

| Q2a | Q5a | Q5b | Q5c | Q5a-c LCC Comments | Q5a-c Draft SPD Response |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Survey Response Ref | I think its important that there are a number of entrances to the station | I think its important for each entrance to the station to be served by high quality public realm | If you Disagree or Strongly Disagree to either of the above statements, please can you say why? | | |
| 1 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Agree | Agree | This is the introduction to Leeds for many travellers and a good first impression is important. A more pleasant start/and to commutes can also only be a good thing. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | Agree | Agree | Where will the vast amount of traffic that moves through the Neville Street "tunnel" actually go? That area is already congested as it is. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Agree | Disagree | You haven't defined "high quality public realm" | Comments noted. | High quality public realm to be defined. |
| 23 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | This is a disgusting waste of tax payers money, just like HS2 | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 29 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Permeability is key in order to avoid the connectivity and accessibility problems that arise from large scale infrastructure. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | It is important that the train station and surrounding areas are improved so that both local residents and newcomers to Leeds will have a good image of the city. It must be easy to access from all areas of the city. One of my concerns is that a revamp of the station may look nice but be far less beneficial to the city than a large scale transportation system for the growth of the economy in Leeds. | Comments noted. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. The proposed inward investment as a result of regeneration in South Bank will have a positive economic and regeneration impact on Leeds and the Leeds City Region. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. Improved connectivity throughout the area is one of the key strategies addressed in the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | The proposed new HS2 station is incorrectly oriented for future east-west rail developments. It should not be north-south. It should be east-west, as HS2 Ltd originally preferred. This would enable the lines into the station to be more direct from the south, to run down existing transport corridors and minimise future blight. | Comments noted. The orientation of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | Strongly Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | It is important that the entrances are accessible to those less able or unable to walk. You shouldn't introduce a fancy entrance that then increases the distance and creates an obstacle course. | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 41 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | What is high quality public realm? | Comments noted. | High quality public realm to be defined. |
| 43 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 44 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | Agree | Agree | If you support the redevelopment of Leeds station then it is impossible to disagree with these statements. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | Strongly Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | We should demonstrate commitment to the combined goals of excellent place making and carbon reduction by reinforcing sustainable transport as at the heart of our city. This is the future standard for excellent cities that will prosper. The station is the gateway to the city we want to be. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Necessary to have attractive positive spaces to improve the image and leeds and promote used of the city for local people and new investors. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 58 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | Disagree | Disagree | there are already 3 entrances to the station more than enough having worked there I know there is enough entrances | Comments noted. The additional entrances will serve the proposed HS2 Station to ensure that the new integrated train station (HS2 & Existing) is permeable and accessible by pedestrians visiting and approaching from South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | Strongly Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 72 | Strongly Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Leeds Station is one of the busiest in the country but us becoming a health and safety hazard as there is not enough open space and not enough exits and entrances. | Comments noted. Additional entrances served by high quality public realm are proposed to the HS2 Station. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Stop wasting money. Why should the South of Leeds get this why doesn't any development happen in West Leeds . Bramley? | Comments noted. With the arrival of HS2 into Leeds from the South of the city there is an opportunity to better integrate regenerate the northern and southern halves of the city centre by regenerating large amounts of buildings and land which are available for development whilst preparing for the provision of High Speed Rail and transformation of Leeds Railway Station. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 90 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| 92 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | It's easier to get around the river with more entrances | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | Agree | Strongly Disagree | I'm not sure I understand the concept of a strong public realm. I appreciate that the main entrance to the train station should be an easily accessible, well maintained area which gives a good impression of the city and always manages the flow of people and traffic well. Multiple foot entrances need not be managed in the same way. The current entrance under the bridge for example, I don't think can be described as a strong public realm, but is useful for foot passengers needing to access from that direction. | Comments noted. | The concept of strong/high quality public realm to be better defined. |
| 98 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | Agree | Strongly Agree | To help the developing inner city areas such as Armley it is vital transport links are easily accessible to help these areas become magnets for expansion and regeneration. I also believe the development of inner city rapid transport is essential, anyone arriving into Leeds by public transport should be given priority over those arriving by car. The behaviour of Hackney carriages should be relegated to a last viable option. | Comments noted. Please refer to Connecting Leeds (https://www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/connecting-leeds) which is looking to develop plans to bring improvements to public transport in Leeds. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | So you spent 20 million on a rear entrance which I rarely see used. You have to be idiotic to create more entrances, we have 3 that is enough. | Comments noted. The additional entrances will serve the proposed HS2 Station to ensure that the new integrated train station (HS2 & Existing) is permeable and accessible by pedestrians visiting and approaching from South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | Agree | Strongly Agree | Public relms are the first thing people see when leaving the station | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | Strongly Agree | Disagree | Speed of pedestrian traffic in and out of the station, and disipating the volume through multiple exits is important for how the station fits into the city environment / other traffic | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | The current main entrance to the station is a major bottle neck in our city. To have access by car to multiple points would be beneficial. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | I believe it is important to ensure the train station has multiple entrances to improve accessibility and reduce congestion. Having open spaces around the entrances will also improve the aesthetics of the station, as well as improve the first impression of those visiting Leeds. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | Disagree | Agree | There is no rationale for a number of entrances - it over complicates the situation for visitors and planning and makes access harder. | Comments noted. The additional entrances will serve the proposed HS2 Station to ensure that the new integrated train station (HS2 & Existing) is permeable and accessible by pedestrians visiting and approaching from South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 128 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 130 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Multiple entrances will give different geographical parts of the city 'ownership' of the city. For a station not particularly accessible by road, it's important that it's accessible easily by foot from lots of directions (those arriving on foot cannot be expected to circumnavigate the station 'campus' when in a hurry) See below re public realm. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q5d | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Survey Response Ref | Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding public realm to the station entrances? | Q5d LCC Comments | Q5d Draft SPD Response |
| 1 | I think it's a wonderful idea. The main issues i have with the current layout is that, which we entrance you use, you come out onto a busy through road either the City Loop at the northern entrances, or Neville Street (effectively) from the Southern Entrance. I think any public realm needs to be accessible - the master plan illustrations published recently seem to show a lot of steps, although i know these are illustrative. Any public realm needs to be EXTRA green! although trees planted here and there in a stone/concrete plaza is fine, i would love to see some extra imagination and take it all the way, especially with The Arbour. A densely tree-lined boulevard with 20 foot trees would be amazing. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | It's important any public realm proposed to be supported by pedestrianisation of nearby highway networks, particularly Princes Square and New Station Street. The roads around the train station are filled with heavy and fast moving traffic that are intimidating to pedestrians and cyclists travelling to/from the train station. | Comments noted. The future position for Neville Street as one of the roads around the station is to improve the pedestrian experience and accessibility and retain a public transport link through Neville Street. Priority for public transport/ over other modes. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Better car pick up/drop off area needed | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Free wifi. Seating | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | It is important that people can easily designate which entrance they are meeting at. A significant feature will help people who are unfamiliar with names in much the same way that most folk call Dortmund Square "The barrel man place". | Comments noted. Wayfinding will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | The areas should be easily maintainable as well as being attractive. There should be ease of access and good signing so that people know where to go for taxis, buses, cars etc. And please an area for use by private hire vehicles so that there is no repeat of the conflicts which currently occur outside Wetherspoons. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Detail surrounding private hire vehicles and maintenance of public areas will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Disabled access including short journeys from drop off points to all platforms should be provided | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 15 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | I worry that the breadth of the station will triple the size of the current Dark Arches that have struggled to be viable for many years. Any plan should be wary that active uses beneath the station may not be as forthcoming as expected. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Detail surrounding active frontages/uses in the Dark Arches will come from the design as work progresses | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | If you define the term in the survey, it would be a helpful reminder as to what you intend as a tangible definition of the term. | Comments noted. | High quality public realm to be defined. |
| 23 | Be brave | Comment noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | I agree but think very clear signage to each exit and entrance is essential. | Comments noted. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 29 | In order to provide a mixed-modal station, that offers seamless transfer from bike to rail; there will need to be mass cycle parking provision at the main station entrances. Traditional cycle parking takes up significant space, and it suffers from theft, and doesn't entice people to cycle. Automated cycle parking can park large numbers of bikes, and the access pods can be discreetly designed into the public realm. Users benefit from a high quantum of spaces, as well as the ability to safely leave possession on the bike, and being availability and pre-booking spaces on an app. Removing the hassle and risk of cycling can entice people to make the journey by bike. With cycling continuing to grow, sufficient cycle parking spaces must be allowed for to future proof the scheme. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Cycle Hubs referenced in the SPD. Specific detail surrounding cycle parking will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | Needs to open out to green areas .at the moment it packed out crazy out of the front doors taxis move them away you can fit a call point to allow a taxi to pick you up .you don't need 20 plus out side | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Include unique sculptures, flags, statues, quality signage for "key landmarks and onward connectivity", and different large 'welcome to Leeds' signage'. All with the aim of providing a big city feel. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. This detail will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | It is important that the primary focus of the entrances is on those that walk to the station, then closely follow by cyclists and public transport users. Car parks and taxis must be a fair distance away or use a totally separate entrance. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. This detail will come from the design as work progresses. Reference has been made regarding the hierarchy of users around the station. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | Public spaces should be invested in around the station. However, these public spaces must remain open to all. In other cities where heavy private investment occurs private security can prevent the most vulnerable in society e.g homeless people or the poorest citizens from using the space. I do not want to see parts of Leeds become exclusive to wealthy people. | Comments noted. Reference in the SPD to public spaces around the station which are proposed to be accessible by all. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | The proposed new HS2 station is incorrectly oriented for future east-west rail developments. It should not be north-south. It should be east-west, as HS2 Ltd originally preferred. This would enable the lines into the station to be more direct from the south, to run down existing transport corridors and minimise future blight. | Comments noted. The orientation of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Ensure that they are made open and accessible to people of all age groups. A mixed use and atmosphere to prevent them becoming areas of crime and antisocial behaviour. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Specific detail surrounding crime prevention and the development mix will come from the design as work progresses. | Reference to be made in the SPD around designing out crime and anti-social behaviour. |
| 39 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | Leeds is a unique city and the station shouldn't look like London Kings Cross or Manchester Piccadilly. Use of local artists would be great. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 44 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | Let the pedestrian dominate, not the motor vehicle. Green our public realm. | Comment noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | It should be ambitious and bold. | Comment noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | The best way to implement this idea is to remove vehicular access from the areas surrounding the Hilton towards Water Lane. Pedestrian zones will vastly improve the area and take traffic to others parts of the city. | Comments noted. The future position for Neville Street is to improve the pedestrian experience and accessibility and retain a public transport link through Neville Street. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | The drop off area needs improving. It's a disaster with only having 1 entrance exit and so little space | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | I think the station and its environs should encourage pedestrian activity, plenty of interesting walkways with public amenities. These should include public facilities (think Local Government and NHS as well as commercial amenities and local independents should be encouraged. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 58 | Needs to be iconic to Leeds so it's recognisable. Lots of green space which is currently missing from and segregated cycle/ped access. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Should be befitting of a big metropolitan European city. A real gateway and welcome to Leeds considering the sheer volume that will use it in Leeds. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | A huge reduction in passing/stationary vehicles must be implemented. The current 'main' entrance is dogged by buses and taxis sitting idly and this adds massively to the noise and air pollution of the area as well as degrading the 'welcome to leeds' aesthetic. The current ease of access is difficult, you have literally thousands of people having to almost single file queue on tight pavements that have the added obstacle of bus stops trying to quickly gain access and exit at the same time. Buses and taxis undoubtedly need to be rerouted away from the main entrance to a designated and more accommodating area. Safety, aesthetics and ease of use of the station will be increased hugely. | Comments noted. The redesign of the current main entrance is being looked at through the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | Excellent plan. I look forward to seeing the plan becoming reality. High quality pedestrian and cycle links are essential. Limiting car use, maximise public transport links. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | Something modern but still incorporate nature, were surrounded by a beautiful canal and we still want Leeds to have trees and gardens in our centre | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | I think it is important that bus access is as great as possible. For example, it is silly that P&R buses do not call at the current station Neither do the 7 series of routes, although it would be easy for them to do so. It is barmy that the Arriva buses only stop at Bridgewater Place, and then not again until Infirmary Street. Both much distance and time away from station | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail around bus service permeability will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 72 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | need more disabled places and entrances and help and not have the crowds that are stopping disabled people moving about the station and cafes that are reasonable in price | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 74 | Each entrance to be intrinsically different from each other, and fully integrated for disability requirements. | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 75 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | Useful public spaces (such as millennium square) which can host events by communities and organisations from around Leeds as well as the surrounding area to show off the region to arrivals as well as bring the region closer together in an important central location | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | Colour schemes, landmarks or statues for each realm so that people less familiar with the city can work out where they are, which entrance/ exit they are at, where they need to go and can also establish meeting points. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | No fast food chains or other shops should be in the immediate realm. These can often close and make a first impression of a city look dilapidated. How about a statue at one of the entrances of either a Leeds born person who has contributed greatly to the world or another famous Yorkshire person? Alternatively move the Arthur Aaron VC monument from the bottom of the headrow to the station? Greenery should be present and also a free map of the city on a board for visitors. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail on the mix of development and cultural uses will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 90 | Bright and inviting, rather fewer more suitable and effective entrances than more cheaper ones | Comments noted. The additional entrances will serve the proposed HS2 Station to ensure that the new integrated train station (HS2 & Existing) is permeable and accessible by pedestrians visiting and approaching from South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | Allow non-ticket holders to pass through as a shortcut across the river. | Comments noted. The station will open to all, including non-ticket holders. This is reinforced by South bank Regeneration Framework principle 5 that includes a key objective which delivers maximum permeability through the station, to ensure the station is integrated with the City's streets and urban context. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | Hurry up and do it, it's the first glimpse to our amazing city and it currently is a massive eyesore! | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | As above | Comments noted. | The concept of strong/high public realm to be better defined. |
| 98 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | Must be fully accessible with more information for deaf blind uses. | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 104 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | Particular attention must be made to waiting areas for passengers. Current use of such realms as holding pens for passengers like cattle is not good enough. It ruins the experience of such realms, reduces spending and increases stress and risk. I would like to such realms like in Berlin or NY why the station itself is a leisure destination with or without intention to travel. | Comments noted. One of the key aims and objectives of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is to enhance passenger facilities and experiences. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | Visit Manchester Piccadilly and Victoria stations for ideas. No more disgusting gold tacky staircases please. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | Easy/close transit options for getting to and from the station to Leeds suburbs (i.e. buses, preferably not operated by First). | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail around bus service permeability will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | Whilst good smooth access is critical i xo not tbink that all entrances need to be "all bells and whistles". I think it right that there is a Grand main entrance but all others can be more modest. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 128 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | The station entrances/ buildings must be welcoming with fantastic public realm facilities, including infrastructure for buses, cycles. Station buildings under the elevated rail line to be as open as possible to encourage rather than deter pedestrian thro movement. It is vital that the City is not cut into a n east and west sector by the HS2 intervention. IT WOULD BE BEST IN A TUNNEL, with normal City activity at grade over. All new station buildings to be examplar architecture that expresses confidence, second rate is not required. Interface with other transport modes (buses in particular) to be well planned and offer innovate solutions. that is not lines of bus shelters! see Aarau station in Switzerland as an example. The station building adjacent to the existing platforms should be serviced from the west/ south to avoid any traffic passing across the northern edge of Sovereign Sqaure park. Neville Street better used for traffic than pedestrians. Very concerned that the primary North South pedestrian route is being promoted along an elongated under rail line route which includes the existing Neville Street underpass and further underpass to the HS2 line. This does not constitute good public realm. See alternative plan and comments below. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan design principles will address the concerns raised. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | A station entrance will be an entry into the city for people -so it's an important first (& last) impression; important for a city seeking ongoing investment that potential investors visiting by train have an immediately positive (& lasting) impression. This provides the opportunity / a catalyst for regeneration in the areas immediately surrounding the entrances. From the point of view of public amenities, entrances need to be appropriately served by services that people arriving / departing in a hurry may require. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan design principles will address the concerns raised. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | Yes, s good idea to get the loop road away frpm city square and quebec street | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | Easy access to pedestrian areas of city and bus\bus routes | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | No point opening up more entrances to the south as barely anyone enters/ exits the station that way, have more entrances on the city side. Look at "leeds dock" "Clarence dock" "liberty dock" what failures it's been because no one uses that side of Leeds enough. Learn from past mistakes. Trinity is successful because of the location. | Comments noted. The additional entrances will serve the proposed HS2 Station to ensure that the new integrated train station (HS2 & Existing) is permeable and accessible by pedestrians visiting and approaching from South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | Access to these by bike is key. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | Spend as little as possible, it will just be used for talent being sucked down to London. | Comments noted. The arrival of HS2 and improved connectivity to London and the South presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q5e | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Survey Response Ref | Do you have any suggestions for the future redevelopment of the Station or any comments on the proposed Station Masterplan? | Q5e LCC Comments | Q5e Draft SPD Response |
