequate parking and on a bus route.
- Old station seems ideal but please don't construct giant car park. Encourage people to walk, cycle, bus. Also be sympathetic to historical architecture both external and internal
- Parking is the main issue to discuss council issues, for all citizens of York
- Parking should be provided for public calling in as most cases this is short periods & time taken to attend to needs of York residents could be x 6 if alternative transport used. Staff encouraged to use public transport, staff parking minimal
- Provide adequate car parking facilities - not everyone is going to walk, cycle or travel by bus
- Put car parking high on agenda
- Short term ample customer parking is needed and not all disabled spaces
- Short term free parking for quick visits such as deliveries, calling to see someone
- Some council employees need a car during their everyday work for visits etc, what provision is being made for them as there is no mention of parking. How will the different departments be arranged - no offices and hot desking doesn't work in some departments
The big thing for me would be parking if you plan to bring children's services under this roof. Hollycroft & Ashbank are bad enough for parking but at least there is street parking
- The cost of parking in the city is disgusting especially when I am just coming in to pay my rent and council tax. Parking would be grateful as it would mean more people would be able to do a quick run into town to pay than have to be out of pocket
- The council are notorious for being "anti car" no facility for parking for either staff or public.
Re-examine
- The lack of car parking space means that levels of bus services should be maintained. 1st choice appears to be letting the community down, in particular OAP's
- There does not appear to be any mention of car parking. Please consider an older person not disabled but car driver
- There is little or no provision for car parking other than for disabled citizens
- There is need for vehicle access so even 10 min restricted parking should be available. Locations are wrong. Look at old gas works at Heworth Green
- There needs to be free parking. Not everyone wants or has time to use the bus
- There should be no staff parking ensuring staff use public transport/park and ride. All furniture should be reused from existing offices.
- Underground car park, under the building to ease the car parking. I would suggest a 2 story car park
- We must have plenty of parking for staff and the public prefer office
- We need a building the people can park
- What a load of rubbish - it's a waste of tax payers money
- What a waste of money this whole project has been. Why on earth you cannot stay in St Leonards Place, which is central and most accessible to the majority of people just beats me
- What about car parking
- What about car parking on site for staff/visitors, some staff members have to use their cars for visits etc.
- What about short term parking
- What about staff car parking, what about visitor car parking? In my opinion both sites are not suitable
- Where are staff/customers going to park. Public transport is not viable/efficient for all - council is anti car but some people need their own car for council business
- Where is the car parking for both staff and visitors
- Where will staff park cars? What access for cars on these sites. Strongly feel West Offices offer appropriate site for York. Either site must be able to accommodate all YCC staff

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Where will staff park? I fully back green transport initiatives but know in reality many council staff will not use public transport. What will become of the existing council properties particularly the crescent?
 - Whether the council and/or its employees agree, it is a fact of life that members of the public, as well as council employees, will want to travel to council premises by car to a very large extent, therefore adequate parking is essential
 - Why cant there be parking on or near a new hq? Both sites are not the best choice
 - Will there be parking space for disabled drivers or for those conveying those who are disabled?
 - Wo - better parking,accessible,roads near it not so busy
 - Yorkshire house is not suitable.there is no parking & it's on a really busy corner.west offices seems to be ideal,lots of parking,easy to get at.don't think it would cost as much to renovate as yh
 - You're not promoting travel to your offices by car, should these people not be accounted for? I presume this also relates to staff parking
-
- A bus station for york should be a greater priority than offices, its disgusting that a city this size has no bus station. For travellers awaiting connecting buses there is nowhere indoors to keep warm
 - A busy road in this location could cause problems daily and when staff are coming and going
 - A central bus depot behind the railways station would help all local people and visitors. A free bus service into the centre of york would solve a lot of traffic problems and enable york citizens to freely access the proposed new offices
 - A centralised bus station should be a priority.york is only city in uk without one.lack of such is a joke.demolish yorkshire house to provide a site, it has no architectural beauty,closely resembling the stonebow carbunkle and picadilly prison
 - A great help for elderly & bad walkers to have a handy bus stop near entrance - walking stick user!
 - A single, easily accessible, hq is a good move, and investing in a suitable future is more important than cutting corners today.
 - A site next to the a64 giving good access for public transport and cars would make more sense
 - Access for all is important. Whilst environmental concerns are also important they must not be at too great financial expense. To waste money on stunning or super green but very costly building would not be well received by york citizens
 - Although both proposed sites are near rails tation and one bus interchange it would be vital that the new site is served by a free or low cost bus route that picks up at the other bus interchanges
 - Any inconvenience to transport through the city should be kept to a minimum
 - As a resident of a village beyond the a64, we need a bus service that will get us into york for trains at 7.00 and home again after 19.00 we minimise visits to the city because of unrealistic parking charges
 - At my age the saving over 30 years is hardly relevant and as my village has minimal public transport anywhere in difficult to get to so i would probably never visit
 - Aviva building is surrounded far too much traffic all day long. Would only be pleasant environment if traffic was reduced on rougier street/lendal bridge. We all know this is unlikely. Other site would give much better environmentally friendly feel

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Both buildings need to be accessible and have all the council services available. They need to be practical, council customers require an efficient value for money council office. I suggest west offices is the most suitable building
- Both locations are excellent. West office is more awkward building but favour it as if you don't redevelop it no one else will & will become blight in key part of York. Aviva property can find other tenants for Yorkshire House
- Bus for staff
- Bus information office should be included in the HQ that is accessible to the public. Yorkshire House would be my choice we need a bus station not fine civic buildings we have lots of fine buildings
- Council building should be a design and sustainable flagship, accessible to all. The whole lot should be considered not just the build cost
- Council building should not be in town. Adds to more congestion. Sometimes there is a need to use cars and vans for time and efficiency reasons. The old gas works on Heworth Green would have been the perfect location for access.
- Customer access to west offices seems a long way from bus stops, especially for the elderly and people with mobility difficulties
- Day to day services need to be in highly accessible place. Back office - non public facing services - should be new football stadium, lets recycle our money too
- Develop cross city transport system to allow park and ride customers to easily arrive at the new offices by using mini buses
- Development should be used to improve transport infrastructure in area & reduce car journeys to HQ - council staff encouraged to use cycles, walk or bus for commuting & travel on council business i.e. No subsidised car parking spaces
- Encourage all staff to use public transport by not providing car parking
- Everything in one place and easy for bus routes
- Excellent choice of location. Far better than Hungate. Yorkshire House gives transparent view on a bus route. Decision to use existing buildings within centre of York is the right move
- Expenditure on external alterations should be kept to improving accessibility
- Feel excessive traffic on roads outside Yorkshire House would be great danger to increased number of people visiting council office
- Feel west offices will provide headquarters away from flow of city centre traffic. Yorkshire House site is at very busy junction!!
- Forget the west offices. Yorkshire House would be a flagship. Easy to access high profile location. You'd be seen and be seen to be seen (ie accountable) you're a council - you should work from bog standard (albeit attractive and efficient) premises. No gloss
- From the diagram of Yorkshire House, it looks like you've blocked vehicle movements from Rougier St to Station Rise, why? Also what is the point of extending the pavement out into Station Rise?
- How far into the future has the transport problem been looked into will we have trouble in 30 years time
- I am concerned that the concentration of offices will increase traffic problems. Also, do we really need the expense at this time?
- I disagree with the whole idea. It won't be any more accessible than current buildings and will cost a huge amount of tax payers money. Consulting the public is no more than a PR exercise (and also very costly) there are more important things to spend on
- I do not agree with the two new chosen sites as they will be harder for people on both sides of the city and a more suitable site could be chosen.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I dont feel the offices should be located in the town centre. The future will be more working through email contact so therefore i believe the council should move to a cheaper out of city site
- I feel that the west offices should be the choice as it seems to be more compact and a nice approach road and away from the main road
- I have previously worked in west offices and know them to be totally unsuitable for mobility impaired people. Without totally gutting the building this would be a considerable impairment to members of staff or public moving about the building.
- I support each of the two options as they are close to the route of all existing bus services which is sensible and should reduce the use of private cars. perhaps yorkshire house has the edge
- I totally disagree with your choice due to the fact this would not work out without major road alterations running into hundreds of thousands of pounds. Piccadilly is a far superior site for these headquarters
- If the council intend to use this as their main public building then they must build a new fully accessible council chamber and meeting rooms. It is all well and good having an historic building such as the guildhall but as lovely as it is it is simply no
If the hq cannot be built near the a1237 or a64 ring road then it at least requires a good access by bus. After wasting so much money on the hungate site council needs to choose cheaper options than the given two
- If yorkshire house is used and the service yard is removed, surely service vehicles will need to access the area, has this been addressed? it seems sensible to use an existing build
- If you opt for west offices then there should be access for the public from old station street as well as toft green to increase accessibility for those using public transport. Toft green is quite a long walk for those with mobility difficulties.
- If you use yorkshire house you will have to alter the road workings. Using west offices you would have to alter the road workings and have transport from the rail and bus stations
- In case of yorkshire house, i dont see the point of changing the entrance, its just more expense and isnt needed
- In view of the fact that nearly all buses coming to york from the east of the city, stop in rougier st., i feel that yorkshire house would be better for elderly people as west offices would mean a walk up station rise
- It should be ensured the new headquarters are accessible to all those who need to access council services, and most importantly those who have no choice about accessing services, for example children, young people and families known to social services. T
Just hope the site is not too far from the city centre to walk to pay bills, city finance centre is nice and central at the moment
- Locate new building adjacent to a park and ride facility allowing for cheaper land costs, better parking and transport
- Main problem with proposed area is its difficult accessibility. West offices is by far best option. It has outdoor space which has possibility of providing public meeting place
- More people/transport in the city centre would cause the city to be even more congested.
- More reliable bus service (not buses missed out with no explanation). Better sunday service as well
- Moving to new and spacious and better offices would give greater accessibility and be more beneficial for people of york and could be better for council staff working in new and modern buildings
- Must be accessible to public and, built if in town, to fit into character of area as york is a historical city and not a new town

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Must be easily accessible from public transport for employees and visitors alike. If large unused building available - better to revamp and hopefully less costly
- Neither is optimum. Site out of but close to city with both public transport and parking facilities would be better. Purpose built modern structure would be cheaper to create and maintain as well as being more environmentally friendly.
- Neither option gives an interesting open, inviting centre. Both locations are tucked away and adjacent to congested part of city. Savings are pathetic. What company would invest £43.8m to produce savings of £5m over 30 years????
- New hq needs to be co-ordinated with provision of transport interchange (bus station) in near vicinity
- No justification in altering pavement/entrance to yorkshire house.it has served norwich union effectively for years.saving £5m over 30 years = c.£175k per year. Better to shed a few director level staff for no capital outlay
- Not enough lifts for such a large building. A lift beside the staff entrance would see the staff and customers are not interfering with each others progress though the building.
- Once again the council wants to hamper the traffic flow by reducing the width of station rise (yorkshire building) why? There is a perfectly good entrance to yorkshire building, with disabled access why change it?
- Please amend/create cycle facilities on lental bridge. Many more cyclists will take this route to work with the new building and it is the worst city centre bridge for cycling on.
- Please do not alter the road system. It was ok for norwich union and railway offices
- Possible drop off zone at west offices- none at yorkshire house
- Prefer the west offices site - easy access, preserve historic nature of city, accessible for disabled
- Prefer west offices - better location
- Prefer west offices location
- Priorities are 1, access for users, 2,price, 3, architectural merit but none are exclusive preferably all three
- Proposed site gives easy access to all areas of the city of york who could use local buses or park and ride. York needs a centre for all admin. What about parking for staff who are out and about during the day, i.e. Social workers
- Public transport is already running past these buildings. No further expense is needed. No 1 choice: yorkshire house
- Public transport is in place, rougier street and station rise. Keep costs down. Dont waste tax payers money. Be very open about costs
- Should be near public transport and east access for private cars
- Should be out of town with easy access for visitors - free car parking on a bus route (park & ride) i.e. Monks cross, clifton moor
- Suitable site for hq must be easily to access by vehicle for person who cannot walk far. Monks cross would be suitable.
- The area should include a bus station
- The aviva (yorkshire house) option has huge negative implications for traffic at one of the most congested spots in york. West offices is already a fine buildign with dignity befitting the city councils hq. Much more space around it, much less traffic.
- The aviva building seems to be the most accessible for public transport.i am very much in favour of restoring and rivising historic properties.this seems to be an excellent proposal.are there any other proposals for the use of this building

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The central locations are good/helpful but what will the impact on traffic flow around the centre of York be if more people are going to either location to visit? Ability for staff to park near either place is limited
- The flow of people around the road for the proposed Yorkshire House site may make the area, which is already congested, even more so.
- The public and traffic would be directed to one location thereby causing congestion. £43.8 million could be used for more deserving causes.
- The roads are very busy around Rougier Street, getting across the roads will be a problem.
- The sites seem to me to be in the most inaccessible places for people living north of York. Unless you use park and ride and walk parking a car is impossible
- The siting of the office must not restrict traffic flows in York further. The city and ringroads are grinding to a halt as it is. Rougier Street must not become pedestrianised.
- The West offices would not be convenient for people who use the bus services, as most services go to Rougier Street and not to the other side of town.
- The Yorkshire House scheme comments that improvements to pavements and pedestrian crossings will be made, why can't this happen anyway? I am much more in favour of the West offices than Yorkshire House. It is so much more in keeping with a city like York
- The Yorkshire House scheme is nearest to bus stops. The West office scheme is lovely but more isolated and could be a challenge to keep free of unsocial behaviour after offices
- The Yorkshire House site should not even be considered. It is in close proximity to an already dangerous pelican crossing and traffic junction. In addition it is a 1960's design and look like it
- Think very carefully of good public transport to site. Also think about staff members or members of public who need to drive to work because they do not live near decent bus route but who are not disabled. I have no personal axe to grind as I do not drive. Traffic on approach roads (delivery trucks etc) might be a problem
- Transport for staff, very important
- Use of YH seems to reduce the width of Station Rd to 2 lanes. Thru lanes, one for bus stops is essential. It would appear that NU will be leasing the converted building to the council. It's essential that a use be found for it
- Use Yorkshire House - easy to find. Best environmental site is one that has the least new input and least alterations. More new fangled ideas are not financially effective or even the best environmental use of resources. Do not widen the pavement
- Using a brown field site promotes redevelopment but access needs to be controlled so traffic problems do not occur. The building should not lose its original character
- Vast majority of public transport passes through or near to including park and ride and reduce number of council employees using cars
- Very concerned about traffic problems in area where 2 proposals lie. On race days or bad weather traffic in this part of city tends to gridlock
- We need a bus station
- We need pleasantly and conveniently sited building with sufficient room for staff & visitors to work. Where possible green options should be followed but do make sure they work properly before installing as money & time could be wasted if they don't
- West offices (my choice/close to buses/trains) and historic views, also because it is set back will be more user friendly to customers and staff
- What needed are good quality facilities easy to access particularly from people who live in rural part of city. Buildings should add value to built environment of city
- Would prefer West offices for the location

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Yes new hqs all together easily accessible. Stop shouting for praise & get on with it. Too many money wasting surveys
 - Yh is the most easily accessed, being on flat ground. (toft green would become congested) yh being most convenient for the disabled. Yh is my choice
 - York cc policy regarding cycling to work and use of the bus, have invested alot of money in park and ride scheme hope to see them encouraged for council staff use
 - Yorkshire house appears to be the best location. It is in a noticable & prominent place
 - Yorkshire house does not look like 60s architecture and is built on dangerous corner regarding traffic crossing. Although old looks more in keeping with ancient city and it has room in front for future if needed extensions
 - Yorkshire house has benefit of prominent position, west offices has a more attractive appearance but with tarras park/bucleuch property and crease strickland parkins to contend with - will this hugely increase the costs?
 - Yorkshire house is a better location regarding public accessability and visibility, but it is a hideous concrete monstrosity no matter how it is dressed up. West offices are a much nicer set of buildings more in keeping with york historic care.
 - Yorkshire house is a very congested area. The new hq should be in keeping with yorks finest buildings while keeping costs under control to provide a lasting facility.
 - Yorkshire house is better option as it is more central and easier to find than west offices
 - Yorkshire house is on a very busy and possibly dangerous one way traffic system so may be less ideal than west offices. also west offices were built so long ago that they have already proved to be well built. also i think west offices are much more in keepi
 - Yorkshire house must be cheapest choice so it has my vote. Also very central for buses
 - Yorkshire house seems the best position, no need for architectural excitement and the building is very situated for transport and access.
 - Yorkshire house suffers from poor pavement widths - particularly station rd and the location of the bus-stops (no. 1?) And the poor traffic lights across rougier street. West offices suffers from lots of traffic from hudson house complex (cars, deliveries
You should not build onto yorkshire house, next to a very busy junction. Utilise and alter the west offices - we do not want a modernistic eyesore! The west offices have open space and gardens to sit it! Use this existing building
 - You should think of how people can get to the site by bus and by car, is there car parking spaces, particularly for disabled people.
 - Younger generation of architect seem to think their name should be promoted by some eyesore which becomes but on landscape. All that required of council offices is easily accessible conveniently placed building
-
- After thorough consultation, a decisive decision making process must be adopted - its imposible to please everyone and the people who criticise are not always representative of majority opinion
 - All your options are engineered in such a way as to back up your ideas whether we agree or not, you are just going through the motions to justify you wasting public funds
 - Alternative presentations not comparable e.g. Yorks house plan gives very little information. Cannot see where 1400 council staff can be accommodated in either proposal
 - As it is patently obvious that this scheme is to progress despite the vast amount of ratepayers money already having been squandered, surely further surveys such as this should cease

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- As noted at 7a no unnecessary grandiose schemes and please proper consultation this time! When do we get a vote to choose between the two sites?
- As usual consultation after decision been made. Neither building is suitable without considerable expensive alteration & even then will not meet all needs. Also in wrong area of york. Piccadilly would have been ideal site
- As with government and concerns the public will have no say either way with decisions.
- At £23k i do not see this survey as good value for money
- At no point have you asked which of the two sites iw ould like you to chose. Being agrophobic, going to the 6th floor of yorkshire house would be impossible
- Awful questionnaire. Q9 longer lasting maybe more cost effective. Q2 modern effective working environment - how would average resident know they don't all work there. £5m saving over 30 years that's less than £20k per year or £1 per resident
- Before continuing with an all new project wouldn't it be advisable to finish old projects before starting new ones. Give the community what they deserve and have been asking for the last 5 years, the loss of revenue through the badly managed barbican
- Cant council make these decisions. Don't feel in position to make such decisions due to lack of knowledge and facts. Will you publish results. Get on with it
- Comparison between ths projects is difficult because no mention is made of different floor areas.no mention is made of future expansion possibilities or who makes the final decision.how accurate is the budget?is yh to rent or buy?
- Consulting the public is a waste of money. How can we make informed comments without knowing the costs, the councils forward planning i.e. Staff numbers, the emphasis of councils work? We pay professionals to make informed decisions and recommendations.
- Consulting the public is difficult but you could try harder.
- Council should plan its requirements carefully and get value for money. Why have you not asked us for our opinion as to which we this is the best site and why. This questionnaire is a waste of time and money
- Council would save money if they did not send duplicate leaflets to same address.
- Councillors are elected to make decisions, i suggest that they get on with it instead of letting residents do it for them.
- Councillors were elected to run the city & to employ staff to do the work.so get on & do it without wasting money on pointless exercises like this.the terry's site would have been ideal
- Did not get a chance to say which one of the two we think would be best for york
- Difficult to answer q1 and 2 as i don't know where the current location is - apart from st leonards. A map would have helped.
- Difficult to give sensible answers to these question at time of such deep recession. So many people without jobs so many living on benefits of one kind or another. Small business struggling. Cannot face any increases in council tax charges for this
- Do not require an extra sheet of paper as i believe this questionnaire is waste of time; a pr exercise; as i am sure decisions has already been made
- Do not spend & waste time talking so much & paying monies out conducting surveys etc on subjects which have been done time & time again over years & answers should now all be known.
- Do we get to give our opinions on which of the two locations we prefer, i vote for west offices
- Don't know really what to ask - trying to do my best to give constructive answers to this but finding it very difficult to say
- Dont let it go the way of the barbican. Would have preferred the survey to not have 'loaded' questions resulting answers that the council only wants to recieve.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Don't think enough of our money has been wasted so far - how much has this survey cost? more expense for council tax payers in York?
- Don't think this questionnaire enables one to judge the appropriate balance between value for money, development and a long term sustainable investment. I would like to see a development that minimises environmental impact at a reasonable cost.
- Don't waste money on questionnaires that we all know are a waste of time and money
- Don't waste our money on ineffectual consultation companies and alter your existing management structure to suit existing accommodation in the new offices, don't spend our money on altering the inside of the building to give certain managers their own offices
- Don't waste time - consult all relevant bodies - make a decision and stick to it
- Either West Offices or Yorkshire House could work equally well. Think this questionnaire is rather a waste of our money. Couldn't YCC make this simple decision itself
- Exhibition days should have been weekend, bank holiday and / or evening - not during working day 26-28/05 which makes it hard for most residents who are working to attend
- Exhibition should be open in evening so full time workers can attend. Based on information here my preference is West Offices.
- Feel this questionnaire is hoping I can justify Council's decision to actually build it. Do not feel there was justification when building you are in is perfectly adequate. Less staff more cost cutting on Council offices, current offices
- Feel this survey is about 2-3 years too late. Don't think Council has any idea on how to run major building contract e.g. Terrys and Barbican to name 2
- Feel you will go with whatever Council wants regardless of what people think. Expect this questionnaire cost a fortune a4 booklet in colour. Do your best to save us money please
- Figures will change, costs will increase even the nominal saving above will disappear. This whole project is an ego building exercise
- Find it hard to believe this questionnaire can produce honest and useful information. Most people will not have informed position from which to answer questions. Accessibility by public transport and car parking will be most important
- Find the marketing approach annoying. The questions are what you want to do not perhaps what we want to say. I'm also aware how little I know about the problems faced in planning new offices for the Council.
- Find this form too difficult.
- For a supposed "consultation" document about the new Council HQ to not ask which of the two options people prefer is ridiculous. We strongly prefer West Offices. To make a big issue of saving £5m over 30yrs when spending over £40m in the next 3 isn't good
- For goodness sake please decide on this issue. We elect councillors who it seems cannot make a decision
- Get on with it. Stop consulting and do something
- Get rid of paper sent to each home
- Get something solid and positive done without all this input
- Good idea to have more modern Council facilities but this questionnaire is flawed. Full of loaded questions and is overly simplistic.
- Good to be consulted
- Had this document been used in the first place a lot of money would have been saved
- Have not been asked which option I prefer in this "have your say" - a great mistake I think as it gives the impression that all is 'cut and dried'. My choice would be West Offices.
- How much is this exercise costing the tax payers? More paper shuffling to justify non-essential staff we want to reduce our Council tax - whichever way we can stop wasting our money

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- How much money is wasted on advertising/printed matter on this project???
- How much more money will be wasted -> will you move into this one? Think this questionnaire is a joke and insulting to people of york
- Hungate would represent a better location and option. This is a ridiculous consultation document - just get on with it
- I am not at all impressed with this questionnaire or consultation process. Why not just get on with what you have been elected to do. This is a total waste of money
- I am at a loss to understand why there is not a selection asking which option i would prefer, surely have your say should mean which one i would pick
- I am dissappointed that this document does not show the current locations of existing council offices.i have only had cause to use the office near library and would be in a better position to talk about change if i knew what the proposals are changing from
I am pleased to have been consulted,but suggest you review your criteria.i have no need to visit buildins accesing services remotely but do believe the council should invest in quality buildings which add to environment of the city
- I am saddened and dissappointed that the leaflet makes no mention of the hungate fiasco. The executive committee should be ashamed of how much money that failed project has wasted. This would have been an ideal opportunity to apologise
- I did visit the exhibition at the mansion house, but was disappointed not to see scale models of the new projects. It is difficult to visualise the buildings of that scale without a model. If the decision not to have models was down to cost then i stron
I don't believe surveys like this have any real influence. Questions are structured to elicit answers which confirm existing decisions.
- I don't understand how my answers to these questions are relevant to the choice of either of the proposed buildings
- I don't see the point in this document. Clearly the questions are slightly loaded but no matter what answers you get, you will do what you want to do.this is an absolute waste of council taxpayers money and you must think us stupid,
- I don't understand why the rate payers money has been wasted by producing this so-called public consultation since it specifically states yh will be transformed into a modern & stylish home for the council
- I find these questionnaires ridiculous,the answers are obvious,you have to do your best within budget having worked for many years in west offices.yorkshire house is better optio
- I have read this communication several times to determine whether both sites were to be considered as one option or two competing ones. The only real clue is in the first small paragraph and is referred to nowhere else.
- I hope this so-called consultation does not delay what is urgently required.councillors are elected to make decisions they seem to have spent an unnecessary length of time getting a badly needed facility sorted
- I hope you dont think that all york people are too thick to notice all the answers will be in the councils favour
- I just wonder how much it costs to do this survey in terms of paper,printing,postage & manpower & if it is really cost effective for the number of replies you will get.you can email me with the answer
- I like this info brochure, would have been nice to keep the info sheets and return only the questionnaire. Its really nice to be kept informed and i appreciate the effort put into keeping us in the picture. Thank you
- I question the need for this survey.the cost of production and analysis

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I think it is a waste of money contacting each home, as I thought councillors were elected to decide such matters. My opinion is this is p.c gone mad, as with many other matters both locally and nationally, get on and do the job you were elected for
- I think q9 is a bit of a trick question. Low cost and long lasting should actually both be the aims of the council. Q10 - again both could be achieved - cost control as well as using and enhancing existing buildings
- I think some of the questions are ambiguous. q1+2 - for my needs exhibition sq is fine. Q5 - planning depends on mine or neighbours building plans - a possibly box would have been more appropriate
- I think this consultation is a waste of money. You should just get on with it using advice from the experts. The public will never agree about anything!
- I think this exercise is a complete and utter waste of council tax payers money, no further comment is necessary.
- I think this exercise is probably a waste of funds in that no doubt the council will already have decided on the action.
- I think this is an expensive way of canvassing opinion. I never visit the offices you could have asked those who attend council buildings, those who work there go for the old building, more in keeping with city.
- I thought councillors were paid to make decisions, I'm not
- I was deeply shocked to see that it cost £23,409 to send this survey. I would be surprised if many people bothered to return it. A form in the press with a free post address would have been cheaper
- I wish you would print the questionnaire separately - not on the reverse side of news we wish to keep. Ok?
- I would have thought it better if your brochure has a separate and distinct reply form in order that we could have retained the brochure as a guide to what we were replying to
- I would prefer if the council didn't waste taxpayers money on fancy new offices and pointless surveys like this!
- I would prefer not to be consulted. If I could be certain that my representatives had the judgement to know what was best for my city & the integrity to implement without fear or favour
- If you send out further questionnaires keep in mind that at moment return on yellow paper is much higher than on white paper. Also results on data are more accurate if boxes are not too far from choices
- In future you could talk to the people of York about their views instead of wasting the money building nothing so far
- Is this survey any use? It doesn't ask which of the 2 options the public favour. Just get on with doing it without wasting anymore rate payers money as has been done with the previous scheme
- It does not make any difference what we say you will do what you want to do anyway. Also who is claiming expenses just like our MPs
- It is clear that the decision that you will have a new HQ is made - this should have been asked about. Savings rather than spending money on new build
- It is ridiculous that you should spend £23,409 on this mail shot when we already receive other council handouts
- It may never have got to this stage of asking for public comments, had the York Council not wasted so much money on the other site at Peasholm Green! Just get on with it and save the public a bit of money please

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- It seems a little bizarre that you are asking questions yet are not wanting to know which option residents prefer. I prefer west offices but are you actually interested? The building is more in keeping with the city's image.
- It seems that the decisions have already been made. What will happen to the old buildings? What will happen to the town hall?
- It would be helpful if the council wanted a questionnaire returned to them it does not print page 1 on the reverse of a page that a person might wish to keep for reference
- It would have been preferable for this document to have been separable into 2 parts, so that you could retain the description of the possible schemes
- Just answer the question on the front and don't do the politician dance
- Keep existing buildings. This survey is a waste of time. You will go ahead whatever we say & at a guess - permission will be building it!
- Let's hope this Q is not going to be a complete waste of money, time and energy and that you're not going to do as you want and waste a few more thousand pounds on useless projects as before. Remember we pay your wages
- Listen to residents' views, take notice, thus saving all round
- Listen to the people - they know best
- Leading question clearly pushing west offices
- My dealing with council's they will do what they want no matter what the ordinary person may say
- No 8 on survey is impossible to answer without information about cost
- Not asked which design is preferred. West offices is much more pleasing design for York. Do not see what is wrong with old offices
- Not sure why you are wasting more of tax payers' money by sending out these forms asking our opinion as you will only do what you want anyway!!
- Nowhere do you ask which new council offices option we favour. For what it's worth I would choose west offices which seem more user friendly. Notice no mention or apparent provision for any public car parking spaces with either option
- One sheet of A4 would have been quite sufficient to elicit public views
- Only comment I have is with council's long history of disregarding opinions of local populace and its own experts (Hungate for instance) why is this costly and irrelevant exercise even taking place? Will do what it wants anyway
- Production of this document is complete waste of tax payers' money as proposed sites are separated by street not ward. Does it really matter? Typical
- Questionnaire that contains questions that are not designed to skew answers to those that you want. £40m+ to save £5m over 30 years?
- Questions are very leading and I don't know how much value you will get out of this process - bit of a tick box exercise and waste of money
- Received this twice, wasting our money again! There's nothing wrong with St Leonards, "have your say" what difference will it make?
- Residents should be given choice between 2 - this survey is a missed opportunity. West offices is by far better - an appropriate building for a historic city like York rather than residents and partners coming to an architecturally poor, modern building
- Responses to question may vary according to preferred site
- Small issue, how do I send questionnaire back but still keep information on council's new plans?
- Small point but keep surveys down to A5 size to save on postage and paper instead of A4
- So this facile consultation exercise cost around £50k, how about giving it to the many deserving voluntary groups in the city?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Sorry but i say what a further waste of money sneding these documents out. £5m already lost on appalling designs when buildings like these could be used. Dont we pay you to make these decisions?
- Sorry, but i still think these questionnaires are a waste of time and money
- Survey is another example of resources being spent, another job creation exercise. Reduce the council headcount in all now critical areas by 20% immediatley and improve productivity throughout. £5m saving over 30yrs will be absorbed by usual over-runs.
- The actual choice has not been requested. Why not? Personal opinion - west offices appear more user friendly and attractive and wouldnt create as many traffic problems as the other
- The cost to the council for sending out this leaflet is a waste of tax payers money
- The council must concentrate on open honest and meaningful consultation. The public of york will not be enthused by biased and conclusion driven consultation
- The council will take no notice of what the taxpayers say anyway. What about hungate? Will this be just another bottom less pit to throw money in to?
- The councillors make the decisions that's why we elected them. How can we decide when we are told the cost of buying the buildings. Please do not waste more of our money.
- The extent to which this is engineered to get the results the council wants is arrant. £5 million over 30 years is a trivial sum compared with the outlay and what has already been spent on hungate by an inept executive.
- The intent of this survey is to provide the desired answers. It's questions are loaded & designed with bias. It is difficult to believe it has been created by an independent body
- The language used to describe the two sites seems weighted towards the acceptance of west offices. I feel that this does not present a balanced picture upon which one may make a choice
- The one question not being asked of residents is which building we prefer. Hungate was the wrong building the wrong place - don't let it happen again - let's have proper meaningful consultation
- The questionnaire ought to be a seperate tear off part so we could keep the information.
- The questionnaire should have been detachable so the resident can keep the information supplies. Regular project updates need to be available
- The questions are too complicated
- The range of 1 - 8 in question 8 is silly. It should be 1-5 or 1-10 but 8!!!!
- There is no direct question asking which site is preferred, i would strongly recommend west offices
- There is not question here about which of 2 options is favoured by york residents. Seems odd to me
- These questions are tailored so you get the answers you want not the citizens of york.get an appropriate, effective and efficient service
- These questions have been shaped in a biased way. Big-brother buildings for the bendy bus bureaucrats or a pro-public building?
- These questions seem to 'generate' answers for the agreement to the building of a new hq when there is a perfectly suitable site within easy reach of all transport. West offices would promote a heritage site already there
- Think council will already of made mind up about project & feel this exercise is waste of money. Council tax payers money. What about inconvenience to hundreds of staff in having to move and relocate.
- Think sending this out waste of time and money and man power. We have received 2!!!!
- This consultation is complete and utter waste of time and effort as council will do what they want anyway, ignoring the wishes of residents

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- This consultation is cosmetic exercise & waste of money. You have clearly already decided to waste £43m on unnecessary new facility - & chosen your preferred option. I await budget over runs....
- This consultation is rigged as are all such political consultations. Where is the question asking public whether you should stay in present buildings and save £43m! Savings are very poor return on £43m being less than 0.5% per annum.
- This consultation should have been launched prior to hungate debacle and gross waste of tax payers money. Better late than never however so lessons have been learned it seems
- This council only listen to what they want to hear. This questionnaire is an expensive pr exercise - no mention of £4m + wasted on hungate
- This doesn't actually give people of york choice. People probably just want council to spend least money possible after all money wasted. Should also ensure all jobs go to local people who have become unemployed as result of aviva
- This exercise is futile. It doesnt ask the people of york for their preference of building. The saving of £4m will of course devalue as time goes on, every effort must be made to shorten the time scale and increase saving!
- This form from our point of view is a complete waste of paper, you've already made up your minds what your going to do, no matter what people of york thin, get the roads repaired and some police on the streets!
- This is an appalling survey, the questions are 'loaded' given the current climate it is ridiculous to spend this sort of money on looking after yourselves.
- This is false choice. Question should be do we need new offices. By pretending to offer choice of west offices or yorkshire house you assume move has been agreed. Whole experience waste of money
- This is one of most specious council consultation processes i have come across and i can tell you i have seen run and managed a few myself. Well done
- This is paper consultation. Council only ever does what it has already planned behind closed doors
- This is very general and fails to look at 2 options - if council wants our views surely this should have been included.
- This paper is a complete waste of someones time and tax payers money, no matter what we say you will only do what you want you really could have put this money to better use
- This provides insufficient info to allow a meaningful choice.thus rendering this a meaningless exercise and no doubt a hugely expensive one
- This q is a waste of council money!there is nowhere to directly comment on the preferred option for the hq,questions are loaded.the councillors are elected to make decisions
- This questioning is worded in a very directional way. Keep the towns development inkeeping with "old walled town" not some datable modern horror
- This questionnaire does not address case for vacating existing premises. Had no occasion to visit council offices. Re-location should only be considered based on option which evaluates remain in current offices & improving some to good standard
- This questionnaire does not ask the most important question - "are you in favour of the council spending £43.8 million on a new building?" why not? Is it because you know what the answer will be?
- This questionnaire is futile & waste of council tax payers money. Will already have made own decisions, public opinion will not be listened to as is always case.
- This questionnaire is ridiculous - it assumes we your employers want you spend millions on refurbishment. What we really want are facilities every other city should have - modern swimming pools & leisure facilities etc