| 1 | I would like to see the southern entrance improved - this is a small issue but there's a big bottle neck where the doors across the river by the dark arches are too narrow, and flows of people in and out of these doors through the narrow section by the escalators is a real pain to get through sometimes. In terms of the master plan, there needs to be a much bigger push for tall buildings! The document seems to indicate '60m+' as a threshold; i say this should be vastly increased to something more like 100, or even 150 metres if not to encourage lots of tall buildings, but at least give a policy standpoint for 1 or 2 standout buildings. 1 iconic building on or next to the station would act as beacon for the city, visible from all over showing where the new heart of the city is. | Comments noted. One of the key aims and objectives of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is to enhance passenger facilities and experiences. The Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD for Leeds is currently being updated. | Reference to be made in the South Bank Regeneration Framework SPD to the Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD. |
| 2 | Masterplan looks good. But remember during planning and design stages to always prioritise accessibility to pedestrians, cyclists and buses (providing that they are green and environmentally friendly) and not taxis and parking spaces. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding street hierarchy and prioritisation will come from the design as work progresses. The SPD does seek to create safe, comfortable and active environments for pedestrians and cyclists while allowing efficient movement of public transport and vehicular traffic. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Why are LCC spending millions on an already functional station. Large areas of Leeds suburbs (eg Harehills) needs loads of investment and regeneration | Comments noted. The arrival of HS2 and improved connectivity to London and the South presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds, its neighbourhoods and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Lockers available. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Lighting and noise mitigation will be important under the HS2 platform and current Dark Arches, the current situation is unpleasant and off-putting. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding lighting and noise mitigation will come from the design as work progresses. The SPD looks at mitigation strategies for the HS2 viaduct, and the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan seeks to activate the Dark Arches. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | A main concourse to match the quality of the historic north concourse. | Comments noted. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | It should be possible to move from local services to hs2 without going outside and getting wet; covered areas are important to avoid ice, snow and other weather related issues. Consideration must also be given to the wind issues caused by tall buildings in that area, we've already had one death as a result of weather related problems (wind blowing over a van onto a person). | Comments noted. The proposed Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan will create a single integrated station to allow for movement between local services and HS2 without going outside. The Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD is currently being updated. | Reference to be made in the South Bank Regeneration Framework SPD to the Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD. |
| 12 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Feel it should connect to bus and a proper light rail or underground system for the city. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Good connectivity between the hs2 platforms and the rest of the station is essential for onward journeys throughout Yorkshire | Comments noted. The proposed Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan will create a single integrated station to allow for movement between local services and HS2. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | I still believe that HS2 should arrive at a terminus at Crown Point. This site used to be a large southern station and still has cutting infrastructure to serve it. A second station would also allow the distribution of regeneration to be continued to other areas of the city. | Comments noted. The orientation of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | The bottleneck as trains enter/exit the station from or to the north and west is the biggest compounding factor in it's inability to contribute to smooth running services across the network. Many more tracks enter and exit the station to and from the south and the west, as opposed to the "one in one out" faced at the other end of the station. This major fault in the station design should surely be addressed above all other plans? | Comments noted. The number of tracks entering / exiting the Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 23 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 25 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | I oppose HS2 and the colossal waste of money on an unnecessary link to London. The money would be better spent upgrading and improving local links across the North. I live in Woodlesford and already get the bus rather than the train to work in Leeds city centre. The train is too busy (not enough carriages), decrepit and woefully infrequent. Fix that first. | Comments noted. The proposed inward investment as a result of regeneration in South Bank will have a positive economic and regeneration impact on Leeds and the Leeds City Region. The train service operation is outside the scope of the SPD and Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | clear signs preferably at eye level, but if not possible then large signs. avoid very shiny floors - look slippy and make people afraid to walk on them lots of bright light, avoid shadows. plants available to brighten space, and also as waymarkers (e.g. near help desk, near toilet) | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 29 | In order to provide a mixed-modal station, that offers seamless transfer from bike to rail; there will need to be mass cycle parking provision at the main station entrances. Traditional cycle parking takes up significant space, and it suffers from theft, and doesn't entice people to cycle. Automated cycle parking can park large numbers of bikes, and the access pods can be discreetly designed into the public realm. Users benefit from a high quantum of spaces, as well as the ability to safely leave possession on the bike, and being availability and pre-booking spaces on an app. Removing the hassle and risk of cycling can entice people to make the journey by bike. With cycling continuing to grow, sufficient cycle parking spaces must be allowed for to future proof the scheme. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Cycle Hubs referenced in the SPD. Specific detail surrounding cycle parking will come from the design as work progresses. In addition, a bike share scheme operator is set to launch in Leeds after councillors gave the go ahead in February 2018 for it to operate. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | Open the out side to city square | Comments noted. City Square is set to be transformed as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Consider a couple of large travel and tourism hubs inside each of the stations. Meaning people can go to one place to local rail tickets, bus tickets, national rail tickets, Mcard top up, coach tickets, and tourist advice (also selling Arena/Town Hall tickets etc.). Link everything up or at least have things in the same area and not disjointed. Also keep the others around the city. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding uses will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | It's important to extensively consider how the station will be served by bus users, given the major changes to road layouts in the whole city centre. A number of routes are likely to drastically change and can the station help to rationalise and simplify these routes. | Comments noted. Public transport proposals will emerge through the detail design. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | The Station should provide an opportunity for small businesses and independent retailers. This will provide a point of difference with other stations, and stimulate the local economy. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding commercial opportunities will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | The design should be modern and ambitious, a serious investment will help to attract global attention and investment. It is then also important to think of ways how investment into the city can be used for the benefit of everyone. For example, in many new city centre housing projects only 5% of the property is used for affordable housing, with changes to universal credit we may see many more people struggling to keep up with rent prices. | Comments noted. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | The proposed new HS2 station is incorrectly oriented for future east-west rail developments. It should not be north-south. It should be east-west, as HS2 Ltd originally preferred. This would enable the lines into the station to be more direct from the south, to run down existing transport corridors and minimise future blight. | Comments noted. The orientation of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 44 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | Leeds does need a high quality central station but the monies available would be better used if allocated towards the construction of a central area twin bore cross city rail tunnel like those in Glasgow, Liverpool and Newcastle which would serve underground stations at major passenger objectives such as Wellington Street near the former YEP buildings, Civic Hall/Infirmary, City Square, Southbank and Leeds Eastgate. These proposals would of course require two tunnelled crossings of the Aire but would allow direct access to the major passenger traffic objectives in central Leeds as well as offering direct access to the new Southbank developments. Furthermore the Metro tunnel would create extra capacity so that the new platforms at Leeds Station at 90 degrees to the others would likely not be needed given that the HS2 trains could be accommodated by modifications to the existing platforms. At present all rail in central Leeds is concentrated in one location and many places are too far a walk from the station, which encourages otherwise avoidable car journeys. | Comments noted. The location of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 47 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | Should be very limited access by private vehicles. No new car parks | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. Proposals also include for a re-provision of the current Station car park, a new car park for HS2 and a new Cycling Hub throughout the much improved station district. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | It should include provision for a later underground mass transit system. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. Proposals also include for a re-provision of the current Station car park, a new car park for HS2 and a new Cycling Hub throughout the much improved station district. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | The area should include a more diverse shopping, leisure experience. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding the mix of uses will from the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | The drop off area needs improving. It's a disaster with only having 1 entrance exit and so little space | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | I'm pleased to see the plan will mean the existing station and the new station will be incorporated into a single space. I think the suggestions for encouraging movement across the line of the station are helpful. I'm really pleased to see that the river and other public spaces will be opened up by the development. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 58 | Current pick up/drop off area and surrounding road infrastructure cannot cope with numbers using it - road often blocked by traffic trying to get in and out of this area. Was nice to see a pop up deli stall at the station the other week - perhaps this could be made a more regular thing, with different stall holders each time. Better signage to promote use of the southern entrance - lots of people don't know it's there or where it takes you to (just says exit). | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding the mix of uses, such as stall holders, will from the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | Please build a 'garden village' on the vast swathes of disused brown land that stretches from Sweet Street to Armley. And leave the green belt alone. | Comments noted. Please refer to the proposals for a new City Park in South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | The station should not divide the city. Ensuring it is inclusive of areas. One reason the south bank can feel cut off now is due to the station. Lack of the southern entrance has helped but dark arches and dingy road underneath do not help today. | Comments noted. The SPD looks at mitigation strategies for the HS2 viaduct, and the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan seeks to activate the Dark Arches. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | Fitting in with the existing station is good. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | More heated areas of the station | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | Quick and easy ways to get from one platform to another would be good - for example the provision of additional / wider escalators. | Comments noted. The proposed Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan will create a single integrated station to allow for movement between local services and HS2. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | I think that we have "missed the boat" The Council/PTA did not involve themselves in HS2 early enough. Manchester has a combined station (and an extra one at the Airport) Even Sheffield lobbied and got a HS2 station in the present location instead of Meadowhall. Leeds ought to have pressed for a direct connection of HS2 into the present station so that new "Classic Trains" could run onto other WY towns (Bradford, Huddersfield, Harrogate, even Wakefield) after reaching Leeds on HS2 tracks. HS2 should have joined Leeds-York line in Micklefield/Garforth area, instead of branching off at Woodlesford. Clearly bringing HS2 terminus towards the existing station is an improvement, but really it is a consolation prize. We certainly did not want the split station like we used to have with Leeds Wellington Station | Comments noted. The location of the proposed HS2 Station is outside the scope of the SPD. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and SPD are frameworks responding to the integration of HS2 with the existing classic station as well as the safeguarded route which has been fixed by HS2 Ltd. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 72 | What is (is there one) the Plan B should HS2 be cancelled/mothballed? | Comments noted. The South Bank Regeneration Framework sets out guidance for regeneration and development for the South Bank which presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds, its neighbourhoods and the Leeds City Region. As a guidance document the SPD is flexible but given a safeguarding direction has been issued for the HS2 route and station this is the context in which the SPD is being prepared. The SPD cannot present a scenario which potentially conflicts with the safeguarding direction. In the event of HS2 not going ahead the document could be revised or withdrawn. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | make it a state of the art station that puts London to shame the future needs train fares to go with the new station if you want people to use the new station then a common sense approach is needed to fairly invest in the passenger growth by bringing down the train fares and increase profit a business practice that will sustain the railways and increase passenger usage | Comments noted. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. Train ticket pricing is outside the scope of the South Bank Regeneration Framework and Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | The 'undercroft' of the station should take advantage of its historical features eg river Aire but must not become a ghetto area. More prominence to be given to establishing a fully integrated local transport hub including a tram system. This should not be a 'bolt on' aspiration but must be a priority. | Comments noted. The SPD looks at mitigation strategies for the HS2 viaduct, and the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan seeks to activate the Dark Arches. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | The current pick up and drop off point is not fit for purpose, the roads are too narrow and congested, I'd suggest a re-site with better vehicular access including coach/taxi and car short stays etc. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | I think Leeds probably should also have a tram-train system utilising our existing main-line railway infrastructure... That would serve all the areas of Leeds that the network already runs through... It would need more railway stations or just tram-train stops with side tracks so that the mainline trains can pass when required... So then there's no need to do all of the unnecessary & disruptive work that was planned with the previous Leeds tram proposals! All of this would obviously be a significant contribution towards solving Leeds' transport problems! If this is to happen then the Station masterplan needs to incorporate the need for more space to house the tram-trains & associated passengers. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | It is essential that sufficient capacity is created for pick up drop off by cars. Currently it's a dreadful shambles and public transport is so bad it's sheer inanity to think that providing inadequate pick up and drop off will 'encourage' passengers to use alternative ways to get to the station. It aint gonna happen. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | Better bus links and also more use of the river as a means of transport or improving the current water taxis | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | You need some kind of airport link from the station that's more efficient than the existing system. | Comments noted. An improved airport link is currently being looked into, please see www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/roadworks/airport-link-road | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 90 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | Can we please try to ensure the entrances to the station are large (due to the amount of footfall) and contain plenty of flowers / green space to make the city look more welcoming and inviting to visitors. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding the size of the entrances will form the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | Less confusing when finding platforms, escalators going down as well as up - in current station most platforms don't have down escalators. | Comments noted. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | Love the public green spaces and squares. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 97 | Eating and drinking options in the station are poor. Lifts are incredibly slow. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding the size of the entrances will from the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 98 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | Traffic management is vital. If we are to be a truly international hub then signage should be in major international languages. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | IMPROVE the service before you spend on this. Our "new" trains are still hand me downs from London for god sake. Yes improve the look of the existing main entrance but fix the current issues first. You throw glitter on shit, still dosnt mean its not shit. Homeless people still sat outside, do something for them before your spend OUR money on making something look better! | Comments noted. The train service operation is outside the scope of the SPD and Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | How the station interacts with a mass transport system within the city is vital. Buses and scanty train lines is NOT sufficient going forwards with the number of houses being built for the city. It will be a fantastic change for the city but only those coming from beyond its boundaries on intercity trains will benefit. Surely the major economic gain for the city will be local workers/residents that will not be able to benefit and indeed this will reduce Leeds' attractiveness for the intercity visitor. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | Plentiful, multiple cycle parking options. 'Boris Bike' type cycle hire implementation. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Cycle Hubs referenced in the SPD. Specific detail surrounding cycle parking will come from the design as work progresses. In addition, a bike share scheme operator is set to launch in Leeds after councillors gave the go ahead in February 2018 for it to operate. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | There is inadequate rail access from the east. The line from the station to Cross Gates needs to be quadrupled to cope with increased demand for travel from Leeds to the north-east. | Comments noted. The train service operation is outside the scope of the SPD and Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | It would be really useful if the bus station was moved and intergrated with the railway station if possible, especially with hs2 coming in the future it is reidiculous that the bus station is at the other end of town! | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | I commute from Leeds to Bradford every day, using the station. The station could do with modernisation but to be honest it's fairly well appointed. By far the bigger problem is getting home again - trekking across town to wait often half hour or more in the cold and dark for a bus that reeks of weed and filled with rubbish. We were hoping to buy in LS1 so I wouldn't need to do the bus journey anymore but cash buyers and buy-to-let market has completely priced us out. | Comments noted. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | Needs a subway! | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | Efficiency of dealing with footfall will have a big impact on the day to day experience of the people who use it the most | Comments noted. One of the key aims and objectives of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is to enhance passenger facilities and experieinces. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | To be able to see the waterfront more and include good lighting along the river such as fairy lights. | Comments noted. One of the 10 key moves in the South Bank Regeneration Framework looks at activating the waterfront. As this is a guidance document specific detail surrounding lighting will come from design as work progresses, but it's importance is referenced in the framework as essential to increasing legibility, wayfinding and safety, especially in the hours of darkness. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | Significantly Insufficient private drop off space. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 126 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 128 | Need for a lot good cheap parking..... not a free taxi park. Ease of entrance and exit for cars, taxis, buses and passengers.. | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | The QPS group proposes some important alterations to the masterplan in order to improve pedestrian routes, and connections both east west and north south. The importance of safe and attractive pedestrian routes and public realm cannot be overstated. I will email a marked up alternative masterplan that clearly illustrates some changes to the published plan. 1. Provide a broad public realm strip circa 30 meters to the south bank of the river Aire connecting the new south Leeds Park to the river Aire/ Leeds Liverpool Canal basin. New development to front this space provides excellent commercial opportunities. The public realm strip provided with various connections across the river. 2. Take advantage of the fact that Neville Street will be closed during HS2 construction works, and provide a world class link thro the arches to the top of Sovereign Square. This to become the primary north south link. Has a stepping stone effect from City Square to South Bank Park thro a series of green spaces. No traffic to cross northern end of Sovereign Square Park with traffic taken to the east of the new station building to service, ditto buses. connect route to Trinity going north. 3. Move the axis of main east west link (inboard from the river) to form a visual link from Southbank park to Temple Works, passing to the south of Bridgewater Place rather than into it. 4. In developing the strip either side of the elevated HS2 line, leave some space for the undercroft to breath, rather than crowd out. Potential of 5 a side pitches rather than building under the elevated rail line. Any building under the rail line to be as open as possible on all sides to encourage east/ west passage. 5. Open public north/ south access at high level thro the station essential. Broaden out discharge onto City Square by redeveloping the Queens Hotel. Needs world class architecture (remember Leeds architects!) 6. Encourage cycle routes along side pedestrian routes. 7. refer to alt. plan. | Comments noted. The SPD is a guidance document which promotes improved connectivity complemented with good public realm. In response to 1), a key move and strategy in the SPD is activating the waterfront with good public realm and active frontages that will give rise to commercial opportunities. In response to 2), a key objective of the SPD is to integrate the city centre north with the south of the river, further detail on these links will emerge through individual planning applications. In response to 3), the SPD promotes the axis outlined and this will continue to be reviewed and encouraged as the detailed design of the HS2 station progresses. In response to 4), viaduct strategies looks at open space opportunities which could promote 5-a-side pitches. In response to 5), the SPD and Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan promotes an open access station allowing access for non-ticket holders. One of the key design principles for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is Architectural Quality. In response to 6), cycle routes and street hierarchy are addressed in the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | I think the proposals are excellent and will enhance Leeds' status as a city of significance. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | Make much better use of the dark arches | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan seeks to activate the Dark Arches. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | Need much more provision for drop off and pick up in vehicles. Public transport in Leeds is not fit for purpose so people would drive to the station to pick people up. Much more provision for public hire cars to pick up and drop off. Don't call it south bank what a silly name we're not London we're Leeds. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | More bike space. Make sure there are easy routes out of the station onto the canal paths. Make sure the road system enables cyclists to travel from the north the south of the city. Cycling in the South of the city is still quite atrocious, so the project should look to improve this at least within its remit. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Specific detail surrounding bike space and the road system will come from design as work progresses. Movement and street design is addressed in the framework. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | Limit the number of entrances, will make it easier to prevent terrorism | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail surrounding designing out crime and anti-social behaviour for the required additional entrances will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q6a | Q6b | Q6c | Q6a-c LCC Comments | Q6a-c Draft SPD Response |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Survey Response Ref | The proposed points of access for pedestrians, buses, cars, pick up and taxis are acceptable | I support the space under the bridge at Neville Street being pedestrianised apart from access for any future mass/ rapid transport proposals | If you Disagree or Strongly Disagree to either of the above statements, please can you say why? | | |