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- This questionnaire is totally useless and a waste of money. The criteria for operation for councillors and council staff should be evident.
- This questionnaire is worded to produce a pre-determined outcome. The way the questions are worded doesn't allow for any real consultation. Any new building should preserve York's character and be "green" but set in an older building.
- This questionnaire should be separate from the information at the front.
- This questionnaire tends to lead to answers the council wants and it does not go in to enough depth.
- This questionnaire would have been more effective if the answers were not weighted by virtue of tick boxes.
- This whole exercise is a complete waste of time and money. The decision has already been made and this is the second survey I have completed. Stop wasting money!
- This questionnaire cost £23,409. Add that to the £43.8m that you estimate for the project plus the tens of millions extra when it goes over budget and I think we can count on yet.
- Thought most of options in here were already agreed. This consultation is therefore a sham....offering no real say on which particular site people prefer....more of same spin from council.
- Using existing buildings is a far better idea but a questionnaire was unnecessary - just another expense. Please use some common sense and remember you're in a privileged position as custodians of the city and have a big responsibility for the long term.
- We all accept the council will do as it pleases and change the rules to fit around that choice. We have contact with the council when we really are left with no choice. As long as we pay up and obey your regulations we get along fine.
- We have already had one of these forms delivered, same old story! Wasting money as usual!
- We pay members and senior officers to make decisions. I really don't know what building is better for purpose.
- We think the council are not prepared to spend money on small local subjects i.e. Roads not "patched up", public convenience closed, youth centres not promoted, children's play areas wrecked by bored teenagers. Old sewer pipes that are too small to cope. We want easy accessibility, long term view without frills or fancies. We need the HQ to work well, we don't need fashion. We prefer West Offices for frontline services.
- What a waste of money, why bother sending this leaflet. You have it all cut and dried before you start, I would like 12p back!
- What a waste of public funds, this has been delivered twice as are all York other leaflets! Get yourselves organised for economies sake!
- What a waste of public money in producing this questionnaire. We have council to make these decisions. Your focus should always be on one thing - value for money especially in this economic recession.
- What is purpose of questionnaire. Questions are very woolly and you have not provided enough information to inform answers. One wonders what cost of this exercise is and what purpose it serves.
- What is the point of stating the two sites then not asking which one people prefer?
- What is the point, you'll only ignore what we think and do what the council wants, even if it costs us another £5m with no result.
- Where as it is good to ask the public, councillors must make the final decisions.
- Where is the consultation report re conclusions on the benefits of the new headquarters as stated in the "have your say" document! How come both sites will cost the same to redevelop? Surely "Yorkshire House" as a purpose built office block would have a

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

Where is the question? Which of the two choices do you prefer? The opening pages say that we are asked for our 'comments and views' on the proposals

- Where or when do we as York residents have a say in which building we prefer?
- Whichever site chosen, get the job done without any more money being wasted on bogus consultation
- While I think it is very positive that the council has released a petition such as this to the general public before our taxes are spent on it, there is something fundamental missing from the poll. It doesn't specifically outright ask which one of the two
Why are the two parts of q10 "as opposed to" I'm sure it's possible to do both. As you haven't asked formally, I want West Offices much better option all round. Why didn't you ask us
- Why are we not asked which option we prefer?
- Why are we not being asked for our choice between the 2 sites. We must use the West Offices
- Why are we not being asked which option we would prefer?
- Why are you not asking which site we prefer, surely that's the most important thing we should have a say on
- Why did the public not have a say before the council wasted 5,000,000 of our money. Asking for our opinion now is an insult. The council will only do what they want. Again with out money!
- Why did you not ask for comments in the first place. Before doing a private deal which I gather is all cut and dried
- Why do survey? Council have/will decide where HQ will be no matter what survey results are. Why not go to Monks Cross where plenty of room and good bus route already set up
- Why do we bother with this? Council will still do what it wants & still waste vast amounts of money. £5million savings over 30 years is a joke!
- Why do you ask these questions when in the past you have totally ignored the public's needs?
- Why don't we get to express a preference on which scheme should be taken forward? The presentation is clearly biased towards W so this exercise is a sham
- Why don't you just get on with it instead of all this waffle
- Why exhibition at mansion house on when great number of people at work? Why lovely design put forward for West Offices could not be used for Hungate which would suit it so well. Perhaps someone will think same in planning dept and give it some thought
- Why have I not been asked which site I prefer? The Aviva site is ugly at the end of the way you can't polish a turd
- Why have you not asked public opinion re which building they would like to see used? Would like West Offices because see it as building which reflects York as place to live in a continental town hall type role
- Why have you not asked what site we prefer? The rest of the questions are peripheral and not very relevant.
- Why hold the exhibition over a bank holiday when many are away - it implies there is something to hide!
- Why move or ask when already decided to move - wasting more money on non essential questionnaires
- Why not give the general public of York the choice of venues (eg Yorkshire House or West Offices)
- Why not use the Barbican Centre? This is such a poorly constructed questionnaire - or is the bias in question formulation deliberate?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Why on earth are you wasting money sending the people of York this information. How much has this cost? Why don't you stop this and save money. Too much of my tax bill is wasted by yourselves as it is. Still on final salary pensions. Early retirement. It' With these types of moves, huge amounts of money are often spent on hiring consultants decisions the council and public are quite capable of making themselves. Once a site is chosen, get on with the job in the most sustainable way possible
- Yes: I think the consultation should include giving residents the choice to say 'no' to a new site. Instead, this is presented as a fait accompli and we are asked to choose between alternative new sites. Alternative uses of the £44m are not presented
- York city will go ahead regardless. Are there buyers for the existing council premises or will they remain empty or converted into unaffordable housing or office space.
- York council could save money by stopping junk mail like this. As you will just do as you want it isn't your money you are spending is it
- York council is corrupt, do not insult my intelligence by asking which I prefer, you will do exactly as you want and have already made your decision, exactly like the Barbican, I am not alone, most York residents feel the same
- York council will do what it wants as always, why ask us? A waste of money again
- You ask for comment and our views and give us no information upon which to judge your plans! You plan a massive spend but I wonder what cost would attach to other sites - Clifton Moor for example
- You could save on cost by using A5 envelopes instead of A4 to send this back
- You didn't send this around last time, about Hungate, it was our fault last time, how strange. Don't even say you have no money again when you have wasted millions
- You don't ask us which site we prefer. The West Offices will take visiting traffic off a very busy one-way system. Also you are one of the biggest employers in York. Will each of the sites hold just 1400 staff?
- You don't specifically ask the question, my wife and I would strongly prefer the West Offices option endorsing the key features shown on pages 6/7. This option optimises York and everything that York is.
- You have not asked me which option I prefer. So I find your consultation shallow. Which of the 2 fits better. How can I tell? Will I be asked again or is this it? Without answers this process is yet another waste of time & money
- You never asked the obvious question i.e. which of these two proposals I support. Answer West Offices by a mile
- You will do what you have already decided to do without any regard for public opinion as when formed against wishes of outlying areas. Please stop wasting our council tax money
- You will proceed whether the public think it's viable or not
- "cheap" is rarely value for money. True quality is durable and maintains value. We do not need the 'Rolls Royce' of public buildings.
- All Q8 very important to promote sustainability. As many council services on same site as possible. 2 options for sites both offer opportunity for relaxed visiting by residents which should be welcome and informative
- Answer to Q9 assumes truly maximum use of locally sourced materials, services and labour
- Any contracts should be awarded locally to help sustain the local economy. I believe it is better to pay more for local labour than import it for less as any extra money will end up being spent in the city anyway.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Any innovative or high tech sustainable features must be fully accessed to include ongoing maintenance costs before being installed. There is a tendency to go for showy gadgets rather than basic good quality
- Any plans should lend themselves to longer lasting facility that can adapt and change to meet any future requirements. Flag ship element for city would be desirable
- As a design and technology teacher in York its essential that eco and sustainability are promoted in the new hq. It basically has to be a benchmark in design for the rest of the city
- As the building will be in use for quite a number of years it is important it is flexible enough to cater for changes in technology and activities. It should also project a suitable image for York
- As well as earning the highest available levels of environmental sustainability, a priority should be to ensure that the building is truly 'fit for purpose'
- Available budget should be enough to create well built, energy efficient, long lasting hq rather than monument to egos of architects & councillors. Don't want repeat of Hungate disaster. West offices appear to be well built & appropriate design for York
- Before even considering sustainability the building and the design has to be first class. Don't lose sight that the building has to do its job effectively. This means that the council employees need to be inspired and motivated and proud of the end result
Best value-we should be told cost us sustainability, no good cheap but need to replace again quickly(spending twice) must be flexible as time gap between decision and input may have changes
- Beware false economy. No shoe box buildings please
- Both ideas appear suitable as they are in keeping with "look" of city whilst being forward thinking, efficient and sustainable
- Build for future. But in keeping with present buildings. Not too modern
- Build for the future and future technology
- Build for the long term
- Building must be as green as possible to cut cost of running, value for money, must be fit for purpose and attractive
- Building should be long lasting facility which is easily adaptable for impending change
- Building should have room for growth and be sustainable for next 20 years at least, so staff are not continually moving offices or having depts restructured. Should be period of stability.
- Building should promote realistic sustainability
- Building the cheapest is not always cost effective, speculate to accumulate for the future
- Concentrate on building something with a viable future, unlike the Barbican, redundant after a short time.
- Consider biomass (wood) peat or chip heating and/or cooking
- Construction works should be undertaken by local contractors to avoid a repeat of what happened at Danesgate Skills Centre
- Cost should not be exorbitant but it must be of lasting quality. Appearance should be in keeping with rest of city unlike new extension at St Johns College
- Costs - both capital and ongoing maintenance should be minimised. Ease of access - bus/foot should be maximised
- Costs vs sustainability & social benefit should not be either/or but should be carefully balanced to get the optimum combination rather than sacrificing one for the others
- Council should be aiming to provide low cost, energy efficient building that will stand test of time & minimise waste of valuable public money

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Council should choose site that provides best office space for future and consider which will have lower future running costs.
- Council should ensure they develop offices that are designed to last, if costs are cut now they are likely to be needed sooner or later
- Council should set example for other development within its boundary in terms of sustainability accessibility design and social inclusion
- Council will probably change offices in another couple of years as they usually do when a new party get it
- Cutting costs for the sake will result in a building outliving its usefulness very quickly. This has been done in the past which is where cyc are at now!
- Do it once, do it well, this in itself gives long term value for money
- Don't particularly care what you do, please just concentrate on environmental issues. A fabulous new building won't mean anything if we are all under 4 feet of water due to climate changes. Don't think councils and govt understand that this is top priority
- Eco friendly highly energy efficient project would pay for itself if building was long lasting facility. Initial cost will be high though cost of running lower
- Either site should satisfy requirements for 30 years
- Energy efficiency is important to me
- Energy efficiency/low emissions are crucial we have no inkling of how bad it is going to get - climate change that is
- Environmental sustainability has to be first consideration. But a historic context would be nice
- Existing buildings are historically difficult to convert to achieve modern sustainability. The design team will require innovative and realistic professionals to make this project successful. I think experience will be a key part in this process
- Expediency despite the current economic difficulties shouldn't dominate the discussions on a lasting civic building that is fit for purpose and not only not a drag on existing resources but a fundamental benefit to existing sustainable resources.
- Fit for purpose, now and later. Easy to build, operate, maintain and work in
- Given that building is expected to be in use for at least 30 years design should be carbon neutral. Heating & cooling should be reduced to minimum through best insulation & ventilation design.
- Good quality building will provide and preserve usefulness and quality of cost will be recouped over the years
- Greenest option - keep things as they are. Don't need new building there is a recession
- Headquarters should keep costs down while investing in long lasting facility
- I agree with keeping costs down but not at the expense of building what is necessary for future years. Cheaper is not the best and it needs to look good. I like the west offices
- I am disappointed that both schemes are aiming to reduce carbon footprints by only 30%. Given the crisis of climate change and peak oil why not aim for 90%
- I believe the building should be equipped with quality materials so as to provide a long lasting solution. These products should be provided by British companies providing employment for local people if possible.
- I consider that a longer lasting facility is important, also the last thing York needs is another 'stonebow house' obviously costs must be considered but not at the expense of quality and appearance
- I do think the environment, ergonomic architecture and sustainability are of the utmost importance in this development.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I favour the west offices site. It seems to combine modern technology and sustainability with the dignity that the historic city of York deserves
- I feel it is important to build a high quality and sustainable building we can be proud of. I appreciate having the opportunity to have my say
- I think it would be easy to tick keep costs down but I think we need to be thinking in terms of keeping long term costs down by involving a longer lasting facility. No false economies please.
- I think it would be wise to invest in a longer lasting facility, rather than low cost as the building needs to be restored to its original outlook & create a lasting look over the years to come & people to admire the redevelopment
- I think solar or windpower would be the best energy solution for the new headquarters
- I think sustainability and retaining former glory are the two overriding priorities obviously balanced against cost. West offices would I think present the better of the two options.
- I think that longevity is important but also that conservation is more important than 'exciting' architecture. Managing ongoing costs (daily consumption etc) should be very high priority (keeping these as low as possible) which may mean higher initial investment
I think the aims should be efficiency and accessibility primarily. Not convinced by the need for millions of tax payers money to be spent so hope the end result gets the job done for reasonable cost. £5 million saving over 30 years is nothing.
- I think the council could produce a recycling plant in York, to produce more jobs on the old Terry's site and all our recyclable waste could be recycled here without tax payers, paying to have it sent abroad.
- I think the offices should be in a good sound building, as we all know many 1960s buildings have been demolished. There must be sufficient parking for staff & public, albeit the offices will be on the bus stops
- I think you should convert an existing building as proposed with energy efficiency and recycled materials on all new areas and incorporated into existing area where possible. The west offices are very acceptable in appearance and would blend in
- I would like to see a long lasting facility that has an attractive architectural contribution to the city, but not at the risk of increased council tax!
- If council tax income must be spent on a new build then it must be green reducing g/h gas emissions & use low cost energy saving measures. It should be west offices which should remain in keeping with the city buildings - York's House should never be built
If this council building is to stand the test of time it needs to be well built and should be well designed and stand out so residents can be proud of it
- Important to produce a headquarters that has a good life and is maintained to ensure that the building lasts.
- In keeping with the new council's HQ using renewable fuels and reducing carbon emissions may I suggest that this will only be possible if the surrounding area is less clogged up with traffic i.e. make the one way system for buses, taxis and cyclists only
- Increase use of on site renewable energy sources above 20%. There are a variety of micro generation technologies that could be used from solar thermal, solar PV, micro CHP, ground/air source heat pumps etc that could contribute to 72% of energy needs
- Invest now in an exciting architectural build instead of building a budget project that will date and wear fast, bringing you back to square one.
- Is there sufficient room for expansion of the accommodation. Will it be designed using the principles of long life (sustainability) low energy/loose fit
- It is important that the building is a flexible space that is hard wearing, will last for a long time and also promotes York in a good light; eco friendly with a classic design.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- It needs to be fit for use and economically and environmentally sustainable. This could mean high investment but make it long term financially viable.
- It needs to be fit for use and long lasting
- It should be building that would last basically forever not to be built at huge expense and then council decide to relocate leaving tax payers footing bill
- Its about balance. Cyc needs functional accessible building which is cost effective. Would not be in favour of exciting architectural contribution which has short shelf life and in practice does not fulfil requirements of council
- Just do building that is efficient cost effective and works
- Local air quality impacts of additional travel to this central site should be considered as should impact of renewable fuel. Biomass can assist in reducing co2 emissions but may have adverse impact on local air quality within area of already poor air
- Long lasting should include sustainability which will ultimately cost effective. Good architecture contributes massively to the atmosphere and environment
- Longlasting and functionality are more important that creating a architechural gem
- Low cost and sustainability and good architecture can work together. It shouldnt be one or the other. The most important thing is that costing and contractors are transparent, we need to see when and why the money has gone
- Making the buildings especially "west offices" energy efficient and people friendly and a healthy work environment for all at the same time preserving not compromising the architectural beauty of the existing building
- Modernised buildings should be well insulated to keep heating costs to minimum - insulation gives bigger savings than fancy wind powered electric generated systems.
- Need a long lasting facility - not another barbican. Need to keep costs down but not at expense of workmanship.
- Need to keep in mind the cost of heating both options as they are open plan
- Need to make the project sustainable, and cost efficient so that it does not becaome a quick fix but something that is a legacy for the city
- Need to take account of improving air quality locally when reducing co2/greenhouse gas emissions. The streetscape/landscape outside the building is important. A strong architectural building is required but not if costs become too much
- Needs to re use where possible with sustained design
- New green inventions are happening all time so my view is to do what you can now for minimum cost so council will have money to access new technology etc
- No mention of wind turbine. No mention of solar panels. Why not build footbridge from north st gardens to city screen so councillors/staff can access guildhall for meetings
- Offices are overheated in winter turn them down. This questionnaire waste of resources. We are not customers but citizens who employ you. This should not be called customer centre
- Please concentrate on a sensible, energy efficient building - not some fancy design
- Pleasing to look at, re-newable materials very green, own generator so when it cuts out you can still work on unlike supermarkets near bus stops and cheap parking all depts under one rood and made to earn its keep and money not psent on other things
- Practise what you preach! You dont recycle in offices, school or residential homes
- Q10:energy efficiency,carbon emmisions and sustainability are key not building an eyesore.use the nice old building breathe new life into it.lets not forget the benefits of that nice bit of green at the front too
- Q8 difficult to answer without knowledge of building/sustainable methods - bit of guesswork done, however agree building should be as sustainable as possible without spending too much. Can we just get on with it now!

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Q's 9&10. 'Keeping costs within reasonable boundaries' is what i wanted to say 'in order to get a sustainable facility' promoting excitement is not on my agenda
- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions wherever possible is vital, regardless of money cost
- Restoring buildings should be balanced with creating an environmentally friendly and sustainable, cost effective headquarters.
- Re-use and recycle but any changes made should embrace energy efficiency, customer ease of access, designated confidential meeting areas and friendly staff. These buildings with staff who care about your customers.
- Should choose environmental aspects over architectural design.design can still be very good without need to be expensive.there should be no saving costs to the detriment of the build quality & longevity of the building
- Should not all be about cost should fit with the environment and staff requirement
- Some of the environmentally-friendly aspects will come at a cost, and i feel it important to maintain a sense of perspective to ensure the benefits outweigh the costs involved. Out of the two schemes, west offices feels much more exciting architecturally
Staff and visitors must be encouraged to use green modes of transport e.g. Walking, cycling, public transport and sharing cars
- Strong support for green option
- Surely in 30 years time the new building will need increasing maintenance or the council will be looking for a new headquarters again. Also a 12 pg leaflet sent to everyone in york is hardly "eco friendly" couldn't this have been put online
- Sustainability (environmentally and economically) and high quality design should be the two priorities for any new building, this includes re-use of existing structures/materials where possible. The choice of building should include consideration of the c

- Sustainability should be key and design is crucial when considering york's tourist trade; an attractive building is essential
- Sustainability/environmental considerations should be paramount as there are always round accessibility issues.
- The building needs to be fit for purpose overall - sustainable and cost effective. An attractive modern interior is important but ultimately must meet the needs of the customers and people who work there
- The building should be designed so that maintenance costs are reduced to a minimum eg: use 'seaguard' emergency lighting system instead of self contained em lighting units.why spend £43.8m in order to save £5m over 30 years
- The building should incorporate solar panels or wind machines for electronic generation
- The buildings should be as 'green' as possible and should be in keeping with the historical aspects of the city where possible
- The chosen building should deliver a highly sustainable and energy efficient solution - providing an example to the rest of the city.
- The council has an opportunity to design a modern recycling efficient building - go for it! West offices is the more attractive prospect
- The council has the opportunity to lead by example by creating an energy efficient local supported green headquarters that utilises renewable energy, keeping future costs down
- The council have a duty to provide a good quality sustainable building for users and employees alike. The project team need to look at whole life costings not just initial outlay. It would be good if for once the council could have some vision and imagin
The council needs to be thinking long term future for this building aswell as cost efficiency

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

looking at the two projects i feel personally that the west offices would be the better prospect away from the busy streets

- The council should aim for zero carbon footprint to set an example for all to follow !!
- The council should aim to be the greenest in the uk - aim to show other cities that the 'york initiative is a new local business opportunity (exportable) from york
- The council should 'lead' the city and this project will give the opportunity to create a sustainable, accessible for all, efficient working environment for future generations to be proud of.
- The council should look at use of renewable energy generation. I strongly prefer west offices as a better option for the council, it has a more dignified appearance in keeping with the historical importance of the city
- The important consideration should be substance over style and long term sustainability over short term cost saving as green buildings can be cost effective in the future and environmentally friendly
- The longer term view should be paramount in the decision. It would be, as i see it, far better to bring back a grade 2 listed building, building on the heritage of the city railway rather than develop a more modern building
- The main criteria should be a long lasting building, not cut corners for cheapness today & never mind tomorrow. Much better to be efficient than fancy
- The most important things are that the buildings is energy efficient, fulfill its purpose well and is a good working environment for employees and service users
- The move has to be right first time and not short term project
- The only boldness in technology should be in energy efficiency. no other architectural or technological innovation should be considered, otherwise it will be nothing more than council self aggrandisement at the tax payers and council tax payers expense
- The only thing that is important to me is the building chosen has the lowest possible carbon footprint
- There has not been enough long term thinking. Need to plan for growing population of town and staff.
- Think generally a long term vision (even if more costly) is preferable to a quick fix. Putting things right or starting again in the future will always cost more. York deserves a headquarters that its citizens can all feel proud of
- Think it would be better to plan for the long term rather than the short term as this will save money in the long run and hopefully give the city a town hall to be proud of for future generations
- Think life cycle costings! This building will be around for many years so think ahead and keep ongoing costs reasonable - even if you have to spend more at start of project
- Think long term and exemplary.
- Think reusing an existing building is much better demonstration of sustainability than new build. Please also think about access for people with buggies/prams. Maybe a crèche
- This is a major project and should be driven by long term economic & architectural gains to the city & taxpayers rather than short term economies. should be realistically budgeted for to achieve a building fit for the 22nd century
- This should be long term and not on cheap. All future costs need to be taken into account
- To transform west offices into an extremely energy efficient building will be a challenge. If cyc can rise to that challenge that will be an exciting and exemplary development.
- Too much notice of conservationists and other retro bodies. We need to look at requirements for the future. Conservation can be unnecessarily costly.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Try not to think about this new facility in the short term. Despite recession, it should have excellent design. Involvement of artists and something york represents york's architectural interests.
 - Volume of cars, another environmental point. Prefer york house as i think you would get more money by selling west offices, main concern is environmental impact while terrys etc remain empty
 - Want a balance of sustainability/innovation/cost. I know this would be the goal but do not want numerous high expenditures on over the top consultancy firms to reach the goal.
 - Was difficult to order feathers in q8 without additional info. Buildings should be sustainable and energy efficient as possible
 - We have to live with results so saving on costs will not have long term benefits should try to include something innovative that draws visitors/educational visits
 - We need a sustainable building for the next 20 years,which can be run for the city's needs.it needs to be easily accessible to the public with a bus stop nearby,permanent notices for public,some car parking space needed but kept to a minimum,
 - We should use an existing building rather than build new as this is more environmentally friendly. Any work should be carried out by local builders etc as work is scarce at the moment. Simply because we have a budget of £32m doesn't mean we should spend a Whatever is built and whichever location is chosen use high quality design, materials and workmanship
 - Whichever alternative is chosen, maintenance of the building must have a higher priority than many of the aspects listed in the questionnaire. The premises must not be allowed to deteriorate as st. Leonard's has
 - While i want building to be built at best cost possible it needs to look to future as don't want to pay for another building in few years time as council has outgrown this one. Get it right first time
 - Whilst west offices is more aesthetically pleasing more concerned with longer term costs involved in maintaining existing building/offices which are not energy efficient or cheap to maintain.
 - Why have energy wasteful atriums for the few who visit - only a very small percentage do. The less you spend the better on build and maintenance. It would have been better to have this in 2 parts - 1 to keep and 1 to return!
 - Will council still be using these buildings in 30 years? What was wrong with hungate? Why is there only room for 1 person to answer on this questionnaire?
 - Within reason, the city should aspire to the best long term solution
 - Without wanting to break the bank it would be good to leave something good for coming generations. Doesn't have to be extravagant to be well designed and longer lasting. Start with some imagination
 - York deserves a 1st class sustainable building,well equipped,well designed and well staffed and maintained. A building can all be proud of and one that should be a pleasure to visit
 - York deserves new modern offices built to a high standard of efficiency in a well designed building that recognises it's importance
 - York should set an example being eco-friendly, also delivering high quality facilities.
-
- 3 disabled parking bays are not enough when you are in a wheelchair.you don't want to be driving around looking for a parking space
 - 7b - if spaces are used too flexibly then it would be impossible for the visually impaired to use

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- All notices suitable for blind and partially sighted people
- Although i am not classed as disabled would like to see more done for deaf people - (telephone is no good) written prompt replies needed
- At one place i can see no mention of disabled parking and at west offices only a couple. I driver a disabled friend around and am getting older myself and aware of my condition becoming a future disabled user and it would entail alot of walking to visit
- Current facilities are a nightmare for disabled people. The parking facilities are limited or non existant. Being told it's only up the road just shows insight council staff have into the limitations of disability. Ycc is quite helpful for disabled people
Design to include : disable access and parking and seating/wheelchair/mobility area. Play area for small children, seating for parents. Info are - leaflets/booklets; computers for web access. Bus, train and taxi info (free/direct phone access)
- Ensure that new building caters for disabled and elderly
- Feel toft green, tanners row difficult for older people to walk to as it is on rise
- Getting bus tokens was a farse this time, being disabled and having to go back and forth from one office to another was disgusting. Especially as the wife is disabled as well.
- Growth of elderly in the city is either taken care of or neglected in various areas, a focal point where views are stored in confidence should be available
- Having worked for br, how did you intend to treat disabled staff who will have problems with no lift facilities in west offices
- I saw that the yorkshire house project has opened backed steps. A lot of people including my self have difficulty with these
- I think there is a need for limited disabled car parking
- It is important that the building is accessible for all disabilities
- Its essential that disabled peoples need are taken into account right from the start and that means involving disabled people effectively
- Make access and all facilities disabled friendly
- Need more spaces for disabled driversas i can not walk far resulting in back injury, and inside needs to be disabled friendly.
- Parking for disabled persons is very important and easy access for prams, wheelchairs etc.
- Please keep in mind disabled access
- Please no steps but as long as a ramp then ok
- Privacy should be respected. Acoustics should be friendly towards the deaf/hard of hearing.
- Should have disabled parking
- Unsure how many disabled parking spaces are available at either site. There must be a fair number. How disappointing that you were not able to have this questionnaire printed in york i would vote in favour of yorkshire house
- Very good disabled access : entrance and every room in building
- We believe west offices are better of 2 options
- Whatever they settle on must consider disabled people must have easy access and easy and nearby parking, needs to have lift for disabled
- Wheel chair friendly plus disabled people easy access to all rooms
- Would be nice to have street seat near end of manor lane with shipton road so older people could have little rest while walking.
- Would prefer west offices to be chosen location for ease of access for disabled citizens and parking for people who have difficulty in travelling to local government offices

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- 7a/7b - if the council workers cannot decide/know what if required of the new building - we are all in trouble!
- 8 years ago i did a 3 month training course for the railway at west offices. It was a nice building to work in. I think your staff will be happier working at west offices rather than yorkshire house.
- A good onsite printing & postal service is always required by such a strong organisation as york council, plus a well placed taxi rank for those who require door to door service
- All areas inside the building should be functional and not built just for show. Only local business' should be used to provide services for the infrastructure and ongoing support services
- Architectural contribution does not necessarily mean high prices. Keep costs down by using "in house" designers and stylists. After all the presentation to the world is important. But is only the shell and reception area.
- As a member of staff i visited the exhibition and notice a considerable difference in the attitudes of the two presenting teams. Several hundred staff are going to work in the new building so their need and thoughts need to be considered too
- As an ex-employer of barnet council many old buildings were closed and staff relocated to a modern bus. Park. All inter-office travel was eliminated and f2f contact with other staff members was a great bonus. Ensure adequate training/conference rooms
- By centralising services it should be possible to reduce council staff by at least 20%
- Cost cutting should come from better automation of processes, self help online & promotion of self funding projects - not short remits cost reductions based on putting up cheap buildings that are eyesores & need replacing in 30 yrs like in 50s
- Council is going overboard for council employees benefit
- Council officers should be able to work efficiently no matter how old the facilities are. If they are not working efficiently now then get rid of them. I doubt if that will happen because it would mean managers managing and i have seen very few examples
Council planners and architects should be able to be creative and innovative and at same time keeping costs to as low as possible whilst providing building and facilities that are long lasting. Questionnaire very loaded
- Council should be looking to adopt flexible working to the full both as a recruitment/retention tool and as a means to maximising office space utilisation. Projects have shown it is possible to reduce space requirement by at least 30%
- Council should look efficiency and reducing staffing levels rather than creating a larger office block to accommodate increasing levels of staff
- Council should spend money on city rather than themselves. City needs improving big time. Not a new building
- Council staff must not be distracting from their duties of organising essential work during reorganisation and moving. My experience of customer service centres is that they provide a stone wall
- Cut non-core jobs (inc at senior levels) increase productivity and measure it
- Do all depts/services need to be under one roof? How many people visit council offices? Is it not easier to phone or email
- Do not spend our money on making your life easier. Spending 40m to save 5m over 30 years
- Do staff who are going to work in new building get biggest say?
- Employ less people, reduce salaries of those on £50,000+, stop spending on non-essentials
- Feel very angry that council should uproot all existing staff in yorkshire house and west side. Shows no consideration for 1000's of people in york who work there already. If council want to move find somewhere new

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Hard to believe that you don't have lawyers, architects, building services already on the payroll. Why go to outside agencies for expertise they should already have?
- Hope all different offices being brought together will have say on services they require from building i.e. Ample meeting rooms; playrooms for children's services etc
- Hopefully workers will have less sickness time in the new offices!
- Hot desking is ridiculous concept that does no one any good. Please ensure that there is enough space to accommodate all permanent members of staff comfortably they are your customers too
- I believe that it is important for the council to concentrate on providing a building which is appropriate to meet the needs of the staff working there first and foremost and money should be spent ensuring that the facilities and structure inside the building
I don't think council offices should be comparable with 'visitor' venues. I agree it should have a pleasant working environment for staff, energy efficient, environmentally friendly.
- I strongly value good working conditions. I feel if the staff are able to function effectively then customers will benefit.
- I think caution needs to be given to having officers open planned access floors as this increases noise levels
- I think consideration to comfortable office space should be considered.
- I would hope that centralisation will see the army of bureaucrats reduced accordingly
- Important that council employees have a large say in the decision
- It is outrageous and destructive of community spirit that management are these days paid so much more than workers. There must be no vip facilities or other features that reinforce this class divide in new building
- Make drastic reductions in wasteful over staffed departments and achieve real savings of millions by reducing the imagined need for empire building by poor heads of depts
- Make sure you have a good and efficient team looking after this project, all health and safety aspects should be considered. Provide facilities for the young and old groups of people
- Many employees are also residents but think their views should be taken into consideration & set of different questions be presented to them. Working in St Leonards place has never been easy. Be bold and plan for future
- Most important issue is to get an efficient and effective working environment for staff. So long as costs are sensible staff view should be central. Public opinion is not very relevant here
- New building should house a new better qualified staff
- No thought has been given for the well being of staff. There are no facilities and staff will end up eating their lunch at already crowded desks. This is unacceptable in a modern office. Thought should be given for allowing staff to get away from the building
Not enough info on proposals for staffing and plans to increase or decrease this
- Please consider closed stairs in place of open type illustrated, the provision of a staff creche. My strong preference is for the west offices site
- Please think about the workers, happy staff leads to good/excellent customer service, good facilities is imperative for all
- Productive space - productive staff. Employee focus creates time management benefits. No mention of crime reduction?
- Reduce staff levels, expenditure and taxes. You are supposed to be public servants. Get on with job of serving tax paying public and forget about building self satisfying gin palaces
- Reduce the number of staff considerably so that smaller offices are required. The council is vastly over staffed

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Reducing staff numbers will bring down long term costs and reduce the necessity for large offices
- Significant cut in number of staff is needed. This would lower design cost. 30-40% cut in staff is rational. Leaving multiple empty offices will have detrimental effect. This is not a debate but a fait-accompli. This questionnaire seems biased and leading
Spend less, thin out staff, employ less people on high salaries
- Staff are what make council not bricks and mortar
- Staff should be consulted before design starts to ensure building is fit for purpose ie: open plan offices/hot desking not appropriate due to issues of confidentiality. Car parking on site for staff that must use their cars in order to work
- Staff should be reduced drastically, money should not be wasted on new offices
- Staff working environment should be a main priority, the public will be transient visitors but council employees will experience the chosen site throughout the year. An older building may score high on the aesthetics but become a maintenance nightmare! Ha
Start cutting costs by getting rid of surplus staff, lot of paper shufflers in york council, why give them a new building?
- The council should reduce unnecessary services and reduce staff numbers
- The decision on the choice of premise must surely include the future accommodation and employment prospects of the employees of norwich union, in york and the delightful british architecture of the believed now vacated managed west offices where i had wor
The exterior of the building can be retained without change. The interior should be updated to allow staff to work in comfortable and safe conditions. Likewise the facilities for the visiting public should be light and airy with plenty of good signage, but
The fact that the council still wants to only provide 4 desks for every staff and not having specific areas for teams is very short sighted and will result in many problems and loss of productivity in the future. The provision does not allow for any expan
The functionality of the offices for officers to ensure that they can operate as efficiently as possible. Sufficient parking for enforcement officers so that they can react to complaints quickly. 24 hour or extending opening hours 24 hour call centre
- The needs of the employees also need to be considered in terms of a good office environment and staff facilities. I prefer the west offices option
- The new buildign should be minimum size required to accomodate the minimum number of people required to deliver the absolute essential services
- Think it is important to have services on one/two sites. Can only improve staff communication and therefore provide better service for customer
- This is botha customer centre and an office of 100's of members of staff. The needs of all should be considered. There must be enough room for all customers, all staff and diverse customer base the council deal with . They will not all exist in harmony.
- Try to use in house brains, or cut out expensive uneveessary consultants
- We trust the reduction of existing buildings will result in reduction of staff required. We require short stay car parking.
- When you bring together all the council offices, how many people will be made redundant
- Why did the soon to be departed chief exec front the booklet? whichever location is selected, will there be sufficient office accomodation for all the employees that is intended to work there?i must go with the west offices location as being more suitable
- Why do you have to employ outside architects with huge fees to be paid out
- Will any of two prospects put forward supply full office space for all council workers? These details need to be published, to allow the public to truely look at the "real" outcome of new offices and not only show current council ideas!