| 1 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | I only disagree with the car pick up/drop off at Sovereign street. If we're aiming for a car-less future, I think the other pick up points are sufficient and given the traffic rearrangements being proposed, I don't see how much vehicular traffic would be able to easily get to Sovereign Street? As far as I'm aware the only access would be from Bridge Street and the downgrading Calls/ Call Lane. I think this would be acceptable for taxis, but encouraging traffic here would not be a great idea in my opinion. The two drop off points proposed are aligned with the proposed parking areas, and are appropriate and sufficient enough without the Sovereign Street entrance. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | Apologise if I'm missing anything. But the proposed masterplan doesn't show that the areas of drop-off and pick-up on Princes Square and New Station Street would be removed? The area around there is currently a nightmare for pedestrians, particularly on Princes Square, where it's very hard to cross the road at peak times. Congestion, pollution and road safety around there is really bad due to heavy drop off and pick up trips pretty much throughout the day and night. I would suggest to look more into placing drop off and pick up locations on Aire Street and Bishopgate Street, or even beyond. Believe me people are willing to walk for a bit to catch a taxi or a bus, just like they would need to do so in Manchester Piccadilly and Birmingham New Street. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | No real noticeable change for car/taxi pickup area. Current system is terrible with cars queuing around corner at Princes square. Needs improvement! | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Disagree | Agree | Drop off is none existent at the moment. Taxis block it off. Whole back parking area near wetherspoons should be waiting area. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree | There needs to be segregated access for private hire vehicles and ordinary cars for pick up / drop off. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | Agree if only a rapid transport system is built. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Disagree | A lot of cars enter the rest of the city centre through Neville Street, pedestrianising it will be disastrous. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | Disagree | | As has been shown with the (long running) improvements to Water Lane, blocking this route to traffic will cause congestion in all other city routes. This severely impacts Leeds businesses and has economic consequences. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 23 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | Strongly Agree | Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 29 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | If Leeds is going to do this it needs a full bus station | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| 33 | Disagree | Disagree | Removing vehicular access from the M621 in through City Square and onward to the inner city loop will cause untold chaos and make it nigh on impossible for car users/commuters to access the city centre. This will have a huge detrimental impact upon their working arrangements and quality of life, in the absence of a suitable flexible and affordable public transport alternative. Without spending £billions on a fit for purpose 21st century tram network, massively improving the range and frequency of local bus services (around and not just into/out from) the city, and running better, more modern & comfortable, more frequent and longer local trains, working in Leeds will become intolerable for many. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. Creation of a clear movement system: Inner Ring Road > City Boulevard > Pedestrian Precinct and Public Transport Box. This hierarchy will include the transformation of the City Centre Loop to a slower, more pedestrian and cycle friendly City Boulevard. This boulevard will allow for active frontages, landscaping and traffic calming measures. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Pedestrianising Neville Street, and construction of the proposed development will reduce access to Leeds city centre for all road traffic from south & east Leeds. The city centre will basically be a no-go area, especially with currently proposed HS2 construction affecting Pontefract Road (by the proposed depot at Arla), the new train lines being constructed between Woodlesford & the new HS2 station and the proposed closure of the rail line between Woodlesford & Leeds for up to 2 years. It will be a shambles. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Neither Agree or Disagree | | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | Agree | Strongly Disagree | This is a key route for access to the businesses down Neville Street. The surrounding roads could not cope with the extra capacity. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | They all seem very far away | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 44 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | Too much car parking provision. | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | Strongly Disagree | Agree | The drop off area needs improving. It's a disaster with only having 1 entrance exit and so little space. Putting in another drop off isn't going to solve the issue with the existing drop off area that is incredibly badly designed. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | Agree | Agree | We definitely need some form of mass transit, the current situation is an embarrassment. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 58 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | Strongly Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Will the taxi drop off n pick be also for public? The current layout/setup is pathetic and requires a major revamp please! I.e. Make it much larger and appealing to the eye! | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | Disagree | Agree | Two main points here - the current car pick up/drop off point is massively inadequate. The traffic this current position creates clogs the city centre by spilling out on to city square/inner loop and down Aire Street. The actual pick up point is a complete free-for-all with no structure or organisation. For a station of its size its massively inadequate and the station is to only get busier/larger. The other issue is the taxi pick up/drop off point at the current main entrance. I assume this will allow the idle sitting of taxis to exist on new station street? The obstruction and pollution this causes is not acceptable. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | Agree | Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | Disagree | Disagree | leave things as they are things run smooth enough and to move the bus station would be a joke causing traffic cahos | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 71 | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Although taxis remain in station forecourt, the buses have been moved out. Even existing station users would now have an unpleasant walk some distance away to Infirmary Street mini-hub, Park Row, the stops opposite Metro Offices or Aire Street, crossing the busy loop traffic or other roads. It would be intolerable for HS2 passengers. It is not clear what is to happen to the M621/A638 traffic. Is it to be diverted along a new loop east/west instead of north? If so, this would also relieve City Square. To me, the obvious answer is that the HS2 tracks etc are sufficiently high to allow traffic below, but limited to buses, taxis, dropping off/picking up. Park Row/Bishopgate Street/Neville Street become a North/South corridor for ALL buses in BOTH directions, stopping near the Sovereign Street "interchange". ALL buses from bus station (or nearby) WEST are diverted to the Sovereign Street interchange, turning North or South to resume existing routes. (there may not be road capacity for East buses after Infirmary Street to go down Bishopgate to turn left at Sovereign St, and left again at Lower Briggate). Whatever is decided, access to buses must be a prime driver, in priority to taxis and other vehicles. If cycles are to be allowed, please give them separate tracks, as they are a huge danger to pedestrians, other road users and themselves-mainly because they don't obey rules on the whole. | The role of Neville Street is under review and the option of retaining bus access one way whilst creating a high quality pedestrian environment is being explored. The detailed design of bus stop locations is still to be determined and will emerge as work progresses. | The role of Neville Street to be reviewed to retain public transport access. |
| 72 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | The new points are too far away from the main station platforms the old one is too small and not fit for purpose (as it has been for some time) the routes around the station are too congested. I'd suggest changing traffic management in the city to adjust for better routing. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | Agree | Strongly Agree | Parking space is currently limited and the appalling car access currently causes severe traffic jams | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | East of money. One way systems cause traffic problems | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | Strongly Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 90 | Agree | Strongly Disagree | Neville street is a much needed route for traffic coming from the m621 and to lose it would put more pressure and traffic onto the already very busy A643. You must think about the impact of traffic on the rest of the city not just this section of the station | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 98 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | make a metro system man . LCC is incompetent | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | Disagree | Disagree | The space allocated is not sufficient. The closure of Neville Street while attractive must be supported by emergency contingency plans in the case of disruption to other surrounding roads. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Detail around the allocation of space will emerge from the design as work progresses. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Its not very clear as to why or how this will help any current situation. The main transport issue is to the rear of the station where the taxi companies arrive. As long as this is extended to remove the traffic build up it makes sense. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | Disagree | Strongly Agree | No account taken for local travellers beyond buses or pick up on already choked roads. How do travellers get out of the city to their homes? The pick up point closest to City Square is not working now and is not sufficient going forwards. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 106 | Disagree | Agree | Too much emphasis on vehicular transport. NOT even a mention of bicycles. This is embarrassing and insulting to people who choose to use bicycles as a mode of transport. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Strongly Agree | There's no bus interchange south of the river | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | How the station interacts with other public transport services I. E. Bus / "potential MTR" will have a big impact on if the service is truly joined up, and ultimately useful! | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | Strongly Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | Strongly Agree | | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | Agree | Disagree | It's a good short cut and will cause too much traffic going down to the next available exit. Leeds needs more multi story car parks. | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | Strongly Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Insufficient drop off facilities | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | The bus stops are all over the place. How is someone to get off a train and catch a bus. There should be a bus/train interch2. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 128 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | It is difficult to assess things from a plan, but it looks S though lessons have been learnt. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | Strongly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | The combined Neville Street/ HS2 underpass is over 200 meters long, and will be an unpleasant walk thro even with traffic taken out. Some danger that with no traffic pedestrians will feel unsafe owing to lack of passing surveillance in a closed route. At best this should be a secondary north south route with the primary route being thro the arches and into the top of Sovereign Square with a west branch and new river crossing provided just to the east of the HS2 line, plus the new bridge crossing to the South bank park. No vehicles should pass along the northern edge of Sovereign Street park in order not to cut the pedestrian link north south. Re direct the Back Row / Arbour axis into a straight line visually connecting the new South bank park to Temple Works. Bus interchange to be connected to the station entrance building under the HS2 flyover rather than on Sovereign Street as shown. Bus interchanges on Wellington Street and Aire Street very detrimental to these two key routes connecting City Square to the West. Keep in Infirmary Street. The existing Corn Exchange example can not be repeated across our City Centre. | Comments noted. The SPD looks at mitigation strategies for the HS2 viaduct. Bus access on Neville Street is still currently up for debate. The SPD promotes the straight line Arbour axis outlined and this will continue to be reviewed and encouraged as the detailed design of the HS2 station progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | Agree | Strongly Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Can't find Neville street on the map. Not enough provision for cars and publicly Hire cars to pick up drop off. Everyone coming from West and north Leeds will still use the area from Wellington street because of the transport system | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | Agree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Neither Agree or Disagree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | Neither Agree or Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | Disagree | Agree | | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q6d | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Survey Response Ref | Do you have any comments/ suggestions on these access proposals? | Q6d LCC Comments | Q6d Draft SPD Response |
| 1 | Remove the sovereign street car drop off point. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Perhaps this mantra would summaries my suggestions for Leeds Train station and the south bank masterplan: "Planning for people, not for cars" :) | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | Hard to see Neville Street on map as it's not marked. | Comment noted. | Within the context of the SPD Neville Street is labeled on a number of plans so that readers become familiar with its location. |
| 6 | The failure to integrate bus and train links remains a problem for Leeds. Would even an elevated mass transport line to the bus station alone be out of the question? | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | The new Taxi Pick-Up point on Bishopgate should also be available as a car pick up point. | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Clear information on onwards transport ie which bus /mrt Interchange to go for | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding signage will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | The riverside has no access from the station. Could this area become poorer as a result? I am not certain how bus traffic on Sovereign street will work? | Comments noted. One of the 10 key moves in the South Bank Regeneration Framework looks at activating the waterfront. This is a guidance document, detail surrounding bus traffic and traffic management will emerge from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 23 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 29 | There is no mention of cyclists within the masterplan? In order to be sustainable and promote active travel, cycle routes and cycle parking will need to be included within the plans. There needs to be a seamless transfer between bike and rail and bike and bus etc. In the Netherlands 42% of people arrive at stations by bike, and they can only do so as there are the cycle routes, and there is also sufficient parking for thousands of bikes. Ample bike parking needs to be provided within this masterplan as it is a form of infrastructure that can't be ignored. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 31 | Where is the cycle route access. It appears ignored as it is currently. Surely with the superhighway nearby there should be well thought through access as well as a secure cycle storage facility as we currently have. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Clear and modern signage is key. Especially when there are so many exit's and so many bus/rail connectivity options when stepping off a train. Consider modern signage to not only advise where to go for what bus or train when you disembark a train/Bus - but also what what time those busses and/or trains will be departing. The station should be designed for the use of people who have never been to the city before, and focus should be on ease of transfer onto busses or connecting rail. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding signage will come from the design as work progresses. With regard to wayfinding, this will be a key element to the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan to ensure people are guided to the correct destination. One of the key aims and objectives of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is to enhance passenger facilities and experineices. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | 1) I like the hierarchy of users and agree with the concept of multiple bus interchanges rather than one large bus station. I'm concerned about the need to two separate taxi pick-ups, perhaps the northern taxi rank could be for mobility impaired users only? 2) Absolutely vital to pedestrianise as many areas as possible | Comments noted. This is a guidance document and the detail surrounding identifying users of the pick up / drop off points will emerge from the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Ensure that certain transport hubs or links don't become too isolated from one another | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 44 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | Better airport links needed. Build a new trainline. | Comments noted. An improved airport link is currently being looked into, please see www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/roadworks/airport-link-road | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | The drop off area needs improving. It's a disaster with only having 1 entrance exit and so little space | Comments noted. This is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | They look pretty well thought through to me. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 58 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Absolutely has to have provisions for mass transit. Leeds must build as if this is a given and make it as compelling an argument as possible that mass transit is a no brainer. The biggest city in Europe without mass transit. The city should be truly ashamed of that. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 64 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | As above. Must restrict vehicles (including taxi and private hire) | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | I like the pedestrian access and bridge from Wellington Street as there is significant commercial development going on there, including a new Government Hub which will contain thousands of people, many of whom will use the train. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | KNOCK DOWN QUEENS HOTEL. This would enable a VAST improvement for pedestrian access, vehicular approaches (whether buses, taxis, or other cars) | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 72 | The proposals cover a vast area; what specific plans have been made to cater for those with special needs and/or disablement? | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 73 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | Rapid transit systems must be fully integrated into the plan not just an afterthought. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | The new points are too far away from the main station platforms the old one is too small and not fit for purpose (as it has been for some time) the routes around the station are too congested. I'd suggest changing traffic management in the city to adjust for better routing. | Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | Leaving space for a mass transit system is essential to future development of the cities transport links | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | Please enforce ge car drop off so that only cars can use this area. Taxi's will undoubtedly try to use and congest this area. | Comments noted. Operational management of the train station is outside the scope of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and the South Bank Regeneration Framework. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 90 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | My only concern would be if there is sufficient parking as parking at a reasonable price is currently a big issue for me when visiting leeds | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | To feel safe these will need to have visible vehical gates | Comments noted. This detail will emerge from the design as the work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 95 | Get cars out of Leeds city centre. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 98 | metro system | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | Facilities for cyclists. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | It's a bit confusing... | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | Ensure walkways under the bridge, e.g. Neville Street, are remodelled to remove the steel cladding, the dark forbidding look and are brightly lit, whether by lighting or use of reflective surfaces. Ensure the proposed walkways under the Dark Arches are light, not wind tunnels - i.e. warm! - and feel safe to use even into the late and / or early hours. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail surrounding lighting and material use will come from the design as work progresses. The SPD looks at mitigation strategies for the HS2 viaduct, and the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan seeks to activate the Dark Arches. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | If Mass / rapid transport proposals is going to mean some sort of light railway / tram, then excellent, the city really needs it! | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | I agree for Neville street to become pedestrianised, providing adequate alternative routes around the city centre are created as access from the east of Leeds to wellington street/kirkstall road would become difficult. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 128 | Some good points and here. Knapp taxis, esp Uber away from car parks. | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| 129 | See alternative plan. We would welcome further discussion. It feels as if the Transport club are being free reign to ruin the centre of Leeds. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | Well thought-through & appropriate. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | Will there be enough pedestrian space inside the station as it is already overwhelming at the moment even at non peak times. | Comments noted. One of the key aims and objectives of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan is to enhance passenger facilities and experiences. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | No discussion of how cyclists will access the station! This is vital! | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. This is a guidance document and therefore specific detail surrounding cyclist access to the station will emerge from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q6e | | |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Survey Response Ref | Do you have any comments on the proposals contained within the draft SPD, or changes that you would propose to the SPD? Please quote the draft SPD page number where relevant. | Q6e LCC Comments | Q6e Draft SPD Response |
| 1 | 1. With works taking place to downgrade Calls/Call Lane to two way traffic, I think there should be (and likely would be) a reduced speed limit to 20 mph? There should also be a shared space crossing where the cobbled street to the Corn Exchange will interface with the new apartment complex and opened riverfront at Calls Wharf. The pavements should also be widened as they are quite narrow and dangerous at points especially on the north side of the road. 2. I don't know if this is relevant to this document with their being an Area Action Plan in place, but the road network arrangements as proposed would still cut off Hunslet and Victoria Mills, and the City Boulevard would cut off Leeds Dock still. Although this might be unavoidable, it would make sense to ensure that the boulevard is accessible enough that these areas remain connected - traffic levels on Oxford Street in London are something similar to what should be provided. | Comments noted. In response to 1. the Council is exploring the option of 20mph zones and will look to implement them across the city centre where deemed appropriate. The area around the Corn Exchange is outside of SPD scope. One of the ten key moves in the SPD as well as an important design strategy for South Bank is activating the waterfront and promoting waterfront access. Street hierarchy is addressed in the SPD through street design to improve the pedestrian experience. 2. The SPD promotes good connectivity in South Bank, as well as addressing street hierarchy and street design so that the volume of traffic on the Boulevard can be mitigated to improve pedestrian experience. | 20mph zones to be referenced in section 4.1 of the SPD. |