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Will there be enough space for staff or will you have to sack half of them to squeeze in, with the rest having to share a desk? Get a decent architect this time
 - Will there be job cuts? I feel this is an opportunity to bring diverse projects and charities together : not just in the same building but into a spirit of cooperation
 - Working environment for office based staff as important as public space. Most contact had in the past by phone. Covered cycle parking preferable both for staff and visitors. An office layout that promotes joined up workign between deps would be beneficia
Would like to see working environment of employees given high priority. High density, open plan office working not ideal environment. Building cheaply is false economy.
 - Would prefer to see management time spend on other issues
 - York needs its council staff to concentrate on delivery of services from their current locations rather than wasting their time and our money
-
- A flexible use of area will be crucial to ensure spaces can be used for confidential meetings as well as encouraging inter department working. I prefer the west offices plans.
 - A major feature of a new hq should be the facility for a quicker response time to public enquiries
 - Adequate and friendly staff with plenty of local knowledge
 - Aim to appoint courteous efficient staff
 - All departments should be clearly signed wth plenty of seating,maybe a creche could be provided & a café area & toilet facilities
 - Apart from a customer facing service there is absolutley no need for back office functions to be in an expensive city centre location
 - As a single occupancy/income household, i feel aggravated at the nominal services i get for my council tax. I live in an apartment, i pay for kerbside recycling but do not get it - th houses in my street do. This is discrimination - sort these issues out.
As an employee of cyc either build needs to give all services enough interview rooms for customer to be seen in and enough office space for people to work in, as not all jobs can be flexible working or sharing facilities an option
 - Buggy park/play area to avoid having to wait for lengthy period with bored children and frustrated parents.
 - Building should be easy on eye, relaxing atmosphere for customers to visit, easily accessible and major information/meeting place for customers and visitors from out of town/tourists etc
 - Building should have seperate entrance for vulberable clients e.g. Youth offenders. I would prefer west offices as its more historic, more exciting and more outside space
 - Café where you could have drink - tea, coffee at reasonable price
 - Concentrate on an innovative interior design in which the people of york feel welcomed, valued and well - served
 - Concerned that both proposals have common access/entry areas for children/youth services and adult services. This enhances wish children & young people could inadvertently come into contact with adults involved in situations affecting those children
 - Consider up in care. Look at services provided to care leavers. Joe public and care leavers may not mix well?
 - Council should concentrate on benefits for york residents and not on a swanky new office for themselves. They should use the money to reduce businesses in york city centre
 - Customer friendly telephone service. No waiting in a queue - if line busy - hear engaged signal

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Easy contact by phone to any dept
- Encourage all cyc staff meeting the public/.citizens of york to be welcoming,cheerfuland courteous.some are indifferent,seem to be disinterested/bored and scarcely even bother with eye contact
- Focus should be on providing the facilities to enable services to be delivered more cost effectively.creating new accommodation for service providers of all depts would be a criminal waste of public money
- Good to combine services but will it make the council more efficient?money also needs to be spent on staff training and systems un use, to ensure errors are not made which cost the tax payer their time and money to sort out!
- Hopefully it will provide one stop shop for people e.g. Elderly, young, to find out about services available to them
- I hope the public will be able to enquire about where to go etc within the building and have a person to help them, not a computer for accessibility i prefer yorkshire house, if this site is chosen i hope the public will be allowed to enjoy the view from
- I think the council could help the local people by promoting customers ideas that could help the council. Reduce cost/savings that can be better spent. Ie monthly competitions that customers ideas if implemented by council would result in prizes
- I think the new hq should have facilities such as conference and meeting rooms available for community use. The building nmust also be fully accessible for all community needs
- I would like to see services out of the usual 9-5pm working hours - weekends and evenings so services are accessible to the community as a whole.
- Innovation must be balanced with practicality and reliability in service
- It is nice to have large open spaces, but intimate space, providing privacy is also important.
- It would be great if the bin men would empty our green garden bin every 2 weeks as we don't want to wait a month for them to be emptied
- It would be great uf teh facilitiy was open outside of office hours occasionally for people who work.
- It would be helpful if any savings could be spent on customer service training. I dread having to ring st leonards for any reason
- Just a comment about 'customers'please remember that york citizens are those who pay for the councils expenditure.we are more than customers.the council are our public servants.could you use 'citizens' or a similar word instead please
- Keep in touch with tenants of york city council
- Low cost (as opposed to glamour) customer service is far more important than premises. Prefer west offices design but would go for lower cost option. Saving on premises will give more budget for selecting the right skills to give better service.
- More important than building is facilities it provides and how user friendly it is. Hours of opening and services specific to user groups are priority
- Move people to help with people with forms and read form, when you cannot read the form it do not help
- New building/offices should be welcoming and offer a how can we help overcome your problems/issues queries rather than put barriers up.
- Please bear in mind people who struggle to reach council office during working hours. Maybe an hour off work is feasible but parking is must. Most disabled parking in our city is not taken up leaving queues for able bodied frustrated and angry
- Reasonably priced cafe sourcing local produce, promoting local businesses. Function room - where all directorates of the council can reasonably have

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Should have friendly, approachable staff rather than the miserable people in the reception area at the moment. Buildings should reflect the historic city but with moderate costs. Some one should be sacked because of the previous fiasco.
 - The building should be as practical and functional as possible with clear signs for all facilities. The staff should have training to assist the public and tourists.
 - The concil services need a practical, efficient and welcoming building
 - The council charges on private owners are too high and we dont benefit and all we get done it our bins emptied so all the money is put into houses for layabouts
 - The most important things are services and practicality and not fanciful ideas. I think of the 2 option in this document yorkshire house is the most appropriate
 - The needs of customers should be paramount - they should not be compromised to accomodate listed/heritage buildings
 - The new location needs to be practical, service the needs of the tax payer
 - The offices are for staff but also for residents to access, make it local, friendly, informal, a place which people could access for courses which would ensure the building is used to the best of its ability
 - There should be space for information points,exhibitions and promotions relative to the people of york. I t really should be a one stop shop maybe even with a community cafe with internet access
 - Those offices are there to serve the people of york.the managers & staff should concentrate on serving the citizens to the best of their ability.the hqs should have enough space for all requirements from day 1,never mind flexibility
 - Thought should be put in to making the building user friendly both for the people who use it and for the people who work there
 - Various departments to be clearly indicated when visiting
 - Waiting space for privacy for both security and respect the customer.
 - We think the council should have a new hq, the new office should be staff, public and it friendly and be easily accessable to all, either by car or public transport. Also in favour of new purpose built building rather than renovation.
 - We want good services & facilities not 'exciting' features or state of the art
 - When finished, please don't call telephone staff "customer service representatives" it's so naff
 - You must invite public in to see you. Don't mean citizens first - i mean every weds afternoon and evening. Public do not bite!
-
- All council offices & hazel court facilities should have gone to terry's factory site when they were vacated & there would have been ample space left for other projects
 - Any reuse of existing buildings will produce a less optimal solution. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity. A new build solution is required. A revised scheme at peasholme green must be an option. Why has it been ruled out?
 - As local pct has several sites accross york whose leases are set to expire and house staff who access public transport it would make sense to have a joint initiative thus making both accessible to the public.
 - As usual is cop out by already embarrassed council. Hungate site was ideal. Design not. York hq should have been designed to have sympathy with city walls. Flowing curves & rounded corners. Something to be proud of
 - Build on land beyond rowntrees on wigginton rd

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Build out of town on one of the business parks, cheaper land and better for customer access. Stop wasting money sending leaflets
- Council could use other existin buildings eg ryedale building in piccadilly or the stonebow or the barbican centre
- Don't bother - or move to monks cross!
- Don't need new building. Plenty of existing building in york for which you can lease cost effectively
- Encourage use of technology & e-working. Back office can be located out of town. Smaller customer service points in neighbourhoods. No need for city centre hq at all
- Greenfield site, west offices, hilda parkhouse
- Has the council approached network rail about using their hq (ex jarvis building) opposite the station. This would seem a better option. Neither yorkshire house or west office convey modern go ahead city
- Have never set foot in council office. Maybe would be cheaper to move council multi functional bus or 2 that visit neighbourhoods combined with more services available online
- Have you considered terrys factory site, rowntrees factory site, debtors prison for poor preformance by finance department?
- Have you thought about using the barbican land for this project-or building a bus station there
- Hungate should still be considered. It is perfectly placed for local transport. Council was too easily dissuaded by vocal middle class minority
- Hungate was the best option - its a shame you though a box was acceptable. This is a poor second!1
- I access council services online mainly now, which could be located in cheaper out of town accomodation. City centre accomodation is expensive. A central office is really all that is needed.
- I am suprised that no other suitable sites came up for consideration. Has the evening press building in walmgate been suggested. This site would help the development of a very neglected area of our site
- I believe the new hq would be better situated on the outskirts of york which would be accessible by park and ride facilities, e.g. Monks cross
- I did find the hungate proposal fit for purpose,exciting & it seemed,fulfilling the aims of reducing co2 emissions & efficient energy use.however,since it was disregarded it would appear the yh would be better than wo
- I question whether the premise for the project is correct, why staff be located in the expensive city centre where it will also be difficult to access them.
- I think a new design on the hungate site preferable to using old buildings.
- I think the hungate location was ideal, it was just the building design that was awful.
- I think the ideal place for the new building is the ryedale building and the surrounding area in piccadilly. There is enough space there to include everything the council wants to provide plus further room for expansion.
- I would rather have a centre of town customer centre in say boots old building with back office at monks cross
- Is there not an existubg site i.e. Clifton moor, monrs cross & poppleton ind est. There are hundereds of empty offices in these locations
- It is crazy to stay in town. The council should build out of town and provide good free parking and bus transport services and do as much as possible on time. Any spare available at st james would be ok.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Knock down the ugly yorkshire house build offices above wasted space above park and ride car parks
- Move out of the city, e.g. Monks cross, don't have staff parking unless it costs more to use than a weekly travel pass. Build the bare minimum having first cut staff levels to the minimum required. Deliver value for money to council tax payers
- Move to clifton moor or monks cross in public transport or bikes. This council has cost the york tax payer millions of pounds in waste i.e. The barbican sitelost jobs in terrys fiasco
- My suggestion is the mfi site in foss islands road but it is no good filling this in as you will only do what you want to do
- Need for purpose built facilities. Combine with stadium to ensure full use of good transport and parking
- Neither of the proposed 'refurbished' options would prove to be environmentally friendly in the long term. The preferred option is of a new build which would be alot more economical in the long run
- Neither sites are suitable. Hqs should be located out to town in innovative and iconic structure. Categories for question are inappropriate should based on likelihood of visiting
- New hq should be built out of town to reduce congestion and make it easy for access
- Only customer facing personnel should be in city centre so only small office needed. Large purpose built or refurbished offices in cheap out of town location for rest of offices.two sites linked by secure dada link.original plan for hungate was a disgrace
Out of city location should be used such as available land space at park and ride site, monks cross
- Out of town site for new hq
- People are fine using the internet or a telephone to access the council stay where you are and lump it
- People who require to access services prefer them to be local. People who care for the elderly and disabled or have young children do not have time to travel to the city centre. The needs of staff to be able to do their jobs efficiently need to be consi
Rather annoyed that twingate site is now deemed too small - low management consultants were employed initially ie why not reorganise?
- Reuse empty large offices no outskirts of town and have a satellite offices in town to facilitate elderly/disabled etc. New plan is total waste of money, see how existing site used by council has decayed and is becoming a total eyesore
- Reuse/renovate existing & empty buildings within the city.reduction in superflous office staff would mean less office space required.build/create proper efficient office space not 'light airy' buildings that waste space
- Should be in a cheaper accessible location where site costs are lower.(hungate site or similar) on the inner ringroad! Saving £5m over 30 years not a significant cost reduction.a poor investment
- Should be on the oppostie side of the river for better access for older people. A necessary visit could be incorporated with shopping. All council services should be in one building and space available for expansion or new services as they arise.
- Should concentrate on ensuring proper development of existing sites such as barbican and hungate. These current developments should be satisfactorily concluded before concentrating on new council offices
- Should consider the possibilities of using the terrys site with parking and park-and-ride facilities opposite. Together with a central office for enquiries with a high-speed audio-visual link to council departments
- Should have built on hungate

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The building should be built purposely for the council from scratch instead of expensive inner-city existing building - too costly - easier access for out of town commuter - public alike. The barbican should have been considered. Sugar beet site possibly?
The city's roads are very congested. Lendal bridge being a particular bottleneck. Would an out of city site be more appropriate?
- The council offices do not need to be in the town centre, it would cost much less to house them out of town. Only customer facing services need to be in the town centre.
- The council should move out of the city, land is cheaper and sell all the existing offices, james street would be a very good area as it is close to the city and other council departments are already there
- The new building should be on a brown field site with ample car parking facilities & access, such as the teardrop, monks cross. I totally disagree with the use of existing building yh or wo
- The offices should not be located in the city centre creating congestion and pollution with staff and people travelling into York. They should be located on the outer ring road next to a park and ride
- The previous vickers instruments site would make a lot better site than city centre.
- There are a lot of large unused offices in Rougier street and new build in the centre of town will be hard to get to. There is also a lot of space at Clifton Moor
- There are plenty of buildings within the city that are not used and derelict that should be considered instead of wasting money on new buildings that won't be of further benefit to the normal person, it's not really a concern having a new building
- There are several empty offices the council could move into at a cost less than £10m. Where does the £43m come from?
- There are sufficient unused buildings which can be used without creating new ones. Very few council offices get visitors as most things are dealt with remotely
- There is no need to have an expensive city site - move out to Clifton Moore, which is an easily accessible site by bus and when people go shopping. Having a city site leads to congestion and expense for those using cars.
- These proposed sites will not adequately house all the council services. I feel a better option would have been to build outside the city centre so relieving congestion as employees try to get to work.
- This option is not necessary. The objectives can be achieved more economically in a ring road location. Modern communications make these expensive 'palaces' non-viable as proven by Aviva's decision to vacate
- This proposal to site the new HQ in the town centre will add to the traffic problem. The new HQ should be easy to access with adequate parking for staff and visitors i.e. The Barbican centre area where there is enough room for all departments
- Use small present offices for public access, move all non-front of house staff to out of town site, move all admin to India or other low cost office service. Contract out as much as possible to reduce pension bill
- Very few people have to visit the HQ so why does it have to be in the centre? If it has to be then it should be good to look at
- Very sad at demise of Hungate site which seemed ideal. Currently favour west offices as makes bold architectural statement
- We feel that one of the best solutions would be to use Georgian buildings opposite to Theatre Royal, maintaining and refurbishing them thereby preserving them as part of York's heritage
- What happened to Hungate? Why was this decision reversed in favour of one of these new locations? Why is the Peasholme Centre still being relocated at a huge cost to taxpayers

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- What happened to the hungate site - it was the council offices?
- What happened to the hungate site, which was purposed for these offices. How much money has been wasted on this site already
- What happened to the hungate site? Can all these costs really be feasibly accommodated?
- What happened to the proposed move to hungate that the council so wanted to happen?
- What is wrong with out of town office space and an enquiry office in the town centre. How can you justify spending vast amounts of money on offices in current climate.
- What is wrong with the ex rowntree site on flaxby rd? Easy access, room for car parking
- What is wrong with the exhibition building?
- Whats wrong with the existing barbican site as a hq/leisure facility?
- Why build a new building when terrys old factory is empty, this could accomodate everything even to maintenance side of the council, parking for all council vehicles, just need a regular bus service
- Why build somewhere not when you already have an empty building-a beautiful building at that!! Surely that is the main point of renewable sourcing & recycling-use what you've already got
- Why can't the council relocate to an out of town building.cheaper costs than being in town. Plus you would be able to park outside, a big benefit when you are disabled
- Why did you not chose immediately available grade a1 energy rated buildings at hearth green. Adjoining site provides maximum flexibility and would develop section of town including link road to layerthorpe.
- Why did you not look at: terrys, nestle, clifton hos.?
- Why do the council need to be in town?you only need front of office staff to meet the public.there are cheaper sites out of york.what is technology for?people can even work at home!more innovative thinking needed
- Why do they have to be in the city centre? Monks cross has excellent p & r facilities
- Why do we need city centre location ? Sell existing buildings and build near monks cross ?
- Why in the city? Why not new build on the out skirts of town with parking?
- Why is hungate not option 3 in this consultation?
- Why needed in city centre at all? Has former civil service sports areas or similar been taken? Equally maybe others accessible areas outer ring road superstores available
- Why not have a bus station on one of the sites? How about council run buses?
- Why not move out of town ? Eg. Monks cross, frequent bus services. No one will walk
- Why not move out of town? Much cheaper. Improve public transport services and there's no reason why you can not be located at monks cross, clifton moor or elsewhere
- Why not refurbish existing offcies
- Why not refurbish existing premises!
- Why not use rowntree offices or some other site outside city centre to avoid additional traffic coming into city centre. After all it is only place of work. York has plenty of fine buildings without creating more costs
- Why not use the nestle haxby rd building
- Why not utilise the old terrys or better still the redundant rountree/nestle site
- Why the obsessions with the city centre? Why not include redundant buildings at terrys and rowntrees in the options at iw ould think far lower costs. There seems to be a determination to spend as much as possible on "exciting architectural contribution"
- Work at 37 monkgate for pct. Would be cost effective to share building so how about looking at sharing with other businesses. We have to move out soon and need building.
- You should be looking for empty premises. Adapt them to suit. How hard is that? Have computer and adapt like most of us - cut out spending on luxury

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- You should have purchased terrys factory bishopthorpe rd. Cut cost by using a prefabricated building
- Building work should be carried out cost effectively but not so that the standard of workmanship results in high maintenance and poor sustainability common sense should prevail
- Buy cheap, buy twice!
- Cheap building id false economy, however, council offices need to be functional rather than aesthetic
- Cheap does not mean efficient. Do it properly first time around. Like both, if pushed like history attached to west offices. Ensure enough office space for workers privacy. Nowhere has this been mentioned.
- Cheapest quotes not always best value as quality is not good. Good workmanship is important as building will represent how people who use it perceive york
- Cheapness leads to shoffyness. Good architecture depends on sensitive use of spaces internally to express pleasure and function.
- Consider savings but not at expense of durability. Happy medium - exciting architecturally but not without economy
- Don't do it cheaply - civic pride but no an outrageously modern design!
- Dont cut costs by using cheaper materials, it will cost more in the long run. Our building is 7 years old and leaks when it rains heavily.
- Don't skimp on landscaping quality - it's the view from the outisde and the attractiveness of the immediate environment that most locals and visitors will see most of the time
- False economy: cheap and nasty buildings we have more than enough of - and these kinds of buildings are 100 percent against any spirits of sustainability, both regarding the environment and economy (in the long run). York is blessed with some beautiful ex Gerrys buildings will never succeed. See bradford in west yorkshire for example!! Words cheap and/or inexpensive are often confused. How long have yorks walls stood?!
- Good quality lasts longer. Making it cost effective in long run
- I agree that corners should not be cut, at the same time there must be a strict control of budgets throughout the project
- I think it is important that the council does not scrimp and save, therefore a high standard using modern and future proof designs and technologies should be used. If it is not done correctly in the first place, future alterations will need to be made w
If the build is approached too cheaply the building will stand in the future as a disappointment of york.
- If the problem is approached with too much emphasis on economy we're likely to get buildings which rapidly become quite inappropriate to our city
- Investment now means saving in the long-term, which need to be communicated postively and effectively to show good value for money to all
- It is better to build accommodation that will last for many years rather than cutting costs to the bone. However it is vital that wastage is kept to a minimum, something the council is not very good at achieving.
- It will have added value if built to a good spec, but efforts must be made to manage the project well to keep costs down
- It would be a false economy to do it on the cheap. A quality building would not only last but would be maintenance free for many years. So saving money in the long run

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Low initial cost often leads to more costs later, please get things right at the start
 - My suggestion is to use the best quality materials in construction to save money over the next 30 years. Otherwise cheap building will be a concrete eyesore with many years ahead of more expense to repair the buildings.
 - Need to achieve a balance between cost, efficiency and style
 - Please don't make false saving which will make use of building inefficient in future years but don't build expensive white elephant. Like west offices accessibility for disabled people but think residents would welcome more to well known yorkshire house
 - Q9. the lowest cost isn't always the most cost effective long term. could be poor quality etc & therefore require more to be spent on maintenance/upkeep
 - Q9. why is 'lower cost' inferring a short lasting facility? cannot 'value for money' also enable long lasting facilities? q10. again, the lower cost, the less 'exciting' the architecture: is that so? who is the judge of 'exciting architecture'?
 - Sensible budgeting is one thing, but over-skipping is a false economy. Spend our money wisely, we all have to live around the buildings you propose to develop so think beauty!
 - The cost should be as low as possible but not so low that it is detrimental to the build/quality. It should be efficiently managed and finished within the timescale set. What will happen to the existing council buildings?
 - The council must keep costs down, but must also have a hq that will last and that is in keeping with the exciting architecture of york city
 - The council should do a great job in order to deliver a service that will last for decades even if that means a higher initial cost. A quality product will last.
 - The council should invest in a move that should last for many years so cost should be considered but not the cheapest. Once the budget is defined, do not overspend when work is underway.
 - The council should not go for the cheapest option which will probably not turn out to be the most economical option in the longer term
 - To build at the cheapest is a false economy. Tenants choice was done very cheaply and over the last 10 years all the fittings have failed and had to be replaced with more expensive ones
 - Would it not be wiser to put a bit extra money in & making a good job in the beginning, than spending more when repairs etc need doing in the future? I find that material & labour go up yearly
 - York has long history of trying to do things on cheap & putting forward proposals that look good on paper but either never materialise or finish up as cheapskate version.
-
- After recent job cuts at norwich union i believe the council shouldnt encourage them to move out of york by taking over their central offices
 - Any new job created if and when the new building is finished should be given to local people. If possible west offices would be my choice of location as it is more aesthetically pleasing and blends in with york in general
 - Are norwich union committed to having an ongoing major presence in york or is this a medium term plan to vacate york quietly to avoid the fallout?
 - As yorkshire house is current norwich union/aviva building should you not be encouraging such major employee to remain in city instead of seeming to encourage them to relocate out of city?
 - Aviva appear to have a vested interest in yorkshire house - what happens to all their (norwich union) staff who currently work there??