| 2 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Why are LCC spending millions on an already functional station. Large areas of Leeds suburbs (eg Harehills) needs loads of investment and regeneration | Comments noted. The arrival of HS2 and improved connectivity to London and the South presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Improve the novelty water taxi service to access other areas of centre or up to kirkstall. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | I think point 7 of this page is one of the main moves that will make this plan a success. Also improving mobility around the area, as well as connections to the rest of the city (not just the centre), will be essential | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | I'm not sure it's sufficiently clear who will be providing cultural activity and where; without coordination and encouragement for artists and practitioners I worry that spaces will be under-utilised or under-promoted and that will hamper the area's ability to draw traffic to the south of the river. | Comments noted. Cultural activity is likely to be facilitated through the Culture Strategy (2017-2030). | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | Looks good. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Timescales are maasively unambitious. A lot of these changes are long overdue irrespective of HS2. Works should be phased to allow non HS2 related works to commence without delay. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document and phasing is beyond the scope of the SPD. However, it is anticipated that some works will come forward in advance of HS2, for example Connecting Leeds (https://www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/connecting-leeds) which is looking to develop plans to bring improvements to public transport in Leeds. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | All very noble aims. I just hope if the Neville St underpass is closed an alternative route is credible (i.e. fully modelled / microsimulated). | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | None. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Needs to happen now. But vital is a rapid transport system. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | Firstly the Council must recognise the years and years of work undertaken by its own staff on this area and the plethora of documents that have gone before. Please don't let this good work go to waste. Secondly although nobody can disagree with the points above the plan does not effectively contain recommendations of how to connect and regenerate Hunslet itself. Hunslet has been destroyed by the Council twice in its history. Please do not let this happen again! This plan should clearly build upon previous work to identify routes and linkages and placemaking opportunities to reconnect Hunslet. This work has already been done but by not being included within the South Bank boundary Hunslet is once again in danger of being forgotten! | Comments noted. The vision for South Bank is for the regeneration to be inclusive which includes improving links to the surrounding neighbourhoods. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | Plans for the station should include another level of commercial space - the total footprint of the station is enormous and much of this space could be better utilised by having more levels above; for both commercial and office use. | Comments noted. The Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD is currently being updated. | Reference to be made in the South Bank Regeneration Framework SPD to the Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD. |
| 20 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | I agree, public spaces should be truly public not part public part private. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 22 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 23 | Utilise culture to help to differentiate the individual spaces is important - with careful consideration and the right individuals this could transform the long term value of the interventions to the city | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | Looks untreated infection and good for future growth | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | Disgusting waste of tax payers money | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | Don't build a massive viaduct across the Aire Valley at Woodlesford. It's huge blot on the landscape. | Comments noted. This is outside of the scope of this consultation. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 28 | It would be great for the area to support independent businesses, social enterprises, art and culture. There is a lot of large, corporate businesses and chains already in Leeds, so it would be brilliant for this area of Leeds to be a thriving local area. good cycling paths lots of park spaces and trees lots of benches for older people and those less able plants to grow on buildings to increase nature and sustainability of city | Comments noted. Commercial opportunities will arise from the regeneration in South Bank. Cycle connectivity, green space and public realm is addressed in the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 29 | Reliance on the car is being reduced, and it is surprising to see such a large multi-storey car park being proposed. Most cities are looking to remove cars from their centres, yet Leeds appears to be encouraging them in? | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | Please, please don't forget the future of sustainable transport and multi modal transport. So sort your cycling thinking through and include it. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Not at this time. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | See general comments below... | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | I anticipate moves 6) & 7) will occur naturally given the untapped nature of the riverfront and the heritage buildings. This will rely on getting the other areas such as road planning and place-making right. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | Additional green areas and re-wilding would be beneficial. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | They sound good. The south bank should be used to create city landmarks through bold, ambitious architecture, with high rise offices apartments and new public parks. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | Maybe listening to the views of the residents of all Leeds, not just the business community & politicians, before drawing up such documents might have been a better, more inclusive idea. | Comments noted. The consultation on this document has been open to everyone, including residents of Leeds. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Ensure that the lessons and mistakes of the Leeds Dock/ Royal Armouries area are learnt from. Listen to what will drive people into the area. Make sure that change implemented is sustainable and will gain interest for the area. A lot of the city's alternative/ underground nightlife is in this area - being in an area with proposed integrated transport systems could open up this area to people further afield than Leeds or its surroundings. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | Love the ideas of opening up the waterfront and celebrating local culture. Rationalisation of the road network needs to be done carefully. Those less able cannot always rely on public transport or foot transport and not all have a blue badge. They can't lose access in vehicles. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | The draft is alienating to the general public | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 44 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | While I support the use of the riverside as a transport and activity hub (social, commercial and residential), care will need to be taken with how to incorporate defensive architecture. A specific example would be the footpath that until recently ran along the back of Riverside Court. This was gated and locked due to repeated concerns from residents. The area was infested with rough sleepers, drug taking and sexual activity especially during weekend nights. There was little or no interest from proactive police patrols to keep the area safe and sanitary. I would object to the development of the riverside unless there was a clear plan to show how it would be kept as a safe space. | Comments noted. As a guidance document this level of detail is beyond the scope of the SPD. This would come from detailed design through individual planning applications and be dealt with through the planning process. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 46 | To reach its full potential Southbank needs its own underground rail station which could be created as part of a Leeds central area metro system akin to those that operate successfully in provincial cities like Newcastle, Liverpool and Glasgow. This is of course also the core of the CrossRail concept which will come to London in 2018 | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | The proposals appear to be at odds with Point 3 (parking) | Comments noted. With the arrival of HS2 and proposed new development in the area the SPD addresses the implementation of a sustainable parking strategy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | All sound suggestions. Look at links to wider area, the banks of the River Aire throughout the city to ensure continuity of feel out from the city centre and encourage active travel. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | Mass transit needed to boost local effect of the station masterplan. I grand station is merely a facade if it can easily be accessed by all in the city by fast reliable public transport, which Leeds is nowhere close too. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | There should be a plan to re-locate and address the area currently described as sex trade Managed area. | Comments noted. This is outside of the scope of this consultation. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 54 | As much affordable housing as possible | Comments noted. This is outside of the scope of this consultation. Affordable Housing will be provided in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | The drop off area needs improving. It's a disaster with only having 1 entrance exit and so little space. Movement in/out of the existing drop off area is horrendous. An improved parking strategy won't help, the issue is the flow of traffic | Comments noted. Pick up/drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | This all looked very exciting. As a lifelong LUFc fan and season ticket holder of 30plus years I was a little disappointed not to see some reference to the stadium being linked into the thinking. Many people come into the city via the station and have an awful time getting to the stadium currently -this scheme should be used as an opportunity to link the two things together. | Comments noted. | Reference to be made in the South Bank Regeneration Framework SPD to improved sporting, cultural and entertainment venue connectivity. |
| 58 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Nothing to add | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | - | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | I agree with the proposal | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | The waterfront area is a strong asset which needs to be maintained and improved within the proposals. Retail and food opportunities are inevitable but should be limited to ensure that they remain viable and integrated in the heritage environment. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | where is all the money coming from for all this the council cuts services but finds money for these things you are supposed to be a labour controlled council joke | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | Good bus links would be great, especially from the bus station lower down town. Or perhaps even a new "mini bus station" around the train station. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 72 | "Utilising culture to help placemaking", what does this mean? | Comments noted. This term is explained and clarified on page 43 of the Regeneration Framework. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | and create green relaxation places within the green and blue network | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | More use to be made of the river eg regular water taxi's to strategic points. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | The item is a large downloadable 130 page pdf not ideal for consultation | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | It's a shame that culture has been relegated to number 10! | Comments noted. The key moves are not in any order of priority. | Clarification to be included in the SPD that confirms the 10 key moves as presented are in no order of priority. |
| 77 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 78 | Don't live in the area so to us it would have to travel. Why isn't there are improvement in West Leeds. IV lived here for 54 years and bramley the poor relatstions | Comments noted. The proposed inward investment as a result of regeneration in South Bank will have a positive economic and regeneration impact on Leeds and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | I think Leeds probably should also have a tram-train system utilising our existing main-line railway infrastructure... That would serve all the areas of Leeds that the network already runs through... It would need more railway stations or just tram-train stops with side tracks so that the mainline trains can pass when required... So then there's no need to do all of the unnecessary & disruptive work that was planned with the previous Leeds tram proposals! All of this would obviously be a significant contribution towards solving Leeds' transport infrastructure problems! If this is to happen then the Station masterplan needs to incorporate the need for more space to house the tram-trains & associated passengers. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. Improved connectivity throughout the area is one of the key strategies addressed in the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | I think it's a very good idea. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | I like it | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 90 | 10. More parks, every good city has a good grass park that is sizeable and allows a much needed break from brick and concrete. It gives people another reason to head into the city and create social spaces, consider Hyde park in london when the winter wonderland opens or during the height of summer when the park becomes a hive of activity of small commerce and fairs but also a great place to be when a royal wedding happens | Comments noted. The SPD references the creation of a green space network as well as the creation of a new City Park. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | Add more bus routes through these new areas for ease of access. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail around bus service permeability will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | Forget shops, cafes, speculative building. Build affordable housing and make it unavailable to buy to let landlords. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Affordable Housing will be provided in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | Making more use of the river for example with the steps down, is a good idea. Waterline boathouse is an example of a popular destination which is bringing people to the south of the river. Cycle lanes built into road infrastructure is excellent. New homes built must be affordable to create a community. Homeowners create communities more than renters. The A1 Aire building flats required a deposit of something like £45,000. If you allow this to happen you won't make a community. This should also be used as a platform to encourage growth in Beeston. | Comments noted. With regard to Affordable Housing, this will be provided in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 98 | , | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | 4. Expanding the pedestrian area expands the real economy of goods and service as it will open up a much undervalued part of Leeds - south bank. I think to ensure character and charm is retained a focus on cycle paths is a good objective to have. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | Do it. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | The most important point is this should not be a vanity project but must be used to link develop inner city Leeds and expand the wealth of the city to the west. | Comments noted. The proposed inward investment as a result of regeneration in South Bank will have a positive economic and regeneration impact on Leeds and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | I have already commented on this in a separate document. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | Road design that considers the needs of cycling at all stages of planning. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 107 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | nah, seems good | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | The proposal makes a lot of sense for the city | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | Improved access, pedestrian zones and being sympathetic to heritage all get a thumbs up from me. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | All looks fantastic to me. A true modernisation, forward thinking and innovated. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | Nothing further to add. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | I think maintaining heritage is really important, otherwise Leeds risks becoming another generic UK mid sized city. Do something bold, be ambitious and don't be averse to using tax payers money to create something epic (I'm sure you're not!). | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | Like the idea of increasing pedestrian area. Improving park and ride schemes and creating joined up public transport links would provide genuine options for travel into the city. Leeds needs the infrastructure to make us leaders in productivity / efficiency. Relocation of retail/ domestic property for the land needed for HS2, AND a tram network would be an acceptable price to pay for our collective future success. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | N.a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | I think the access to Leeds via driving is fine and the original road layout and loop works well. I think it's more important to improve the access to the waterfront and make it look prettier like the Birmingham canal network around the back of the mailbox. It needs fairy lights and pedestrian areas and meeting points and bars and pubs on the waterfront (not shops). This new plan is unnecessarily complicated. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Specific detail surrounding lighting and development uses will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | No comment | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | I don't understand this | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | This would be a good idea and it needs to benefit Leeds | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 128 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | Must be world class. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | Clear thinking -good to see. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | What are green and blue networks? | Comments noted. The green network consists of streets, paths, urban spaces and parks, see page 38 of the framework. The blue network refers to the water (river, canal etc.), see page 92 of the framework. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | I can't find any mention of cycle storage i.e. places to lock up a bike. This is already at capacity in the station, and needs to be expanded. There should also be places in the new public spaces to lock up bikes. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Cycle Hubs referenced in the SPD. Specific detail surrounding cycle parking will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | It sounds good. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 137 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| Q2a | Q6f | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Survey Response Ref | Do you have any general comments on the draft SPD? Please quote the draft SPD page number where relevant. | Q6f LCC Comments | Q6f Draft SPD Response |
| 1 | I think the SPD is ambitious, daring and brilliant for the city. I think it does well to reduce car usage and open up the city centre. While i do think even more radical proposals to reduce traffic could be explored these would rely on major public transport upgrade such as a 'potential MTR' as discussed in the document... any information on this would be really appreciated!! | Comments noted. As work progresses on a potential MTR for Leeds this will be shared with the public. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | Why are LCC spending millions on an already functional station. Large areas of Leeds suburbs (eg Harehills) needs loads of investment and regeneration | Comments noted. The proposed inward investment as a result of regeneration in South Bank will have a positive economic and regeneration impact on Leeds and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | It would be great if incentives were put in place for small and local businesses to establish themselves in the area. | Comments noted. This is planning guidance and therefore outside the scope of this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 7 | Looks good. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | N/a | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | High quality public space is essential - it's what visitors remember the most - if their experience was pleasant. I also eagerly endorse a new skyscraper for Leeds' skyline. Bridgewater Place is visible from miles away on most routes into & around Leeds and ok as it is, a more impressive building (i.e. like London's Shard building) would really be an impressive addition. If we want Leeds to be one of the top 5 cities in the country, we need it to look like a large international city - and 1 tall standout building would really help here. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | None. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Needs to happen now. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 18 | See above | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 19 | More emphasis needs to be given to the integration of a future MRT system. A monorail could feed directly into the upper tiers of the station. These developments are all very exciting with Leeds as a gateway to the North, but if we cannot move people on efficiently once they have arrived then what is the point? For example, to matches at Headingley or Elland road, to the University campuses, non-city centre tourist attractions (Tropical world, Kirkstall Abbey, Thackray) | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 20 | Implement a sustainable parking strategy - as has been seen with Park and Ride - does not have the effectiveness that is planned. The further the parking is from the transportation hubs, or the more congested the routes are to parking, then the more the benefit from the public transportation is reduced. | Comments noted. The framework recognises the need for a sustainable car parking strategy as a result of proposed new development and the arrival of HS2. The framework is a guidance document only, the detail of parking provision will come from design as the work progresses and should be in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | existing businesses in the area and local business should be prioritised over chains and national companies. | Comments noted. This is planning guidance and therefore outside the scope of this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 23 | Thanks for sharing | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 24 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 25 | Disgusting waste of tax payers money | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 26 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 27 | While I believe that regeneration of the south bank would be good for Leeds, I don't support the construction of HS2, and believe the huge amounts of cash that will be spent on this white elephant would be better used on development of local transport - i.e. transport that majority of people use rather than the minority. The HS2 scheme is going to cause devastation and disruption for those people who live near the proposed route. The proposed route should follow existing transport corridors, rather than destroying countryside on the outskirts of Leeds that people enjoy and use. The huge 30 metre high 2 mile long viaduct that will run to the east of Woodlesford will completely devastate the area, and is completely unacceptable to local residents. The compensation amounts proposed by the government are woefully inadequate. The draft SPD looks fine, and would be an improvement on the current south bank, however, the views of local residents should not be ignored and full mitigation steps should be put in place to reduce the enviromental impacts of this white elephant. | Comments noted. The alignment of the proposed HS2 line is outside the scope of the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 28 | within housing - it would be wonderful to have an apartment block that was specialist dementia friendly housing. https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/info/20079/dementia_friendly_communities/1021/dementia-friendly_housing_charter http://www.dementiacare.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Housing-options-for-people-with-dementia.pdf https://www.housinglin.org.uk/_assets/Resources/Housing/HLIN_Dementia_Brochure.pdf http://dementia.stir.ac.uk/housing-dsdc/design-housing | Comments noted. This level of detail will be dealt with through the planning process. | Reference made in the SPD encouraging specialist housing as part of the housing tenure mix. |