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Concerns over aviva's plans for employment in city given yorkshire house proposal. Is west offices currently occupied
- Do not use aviva scheme. They have done nothing but cut jobs in york over last few years. We should not be paying our taxes to a company who do not preserve jobs in difficult time. Better to use west offices
- Dont think aviva should benefit as they have let york down
- Have not heard that yh is a candidate for new council offices, where will aviva staff be going?
- I am surprised at avivas proposal. Does this mean a continuing decline in jobs and commitment of aviva/naraich union to york?
- I think the council should use local companies and tradespeople to cary out this work,keeping jobs in the york area.york has a long heritage and the new site should reflect this as well as being a sustainable modern ethos and future.i prefer west offices
- I think the people employed building the new headquarters should be local and copy the idea of the london olympic site, where you need to live at a local postcode to work on the site.
- I work in yorkshire house & although aviva have mentioned moving been given no definite indication what will happen to staff. To then receive this questionnaire is utter disgrace. Should have considered hundreds of people who work in these buildings
- I would like to see local trademen & women involved with the project.also rather than wasting money on this project by employing lavish architects,more focus should be placed with using local innovation
- If possible the contractor used should be from york , with a contract clause that 80% of the workforce used should be long term york residents . This would result in the monies paid to the contractor by the council, then on to the worker as wages , being
- It is important to ensure that construction of this building utilised a local workforce to keep unemployment in city down
- Its all well but council tax gone up and i commute to newcastle to work as cannot find job in york. Plenty of attractions for tourists but nothing for locals
- Local skills & businesses should be used
- Maybe you could get these questionnaires printed in york! And what a waste of money to provide this information in other languages
- Partnership with aviva would prevent a public disappearance since they are providing job opportunities in york, proposed saving hardly washes the projects face. The toft green site is better but look at the east savings
- Re;yh proposal:nu's employment policies have done a great deal of harm to the local economy in recent years & still do so,so it would be disappointing to see 'aviva' benefit from this scheme
- Redevelop west offices using local tradesman into an energy efficient and user friendly hq
- The work should be given to local people instead of bringing in outside contractors
- Use local materials where possible; but services and expertise could be sourced elsewhere at better cost and vfm without harming environment! Use wind generator - compact design
- Use of locally sourced materials - this should be put out to tender countrywide. Local may be far more expensive. How would you know if you dont ask? My choice would be yorkshire house
- Using local tradesmen and companies to new premises is a must to help local economy
- Using west offices would mean existing tenants having to find somewhere else - and small central business units are vital for city's prosperity. For that reason alone west offices should be ruled out - yorkshire house would be excellent

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Very important that local york suppliers and skilled tradesmen are used at all times. Maximum use of our local workforce is vital. Rate paying york citizens should benefit directly from this type of project.
 - What guarantees have council requested from aviva that the jobs of current occupants of yorkshire house will remain in york?
 - What will happen to staff at yorkshire house, will their jobs be safe. Very important to safeguard local jobs
 - Will aviva move more work from york if they have to move from rougier street?
 - Will this project give employment to many jobless locally?
 - Will we be able to buy more room if poss. Don't buy avivas it will give them an excuse to make staff out of work
 - Yorkshire house is currently occupied by aviva staff, by taking over thsi building you are displacing staff to another location and giving to reduce head count from york or displace staf fto monks cross. Which this council have made a nightmare to get to!
-
- Are options an efficient use of valuable space ?
 - Are there commercially viable uses of existing buildings? If not,the move should not be made. In a world of electronic communication, is a high cost customer service centre really required?
 - At last the council are looking at buildings that already exist and have already been used as offices so will need the minimum of funding spent on them. The offices need to be easily accessible to staff as well as users.
 - Both building are already there - so costs should be for refurbishment only. The building needs to be servicable, comfortable and easy to keep clean, all these other things cost money. Promotion, i.e. Advertising should nto be necessary
 - Both proposed sites are now in existence and unless the new additions are offensive to the existing structures, i cant see why the costs of everything shouldnt be given priority. The architects should be responsible for the perfect blending of old and new
Due to close proximity of 2 sites is there any other nearby buildings that may be purchased in future to allow for expansion of council offices if required
 - Far better to use and renovate an old existing building
 - I applaud the use of existing buildings that are,in one case,vastly superior to any that could be dreamed up by a 'modern' architect eager for self expression
 - I feel re-use of a site would serve dual purpose of tidying an unused, unsightly area.
 - If existing buildings can be modified and used effectively for new headquarters this has to be better option to a new build project
 - If you can sell the st leonards site for just 1 million it beggars belief what you will pay for the new hq. I would estimate the price of st leonards as £20,000 000 minimum
 - Information missing makes replies spurious e.g. If the west offices are chosen what happens to yorkshire house? (&vice versa) q.8 impossible to complete logically
 - It is good that the council intend to use an existing building which might otherwise be empty, more of this should be done rather than building from scratch. It is important to make facilities which will last for the long term .
 - Its about time the acomb office was closed to continue services to the public and save money
 - New building should not be built. Old ones should be used and money raised through selling what you have should be used specifically for this project instead of wasting it.
 - No mentions of st leonards place?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- No option given to continue the use of existing facilities which would be my preferred option therefore this survey is disingenuous as it does not allow for meaningful input
- No real cost of disposing of existing property shown. Council in red how can they afford this
- Nothing wrong with what we have! Why waste more of our money, its a recession why spend when there is no need to, telephone call centre would suffice. Always finding a way to spend more of our money!!!
- Nothing wrong with current building, its wrong to spend so much money on something we allready have
- Nothing wrong with offices we've got now. Spend money on doing up roads & footpaths which are disgrace
- One building is more modern, the other has more character, each attractive in their own way, why change them
- Options to utilise existing buildings should have been strongly considered, rather than the time and money wasted on the proposed hungate development, given the fact that council tax continues to rise year after year and services reduce
- Please use what is there where you can
- Pleased that old existing buildings will be used. I would have liked to have been able to keep this booklet with the information about the project, but cant as i have to send it back with questionnaire
- Pleased to hear of use of existing building and local experts being employed.
- Pleased to see we will reuse existing buildings rather than build new
- Re use of existing space without the expense of an architectural albatros. Care in cost for initial build and future use needed to be taken to ensure value for money is achieved, particularly in todays economical climate
- Refurbish & rebuild barbican centre and use for hq - it's doing nothing else!
- Regeneration of an existing building in an imaginative energy and cost efficient way would set a good example and show the council well in future efficiency ratings
- Renovate existing building to last long term instead of building short term white elephants
- Restoring a graded building must be preferable to adapting one with no architectural interest and probably not a long life expectancy
- Retention of historic building & also up to date technology to satisfy 'green' issues, cost & efficiency for staff and their customers.
- Reuse and sensitive extension of west offices would ensure the future of this image of the council as respecting the heritage whilst recognising its sustainability obligations. Yorkshire is little more than a poor quality 60s cast off not benefiting a hq
- Re-use of historic buildings essential in a historic city. Also very green.
- Re-using and modifying existing building within the city is a good idea but need to ensure that any "innovation" or "landmark" architectural development does not rapidly deteriorate or become an eyesore
- Sensible to use an existing building, albeit with alterations done for the specific use intended. West offices would be ideal in every way. Vital that no more council tax money is wasted as with hungate
- Should use existing buildings in city. No new build
- Shouldnt have to build, there are sufficient buildings in the city that only need cosmetic updating, although fuel, lighting should be green, west offices would be the better choice
- St leonards place building should be cleared. Nothing to do with this project be one of yorks finest buildings is a disgrace
- Stonebow should be pulled down they are a eyesore spolis the city

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Stop destroying heritage, restore old buildings with quality work and you wont need to be spending over money on cheap relocating all the time, you have many sad examples, barbican etc
- Surely there will be massive returns on the building in st leonards place? Are these thrown in your figures or do they relate only to savings?
- The barkcain site ??
- The building already exists. Important it is desinged correctly from the start
- The most important point in york is reuse of existing buildings where possible in all cases. The most critical thing is that modern alterations are sympathetic e.g. The city screen cinema
- The old offices should be sold to offset price of the new building
- These 2 buildings are already existing and both reasonably pleasant looking, exterior alterations should not be greatly required
- They are both offices now so no need to change them except for a bit of paint
- Use of existing buildings is sensible and should save financial costs but york needs a half decent hq so some high quality refurbishment should produce buildings with relatively economical initial outlay and low cost in use
- Use of existing buildings should save on new build costs which always increase as the project progresses and save wasting £4 million as with hungate
- Using existing buildings and modifying them should be a priority, not building new structures. I hope the council can see how angry people are about the percieved waste of resources and money put in to the hungate development and are much more aware of c Using existing buildings is good but you should also use existing carpets/furniture etc etc. Against spending 1p of taxpayers money unless essential. Why spend 12p per taxpayer on this leaflet you could have photocopied it much cheaper
- Using existing buildings should keep costs down in itself. internal dept divisions should be functional & simple. the building exteriors are their architectional contributions
- Utilise a building that is already there providing the interior changes are not too extensive
- Very happy to see the use of existing buildings rather than building new ones
- We support refurbishment of an existing central site over new build. Both proposed sites are central, accessible and appear suitable
- What are the alternative uses for the buildings if the council doesnt use them? What is meant by "the developing cultural quater of the city"?
- What exactly is wrong with the existing sites other than slight inconvienece for a few council workers? £5 million over 30 years does not represent good value.
- What is going to happen to the buildings that the council will be vacating? Will these be sold abd if so, where will these funds go?
- What is going to happen to the existing council buildings ?
- What is to happen to the building which the council is at present occupying?
- What is wrong with old buildings and what will you be doing with them? Some are listed
- What is wrong with the new offices, that seem to be very hard to rent out, on the old gas works site. consultants should be avoided at all costs, the council should use their own expertise
- What will happen to current council buildings? York citizens should have a say in how they will be used/passed on/sold. Measure should also be implemented to ensure sustainability and cost-effectiveness are maintained. Consider maximum efficiency of build
- What will happen to the current buildings?
- What will happen to the old buildings? Sell?

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Who occupies the two proposed buildings now? Why are they moving? Which one becomes available soonest? Does the council have to pay to get occupants out? If so, which is cheapest?
 - Will aviva still own yorkshire house & rent to council if aviva is proposing to refurbish & extend it. Economy of costs should not detract from architectural standard.
 - Will existing offices be sold to reduce costs or rented
-
- Against renting any site - york to own its own hq
 - Assume york council will not be able to own their own hq, what level of rent would be required and how will this compare to the cost of buying west offices? Do you believe in global warming? The statistics are corrupt. Hope you mean £5m saving per year!
 - If the aviva scheme is only renting the building this seems pointless at least the wo would be owned by the council.the wo are in keeping with yorks buildings.the aviva building is a typical ugly 60s building
 - Information doesnt specify if the council would own yorkshire house or not, how long would the lease be? What is the point in building a hq which wont last and is clearly not sustainable? Where are the questions about which building is preferable?
 - Its in the interests of york residents for the council to own outright its own premises and not to rent office space on a commercial basis. In the current economic condition developers are desperate to obtain tenants for their office space
 - Not clear whether buildings currently will be rented or bought. Why cant we have questionnaires for each member of our household?
 - Prefer a freehold option. The west offices seem to present a better looking and better situated opportunity
 - Proposal for yorkshire house does not say if building is to be purchased by council or rented
 - Refurbish a site that the council already owns, saving £32 million. Yorkshire house is going to be another green house look building with all the windows that will have to be kept clean costing more money.
 - Someone should be brought to task for selling existing quarters before new ones are found and then renting back the offices - this just wouldn't happen in private sector
 - The building should be owned by york. Our preference would be for west offices and are suprised that you have not given residents a choice. The design of the hungate site was so wrong, but i think a more appropriate design would have been more effective
 - The building should belong to york, no more stonebow houses, i would go with west offices
 - What are leasing costs? Why are we not building our own facility with extra room to lease out to other service providers - thus generating income
 - Wish for totally new building to build on corporation owned land
 - 2 issues have been mixed up here ; innovation (7a) and sustainability (8) - all involving cost (10). Sustainability is much more important so worth investing in. Innovation is secondary - good but not worth large expenditure
-
- All aspects should be considered and not go in to projects that are not viable as has been the case over the last few years i.e. Hungate, the barbican etc.
 - All new additions/alterations should be sympathetic to the original structure but also innovative not bland

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Although cyc is not yet ready to consider a choice of sit it ought from an early stage consider the unique opportunity to build its hq at west offices to demonstrate its link with the former use of this site.
- Any other than a lib-dem council (pref. Cons) would have got it right first time!
- As we are a hard working couple in our 50's living in our own house, paying tax etc we have very little contact with the council & its services, so do not feel connected to this project in any way!
- Avoid criticism/bad press by investing in unsightly art works or sculptures
- Both sites are totally unsuitable. Build new sports stadium for people of york and utilise new building for your hq. It is so easy!! People of york deserve one, look at the kc stadium hull
- Bring back the barbican pool
- Building in rougier street fire risk due to number of floors, non use of lifts building could not be evacuated anywhere near quickly enough. Potentially very dangerous. Prefer west offices.
- Building such as this is real opportunity to create greater cohesion in city and to help all residents to work together on achieving safer, healthier city.
- Buildings such as yorkshire house should not be encouraged in york. In common with rydale house (piccadilly) and the stonebow, it's too large and a blot on the city+ap2scape. Ideally such buildings should be taken down. Council should utilise west offices
Buy back barbican and restore swimming pool and base offices there
- Choice between low cost or longer lasting - why not have both. Will council own yorkshire house or will they be at mercy of rising rents. Think west offices is forgone conclusion
- Combining the new sports arena with offices built in for the council to use monday - friday. This will provide parking for the council staff or sports supporters. Remove traffic from city, the cost being shared by council, yafc and yc knights
- Complete work as quickly as possible. Try to estimate the number of people likely to work there over a period. Have as many windows as possible
- Concerned about future of building you don't use. If you use yorkshire house will west offices be preserved and utilised sensitively.
- Consider income generation from hiring out rooms to third parties and some retail. Working with the visitor info centre, get a cash point and other useful services. Bus timetables etc
- Consider the names, have a competition. York civic centre & council offices. York guild hall & council chambers some such gives an uplift to function. Customer centre suggest an out of town shed
- Council offices should be utilitarian with basic function as a priority. The offices should not be a monument to local council 'barons'
- Council should balance expense with long term strategy so if local suppliers more expensive then those further afield should be used. Council should be setting example for energy efficiency. Prefer west officers as option.
- Council should get refund on design fees for building that couldn't be built due to its design
- Cyc should look to make income out of the new building, for instance, hiring out rooms at weekends and evenings.
- Decide what functions the council will need to provide, look to house customer services in centre, monks cross etc location for most staff left. Do you wonder why other orgs leave the city centre?
- Do away with the proposed massive open space from ground to roof.fill accross with floors to maximise use and it will be easier to maintain.less wasteful of energy
- Do not agree with change of entrance for vehicles, it suited norwich union for some time - plus the flow of traffic on station road is fine

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Don't understand need for rooftop extension - is this for benefit of staff only? Will development further restrict already crowded bus pick up area? Where will people coming by car park?
- Don't balls it all up again
- Don't think two sites are good idea. You should look for one site to accommodate all of council requirements
- Drainage modernised
- Early conclusion please
- Effectiveness and efficiency of council is far more important than flagship building. Way you have gone about this process proves that is where problem lies. New packaging same rotten product
- Ensure council officials are not on pay offs by contractors. As has been case in past
- Existing building/s look ok and need to be adapted internally for needs of staff and residents
- Extremely concerned about how the most important railway remains within the west offices site can be conserved & retained within the proposed development
- Fashions even in buildings change, the ones that are chosen need to fit well with good previous designs but need to be aware of 'here today gone tomorrow' 'experts'
- Feel used buildings of good sound construction should be used if possible i.e. Yorkshire house which is not old and well built. West offices i know nothing about but looks to have plenty of space
- Get it right this time. Don't spend a further penny on public transport most if not all existing services are good enough and near enough for most of us. I really like the west office option, a historic building put to great use.
- Get it right this time. Involve all political parties in the solution. Labour seem disconnected by their current leaders position in the press
- Get on with it
- Given flood risks around york reducing surface water discharge must be priority. What about legislation to ensure all new builds in york area use rainwater for wcs?
- Go the whole way, let york lead the way for other councils. Do not let directorate individuals argue against one location, this is the right thing to do. Make it stand out as a quality mark for the city and as stated look at long term payback
- Good design should provide a cost efficient solution that is economical to build and subsequently yo operate the two are not opposing requirements.the provision of visually appealing but insufficient spaces should be avoided.
- Good sense and responsibility can go hand in hand with promoting interesting architectural and sustainable ideas. It is not a question of cheapness versus promotion as in q10 necessarily
- Great achievement if the old york railway station was refurbished, perhaps a paying exhibition could be intergrated to generate revenue for york
- Green roof? Outside performance area etc. As much green living matter outside as possible with seating. Café areas perhaps provided by local charity/charities. Lots of boards showing work from local schools, etc
- Has the idea of a joint venture to bring a stadium/offices/event centre/council offices been dropped?
- Have very little need to contact council other than for information which should be available without visiting council hqs. Would suggest that areas for visitors to congregate such as gardens are limited to discourage misuse
- Having an extra 'green area' & promote access to a beautiful,hidden building (west offices) would be a plus!