| 29 | It is essential to be ambitious whilst also looking to the future. How do the plans consider driverless cars, and also ensure there are places on top of buildings where electric flying taxi's can set down, for companies like Airbus will have a prototype by the end of 2017? | Comments noted. This is a guidance document, detail around driverless cars and space on building rooftops for electric flying taxis will emerge through the design and planning process as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 30 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 31 | We need another drop off space that doesn't require it to cross transiting vehicles as it does now, currently clogging up bus routes as well as cars. Have safe straightforward and efficient pedestrian and cycle access as well as secure cycle storage. | Comments noted. Drop off is being looked at as part of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. Cycle Hubs referred to in both the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan and the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 32 | Not at this time. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 33 | What the city really needs is longer, better, more modern (comfortable & air conditioned) and more frequent LOCAL train services; a more comprehensive network of bus services (both around as well as in and out of the city) with increased frequency; and a state of the art tram network; all integrated with a large and well-equipped network of park and ride locations strategically situated around the city, adjacent to the M1, M1 link, M62, Stanningley bypass, and in other suitable locations to the north and northeast of the city. | Comments noted. The operation of train services is beyond the scope of the SPD. Please refer to Connecting Leeds for proposed public transport improvements in Leeds (https://www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/connecting-leeds). The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 34 | 1) They provide a clearly defined route for a 'City Boulevard' to replace the city centre loop – See page 34 for map. Page 48 has breaks down the new routes through the city. 2) Distinct parking strategy concept reduces vehicle intensity towards the city centre and the pedestrian precinct. Park & Rides are located outside the Outer Ring Road, long stay parking is located outside the City Boulevard and short stay, together with strategic long stay parking, is provided in the city centre – See page 36 for diagram 3) Expand the pedestrian precinct (Public Transport Box) and redefine the city centre. 4) Create better city location public realm locations (which refers to a specific enhancement at the Corn Exchange) – see page 38 for map. 5) Make the waterfront a central place of activity for the city (page 39) which fits well with shifting the bus routes further south and taking them along the calls 6) I'm slightly concerned about the lack of thought about buses but page 59 does specifically refer to LPTIP and the "significant medium term improvements to the bus network" it will bring. 7) Street Design has been looked at in detail, with lots of allowances for active modes and some for buses 8) In terms of bus routing, it's interesting to see that the HS2 Station Masterplan has buses turning right onto Bishopgate Street. Page 99 has multiple "Bus Interchange" locations marked on which may be worth working out if they fit with any short-term to medium-term re-routing. 9) They seem to have had some fun drawing some Mass Transit Routes in and around the new station. They even have one route using Swinegate then Sovereign St! | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan provides a framework for detailed design work to progress. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 35 | The proposals all seem to be based on sound principles, and make sense. Leeds should have first-rate transport facilities to help cement its position as a Northern economic hub. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 36 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 37 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 38 | Rty | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 39 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 40 | This area is occupied by a number of homeless people at the moment. The strategy should consider these vulnerable people. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 41 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 42 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 43 | In principle I support the expansion of the pedestrianised area. However, it is very important not to overlook the additional difficulty this could create for many disabled and vulnerable people. It will be essential to boost the provision of disabled parking close into the town centre to avoid closing off the town centre to such people. | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 44 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 45 | The resolution of the images made it hard to read the detail on the maps. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 46 | Nothing more than said in earlier paragraphs | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 47 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 48 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 49 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 50 | N9ne | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 51 | To ensure this project goes through, it should not be rushed, but this project should commence as soon as possible to consolidate further investment in the area or prevent the potential collapse of the project, or even HS2 itself. Make sure the projects going before it gets scrapped as with other transport schemes in Leeds. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 52 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 53 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 54 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 55 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 56 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 57 | At 130 pages in length it was a bit over long and hard to follow in places. You should produce a decent executive summary and an easy read version so that more people have the opportunity to comment. It looks at this stage that they are only really interested in courting investors and developers, this should be about more than that. | Comments noted. It is not customary to produce an executive summary of an SPD because of its formal status as planning policy. Chapter 4 on the Ten Key Moves is a useful overview. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 58 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 59 | Please build a 'garden village' on the vast swathes of disused brown land that stretches from Sweet Street to Armley. And leave the green belt alone. | Comments noted. Reference made in the SPD to a green space network and a new City Park in South Bank. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 60 | Nothing to add | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 61 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 62 | - | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 63 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 64 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 65 | I look forward to seeing the plan becoming reality | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 66 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 67 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 68 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 69 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 70 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 71 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 72 | What sort of time frame towards completion are we looking at? Should HS2 be cancelled by a future government will the whole thing be cancelled? | Comments noted. The South Bank Regeneration Framework sets out guidance for regeneration and development for the South Bank which presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds, its neighbourhoods and the Leeds City Region. As a guidance document the SPD is flexible but given a safeguarding direction has been issued for the HS2 route and station this is the context in which the SPD is being prepared. The SPD cannot present a scenrio which potentially conflicts with the safeguarding direction. In the event of HS2 not going ahead the document could be revised or withdrawn. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 73 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 74 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 75 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 76 | N/A | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 77 | NO | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 78 | Be fair with tax and council tax payers money. The council constantly is wasting money. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 79 | Not yet | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 80 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 81 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 82 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 83 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 84 | I would like to see how it is proposed to make the new city park safe also at night | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Detail around community safety will emerge from the design as work on the City Park progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 85 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 86 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 87 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 88 | This seems to be a very strong development that hopefully will go ahead as planned | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 89 | Promising, however they need to make the objectives last the duration of the project and ensure the end product will last for generations | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 90 | 10. More parks, every good city has a good grass park that is sizeable and allows a much needed break from brick and concrete. It gives people another reason to head into the city and create social spaces, consider Hyde park in london when the winter wonderland opens or during the height of summer when the park becomes a hive of activity of small commerce and fairs but also a great place to be when a royal wedding happens | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 91 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 92 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 93 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 94 | Love the changes | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 95 | Where are the proposals to use the vast empty spaces to build affordable housing? | Comments noted. With regard to Affordable Housing, this will be provided in line with planning policy. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 96 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 97 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 98 | ''' | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 99 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 100 | It looks good | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 101 | Do it. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 102 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 103 | It should be opened up to the inner wards for a number of information sessions to hear their concerns. | Comments noted. Two rounds of extensive public consultation took place on the SPD which included drop-in sessions at venues in neighbouring inner wards. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 104 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 105 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 106 | It ignores cycling. That's not a forward looking scheme. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan references cycling links and cycling hubs. The masterplan will be informed by the South Bank Regeneration Framework which also includes cycling, looking at connectivity, cycle space as part of street design and cycle parking. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 107 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 108 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 109 | anything free for doing this survey? also what kinds of leisure and shops will you be offering? | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. Detail around the mix of uses will emerge from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 110 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 111 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 112 | No. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 113 | All looks fantastic to me. A true modernisation, forward thinking and innovated. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 114 | Nothing further to add. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 115 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 116 | Looks good, am excited | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 117 | Sections 4.1 and 4.3 are the most critical part of the whole document. Section 4.2 will have a marginal impact on the city (and I'm saying that a some who enjoys a bike ride / walk) | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 118 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 119 | I think all of the proposals are necessary for Leeds to be considered as a major European City. The one thing that lets our city down is the lack of a mass transit network. I've said for years that Leeds needs a tram system to compete with leading European cities. I also firmly believe that a tram network stretching out into Leeds's suburbs/districts would greatly help this cities awful pollution levels as well as relieving some of the congestion around the city, which as a resident living near the centre of Leeds, I can say is dreadful. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 120 | N/a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 121 | N.a | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 122 | Draft no one | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 123 | No comment | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 124 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 125 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 126 | None | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 127 | It looks good and is an exciting prospect | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 128 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 129 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 130 | Excellent -great to see such a visionary, ambitious approach. I fully applaud those inputting ideas and energy into this project. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 131 | No | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 132 | . | None specific to this comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 133 | Haven't read it | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 134 | Regarding changes to cycle routes/access, it is good to see some mention. Only a few examples are given. These are buried in the document, and hard to imagine as a cyclist. I would like to see a map devoted to cycle transport - this would show the current state of cycle access which would be coded for different types (e.g. road/segregated lane/seperate cycleway etc). Then a new version of this with the proposed plans. This would allow cyclists to consider their own journey's and highlight any missed bottlenecks that they're aware of. | Comments noted. Figure 7.8 shows some cycle links but the final form (eg road / segregated) is still to be determined as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 135 | no | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 136 | Unclear as to distances which would need to be covered by people with limited mobility. Currently the Park & Ride scheme only allows limited access to parts of the city for those who cannot walk a great distance. Access buses available to Blue Badge holders around the city to connect areas should be considered, also bookable parking in key locations, eg for access to galleries, theatres etc. | Comments noted. | Reference to design compliance with the Equality Act. |
| 137 | Would be better spending money on a joined up infrastructure for people travelling around Leeds rather than something for people leaving Leeds. | Comments noted. The arrival of HS2 and improved connectivity to London and the South presents an opportunity for inward investment and economic growth to Leeds, its neighbourhoods and the Leeds City Region. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| General Comment Ref | General Public - Comments | LCC Comments | Draft SPD Response |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| 1 | <p>With regards to the above, whilst I welcome plans to improve the infrastructure for cyclists by including in the plans the creation of a 'green corridor' (essentially a segregated cycle lane) along the A369 Hunslet/Pontefract Road from Leeds towards Woodlesford, I feel it would better to divert attention to the current route from Leeds City Centre to Woodlesford along the canal path.</p> <p>The current condition of the route beyond Thwaite Mills is atrocious. The damage caused by extensive flooding in late 2015 has not been resolved. The 'path' was already susceptible to flood damage making it almost impossible to navigate safely with the mud & puddles. There is also the health effect considering the pollution from the sewage treatment plant at Knostrop coming 'down river'.</p> <p>I used to use this route but gave up commuting this way as it involves a twice-daily washing down of my bike however, the alternative route I then used down Pontefract Lane has also encountered problems for me recently inasmuch as almost being assaulted for having the audacity to use a pavement which is also a cycle path. There have been two incidents with one man which I reported to the police & I am now using a third route to cycle home to Woodlesford going through Stourton. This is not ideal without a designated cycle lane at present.</p> <p>The issues I have mentioned with regards to the following the canal path are exacerbated for those who may consider commuting or cycling for leisure by the fact that there is no lighting for most of the journey. Again, this makes it unsafe especially in the dark months of the year.</p> | Comments noted but beyond the scope of the South Bank SPD. Look to share the feedback with relevant contacts. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | <p>I write in a personal capacity as a Leeds resident and as somebody who both works and regularly socialises within Holbeck.</p> <p>My career as an ecologist and as somebody who consults nationally upon conservation, climate-change residence, natural-capital and green-infrastructure, affords me an overview of some of the most ambitious developments around the country.</p> <p>It's hard to see anything but a very limited ambition to incorporate green-infrastructure and people's health and well-being within the current proposals.</p> <p>Leeds has a really very valuable opportunity to do something truly novel, sustainable and groundbreaking in Holbeck because it appears to have really very few of the constraints and limitations which some of the most progressive urban designers have had to overcome within cities like Bristol. Instead it lacks ambition and shows hugely limited scope throughout. This is a great shame and I hope you reconsider some of the fundamentals within this development because if designed well, high functioning urban ecology can propel a more healthy urban environment and attract both innovators and many well paid employers to an area.</p> <p>If you want a more future scoping urban design, why don't you start by evaluating the potential worth which some of the area's watercourses (both open, underground and culverted) could afford. Many European cities have transformed parts of their cities by transforming culverted underground sewers/watercourses into flourishing open green corridors which attract both people and wildlife, in addition to increased flood resilience. Surely you can do better with the waterbody which currently runs the length of Water Lane in Holbeck!?</p> <p>Come on Leeds we can do better than this!!</p> | The Holbeck South Bank SPD promotes enhancements to the Hol Beck. The SPD seeks to create a connected green and blue network as one of its fundamental concepts. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | <p>Would it not be better to improve the original cycle path and less expensive rather than build new ones. This canal path is beautiful, used extensive by walkers and bikes and will during next year go on to link Leeds, Woodlesford, Methley, Castleford and Wakefield, what a fantastic achievement, and going West as far as Liverpool.</p> <p>Living in Oulton I use it regular, however, I find it dangerous in winter and unable to use it when taken children with me due to the poor state of the path, mainly because we have to carry our bikes up the stairs and over at Skelton bridge.</p> <p>The new river Aire bridge that links the path to Temple Newsam has been a great success, the extension of improvement to the path all the way to Leeds would be amazing.</p> | Comments noted but beyond the scope of the South Bank SPD. Look to share the feedback with relevant contacts. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | <p>I'm emailing with regards to the feedback on the proposed by the project cycle ways.</p> <p>I live in Woodlesford, a suburb directly connected with the south of the city centre by the river. If there was a safe, easy path that I could take I would without any hesitation immediately ditch the car and choose my bike. So would my husband and many of my Woodlesford based friends.</p> <p>It is well established knowledge that a path far from car traffic is far better for cycling and therefore I pledge to refurbish the cycling path that already semi exists, instead of investing a fortune in a cycleway along car fumes.</p> | Comments noted but beyond the scope of the South Bank SPD. Look to share the feedback with relevant contacts. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Temple Works</p> <p>I wish to make the comment that this building has to be saved not only for the city but for history. We will never see this sort of building again. It needs to be re- gened and used for the benefit of the people.</p> | Noted / Agree | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | <p>Firstly I wish to complain about the format in which the Station Masterplan has been made available. The document does not print out in a readable format. As someone who only has sight in one eye I feel that this is inappropriate. Does the Council have accessibility standards for the format in which documents are issued? If so does this document comply with those standards?</p> | Note comments relating to format - to address in final version. | It may be necessary to print an A4 version in addition to the A5 and higher resolution plans will be incorporated where relevant. |
| 6 | <p>I think that the South Bank SPD is a very good document and overall I support the contents. However the Station Masterplan is written in a very different style and reads like a glossy publicity document. There is very little discussion about the how the aspirations contained in Chapter 6 of the SPD will be delivered – the text is more a restatement of those aspirations leaving the reader to infer the contents of the plan itself from the diagrams.</p> | The work relating to the detailed design of HS2 is on going. There is a note included at P91 that proposals for the station should respond to the masterplan. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 6 | The station is a very constrained site with the river, also existing features such as the Queens Hotel may limit the ability to fully achieve the aspirations. There will also be operational constraints associated with the efficient operation of the station. This means that there will be trade-offs between the objectives in what can be achieved with the need to balance or choose between e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, bus passengers, taxis. The Masterplan does not seem to recognise these conflicts or that compromise is necessary in the design. There is no reference to any option appraisal having been carried out. This gives concern as to whether there has been adequate evaluation. | Current proposal is as a result of an options appraisal - include some background information for LISM within SPD. | Include background information relating to LISM within the introduction - 'How we produced the framework'. |
| 6 | Page 90 - The plans for a common concourse above the platform areas seem very good. The implication of the Masterplan is that it would not be necessary to have a train ticket to access this area and that it would be open to the public. However there is no indication as to how this might be achieved. Issues of revenue protection and safety are also important and it would not be acceptable for there to be lengthy queues at barriers to enter individual platforms from the common concourse. Designing around aspirational digital futures which are not yet operationalised is problematic and may suggest the need for flexibility to respond to future developments in ticketing. It seems that the intention is to retain the current overbridge as additional to the common concourse. One possibility would be for use of the current overbridge to be restricted to people with tickets (as at present) enabling it to provide a useful means for people to interchange between trains without having to exit and re-enter any ticket barriers to the common concourse. This would be analogous to people being able to change planes whilst being 'air-side' at an airport. | Level of detail requested beyond the scope of SPD/LISM which sets the aspiration but does not intend to go into detail design. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Figures throughout chapter 7 (page 90 onwards) - I question whether this location will be able to accommodate the number of taxis at an enlarged station. Also being at a lower level than the station entrance it will not be very convenient. I suggest that the taxi rank would be better located on the other (Wetherspoons) side of the station where it will be easier for taxis to get in and out of the city via Wellington Street and Whitehall Road. There is a car park near there currently used by Princes Exchange. Could this be incorporated into the station 'campus' for use as a taxi rank? If more space then this is needed then additional space might be provided by constructing a 'raft' / platform over part of the river near Princes Exchange to accommodate taxis waiting / a holding area. This would also enable extension of the new walkway underneath the station to Whitehall Road. | Pick up and drop off arrangements are being looked at as part of LISM and exact locations will be determined as work progresses. | Amended wording to include reference to drop off and pick up along the transport network in the city. |