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Having only moved to York within the last years I tend to feel there has been little vision for the future. York needs on historical council building with technology built in. It needs to enhance the environment but still be cost effective
- Having seen the ambitions the council hopes to achieve in the new HQ in terms of ways of working, I think there will be a massive job in education staff to stop using paper etc in the way they currently do
- Having worked in the West Offices I consider them totally unsuitable for use by City of York Council. They would be better developed as an extension to the Railway Museum.
- Having worked in West Offices for number of years I am surprised that anything attractive could be made of the interior
- Having worked in West Offices they are cold and dark in the winter and should not be considered at all
- Hopefully the Hungate will never disgrace our city - how could it have even been contemplated
- How long has the current buildings been used? The Yorkshire building will probably be dated in 10 years time - the West Offices are classical design and more likely to be so in the future as long as the inside is not ruined!
- How many York citizens visit council offices? Offices should be functional rather than state of art
- How much of the current internal structure within West Offices will have to remain. I.e. Is it protected? It is a bit of a rabbit warren
- Huge self indulgence
- Hungate should never have been considered when you have good strong building just waiting to be used so use them not some flash place that like rest of Stonebow wants demolishing not in keeping with York
- Hungate was a missed opportunity that English Heritage should take a lot of responsibility for.
- I believe in order to encourage creativity, innovation and communication within the council it will be essential to have an area where staff from different departments can meet to exchange ideas, chat over lunch and talk to people they may otherwise have
- I don't think it matters which location it is on.
- I don't visit the council offices, I have not done so in the past ten years. I use the council website and email when necessary. It seems to me that this will be the pattern for more and more people in the future. Prefer something more modest.
- I handled papers for abandoned scheme 60 years ago for site at Castle Museum - now foundations under car park! Have watched with disgust waste at Hungate and now await another fiasco
- I have been waiting 7 years for this area to be upgraded as part of the teardrop dev. when is your planning dept going to get on with this project. I think the £43m would be better spent on this area which is an eyesore & really lets York down
- I have lived in York 44 years & only once had occasion to visit council offices
- I have lived in York for 20 years and have never had cause to visit the council offices. How busy do the current offices get?
- I have mentioned the City of York Archives, surely one of the most important in England. Have any plans yet been made to house them initially, keeping them where they belong in the city centre
- I have never had need to visit any of the council offices in the past. To be honest I'm not entirely sure where they are
- I have no knowledge of building so I'll leave it to people who have

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I have personal experience of yorkshire house (i was the office manager many years ago)and feel the design of the existing structure with all the services in the central core could limit the way in which it is redeveloped for council use. Does it not also
I have very little cause to visit the council offices - my only visit has been to renew the bus pass - next visit 2013
- I have worked in west offices 35 years still do, what happens to me and others same, is it scrap heap for me at 54 or are city of york going to find me job. Very worried. York resident and tax payer all my life
- I hope you have fully explored what and how the council will be providing services in the future and that these building meet those requirements
- I presume the council will give themselves planning permission and will take 3 months over it not like the ones we put in which often take over a year!!!
- I strongly disagree with the wording used in statements 9 and 10. The building should be cost effective and believe it or not well built. Is this impossible in this day and age?
- I think it is important to have an efficient hq although i may not personally need to use it. I think it is important to incest in viable economic structural solutions that contribute to the efficient running costs of the blog.
- I think the timescale for moving in to the new building is inefficient and the process could surely be condensed, using critical path analysis software.
- I worked in west offices for 20 years - it was, and still is a dump - too many steps and staircases, impossible to make wheelchair friendly. For both options double height space is wasted space - we cannot afford it!
- I worked in west offices for a number of years, the only drawback i can see is there was no lift, unless one has been added since i left! It only has three floors compared to st leonards 5! It seems the ideal location away from traffic.
- I would like to see these buildings remain as they are. There are already too many monstrosity buildings been built in our lovely city. It is being ruined! West offices seem ideal to me.
- Ideally if building could be found that would suit council needs this would be better than building new building and would be much more cost effective
- If both building are of equal merit the one which provides the most efficient and agreeable working conditions for the council staff should be chosen. Reusing yorks historic railway premises seems a worthwhile idea
- If civic building it should be place for public to use not just council offices but something that is available for community to use. Most used service should be library which may be part of scheme
- If decent building is produced then you have to disagree with q10. Only build long lasting building if it looks good and will not date - norwich union building is great, hotel in same street is grim!!
- If people are going to visit york they will not be doing it to look at the new council bulding, they will look at the minster and the town walls etc. It doesnt have to be existing architecturally it just needs to fit in. Yorkshire house idea looks best
- If the hq building is to last 30 years i dont think exciting is a safe word to use as it is likely to date after the fisrt few years.it should be elegant,dignified and in good taste.
- If the listed building is selected,please ensure that the listings department does not prevent the building from being brought up to date
- If the tender system changed the end product should not be affected. All too often companies rip off public sector by over charging

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- If we try to promote too many criteria council will end up spending more money on wrong things. Lets just have good working offices that are relevant and leave saving the whale to others
- If you are building shiny new offices for yourself you should also prove how you are trying to accommodate those across the city who haven't even got a home never mind a fancy office
- If you continue building more houses people will move into them leaving older ones for more and more immigrants to move into
- If you were competent at your job you wouldnt be asking these stupid questions
- In a strong economic climate i would propose building to last a century but at present the aim should be to make the project economically viable over a planned period. Nothing lasts forever, plan for 30-50 years
- In addition to q6, alot of useful information can be obtained from british civil defence in lincolnshire. Tel 01205 280144. The director general is patrick stanton mc
- Innovative design is not essential and sometimes prove inpracticle. The building should be light, clean and airy for employees/clients, however costs should be the priority in this economic downturn and for the future. The building should meet its purpose
Is all the council offices cast space needed ? I think not !
- Is there not possibility of present buildings being given a facelift - it is in very convenient position.
- It is not necessary for the administration and customer services to be on the same site. Admin should be low cost and out of town site. A smaller customer services in the centre is lower cost and sufficient
- It would be interesting to know what p/c of the number of york citizens actually visit the existing premises. Would have been helpful information with this form?
- It would be useful to have exhibition space within the building to bring in locals who don't use the facilities on a regular basis. It could be woven in with a space for highlighting artwork from local and or up and coming artists particularly sculpture.
- It would be useful to know-1)how the square footage of office space in each new building compares with that now used by staff, how staff vehicle parking will be organised.how annual saving has been calculated.a payback of £170,000 per annum seems small
- It would inspire more confidence if this leaflet told us how much had been spent/cost on hungate site. Will savings of £5m over 30 years take this into account? Much prefer station site, i.e. West offices
- Its fairly easy to compare start up costs and real terms running costs.
- Its just an office. Why try to big yourselves up. Get over it
- Its not going to be a 'white elephant' like the barbican fiasco is it?
- July 2009 - autumn 2012 - 3 years does this really take 3 years. I suppose may need new desks, filing cabinets. Lets keep down costs and use what you have. West offices is more in keeping with york and its buildings
- Just get it done stop pussyfooting around
- Just get on with it
- Just get on with it. Either build a building on a hungate and tell english heritage to "get real" or conver west offices. Dont forget to locate queen victoria's bedroom in there
- Just get on with it. Stop wasting even more money on things like this. You are elected or paid to make these decisions so just get on with it. Remember that it is our money so spend it wisely
- Just make up your minds and get on with it
- Just to add i would like too see the proposed new stadium stopped and re-located to the perfectly adequate monks cross site, not incorporated in any new council hq's

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Keep it simple
- Let us hope lessons have been learned from the hungate fiasco
- Let's not forget the rule of gardeners. we do not plant trees for our benefit but for the future. let our children & theirs know we had them in mind when building something we will be proud of. a show piece in yorkshire
- Let's not have a repeat balls-up as we had with the previous accommodation proposal please, or we might as well just flush another million pounds down the drain for the hell of it. Certainly not an efficient use of tax payers' money to date!
- Location means not a flagship tourist site/not eyesore to york centre. Cost therefore very important. Doesn't have to be state of art to fulfil its function
- Look at the barbican centre, that says it all
- Look to the new university building and the york walls for inspiration
- Lots of trees, shrubs and flowers
- Make building both functional and aesthetically exciting
- Make sure new building lasts longer than the barbican fiasco
- Make sure the council has no input as when anything goes they will not take responsibility. this is a proven fact of the lib dems council
- Makes sense to make 1 council building. Cannot afford to create exciting architectural contributions to city it is using our money. Get on with it don't waste any more money
- Maximise paved and green space, links with rail station and improved bus interchange, teardrop development, cultural city centre
- More time wasted - what happened to hungate! This local govt is a joke, just get the job done and stop wasting our time and money! What about barbican? Need i say more? A bunch of egotistical, mad, self centred fat cats who deserve only contempt!
- Most likely to contact council through email/internet - access web page - or by telephone. However who knows what changes will occur in my life that may require me to use council offices
- Most services can be accessed over the internet. Significantly reduce the numbers of staff and you will need a smaller building. Therefore save more resources and significant cost.
- Move forward to building that has some style - depts in 1 building - at moment all over place - not suitable for city like york. West offices is bar far most attractive and suitable site
- Much of the new building over recent decades has been mediocre or worse. Decide how to cut your costs and improve efficiencies first.
- Need to consider what is likely to happen to yorkshire house if council does not move in - will it become derelict? Need to consider impact on road traffic in immediate area and possibility for people to park nearby
- Needs to be practical, accessible, flexible, informing and welcoming
- Never mind plush offices for yourselves - we want out barbican back
- Never visited council office in 24 years so siting is irrelevant to me as long as phones work. Would prefer council concentrated on value for money on behalf of public
- Never wished to be in york area, voted many years ago and won for strensted to stay in ryedale. An unhappy council tax payer, have no view on the proposal or design of new offices
- New build would have increased all of section 8 without adapting older technologh. new build would have provided opportunity to make 21st century landmark, rather than make and mend. whatever the choice make sure it is done promptly and well
- New building needs to be big enough for potential growth of council and should have potential for use by its partners. It should be welcoming and inviting to its customers

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- New centralised hqs offers the coy opportunity to show other cities how it should be done both architecturally and form a sustainability aspect also
- New hq need to be functional not fancy. Many people wont want to go into centre of york will just want to get in touch over phone so this should be priority. Should be value for money for residents. Yorkshire house should need minimal change for council
- No further eyesores in centre of york. Whats the matter with just transfer all offices to railway ones already there and empty and no to building upwards
- No more stonebow or hungate monstrosities please!
- No new build hungate fiasco
- No one who cannot speak english should have any input. They either have not integrated or are newly arrived
- No 'pot plants' and 'water features' just enough to do the job. I am paying the bill!
- Not a priority - people are not interested in york council grandiose projects. Interested in reduction of council tax not increases
- Not an easy point to answer. So many points will be concerned whatever happens city must not be spoilt
- Not clear why you need to move to one building, how will this save money in the long run?
- Not interested, you will do what you want anyway and the rest of us will pay for it
- Not sure where present offices are except for st leonards place, which is a dreadful building for use as offices but conveniently situated. prefer west offices of the two options offered
- Not sure why a council building should be "an exciting architectural" building especially in an historic town like york. Should be looking to use and upgrade existing buildings and making them efficient for purpose.
- Nothing weird and wonderful, bespoke architecture means expensive. Straight forward practical design does the job
- On paper it looks like the west offices will cost more as there is renovation needed. however it would be safer to access, especially on bike, than the yorkshire house (on a very busy road)
- One of the buildings you propose to re-use has/is an eyesore & it seems at the best a poor solution after selling off beautiful buildings, to be in a position where the best you can do for york council tax is buy up old nu. what happened to hungate plans?
- Open offices are too noisy all officers need a desk
- Optimism is low level.
- Other than the payment of my council tax and collection of my bus pass i dont have much cause to use the council services i.e. I do not normally need to locate or visit the offices.
- People do not want a mall or 5star hotel type building. the public need to go into the office required, get dealt with and get out. it is ludicrous in the worst recession ever to even think of spending £48m when it could be used to sort out something else
- Planners pictures can make buildings look better than they are going to end up. However i like look of west office proposal best
- Planning should start asap to ensure that systems are in place and are fed top down to enable staff to work in as productive a manner as possible, not spending significant time hunting for desks, printers etc
- Please avoid a repeat of the barbican fiasco
- Please choose a site which will be a pleasure for all to visit. Not keeping a nasty 70's building that doesn't represent our beautiful city
- Please do not let this project become another barbican, stonebow, terry's, sports stadium.....
- Please drop the word 'customer' . I am either a 'user' 'client' or 'citizen'

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Please ensure the fiasco on howgate is not repeated, get the service delivery right
- Please make it a brave and exciting project that leads the way in council building. Make it inevitable and environmentally sound
- Please please don't involve anybody who had anything to do with the debacle we know as the barbican centre!!! A modern practical workable and value for money project please - too much to ask for - i sincerely hope not!!!
- Prefer contact via telephone, email or web. Building not that important, though should not be a dirty eyesore like the offices near the theatre.
- Project is already such a disaster that it looks as though the current chief executive has decided to get out before having to carry the can
- Project should be well integrated with city's needs/development as whole not a stand alone project. Consideration given to traffic problems in york.
- Project should not become field of glory for planners and senior users, care must be taken to ensure that scheme can fulfil its purpose
- Purpose built for council hq, central accessible, one stop shop
- Put a tiled roof on the old n.u. building
- Q10 very ambiguous. If using aviva building should be little need to alter what is very good building. Don't think council has skills to develop properly west office. This redevelopment would be at an unacceptable cost. Wasted too much money already
- Q10:as long as the building is good to look at and fit for purpose exciting architecture is not a priority.i think west offices are suitable for the situation-have some 'presence' & should be used though i realise they will need a lot of work
- Q7-11 too complicated to deal with so simply. Would think buildings should be as efficient as possible i.e. That available money can provide but in current economic climate excessive expenditure should not be undertaken
- Q8 all come at price ideally 8 is answer to each but you have not looked at cost. Why freehold purchase why not rent? Could we see development appraisal?
- Q8 found it v difficult to place these in specific order as feel they are all sensible and forward thinking
- Q8 is not helpful.the 2nd suggestion 'a building & systems that are highly efficient should necessarily incorporate at least 5 of the other suggestions-& yet you are making us choose between them!
- Q9 & 10 irrelevant as buildings are already in situ and only internal alterations should be required
- Q9 is poorly worded and leads to an expected answer of disagree,only £5m saving over 30 years.just sack 20 people on £30,000 a year + same saving
- Qs 10&11 are confusing.as i see it the 2 options need nor be mutually exclusive
- Q's 9+10 are dreadful questions are they poor thinking or attempt to get the answers you want ? No extension of york building
- Quality building - not fancy gimmicks but to be building so workers have space to do the work and where people can easily find departments they require.
- Really need a venue for concerts, barbican site needs sorting out. Renting a venue would bring in the money and improve york for residents. Where the council goes is not important.
- Regarding the more modern architecture of yorkshire house this could possibly lend itself to a project that would include an existing architectural contribution to make it a more creative buiding in appearance
- Regards planning generally non use of understorys for parking, storage areas etc. These could be made sealable tanks until flood recede. Could be probably used in other way too

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Regret loss of opportunity to be part of the exciting new development in hungate. Disagree strongly with both the content and timing of the english heritage report, also negative campaign in the press.
- Remember it will be tourists who are interested in look of site - residents want an efficiently run council who will take care of public funding by keeping costs down
- Roof top terraces are not necessary, nor are 'exciting architectural contributions. Money has been wasted at both the barbican and hungate so we need to know costs will be kept low
- Rooftop extension with views across city is not necessary and waste of money
- Scrap it and live in the real world
- Should be good quality design that respects the local setting and environment balancing aesthetic contribution with a not unreasonable cost to the taxpayer.
- Should be possible to blend new and attractive old without breaking bank and avoiding carbuncle effect
- Should be well built with simple design that wont be out of date in few years time like barbican. Every increasing council tax many are struggling to meet
- Should get on with it, too much time and money wasted already.
- Should have been made clear which option fits questions, information is not given. 1960s building does not reflect york so west offices fit proposed ideas best - also considering 1960s hidden asbestos costs. Fine historic building
- Should have committed yourself to take account/accept results of this survey as i understand replies are not binding
- Show some natural stone i.e. York stone. Hide all reconstituted stone/concrete esp on footpaths - have granite kerbs rather than concrete. Cctv on cycle rack areas. Creative iron cycle rails/tons dog waste bins etc. No golden railings. Clear signposting
- Skill is to balance cost v value also architecture v cost
- Small footprint high rise or large footprint low rise. Get a grip! Manage move. To choose high rise will be disastrous but you will!
- So york council propose to move out of old and unsuitable buildings into an older unsuitable building!
- Sooner council is thrown out better. Just like present mp claims debate their has to be public enquiry for £4m waste already and police need to be involved and prosecutions brought about to those that took bribes and back hinders
- Sort the barbican out first
- Stop signwriting in all languages to keep costs down
- Strongly disagree with statement 10 - don't see why keeping costs down should have to be opposite to good exciting architecture. Q8 - reuse of existing buildings - does this include the west offices or just reuse of york house
- Surely not necessary for 4 planning meetings. Make quicker decisions to reduce costs and get job done!! Another 3 years wait?
- Take account of fact it is long term project
- Tend to feel that local council buildings are places that people have to be there for a reason not to socialise, they just want to be in and out. Unnecessary focus other than access is a waste of taxpayers money. An energy efficient building is useful.
- The 60's building should be demolished. We see nothing worthy of saving!its an eyesore which reflects poorly on the city- to consider it a council building is typical of the dreadful decisions this council has made in recent years