| 6 | I think that the plans for this area need a major rethink. Most people exiting the station here will either turn left into City Square or right into New Station Street and so will not encounter this area. To have steps leading down from the station is unsuitable and could lead to accidents. Also they do not lead anywhere other than to the taxi rank. Being overshadowed by other buildings it will probably not be a pleasant place for people to sit. Construction of this area is likely to be very expensive. The 'driver' for this seems to be the desire for Leeds to have a 'grand' station entrance. I am concerned that rather than adding to the street scene this may turn into a 'vanity project' with the steps being seen in future years as a 'folly'. | The images for Bishopgate are illustrative, detailed design of the station entrances will be determined as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Leeds differs from many major cities (e.g. Newcastle) in not having a 'grand' station entrance. The nearest to a grand frontage is the Queens Hotel with City Square functioning as the 'station square'. A 'grand' entrance to the station would logically be on to City Square and not Bishopgate, but this would involve demolition of the Queens Hotel! | Demolition of the Queens Hotel not promoted by LISM. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | An alternative to providing an "artificial" grand entrance (such as the proposal on Bishopgate) would be to provide entrances which could be seen as "understatement" and hence present the image of a "working" as opposed to a "capital" city. They can nevertheless constitute tasteful and pleasant areas well-designed according to what is appropriate for each entrance and its environs. The new Southern Entrance is an example of a high quality entrance that would not be described as "grand". This approach would provide the element of surprise once inside the station (e.g. common concourse). Perhaps by daring to be different we in Leeds can turn the lack of a grand entrance into a strength? | Comments noted. The detailed design of the station entrances will be determined as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Highlighted in figures throughout chapter 7 - The Masterplan does not seem to have attached sufficient importance to buses and the need for provision of good quality interchange between bus and rail services. This would seem to be inconsistent with the need for good quality interchange indicated in the WYCA transport strategy and also the Leeds strategy of seeking large increases in bus patronage. I do not think that the intention for people to have to walk outside the station to bus stops in the city (e.g. Infirmary Street, Park Row or Boar Lane) provides the level of integration that is necessary. My own '7' series bus service currently comes directly into the station via New Station Street which is excellent. According to the Masterplan I will need to walk from Boar Lane or Infirmary Street to get to the station. This is far enough to get very wet in bad weather. If I have a guest visiting, should I leave them to get the bus from the railway station up to Alwoodley or as a good host should I drive into Leeds and meet them at the station. If the buses went from an interchange integrated into the station campus I would probably do the former, if they needed to walk to Infirmary Street I would probably feel that I should take the car and meet them. | Comments noted. The Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan proposals include for access for all modes of transport, with passive provision to be enabled for any future mass transit proposals. | Amendments proposed to the SPD to strengthen the role of Public Transport. Amended wording in the Access to Multiple Modes of travel section to include reference to drop off and pick up along the transport network in the city. |
| 6 | Highlighted in figures throughout chapter 7 - Clearly not all bus routes are able to serve the station. However I think that there are two opportunities to provide high quality interchange between bus-rail at the station. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Highlighted in figures throughout chapter 7 - Whilst I support the removal of general traffic from Neville Street a bus interchange could be provided underneath the station on Neville Street for buses operating on the important north-south route including the Infirmary, University and Arena and new commercial district around the HS2 station. Rail passengers could access this by taking the proposed escalators down from the concourse area to the dark arches thus enabling a seamless interchange within the station. Longer term Neville Street could become an interchange for a rapid transit system. | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The specific detail around bus service permeability will come from the design as work progresses. LISM already envisages passive provision for future rapid transit system through Neville Street and does not preclude it becoming an interchange. The role of Neville Street is to be determined but potential to retain access for busses. | SPD response to be agreed depending on Neville Street decision. |

| | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|
| <p>6</p> | <p>Highlighted in figures throughout chapter 7 - Instead of the proposed Bishopgate terrace, New Station Street could continue to operate as an interchange for east-west buses. If the taxi rank were moved to the north-west side of the station as proposed above, then the space vacated could be used for a new bus interchange connected to the station entrance by covered walkway. This would leave space to extend the pedestrian area in front of the station entrance as proposed in the masterplan and to provide a plaza as a smaller scale but nevertheless high quality area of public realm. If the buses from New Station Street were to access City Square via a link to Bishopgate then the area underneath the Queens Hotel arch could still be pedestrianised. Routing east-west buses via New Station Street would also have the advantage that, if in the future Bishopgate became a north-south Rapid Transit corridor, New Station Street would provide a means for east-west buses to cross this without the need for a 'flat' junction. The cycle route from Sovereign Bridge / Square could be routed to City Square via Mill Hill and Boar Lane. Longer term, I suggest consideration be given to provision of a second city centre station (to be used by local services only) to serve Quarry Hill and the Bus/Coach Station. This would reduce the footfall eastwards on New Station Street as passengers would be able to alight from local services at the east side of the city centre or change from longer distance services on to the local metro within the station complex.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Please refer to Connecting Leeds (https://www.leeds.gov.uk/residents/parking-roads-and-travel/connecting-leeds) which is looking to develop plans to bring improvements to public transport in Leeds.</p> | <p>Amendment to Key Move to strengthen the emphasis on public transport.</p> |
| <p>6</p> | <p>Page 34 4.1 - City Boulevard To remove traffic from City Square and Neville Street the intention is that through traffic should use the Inner Ring Road. Whilst I support this in principle the intention seems to designate the M621 J2-3 and the A643 Ingram Distributor as part of the Inner Ring Road. J2 of the M621 is approx. 1.5 miles from the centre of Leeds (as represented by City Square) – I think that this is too far out for the route of an Inner Ring Road. The crow flies distance on each of the sides of the triangle formed between the M61 J3, M621 J2 and the Armley Giratory is approx. 1 mile. This means that traffic from the M1 wanting to access the A65 Kirkstall Road or A647 Armley Road would have to travel a mile more than necessary. I have seen figures indicating that 25,000 vehicles per day travel through Neville Street and into City Square. If traffic in each direction is routed via M621 J2 this represents an additional 50,000 needless miles travelled. Overall this will increase noise and pollution in central Leeds. The City Boulevard is shown as extending round the south west side of the city centre from Jack Lane to Whitehall Road. Could this instead become a new section of Inner Ring Road from M621 J3 (which already exists) and linking into the Armley Giratory? This would save the expense of enhancements to the M621 and A643.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Traffic will be encouraged to move around the city centre rather than through it. The Inner Ring Road will have the greatest volume of traffic, while a proposed City Boulevard will accommodate slower moving vehicles, prioritising pedestrians and cyclists in a pleasant and safe environment. Specific junction arrangements will emerge through the detailed design process.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| <p>6</p> | <p>Glass roof on the NE Station Entrance There is reference to the possibility of a "feature glass roof" for the NE station entrance. Could variation in lighting levels make the digital display screens indicating train arrivals and departures more difficult to see?</p> | <p>Level of detail to be dealt with at a detailed design stage</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |

| General Comment Ref | Organisations - Comments | LCC Comments | Draft SPD Response |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 1 | ASDA are proud to be located in Leeds and welcome the opportunity to enter into dialogue with the Council to ensure that the interests of both parties are represented in this time of change and regeneration for the South Bank, and to ensure that conducting business in this area remains viable. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | When adopted, the SPD will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications which fall within the South Bank, as such it is important that policies acknowledge that a flexible and pragmatic approach to businesses already operating in the area is required, particularly with regard to the High Speed 2 ('HS2') proposals, the lead in time to which will pose enormous challenges for ASDA in terms of their commercial operations and business planning. The SPD document should provide support to ASDA and other businesses in the area to assist these organisations in maintaining and growing, specifically recognising the importance of temporary developments and flexibility during the lead in period to the introduction of High Speed Rail to the area. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | Page 24/25 2.9 - Principles - flexibility and temporary use. The Principles set out at SBRF 1 to SBRF 5 aim to shape the delivery of the South Bank, in particular the land around the HS2 station. Whilst ASDA is supportive of the framework and the principles therein, the importance of flexibility for businesses which currently occupy space on the South Bank cannot be overstated. It is likely that in the current period up until the delivery of HS2, a number of temporary and flexible use applications will be required to ensure that business space can continue to be viably occupied in the area and other land holdings can accommodate flexible land uses to support the business space in the interim. | Temporary uses are considered in the document at 5.4.2, 8.4.2 and 8.4.4. It would be difficult for the document to go further into specific uses within the scope of an SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | Page 68. ASDA welcome the support at section for 5.4 for temporary uses and the re-use of existing buildings, and would like to see this support echoed throughout the document, particularly in the context of the principles which will shape the South Bank area. | Temporary uses are well covered in the SPD including at Section 8.4. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | Page 121. Ensuring flexibility will benefit the area, maintaining vibrancy in the interim before the HS2 proposals are delivered. This accords with section 8.4.4 which states 'This framework strongly advocates and encourages worthwhile and meaningful uses, and we discourage sites remaining vacant and derelict'. ASDA support this statement. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | Page 118. Finally, ASDA also welcome paragraph 8.1.5 to 'work flexibly with businesses and supply chains to encourage and deliver growth for businesses' and look forward to engaging with the council to ensure that the South Bank area remains a vibrant place to conduct business. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 1 | In conclusion, whilst supportive of the regeneration of the South Bank and the overall principles expressed within the 'South Bank Leeds Regeneration Framework: SPD Consultation Draft' document, ASDA requests that the document should better recognise the significant challenges to businesses already located in the area, in particular ASDA, with their significant employment and land interests. The SPD planning policies (SBRF 1 to SBRF 5) should reflect this through including more flexibility for businesses conducting operations in the area, particularly in the lead in to the delivery of HS2. | Temporary uses are considered within the document. The SPD seeks to be a flexible framework to support and guide development in the Bank. The SPD principles will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and will therefore be balanced by the LPA in the context of an application. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Pages 89-99. In terms of specific comments on the content of the Framework, we have previously expressed our support for the approach advocated within the emerging HS2 Station Masterplan, and replicated within the draft Framework, of having multiple entrances within the South Bank area in order to maximise the benefits of the station for the City, and the South Bank in particular. This approach will also provide the station and its facilities with maximum levels of patronage and support. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Pages 34, 58 & 59. A key concern of Aviva is that road infrastructure continues to be able to support efficient operation of the CPSP, and other businesses/destinations in the South Bank. Creation of the 'City Boulevard' along Hunslet Road/Great Wilson Street to the frontage of the CPSP will clearly have an impact in this regard. Our understanding is that the Boulevard will be narrowed to a single lane carriageway in each direction in this location. The continuation of two way movements is supported by Aviva. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | Pages 34, 58 & 59. We would, however, request the opportunity to review the proposals in more detail where they relate to the main site access to the CPSP. The concern is that during peak periods, and despite the high proportion of trips made to the CPSP via non-car modes, this site access is very busy and heavily reliant on the dedicated slip lanes to accommodate traffic turning into the site whilst maintaining flows on the main carriageway. In our view it is essential, and in the interest of both the CPSP and the wider highway network, that such an approach is maintained. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | As with most interested parties in the South Bank, Aviva would also be keen to understand how works will be programmed and undertaken in order to keep disruption to an absolute minimum. Aviva expect to be consulted on these details. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | The aspiration for the area set out within the Framework provides a clear opportunity for the CPSP to perform an anchor 'district centre' role within the South Bank. This will form part of a logical evolution of the CPSP's role and function given the corresponding increase in working and resident population anticipated within the area. | The SPD cannot designate Crown Point as a 'district centre'. The role and function of centres is a matter for the Core Strategy or other development plan document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 2 | However, it is noted that there is a significant amount of further retail/leisure/food and beverage space being promoted within the South Bank, whether through the Framework or independent planning applications. For example, the proposals for the HS2 station include an allowance for approximately 7,000 sqm of such space, the outline planning permission for redevelopment of the Tetley Brewery site includes an allowance for circa 15,000 sqm of such space, whilst the CEG proposals at Holbeck include approximately 12,000 sqm of retail/leisure/food and beverage space. In total, this broadly equates to the scale of a new CPSP. Whilst all of this may be deemed 'ancillary' to the respective development, with the anticipation that it will not compete with the City Centre retail offer, or indeed that of the CPSP, it is nevertheless a significant quantum of space and there is justification for, and scope to manage the potential implications of this volume of space through the Framework. This is necessary to ensure that the primary shopping quarter of the City Centre doesn't become even more stretched and dispersed. | Town centre uses acceptable throughout the South Bank. Individual planning approvals have been the subject of the relevant policy tests. SBRF Principle 2 references Policy P7 of the Core Strategy. Caveats to be added where retail is referenced that it is *Subject to planning policy. | Caveats added after retail references that it is ancillary and/or as appropriate 'subject to planning policy'. Replace Large scale retail with - Leisure or commercial spaces as a viaduct strategy. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | <p>In summary, Aviva support the broad approach and level of aspiration for the South Bank set out within the draft Framework. This support is offered subject to the addition of further detail and/or the scope for further detailed consultation on a limited number of points, and most importantly those regarding road infrastructure changes.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>1. Status of the Draft SPD We commend the status of the document as an SPD, in providing a formal planning framework to guide the future development of the South Bank area. This is important for providing some certainty for developers with respect to the planning status of the document and its role in guiding development decisions, as well as providing a vision for the future development and growth of the area. The SPD helpfully sets out the policy context for the South Bank area (Chapter 2) and outlines how the SPD relates to the other documents within the Local Development Framework (the Core Strategy, draft Southbank Framework Plan, the Holbeck South Bank Urban Village SPD, The Local Plan Site Allocations Plan, The Aire Valley Action Plan DPD, the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan and the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan). This is important for clarifying the position of the document in the policy hierarchy. However, we still consider that there is a significant amount of guidance available which is confusing and indeed, which doesn't really get to the heart of what should be happening where. Whilst we welcome the freedom and flexibility this brings, and recognise that certain key sites will inevitably be more advanced than others, we would also welcome some guidance and certainty about how the south bank will progress in the future, particularly in the more peripheral areas. We also consider that the timeframes for delivery of HS2 are so remote, even in a scenario where that infrastructure is delivered, that the SPD could offer more guidance on the shorter term desired outcomes for the area. Our concern is that the more peripheral areas of the south bank could stagnate until the core sites (eg new station, Tetley, Burberry) are delivered. Whilst some of these are moving forward, others are delayed and this is causing uncertainty around what the future market will be.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>We also do not consider that the SPD goes far enough in terms of drawing the themes and key proposals in the existing / emerging documents together into a cohesive whole. It should aim to cement the approach being adopted across the area and to offer a unified face to both current landowners and future investors. This is important at a time when there is uncertainty about both major infrastructure decisions and the nature and strength of the market across the South Bank to have a single vision for the future development and growth of the area. In previous consultation on the South Bank Leeds Framework Plan we suggested that the SPD should include a "road map" for all of the overlapping guidance in the South Bank so that the timeline and ultimate picture sought by these various documents is well articulated.</p> | <p>Road map covered by Figures 2.1 to a large extent. Add expected adoption date for SAP. It is not the purpose of an SPD to repeat what is included in other plans or direct the pace of development activity.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>2. General Comments on the draft SPD As outlined in Section 2.4 of the document, we note that the focus of the SPD is predominately upon the HS2 interchange, the station masterplan and the 'immediate hinterland' in the area surrounding the proposed integrated station. The SPD maintains a high level focus in relation to the rest of the South Bank area and does not, for example, provide specific guidance regarding our client's site. We will and do welcome some flexibility in approach, given the current market uncertainty, but would also welcome some guidance on what development may occur on other sites in order to inform our ongoing master planning process</p> | <p>The SPD cannot make statement about the use of land. Appropriate uses in the wider area are set out in the Core Strategy and where appropriate site-specific allocations are made in the Aire Valley AAP and draft SAP.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Section 5.3 - The City Boulevard. This is a logical proposal in theory, but it should not result in a reduction of the net developable area of sites. Avoiding the loss of developable area is imperative for the commerciality of sites. For the 'City One' site there are some serious challenges with the amount of utility infrastructure that crosses the site - e.g. the primary sub-station and the high pressure gas mains - which impact on net site area already. The further loss of developable space will have an adverse effect on the usability and commerciality of the site in bringing this key gateway site and others like it, forward for development. In principle we support the boulevard concept but will wish to comment in detail once the land take is better understood.</p> | <p>The Boulevard is an aspiration but the detail is still to be agreed.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Section 5.3 - Reworking the Gyrotory System. As commercial developers, my client cannot stress enough the importance of ensuring that any changes to the road network and / or motorway junctions do not reduce the capacity of the existing highways network. Highways capacity is a critical element in any planning proposal and has been the source of delay and cost for earlier proposed development in the South Bank, particularly those which may affect motorway junctions. Early discussions between the Council and Highways England will be imperative in delivering the proposed movement and network changes. We would also wish to be a part of those discussions. Whilst we would welcome and support the principle of making the city centre less car oriented, in the current climate we would urge caution about any proposals which would be likely to result in lengthy negotiations and delays as a result of the more traditional views of highway capacity and development.</p> | <p>The council is working with Highways England to share proposals and agree a consistent methodology for planning application appraisals.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Section 5.3 - Street Design. The proposed street redesign will undoubtedly enhance the urban fabric of the South Bank area, but we query the methods that will be used to fund the extensive public realm improvements that are proposed and the effects that this may have on commercial returns, particularly on sites where there is already a challenging financial picture</p> | <p>The CIL contributions can be used towards public realm improvements. Policy G5 of the Core Strategy provides the basis for public realm improvements in lieu of open space requirements that cannot be met on site. The SPD is not seeking any further contributions from development sites.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Section 4.2 - Pedesrian and Cycling accessibility. We welcome the move to review the movement and access framework across the area. There is clearly significant room for improvement and we can see real potential to enhance pedestrian and cycle accessibility across the area, particularly with links through new green space and creating new connections between key transport hubs and major development sites. Making sure the individual development sites are joined up will be important</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Section 7.3 - Proposed uses. The document indicates a preference for commercial uses in the area wherein the City One site is located, although there is no clear steer on this. The proposals include a suggestion of "micrologistics" or last mile delivery operations close to the M621 junction. Providing flexibility in the mix of uses for development in this area will be important, rather than promoting a commercial bias for this area, which will limit the development potential of sites and their commercial viability. We currently see the site as being appropriate for a mix of residential and commercial uses, including new open spaces and active ground floor uses. Whilst there may be a role for micro-logistics this would need to be in a non-traditional format and be able to be well integrated with more traditional city centre blocks and uses.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | <p>3. Changes sought to the Draft SPD</p> <p>The SPD should include a "road map" for all the overlapping policy guidance in the South Bank so that the timeline and ultimate picture is well articulated in one framework document for the area. Whilst this is improved over the last draft document, there remains a patchwork of guidance which is difficult to negotiate, particularly for the non-professional reader.</p> <p>We understand that the document is strategic in its nature. However, we would urge caution about measures which will reduce the amount of developable land available on key sites, whether through small scale erosion (e.g. by new access routes) or by taking larger areas for non-essential infrastructure.</p> <p>We also seek that the commercial bias for the sites close to the M621 junctions is amended, as residential and other uses will be important components in this area. Flexibility for the proposed mix of uses in this area should be emphasised in the document.</p> <p>No consideration is given in the document to the "no HS2" scenario and how this would affect development in the South Bank. We consider that if the framework is to have longevity as a forward planning document, as well as the flexibility this requires, it should consider the question "What if there is no HS2?". Whilst this now seems more certain than it did during the last consultation, the current framework is heavily reliant on HS2, and we consider that the South Bank market would be very different without that major infrastructure in place. Whilst at this time, we understand a lack of desire to plan for failure of HS2, it is an outcome that should at least be considered even if it is to be discounted as a strategic planning concept.</p> | The framework is flexible but given a safeguarding direction has been issued for the HS2 route and station this is the context in which the SPD is being prepared. Would not wish to present a scenario which potentially conflicts with the safeguarding direction. In the event of HS2 no going ahead the document could be revised or withdrawn. Core Strategy Policy CC1 a) already favours large scale office development for locations in the city centre with the best public transport accessibility. There is no such policy requirement for motorway junctions. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 3 | <p>4. Summary</p> <p>Continued engagement with landowners will be imperative as the SPD progresses, given the importance of this document in future decision making and indeed, to the achievable land values on any given parcel of land. We urge that landowners are consulted with regard to potential measures which will reduce the amount of developable land, or which will result in onerous costs relating to the delivery of the ambitious public realm improvements.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement between the Council and Highways England will also be very important for providing certainty for developers with respect to the proposed network and movement changes, so as to prevent source future delays and costs for the delivery of proposed development in the South Bank, particularly those which may affect motorway junctions.</p> | The council is working with Highways England to share proposals and agree a consistent methodology for planning application appraisals. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | <p>The above entities own the majority freehold interest of Leeds City Office Park with Credit Suisse owning the remainder. Leeds City Office Park forms part of the area of land covered by the South Bank Leeds Regeneration Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>These representations are submitted in response to the South Bank Leeds SPD which incorporates much of the content of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. Part of the Leeds City Office Park site falls within the HS2 safeguarded area as adopted in July 2017.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | <p>Pages 96 & 97. By comparing the HS2 Boundary outlined in the LISM document with the HS2 safeguarded map, it is clear that there are some discrepancies between the two plans and their HS2 areas.</p> | Comments noted. | Include clarification that the LISM study boundary is different from the HS2 safeguarded land map within section 7. |
| 4 | <p>Figures on 91, 96, 97 and throughout. The HS2 safeguarded land boundary is not consistent within the Leeds City Office Park site. This is most noticeable to the north of Building 3 and to the south of Building 2. It appears that this is due to the proposed masterplan changes to the road layout to the south of the site, along the alignment of the internal road in the car park. These inconsistencies manifest themselves most obviously on the proposed multi-storey car park. The car park is split in three, forming part of the HS2 boundary area, part of the HS2 Safeguarded area and part outside both of these areas. Our client has not, to date, been aware of the requirement for a multi-storey car park and questions where this has come from and how defined this is.</p> | Comments noted. | Include clarification that the LISM study boundary is different from the HS2 safeguarded land map within section 7. |
| 4 | <p>Figures on 91, 96, 97 and throughout. We request that the SPD and masterplan document are reviewed to consistently reflect the adopted HS2 safeguarded area boundary and the anomaly between the plans is rectified.</p> | Comments noted. | Include clarification that the LISM study boundary is different from the HS2 safeguarded land map within section 7. |
| 4 | <p>Leeds City Office Park lies within the South Bank Leeds SPD's geography and forms part of the defined 'South Bank Leeds Regeneration Framework', as well as the 'Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan'. There are significant changes proposed shown in the SPD for the Leeds City Office Park site; in fact, it shows a large proportion of the Office Park being entirely redeveloped.</p> | The draft SPD assumes that some sites within the HS2 safeguarded route will be redeveloped. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | <p>In general, the owners are supportive of initiatives to regenerate and improve the appearance and perception of the wider South Bank area and in principle do not oppose redevelopment. They are supportive of the general principles within the SPD, specifically the proposed design and legibility principles.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 4 | Page 91 - figure 7.1. Specifically Figure 5 below shows the Leeds station masterplan with the Leeds City Office Park shown in a redeveloped form. This includes the demolition of Building 3 (see Figure 2) and replacement by a multi-storey car park, station entrance and a taxi pick-up/drop off. Most importantly, it is clear from the revisions to the masterplan below that the southern entrance to the HS2 terminus is proposed on land currently occupied by Building 3. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Page 91 - figure 7.1. The owners do not object to the location of the proposed southern entrance in light of the fact that this falls within the safeguarding boundary but would seek to work closely with HS2 and Leeds City Council to better understand the details of the masterplan in the coming months, and how this may impact upon their ownership interests. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Page 91 - figure 7.1. The owners were surprised to see the proposals for a multi-storey car park at the Leeds City Office Park site, as they have not previously been made aware of this element of the masterplan. As discussed above, the proposed location of the multi-storey car park currently comprises three designations on the masterplan part of which lies outside of the safeguarding boundary. We request further explanation from HS2 about this element of the plan and the background to the decision to locate the multi-storey car park at the Leeds City Office Park site. From our discussions with HS2 to date we have not been made aware that any such decision has been made. | Plans within the draft SPD are illustrative only and detailed designs are evolving and may change from that shown within the draft SPD. If information is required from HS2 this will need to be sought directly. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Page 91 - figure 7.1. We note that there is also a proposed change to the alignment of the access road to Leeds City Office Park and land to the south of the proposed multi-storey car park is shown as a location for additional car parking. The owners would appreciate some confirmation as to how Building 2 Leeds City Office Park, in particular, will continue to be serviced and effectively operate; especially as it would also appear that 130 of the surface car park spaces fall within the safeguarding boundary and would therefore be lost. | Plans within the draft SPD are illustrative only and detailed designs are evolving and may change from that shown within the draft SPD. If information is required from HS2 this will need to be sought directly. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Page 91 - figure 7.1. It is also noted that the HS2 safeguarding boundary intersects the proposed taxi pick up/ drop off area where there is at present an area of green communal amenity space. It is clear that the proposed layout is associated with the proposed southern entrance, however, it is not considered that this relates well to the safeguarding boundary. An explanation on the layout associated with the taxi pick up/drop off is therefore requested from HS2. Further information and guidance is needed to understand how defined this requirement will be in the masterplan. | Plans within the draft SPD are illustrative only and detailed designs are evolving and may change from that shown within the draft SPD. If information is required from HS2 this will need to be sought directly. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | LISM Page 31 Map showing indicative phasing strategy. The Leeds City Office Park site is situated nearby to Zone 7 with regards to the implementation of the integrated station proposals. At present, this is timetabled for commencement and completion in 2021- 2042. This period includes all of the works south of the river, phased and sequenced to suit the delivery of HS2 and market demands for commercial development. We would anticipate that this element of the proposals would need to come forward sooner from a practical standpoint, especially now that the southern entrance is proposed in this area. Additionally, it is unclear why Leeds City Office Park is not included within a specific implementation zone (ie an extended dotted line to the above plan extract), given the associated HS2 plans for the site, including the proposed southern entrance. The owners request that the implementation zones are reviewed to include the area in question and that further clarification in respect of the wider implementation timetable is provided. | The comment relates to information which is beyond the scope of the SPD as it relates to the delivery and phasing of HS2. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | As per previous representations, the owners are keen to continue working proactively with the Council and HS2 to better understand their proposals and how they may impact on the Leeds City Office Park site. Specifically, they would need to be consulted in detail and be involved in the next step of the SPD and integrated station masterplan. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | In general, the owners are supportive of initiatives to regenerate and improve the appearance and perception of the wider South Bank area and in principle do not oppose redevelopment. However, our client requests further information from the Council and HS2 on the layout of the proposed taxi pick up/drop off area and the multi-storey car park. The owners would be prepared to work collaboratively with the Council and HS2 on plans for the site, once this is better understood. | Comments noted. The layouts in the SPD are indicative and may change as detailed design is undertaken. The final design may change but if information is required from HS2 this will need to be sought directly. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 4 | Finally, it is important to note that the discrepancies between the Leeds South Bank SPD masterplan for the site and the formal HS2 safeguarded area map. We request that this is reviewed as there is at present inconsistencies with the safeguarded land boundary at the site. We would also request further clarification on the implementation zones, as set out in the Leeds Station Integrated Masterplan and further clarification on the wider implementation timetable. | Comments noted. | Clarification included within section 7 that the LISM study area boundary is not the same as the HS2 safeguarded map. |
| 5 | We broadly welcome the aims of the principles of the document to enhance access to the river, and to form new open spaces alongside. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | To fully realise the benefits of the waterway, we also believe that additional acknowledgement of the following matters should be included in the document: - detailed public realm proposals below the HS2 station/viaduct for the area beside the river; - the potential for our waterways to aid sustainable development strategies, including the use of water for thermal heat pumps and grey water supply; - account for the movement of freight by water; - the use of developer contributions to help fund public realm improvements; - measures to promote biodiversity improvements alongside new development; and; - the need to take further account of the proposed massing of development in relation to the impact on the waterway and open spaces. | The SPD is intended as a flexible framework but the detailed design of HS2 is still to be carried out. The SPD seeks to establish principles to help mitigate the impact of the viaduct. We can only insist upon developer contributions towards public realm works which are needed to mitigate the adverse impact of a development. Otherwise public realm improvements will have to be funded through CIL and other mechanisms. | Reference incorporated where relevant within the SPD. |
| 5 | Pages 90-91, 96-99. We note that a number of the illustrative figures, for example, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.8, 5.1 and 5.11, indicate a crossing of the Leeds & Liverpool Canal to the west of the existing railway viaduct. As the Trust is landowner in this location, the formation of any new bridge crossing the canal requires the agreement of the Trust. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 5 | <p>We are concerned that the Masterplan shown on pages 90-91 and 96-99 includes the provision of a new bridge over the Leeds & Liverpool canal, where the Trust is landowner and navigation authority. No prior consultation has been carried out with us with respect to the impact on navigation or our property.</p> <p>We believe that proposals for this bridge should not be included in the document, as there are significant constraints on site, which would threaten its deliverability.</p> | Comments noted. | Remove pedestrian bridge from LISM images. TBC. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 90-91, 96-99. The formation of any new bridge crossing the canal requires the agreement of the Trust. Movable 'at grade' bridges are not normally considered acceptable because of their impact on navigation, health and safety in operation and ongoing maintenance requirements. Moveable bridges also have the potential to introduce conflict between boaters and pedestrian users of the bridge. An up-and-over bridge, meanwhile, would require the formation of a series of ramps, which would harm the setting of nearby listed structures (notably the Leeds & Liverpool Canal Company Warehouse, crane beside the canal; and the stone wash wall of the canal), as well as the setting of the Holbeck Conservation Area.</p> | Comments noted. | Remove pedestrian bridge from LISM images. TBC. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 90-99. The Canal & River Trust own land to the south west of Victoria Bridge, presently used as a car park, and proposed as a new public area in the Masterplan. Potential access to a new bridge across the Aire is also shown here. The Trust's consent and permission as landowner would be required for such works, and cannot be automatically relied upon. We would welcome a discussion about proposals for this area to help inform the Framework as it is developed further.</p> <p>We would like to make you aware that a storm drain outfall exists at the position of the proposed pedestrian bridge over the Aire. This may impact upon the future deliverability of this bridge. In addition, this bridge may obstruct views towards Victoria bridge from the west. The bridge is a Grade II listed structure, and the Plan should seek to avoid any proposals that may harm its setting.</p> | Comments noted. | Remove pedestrian bridge from LISM images. TBC. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 100 -103 and chapter 6. H52 infrastructure has the potential to form a barrier to movement across South Bank. Without mitigation, the width of the viaduct and proximity of the road bridge on Neville Street could provide for a dark, uninventing location next to the river. Underutilised covered spaces can encourage antisocial behaviour, which could deter use of the adjacent waterway and may create a nuisance and problem for boaters.</p> | The SPD seeks to promote strategies to address challenges but detailed designs will be developed at a later date. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 101 -103 and chapter 6. There is a significant risk that, without suitable strategies being developed for creating active permeable spaces under the viaduct next to the river, then the land under the viaduct could become an unattractive residual space. This is especially the case for the northern bank of the river, as a combination of factors would discourage activity here. Challenges consist of the proximity to Victoria bridge, presence of steps up to Victoria bridge and the coverage of the viaduct would present significant challenges to promoting activity here. Consideration should therefore be given to directly addressing these challenges within the plan. This may include promoting the use of routes to the south of the river Aire only, where there are less barriers to movement.</p> | Note the challenge particularly in relation to the constraints associated with Victoria Bridge. Detail will be agreed as designs are progressed however where possible pedestrian routes along the North Bank would be desirable therefore they have been left in as an aspiration. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 54, 52, 93 and chapter 6. Although open spaces next to the Aire are considered in sections 5.2.3 and 7.1, no detail is provided as to how the space under the viaduct would be treated to promote activity. The indicative cross-section on page 54 and plans on pages 52 and 93 suggest the provision of hardstanding, with limited information as to how this space could be occupied, or how activity could be promoted here. Whilst the general approach to the spaces under the viaduct is considered in sections 6.5 and 6.7, there is limited information on how these aspirations can be realised along the river.</p> | The SPD seeks to promote strategies to address challenges but detailed designs will be developed at a later date. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Page 102. We are very concerned that consideration of the space along the riverside under the viaduct is not considered within section 7.2.3. This section identifies the main active crossings through the viaduct, and general design principles for these. It is essential that the river corridor is also included, so that design approaches to reduce the negative impact of the viaduct can be considered. This is especially important given the focus of the SPD to promote access to the River Aire (e.g. section 6.5).</p> | Agree the treatment of the viaduct where it crosses the river is important. The principles set out at 7.2.3 also apply to the river and detailed design is still to be undertaken but the importance of the treatment is highlighted in Section 6.5 and at 5.2.4. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 74/75. Expand on section 5.5.4. to include use of water resources and following potential benefits.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 74/75. The Department of Energy and Climate Change (now the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy) have included our waterways in their heat map, which indicates that the Aire and Calder Navigation and Leeds & Liverpool Canal have potential to provide energy for water source heat pumps (http://nationalheatmap.cse.org.uk). Using the thermal energy for heating and cooling is a low carbon solution which contributes to UK Government targets to reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050.</p> <p>The river Aire and Leeds/Liverpool canal is a feasible source for low carbon energy, alongside the use of geothermal and combined heat and power identified in the SPD.</p> | Comments noted. This is not specific to the SPD area nor are there any specific opportunities that could be identified as such it should be picked up by a city-wide policy if necessary. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 74/75. Water from the river and canal can be used to provide for a sustainable water supply for new development in the area. Consideration should be given towards promoting the use of water for irrigation, and indoor activities where treated water is not required (such as the flushing of toilets).</p> | Comments noted. | Add in paragraph to section 5.54 referencing water resources. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 74/75. The use of the Aire & Calder navigation to supply building materials (including aggregates), and to remove demolition waste, should be considered as an additional methodology in section 5.5.4 to promote sustainable development.</p> | The opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials which is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated in this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | <p>The Aire & Calder Navigation has been designated as a Priority Freight Route in the Canal & River Trust Freight Policy. Priority Freight Routes are those routes considered to have the highest potential for viable freight traffic.</p> <p>The extent of new development around South Bank will require the removal and importation of a significant amount of rubble and building materials respectively. The use of waterborne freight on the navigation could provide a sustainable alternative transport option to the use of road vehicles.</p> <p>The adopted Leeds Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan (NRWLP) includes policies for the movement of minerals and other freight, and states that Leeds will make the most of opportunities for the movement of freight by canal (paras. 3.33 and 3.36). The National Planning Policy Framework supports the use of sustainable transport, including solutions that support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (paragraph 30).</p> | The relevant policies of the NRWLP are applicable to the SPD area. There is no need to repeat the policies in this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Planning permission exists for the construction of a wharf at Skelton Grange Road, Stourton (application reference 14/07440/FU). The Stourton site is in proximity to the Leeds South Bank area. Local transport could ferry materials to and from the site by road. This could result in the need for less road miles compared to a solution without the use of waterborne freight.</p> | The opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials which is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated in this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>For development in close proximity to the waterside, there is potential for the use of temporary jetties (either directly, or in tandem with transport to and from a wharf at Stourton). These could allow for the direct transport of goods to and from sites, potentially limiting the need for vehicular transport.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>There is significant potential that waterway freight can supply aggregate and building materials to sites in locations covered by the SPD, with associated sustainability benefits. The aspirations of the NRWLP rely on new development utilising waterborne freight, and the SPD should therefore make specific reference to this opportunity to ensure that these aspirations can be met.</p> | The opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials which is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated in this document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 110-113. More information on building heights is required. Drawings do not define indicative building heights. Without this they are open to interpretation and might result in buildings placed next to the waterway and key open spaces, which would result in excessive overshadowing of these spaces.</p> <p>We would welcome reference in section 7.3.3 to a maximum height range for buildings fronting the river, with controls to ensure the massing steps up from the river.</p> | The south bank area even the riverside has a varied character in terms of building heights. There are also many cleared sites with committed development for a range of heights including tall tower buildings. The design approach to each site therefore needs to be contextual as stated by 7.3.3. to co-ordinate with existing and planned townscape character. It would not be appropriate to suggest maximum building heights in this context without considerable assessment of the emerging townscape character. Make reference to the tall building SPD which includes the south bank area where opportunities for taller buildings have been identified near to major road, rail and city park infrastructure. | Include reference to the Tall Building SPD within 7.3.3 (p110). |
| 5 | <p>Pages 24 and 110-113. Account should also be taken towards ensuring that tall buildings planned for the area will not result in excessive wind speeds over key public areas, or the Aire & Calder Navigation and Leeds & Liverpool canal. Excessive wind speeds could discourage pedestrian and boating activity in these areas and could impact upon craft navigation on the waterways. We request that reference to the need for wind modelling for tall buildings is included in section 7.3.3, and SBRF principle 3 within section 2.9. The wind modelling should consider both the impact on open space and also on navigating craft.</p> | The tall buildings SPD provides clarity on the need for wind assessments. | Include reference to the Tall Building SPD within 7.3.3 (p110). |
| 5 | <p>The Council, however, should be aware that the provision of new online moorings and walkways on the river Aire have the potential to create a hazard to navigational safety. This would require assessment. This may have implications for the delivery of these features referred to in pages 52-55.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>Pages 52-56. Trust would need to be satisfied that the proposed Sovereign Bridge would not pose a hazard to navigation. Consideration should be given to ensuring that it provides suitable navigable height for craft, and does not introduce new obstructions in the waterway. We request that consideration should also be given to ensuring that the design of the bridge complements and enhances the character and appearance of the waterway.</p> | Issues raised will be dealt with through the planning application process. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 5 | <p>The drawings shown for the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan (e.g. p.91) propose different arrangements for development and spaces in proximity to the River Aire compared to the approach on page 52; the location of crossings on p.93; and the location of streets upon the 'Finer Grain Green Network' (e.g. p.p. 38; 47).</p> | There are different arrangements for developments and spaces in the images. These are illustrative and the detailed design will emerge as work progresses. | Review |
| 5 | <p>The plan on page 93 shows a 'Waterfront Connection' to the west of the lock entrance to the Leeds & Liverpool canal. This indicates that a bridge is present here, which does not exist.</p> | Comments noted. | Amend plan on p93 to show correct pedestrian connection. |
| 5 | <p>Page 93. The proposed public routes on page 93 do not match those shown within section 7.2 – notably regarding routes crossing the Leeds & Liverpool canal</p> | The LISM study does propose additional routes crossing the Leeds Liverpool Canal - however all drawings are illustrative and the detailed design will emerge as work progresses. | Response TBA - discrepancies between LISM plans. |
| 5 | <p>Page 78. In section 6, the Design Principles diagrams show the proposed HS2 station sited further to the east than in the other drawings of the document.</p> | Amend Design Principles sketches so HS2 viaduct is shifted to the west to correlate with current alignment. | Amend plans within Section 6. |