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The argument for the building of these new hq's has not been fully made. I am unsure why the council feels the need to move. The fiascos of the Barbican and new council offices are still fresh in the mind
- The building doesn't have to be exciting as long as it's functional it isn't a tourist attraction - it's there for a purpose
- The building should be an effective means of regenerating the Micklegate area. Yorkshire House will merely substitute one set of jobs for another. West offices will bring new jobs into this area and will be a driver for economic regeneration of Micklegate
The building should be central to York City, fit for purpose depts. Easy to find, easy to reach/well signed by department
- The building should be functional, fit for purpose but not needlessly extravagant. The city does not need a new 'landmark building'
- The building will be one of the first buildings tourists will see on leaving the station
- The buildings are already externally above average, they just need to be made structurally safe, workable and environmentally safe as possible.
- The buildings are there - alter to accommodate the best use - it is a municipal building which should be compatible to employees and public alike - it is not the new Tate Gallery!
- The character of the building should be considered during redevelopment. However it is important to not be extravagant with the costs of development
- The council and its various buildings around the city are useless and outdated like the people who run it
- The council is not building a new headquarters, but adapting an existing building. Either option detailed will be long lasting. If the grade II building is used, particular materials will have to be used, increasing cost.
- The council must optimise the use of space by having open plan offices for all staff and councillors, no declarations of status through single occupancy offices, expensive furniture etc. any modern organisation is trying to achieve this
- The council must take into consideration the future use of the building not chosen for this project. As West Offices in grade 2 the external appearance is to some extent guaranteed. I prefer Yorkshire House
- The council should be aware of employing 'experts' who charge huge fees for stating the obvious. Common sense needs to be reintroduced
- The council should expect the centre to be rebuilt/replaced within 50 years. Only this way can it be justified to have taken the present situation responsibly
- The council should look at medium/long term picture - short term thinking is never very efficient in the long run
- The council should promote more about the services to reach their maximum utilisation
- The council should put more effort into publicising the project planning and consultations in the wider community, including the local minority, ethnic residents/groups, although I'm aware that the council provide info in other languages if required
- The council's development programme is very comfortable and should be reduced and the benefits of delivering a new headquarters enhanced by bringing the completion brought forward by 12 months.
- The current state of the project is a shambles, not helped by the apparent current attempt to place responsibility for this on 'the public', and English Heritage, instead of on the executive, where it rightly belongs. Nothing is now heard of the project
The move to either building should be completed with minimum structural alteration and cost using current furnishings and equipment excluding where this is for normal replacement

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- The new hq is 3 years away. What will the council be doing now to bring existing buildings up to a decent standard
- The new hq should be fit for purpose and durable. Please keep fancy gimmicks to a minimum. Why do we need glass spiral staircases? Just make the decision and get on with it.
- The new hq should be used as a destination service for a range of other complimentary services for people to access
- The new site would also have the advantage of helping to re-vitalise the micklegate area which is nearby
- The offices should be long term permanent move
- The picture of the proposed yorkshire house is misleading.you can't extend the paving as far as you have shown.also the extension is being built on car park,lots of money needed for reinforcement as car park forms part of roof of basement.
- The purpose of this project is to provide new administrative accommodation. Therefore the principal driver isn't to save money, or to decrease the carbon footprint, or to set an energy efficiency example for other local employers - it is simply to provide
The ramp leading to entrance of yorkshire house would soon become eyesore due to the use of the ramp by skateboarders,proposed interior and exterior of west offices are nicer symbols of york than the glass and concrete of yorkshire house
- The sooner this project is completed the better!!
- The space around the building is also very important.a more calm,tranquil setting is more appropriate.this city deserves a suitable civic building with surroundings to match.west offices provide them both
- The stonebow was a mistake-let this important building stand as one of importance & strength in this difficult world
- The wisdom of taking on the problems that will arise if west offices is chosen is questioned. It is also a very drawn-out plan with considerable walking distances. The extension to yorkshire house does not inspire me. The location is good
- The wo site is too attractive & non-utilitarian for the sort of person often to be found at a council office.the local drug dealers will be tying their pit bull terriers to the railings
- There will obviously have to be a cap on funding. However the best addition to the city must be obtained. Otherwise the whole exercise is at least partially defeated.
- They could have had main hq and norwich union practically on the same site.what a great saving
- Think if you're going to regenerate area, more people will be going past war memorial, think should be repaired - all names made readable, also st. Leonard's houses should be brought back to pristine condition and sold, not just given away at stupid price
Think regeneration of whole area surrounding both of proposed sights should be priority as this area lets city down. It is even more unfortunate given proximity to train station & most bus routes so majority of visitors are likely to see it
- This disaster has gone on too long. Sort it!
- This has to be the best suitable site to date!!So no more waste of money on other projects/plans for eg hungate,barbican,peasholme centre to name a few
- This is an ego trip for walker and galloway. Get them out
- This is fine for the council side but let us have the barbican as it was!
- This is functioning public services building not statement building
- This is terrible question! It should not be an either/or decision. Create building for reasonable cost and make sure it is long lasting set up. Just don't put in gold taps and everyone will be happy

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- This project has taken far too long & could we please have some good old common sense with planning and all other decisions which have to be discussed
- This project is 10 years too late. Should have been done when cash flow was good. Many york businesses are closing as you're rating them too high, the more they go under the less revenue you receive
- This project should be purely functional no expensive furnishings but good basic design without luxurious fittings
- This should be big improvement on stonebow house
- This whole issues is a farce. You should never have sold off st leonards. Disgraceful, untrustworthy, useless council
- Those benefitting from use of current building once they are freed up should be obligated to a sustainability/green mandate also. West offices looks the better option
- To place all services in one site reduces resilience & reduces options during fire, it failure and other threats. Moving to single (& expensive) site is folly
- Too many councils jump from building to building. Please just for once show a common sense approach and dont waste more millions. A balance needs to be struck and yuouve wasted millions already. Do the job once and do it properly and effectively
- Turn a 1960s box into our centre and benefit a company intent on sending local jobs abroad or re-invigorate a 1800s hidden gem and bring it into re-use? Did we need a questionnaire for this - west offices please.
- Until or if an exciting contribution is made known to york citizens no real views can be made on subject
- Until the project is complete can you please clean up the st leonards place buildings which are an eyesore. A few hanging baskets would also improve the external appearance.
- Use the existing structure of one of the new sites with minimal disruption to the structure with innoivative solutions built in to enhance the facilities and give green credentials
- Use what is there. No more empire building, the barbican over again. Change as little as possible to the building chosen. Remember its not your money and we cant afford it to be some pipe dream like the horror you lot planned in hungate
- Using an existing development is preferred if the building would otherwise be an empty eyesore of the two suggested sites yorkshire house is the best proposition
- Very words architect and design means it could end up looking like new college at top of sim balk lane, pile of strewn shoe boxes and cost earth.
- We are familiar with the successful revise of large buildings for different functions. This adapting of an existing structure can be visually exciting and practical.go west!
- We could do with a bus shelter in station rise as this will become a very busy bus stop, if space can be found.
- We harldy use council facilities except by phone perhaps email
- We have heard the "pros" what are the "cons"?? I do not know of any governmental project of this magnitude that has been finished within budget.under the current economic climate i wondered if it wise to begin such a project yet
- We need to have a building that is functional and build to last.easy on the eye but not flashy.too much time is being wasted on innovation lets just get on with it!
- We should do the job right this time and not have to re-do it in a few years time as costs will be a lot higher in the future
- What a wonderful opportunity to create a new council hq at aviva and our new bus station at west offices right next to each other.we need a bus station in york
- What about bull-dozing the barbican centre (instead of continuing to waste tax payers money on it) and developing the site fot the new headquarters

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- What about doing something with barbican. Potential is huge. Perhaps there is some long lasting grudge against rod hills or is it just plain jealousy
- What decisions will be made on use of barbican centre, white elephant from day 1. We need some kind of recreation for younger people of city (ice rink) maybe as ice factor is so popular at christmas time why not an all year round facility!!!
- What is the point of having a huge foyer area with the inevitable 'potted palms' by all means have adequate apace and seating but make sure that the offices are totally fit for purpose. For instance one man one desk. Hot desking is a total waste of tim
What will happen to the site that is not selected for development especially west offices, shame to see it left empty, is anyone else interested ?
- Whatever you do it will be wrong!!
- Whats the point
- When are york city council going to build football at sport club for city. They soon got ticket for wembley
- When do we get a new home?
- Where does "hungate" fit in with these plans?
- Wherever it is it should be in the city centre. No out-of-town location should be considered. And no horrible concrete box like those jokers put forward last time. York should have a building of which it can be proud, not ashamed.
- While the proposal to house all council functional under one roof is to be commended, i remain skeptical that two choices on offer are cheapest, may as well stay were it is if not willing to move
- Whole thing is stupid is there any need for all these luxury additions such as shown in sketches. In these economic times surely you should cut your cloth accordingly.
- Why build a new rooftop extension at yorkshire house? Waste of money - who is going to use it - the staff eating their lunch?
- Why do the council keep moving there building at all, it seems to me that someone high up in the council has nothing better to do than sit and think of ways of wasting tax payer money. Stay where you are and save money
- Why do you need the vast empty capacity space in either of these buildings? It is not cost effective & a total waste,the vast empty space could be utilised for other uses
- Why have the council decided on this new line of approach after spending vast amounts of money on the old new-build scheme. Totally useless council decision making running team
- Why was the hungate development dropped?
- Why was this leaflet not printed by a local york company?
- Will chief executive resign if costs of building are not met and savings not as expected. There is little chance of figures quoted being achieved
- Will there be a council chamber there? With provision for the public to attend? Surely this is the core function of a council hq but you dont say anything about it
- Will total current area of working space be maintained or hopefully increased? If putting all these areas into 1 building means they loose space & are cramped or even have to lose staff to fit then project is detrimental to services
- With regards to a new building, there needs to be a balance between cost & exisiting architectural contribution to the city. Don't spend where it is not nessesary, be cost effective but make sure it does promote the city & contribute to it
- With respect to q10, whilst we agree that costs should be controlled, it should also be in keeping with the city, which will require good, sympathetic architectural imput. You should not allow an architect to design a building to feed his/her ego

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- Wo is at present a 'rabbit warren' of small rooms & corridors. It will be a real challenge to make a modern office of it. Might it not be better made into part of the national railway museum? Or handed over to the national trust?
- Work should be cost effective, good value available for future expected needs. Architecturally it should blend in with our historic city
- Would be apprehensive about using west offices as new council building working in listed building there are so many constraints on what can/cant be done not just during build but there are implications for future maintenance costs
- Would be useful to know which buildings and services will be closing/moving to new site - this info would have helped me to complete this questionnaire. As long as council tax doesn't increase would favour promoting
- Would expect professional approach balancing all points listed. Cost, quality, service, environment etc. To make correct decision promptly.
- Would have been more realistic for community to have been given option to one of 2 sites in question
- Would hope that the right balance will be found with reference to questions 9 & 10.
- Would it create problems - for example, the use of the building vacated by the council, has any interest been shown? Would they lie empty and derelict?
- Would like to see more information on website - what useable floor space will these new premises have & what existing floor space is it replacing. Think of poor bricklayer planned out of york college!
- Would prefer for no change at all but building looks very attractive. Think it would be better to be long lasting and not cheap and cheerful hq
- Would prefer more info for the staff examples of working environment produced. Understanding of staff and their needs, not just the opinion of managers.
- Would rather see york hospital remodernized with cleaner facilities and a matrong that makes sure nurses are professional and dont need to be asked if they have washed their hands! People lives are more important than this new proposal
- Would support either option. I would like to see the old station put to good use. I believe the conservation aspects of converting the old station need much careful further consideration before a decision is taken.
- Would these buildings be large enough to take in all the out-sourced centres that are currently used?
- Would they be guessing or would they be paying installments for council tax etc.
- Years ago when york was crying out for a bus station (and still is) the answer was the ground wasn't weight holding, or words to that effect, foundations etc., since then we have had yorkshire insurance, norwich union and now council offices
- York council has little community focus with its existing buildings, of the two schemes, west offices could improve this with public space and an attractive building. The yorkshire house proposal looks like a multi-storey carpark
- York needs space in the new council building for multi faith events. The hindus and sikhs do no have a dedicated prayer room with proper facilities!
- York urgently needs investment in new companies coming to york and taking over these buildings. Outrageous that £43.8m will be spent on fancy council buildings - we need money spent on sustainable jobs!!
- Yorkshire house - a multi-storey atrium is a waste of space, disrupts the working environment. All these are features of the existing aviva building. Does the council need 'unique views across the city'
- Yorkshire house location is one of the most exposed locations in york in bad weather.

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- You can do what you like inside the building but please make the exterior blend in with the rest of the buildings in York - no ultra modern monstrosities. Think of Stonebow House
 - You have not shown us dimensions of buildings and space available in 2 options for comparison
 - You know the requirement for best performance but is a five star hotel appearance necessary. Who wants to spend time sitting in a park when they come to discuss problems
 - You say the West Offices option would revitalise the whole area - more info is needed on this - a new shopping district? also grade 2 listed building - isn't that what got us into the mess in the first place!?
 - You should have a mental health resource centre. Selby has one. It could be run by a manager and some internships from the universities.
 - You should have gone ahead with your original plan when so much money has already been spent
 - You'll probably make a screw up of it anyway
-
- Agree new modern building is needed which gives nice friendly environment
 - Agree with the need for council offices to be under one roof, and easy to access by the public. But also feel that in our beautiful historic city they need to blend in, preferably a building such as West Offices
 - An opportunity to invest in an exciting long lasting project which if efficient, aesthetically pleasing & provide a centralised easy access facility - architecturally pleasing for a city like York
 - As both an employee and citizen of York I am excited by the possibility that the old railway offices could be used. I feel angry at some of the correspondence that has appeared from people who would be happy with a portakabin at Mark Cross.
 - As have spent whole working life either in or near both sites would certainly welcome right development on both sites. In particular West Offices is important & up to now hidden gem that should be developed in right way even if it is not new council HQ
 - Change is good, good luck with this project
 - Concentrate as many services as possible on one site. Hungate would have been better
 - Either of the two proposed buildings is far, far preferable to Hungate. It's very good news that existing buildings will be used well done. I prefer Yorkshire House
 - Everything under one roof concerning any council business
 - Exciting project - either location
 - Focus should be on practicality getting all council services under one roof, sustainability & creating pleasant airy space. Don't get carried away on plans for amazing architecture
 - For 9 - perhaps not lowest possible but no need to go overboard
 - Go ahead I think it's a great idea
 - Go for it, make something to be proud of using as much local resources as possible therefore creating local jobs so we can pay the tax to pay for it
 - Good luck - it should be a wonderful improvement
 - Good to have two important buildings under one roof, time saving to the customer as well as staff, ensure a nice parking facility should be available, ensure workers from York are used.
 - Good to use an existing building, good to concentrate all services in one place, even though I use hardly use any of the services
 - Great idea
 - I agree that the council should be in one building that will save on renting etc. The building should be long lasting but I wouldn't care how pleasing it was on the eye as long as it was cost efficient

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- I do agree with the council amalgamating all its services together because if you have a query you only have to go to one place instead of going round 3 or 4 places
- I do not pretend to be an expert on building techniques but i strongly support the concept of a centralised hq
- I think it looks great and very modern
- I think its a great idea
- I think its going to be a super building either one
- I think new sites are very good and lot better to have all facilities at one building
- I think reusing an existing building in the city centre is a brilliant idea, lot better than building stonebow 2 in hungate.
- I think the two sites are a wonderful idea, both on good bus routes and central
- I think this idea sounds like a good thing for york city council and its york residents etc.people of the city of york
- I welcome this new centralisation of york council services, it will be greatly beneficial to all york residents. We need the building to be efficient, accessible and attractive, it must fit in with york's historical beauty
- I wonder if it is sensible to have just one 'reception' for all cyc services/all client groups
- If a single hq is the way to go to save money why has it not happened before?
- Its a good idea to have everything under one roof. At the moment i dont need to use the services, but you never know when you may in the future.
- Its good to cover all these points featured
- Keep up the good work, it looks very good.
- Should be good for your new quarters
- Sounds like an excellent project that i fully support. Will be important to invest for future in designing the building - scrimping and saving will be false economy in the long run. Reducing carbon dioxide emissions is vital
- The management advantages of having most directorates in one place are great.cut down also the need for unnecessary e-mailing etc.
- The new hq should be big enough for all council departments to be housed. Built to host - not move again in 10-20 years, built for purpose - not to look nice.
- These seems to be exactly what the city needs and will open up th area to other businesses and shops. The buildings originally used by the council will be re-developed to enhance the cities needs, tourism etc
- Think it is important that council offices & services are all in one place instead of being spread about the city but wouldn't like to see thousands of pounds being spent on a fancy new building with a fancy interior
- Think you are an excellent team of organisers - keep up good work - all best to you
- This is a once in a generation opportunity for the council to make a lasting contribution to the architectural heritage of york. Particularly, the west offices option would revitalise the old station area and make it accessible to the public. It's important.
This is a once in a generation opportunity to make a positive contribution to york's cityscape. The new offices should be a distinctive building reflecting the historic character but forward-looking nature of the city. The setting of the building should
This is a once in a lifetime opportunity - don't waste it. Would prefer the option of recycling the older building, and making it funky and energy efficient inside. The other building option will look just like any other modern office block. Speed up the
This seems a long time in coming the old offices were well passed their sell by date
- To have all department in one building is quite a good idea and could be cost effective. Saving money on phonecalls to spread out departments

APPENDIX 3 - RESPONSE TO OPEN QUESTIONS

- We agree that the COY council should occupy space which represents a single hq centre. The opportunity to occupy a site so historic as the west office seems heaven sent. It would link past, present and future
- We feel strongly that the council needs to be situated in one location in good accomodation for council officers and staff. We feel the west offices would give a good spacious location