| 6 | <p>CEG supports the overall vision for the South Bank area, and the aspiration to deliver significant levels of jobs and homes in a sustainable location to encourage city centre living and working, including by providing homes for families and a mix of tenures. CEG welcomes the emphasis on improving inclusivity and connections with the surrounding neighbourhoods by delivering links to emerging employment opportunities within the South Bank areas. The recognition of Temple Works as a significant asset and opportunity within the SPD is also welcomed in the context of the importance of ensuring that this opportunity is supported by the enhancement of its surrounding infrastructure and environment.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | CEG does however maintain that it may not be necessary for the Council to publish further planning guidance for this area as the South Bank is already covered by numerous layers of existing planning policy | The SPD seeks to draw together the strands of existing policies with later proposals such as HS2 which are not reflected fully in the adopted development plan. The SPD provides examples to help implement higher level planning policy and articulate how policy can be applied in practice. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Pages 19-25. It is however recognised there is a need to address the changing context, in relation to both ownerships and development opportunities. While some policies/policy documents are currently under review, CEG would welcome a more comprehensive approach which brings together and updates existing policy for the South Bank alongside new policies and principles which will help to secure an integrated rail hub and wider connectivity to the surrounding area. | The SPD seeks to draw together the strands of existing policies with later proposals such as HS2 which are not reflected fully in the adopted development plan. The SPD provides examples to help implement higher level planning policy and articulate how policy can be applied in practice. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Pages 19-25. The SPD provides the opportunity to present a visionary and unifying framework, with overarching objectives around which future policy and investment decisions in the South Bank can be shaped. It is understood that the previous SBPF has already been used to this effect and has informed infrastructure and design guides for the South Bank, including the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. A framework approach would provide greater scope and be more effective for this function, providing an aspirational statement for the future of the South Bank area and setting a broader and more ambitious agenda which is able to remain flexible. | SBPF covered a much smaller area and was prepared prior to HS2. Otherwise the SPD is considered to provide the functions stated in the comment. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 6 | Pages 19-25. Much of the current draft is illustrative and provides background analysis which is helpful. We are however concerned that some matters may not be appropriate to include in a SPD (or indeed provided for under the Regulations, as a SPD may only involve matters referred to in Regulation 5 (1) (a) (iii) and which, under Regulation 6, do not conflict with the adopted development plan). If the document is to be adopted as a SPD, a more focused approach which does not duplicate or contradict adopted planning policy would be appropriate. For example, the extent of the Public Transport Box does not accord with the detail in the adopted Core Strategy (see below). | On plans identify the Public Transport Box and the area to the south and call it the Pedestrian Core...seek to prioritise walking within the area. | Amend Key Move 4.4 to remove reference to the expansion of the public transport box. Reword Principle 1 iv to match the amended key move. Amend plans so that they show the Public Transport Box adjoined by the Pedestrian Core (<i>where the pedestrian environment is safe, comfortable and attractive to complement the existing Public Transport Box and spans the river - but doesn't have implications for parking</i>). |
| 6 | Page 13. Related to the question of scope and purpose, the SPD currently refers to a 'Study Area' boundary which has been extended since the SBPF. The SPD area boundary needs to be clearly defined and the extent of the SPD area needs to be set out in the document. As it stands the boundary appears to be arbitrary with no justification for the inclusion of areas which are currently outside some existing policy document boundaries but inside others. | Comments noted. | Include a paragraph justifying the SPD boundary within Chapter 2. |
| 6 | CEG supports the inclusion of details of the Leeds Integrated Station Masterplan. To support the delivery of the Leeds Integrated Station and wider proposals and objectives within the South Bank area, it is important that the SPD remains flexible and capable of meeting the emerging and changing needs of the area. The SPD should not however seek to establish new or amended policy (as the reference in paragraph 8 on p11 of the SPD suggests may be the case). The broad principles (and illustrative background analysis) are supported, but the SPD may not provide the flexibility or the clarity needed to assist emerging applications and infrastructure delivery. There are significant development proposals, including HS2, which will continue to be delivered well beyond the current Core Strategy plan period, and a (revised) LDD may be needed to address these. The SPD (or LDD) needs to be able to respond to changes in site ownership which may result in amendments to previously approved schemes as well as being responsive to changing market circumstances. This includes ensuring the SPD's vision and policies are capable of supporting development even if there are changes to the delivery of HS2 or if Leeds Integrated Station is not brought forward as currently envisaged. As drafted, CEG is concerned that the SPD does not provide enough flexibility to secure the delivery of its objectives for the South Bank area in the long term. It is important for investor and developer confidence that the plan does not quickly become out of date following its adoption. | The framework is seeking to provide strategic guidance about how HS2 is best integrated into the city in amplification of core strategy SP3 (ix) <i>Support the role of Leeds City Station, enhancing Leeds' role as a regional transport hub and supporting the potential for the integration of high speed rail</i> , | Remove 'planning policy' from para 8 p11. |
| 6 | Whilst the South Bank Framework Principles (p24/25) seek to draw together and explain the relevant parts of the SPD with reference to adopted planning policy, the principles should not be overly prescriptive. As set out within the NPPF (para 153), SPDs should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications. To achieve this policy objective, the principles within the SPD should seek to provide more guidance with correlation and cross reference to adopted policy, rather than duplicating adopted planning policy. | The principles at p24/25 clarify the planning requirements to deliver the regeneration framework. Once adopted they will be a material consideration in the determination of applications. The explanatory text accompanying the principles highlights where there is flexibility. | Figure 1.2 to be amended to note the other relevant policy documents for clarity. |
| 6 | Pages 24 and 37. The expansion of the pedestrian precinct (Public Transport [Access] Box) to include an additional area beyond that identified under Core Strategy Policy CC3 (and CS Map 11) should not be sought through this SPD. | SPD is to be amended so that it does not seek to extend the Public Transport Box - however it will promote an enhanced pedestrian environment in an area to the south of the PTB. | Amendments to be made to the key move and plans to show the Public Transport Box and an area to be called the Pedestrian Core to the south. |
| 6 | Page 24. Further guidance should be provided as to what a 'Culture Statement' is intended to achieve and how this should be prepared. It will be necessary to understand which policies of the Core Strategy this requirement is seeking to support. | Reference to a culture statement to be removed. | Delete SBPF principle 2 bullet iv (p24) |
| 6 | Page 25. CEG supports the approach to the redevelopment of Leeds City Station, the integration of HS2 and the development of spaces adjoining the rail infrastructure, including by maximising integration, connectivity, distinctiveness and design quality through this process. It is however suggested that this approach should extend further across the South Bank Area, including to Temple Works which is recognised as a significant and unique contributor to the South Bank area. A broader perspective will help to achieve wider integration and connectivity, as well as extending the positive impact of the infrastructure investment. It may be appropriate to address the 'HS2 Station and Hinterland area' in a standalone SPD or Annex to allow the SPD to establish broader aspirations and design guidance for the wider area. | Advice on connectivity and approach to quality spaces has been provided in the Holbeck SPD for the Temple Works area | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | <p>Page 24. Principles 1 and 3 refer to improved resilience and sustainability, including contributions to flood resilience and sustainable development strategies where feasible, with Section 5.5 providing further analysis. Whilst it is clear that much of this analysis relates to the HS2 hinterland, the SPD appears to be seeking to set guidance for South Bank as a whole. As such, there needs to be flexibility within the SPD when it comes to the delivery of sustainability measures on specific site. Whilst it is recognised that there are existing policy requirements to deliver sustainability measures, the SPD and its principles should avoid adding any unnecessary financial burdens on development, as set out within national policy (NPPF para 153).</p> | <p>The framework seeks to encourage rather than require creative responses to sustainability issues by presenting options. It does not go beyond existing policy requirements.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 6 | <p>CEG supports a more flexible approach to the delivery of high quality and well-designed tall buildings within the South Bank area, and the support the SPD provides for well-designed tall buildings within the vicinity of the Station is welcomed. The SPD should however give further consideration to the opportunities provided in the South Bank area as a whole, and it should be noted that there are opportunities within the wider area to deliver well-designed tall buildings which maximise the benefits provided by enhanced connectivity and serve as focal points for placemaking and regeneration. It is also understood that the Tall Buildings SPD and its application is under review; consistency is important and well as avoiding duplication.</p> | <p>The document is consistent with the emerging Tall Buildings SPD.</p> | <p>Include reference to the Tall Building SPD within 7.3.3 (p110).</p> |
| 6 | <p>Pages 24, 40, 66. CEG welcomes, in principle, the support to retain historic assets and make them central to place making as set out within the overall vision of the SPD. This is expanded within Principles 1 and 3 which require development proposals, where relevant, to adapt heritage buildings, provide links with existing assets and demonstrate how activities will secure the future of Temple Works. CEG would welcome early discussions with the City Council regarding Temple Works, before the next version of this SPD is published, to explore in more detail how this element of the vision and principles could be achieved.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Pages 66-69. CEG supports the potential of viable temporary and 'meanwhile' uses across the South Bank (noted in section 5.4) as an efficient use of land whilst the long term development prospects for the area are realised, recognising the opportunities to facilitate links with local businesses and local communities that these uses offer. Temporary uses within the South Bank area can raise the profile of emerging development sites and encourage people to visit the south side of the City Centre, generating footfall and activity on site which would support wider regeneration aims for the area. CEG is actively pursuing opportunities to utilise the CEG: South Bank site for temporary events where these do not prejudice the delivery of long term redevelopment. In due course, this approach may have potential for the Temple Works site.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 6 | <p>CEG would welcome further engagement in respect of the principle of the emerging SPD as a whole, and in relation to its interests in the South Bank area in particular. It is noted that the Plan is considered to be a 'consultation draft' and, given its amended scope and content, it is expected that further consultation on a 'publication draft' will be necessary.</p> | <p>Previous extensive consultation was undertaken and is detailed in the SPD. Further consultation is not anticipated as no 'substantive' changes are proposed.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Page 52. The Leeds South Bank SPD appears to cover well various subjects both for business growth and leisure. However CBOA finds that it seems to not cover well the issue of using the Aire and Calder Navigation (A&CN) and also possibly the Leeds and Liverpool Canal for freight use. The A&CN is a major freight waterway capable of handling significant volumes of freight. A brief mention is made in Section 5.2.3 page 52 of water freight freight and sustainable transport opportunities, but this seems not to be expounded upon in any way.</p> | <p>Reference is made in Section 5.2.3 however the opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials which is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated in this document.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Within the city centre or environs, the possibilities for barge freight are for smaller volume freight associated with local goods deliveries and requirement for materials. One of the growing realisations within London and capital cities within Europe is for the benefits of 'Last Mile' concept. Here, goods are brought to waterside premises from a wharf just outside the city, or at a suitable nearby road/water modal interchange point (small wharf); the goods are then distributed via water transport to waterside and nearby premises. Large wharves would not be required for this - a small wharf or unloading area is required. Schemes for local delivery to site include small electric or gas vehicles and bicycle type arrangements for light goods, or for close to sites delivery on foot using trolleys or small electric barrows. Amsterdam and Paris are already using these schemes, with other cities to follow.</p> <p>This type of wharf could perhaps could be shared with passenger operations providing not only pleasure trips but needed transport solutions for people wishing to travel across the city broadly on the line of the A&CN.</p> | <p>Reference is made in Section 5.2.3 to potential of river for freight and sustainable transport opportunities. The opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated further in this document.</p> | <p>Expand text of p52 to highlight opportunity for freight transport and last mile concept.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Another possible use for water transport is for waste removal. Every city has this issue and there is no reason why waste cannot be cleanly handled using sealed containers to avoid an unsightly scene.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Waterside land and current wharves in strategic places need to be kept for possible use as wharves both for freight and passenger use. To effect construction or other use for all these areas during the planning phase would mean the chance being lost forever for water freight and passenger use benefitting the city. To see barges and passenger boats operating in a city is also a visual 'plus' to the waterside scene, to what is otherwise a dormant river navigation, when the rest of the city is vibrant.</p> | <p>Protecting wharf sites would fall outside the scope of the SPD as it would make a statement about the use of land. The NRWLP includes policies relating to water freight.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Significant reduction of road congestion Lower risk of road accidents/fatalities Lower noise on highways Reduced highway wear and tear from HGVs, meaning lower long term highway maintenance costs Lower fuel consumption meaning reduction of the carbon footprint Lower exhaust emissions, meaning less air pollution in the district. Each barge can carry 10 or more lorry loads.</p> | <p>Reference is made in Section 5.2.3 however the opportunity to make use of the waterway network to transport materials which is supported by proposals and allocation set out in the NRWLP and does not need to be repeated in this document.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Page 119. The ESFA welcomes reference within the SPD to support the development of appropriate social and community infrastructure (paragraph 8.2.3).</p> <p>Ensuring there is an adequate supply of sites for schools is essential and will ensure that Leeds is able to meet the aspirations of the SPD as set out in paragraph 8.2.3. The safeguarding of sites for schools will help to ensure that Leeds can swiftly and flexibly respond to the existing and future need for school places to meet the needs of this part of the city over the plan period.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 8 | In light of the above and the Duty to Cooperate on strategic priorities such as community infrastructure (NPPF para 156), the ESFA encourages close working with local authorities during all stages of planning policy development to help guide the development of new school infrastructure and to meet the predicted demand for primary and secondary schoolplaces. The ESFA would like to be included as early as possible in discussions on potential site allocations, as there are pipeline school projects in Leeds that may be appropriate for specific designation. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the council in the near future to discuss these projects. | Recognise the importance of co-operation with the ESFA. This is undertaken through consultation on statutory development plan documents. The SPD does not allocate sites for specific types of development. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | In light of proposals to bring forward 8,000 homes during the plan period within the South Bank area, emerging ESFA proposals for forward funding schools as part of large residential developments may be of interest to the Council. We would be happy to meet to discuss this opportunity at an appropriate time. | Comments shared with relevant colleagues. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 8 | The ESFA notes that significant growth in housing stock is expected in South Bank; This will place additional pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities. The ESFA will continue to work closely with Leeds City Council to help ensure that appropriate sites can be secured for new schools within the South Bank area. | The Site Allocations Plan and Aire Valley AAP makes the allocations of sites for housing in the SPD area and include proposals for new schools to support areas where significant growth is proposed, including the South Bank area. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | The draft document states: 'Investment in the Flood Alleviation Scheme which will provide 1 in 75 year protection against flooding'. We advise you consult the Leeds Flood Risk Management Section (LFRMS) on this statement. Our understanding is that the standard of protection has now been confirmed to be higher. LFRMS should be consulted on the following suggested wording: Investment in the Flood Alleviation Scheme which will provide at least a 1 in 100 year protection against flooding. This has already been achieved between Leeds Railway Station and Knostrop Weir. Taking a catchment wide approach, feasibility work to reduce flood risk elsewhere on the River Aire in Leeds is ongoing. | FAS provides 1 in 100 year protection against flooding. | Include following wording at page 9: Investment in the Flood Alleviation Scheme which will provide at least a 1 in 100 year protection against flooding. This has already been achieved between Leeds Railway Station and Knostrop Weir. Taking a catchment wide approach, feasibility work to reduce flood risk elsewhere on the River Aire in Leeds is ongoing. |
| 9 | Pages 14/15. We support the approach of 'life first' but would like to see 'life' expanded to include wildlife – currently 'life' is limited to people and reads as 'people first' rather than 'life first'. | Whereas this is an interesting suggestion this section is about bringing the place to life and creating activity. The SPD seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity at sections 4.5 and 5.2. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 22. We are pleased to see the SPD highlight following key issues for the South Bank under the NRWLP: 1 Managing development to minimise flood risk 1 Protecting sites for waste management 1 Enhancing water resources particularly the River Aire and Hol Beck 1 Improving air quality. | Comment noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 24. We support the following development layout requirements as outlined in SBRF principle 1: v) Create a green network that connects through a legible system of streets, paths, urban spaces and parks. vi) Make the waterfront a central place of activity for the city ix) Improve resilience and sustainability, contributing to the overall Flood Alleviation Strategy for Leeds and the South Bank. We support the following requirements, as outlined in SBRF principle 3, for development proposals to demonstrate how they contribute to achieving the South Bank Strategies in relation to: i) The delivery of the framework concept of promoting well designed streets and public spaces and enhancing the green and blue network as a means of galvanising development . . . iii) The ambition for the River Aire set out in the sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 on 'Making the most of a natural asset' and 'access and integration of the waterfront'. Including encouraging active use of the river and where development occurs on sites next to the river the development addresses the water and responds positively and fully to opportunities offered by the waterfront. vi) As it refers to trees and planting ix) The incorporation of innovative approaches to Flood Resilience and Sustainable Development Strategies where feasible and otherwise in accordance with NRWLP policies. | Comment noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 33. '- We support the following key moves: 'connect the green & blue network', 'activate the waterfront' and 'improve resilience and sustainability'. - The Figures in this section of the document (e.g. 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4) show 'strategic green links' and 'finer grain green network' but what is meant by the 'green network' isn't defined until section 4.5. For clarity, section 4.5 with the green network definition should come first. | Include definition of a green network at an earlier stage in the document for a more logical progression. | Re-order the key moves so that 4.5 becomes 4.1 and others move accordingly. |
| 9 | The definition in 4.5 is: 'The strategic green network consists of streets, paths, urban spaces and parks that connect the South Bank, the city centre and adjacent neighbourhoods. Combined with the finer grain network they offer a choice of movement routes for pedestrians and cyclists. With the right treatment this could provide a valuable network for wildlife aiding biodiversity in the South Bank...' We are pleased to see the last sentence of the definition including reference to the potential function as a network for wildlife and aiding biodiversity. Figure 4.5 shows all public spaces in green regardless of whether they are green or 'urban'. To help inform a better understanding of the distribution of green spaces in the city centre the public spaces in figure 4.5 should be coloured as in Figure 5.1 - which differentiates between 'urban public space' and 'green public space'. Differentiating between green and urban public spaces in Figure 4.5 would help with future planning to connect green spaces and provide green public spaces, for the wellbeing of both people and wildlife, in areas identified as having insufficient provision. | Because the detailed nature of particular spaces has not yet been determined it is difficult to know the exact nature of each space and as such it is difficult to colour code until the detailed design has been carried out. Ambitions to protect and enhance biodiversity are included at sections 4.5 and 5.2. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 48. We note the consultation responses highlighted a strong desire for the new city park to 'be part of a wider green network of spaces', to 'feature expanses of green, with mature trees, gardens, water features..' and 'increase biodiversity by creating new habitats for wildlife and pollinator resources'. We support these desires and would like to see the design and management of the City Park, which is next to the River Aire, support new habitats for wildlife and pollinator resources. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 9 | We are pleased to see this section acknowledge that 'all elements of the blue and green network will be required to work in synergy for the network to be successful.' We support the 'Draft manifesto for good Public Spaces in Leeds' requirement stating: 'Our public space will be resilient to climate change, naturally green/trees, cooling the air, sustainably managing surface water and absorbing carbon.' | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 52. We are pleased to see 5.2.3 recognise and highlight that 'the River is one of the most important ecological networks in the area and measures to create a more natural river would be beneficial for wildlife'. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 54. We very much support the following moves outlined in 5.2.4: 'The waterfront is seamlessly integrated into the wider green network' 'As well as facilitating the movement of people, the green network also has the potential to strengthen wildlife corridors creating new connections and adding to the range of habitat available in the area' 'Ways to reduce both water and air pollution from entering the river will be supported wherever possible. In stream enhancement of the waterway will be supported including tree planting, creating diversity and siting amenity green space close to the river.' | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 70. We support the move in 5.5.1: 'Green streets which feature planting, especially trees, is a key aspect of the framework concept of an expanded and integrated green and blue network and can help make the area resilient to the impacts of climate change.' We support the acknowledgement in 5.5.2 of the need to ensure permeability of the viaduct for the management of flood risks. We support the acknowledgement in 5.5.3 that public spaces can have a flood risk management role. We support the use of well-maintained swales for the role they play in filtering pollutants. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 74. We would have no in principle concerns with the use of geothermal heating as referenced in 5.5.4. Any proposals would need to demonstrate that they do not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to the water environment. | Comments noted, this issue would be dealt with at the detailed application stage. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 77. We support that the station: 1 will provide 'significant green landscape elements' as stated in 6.1 1 designs will 'incorporate features which can enhance biodiversity and promote the ecology of the river as well as connecting with wider green networks' as stated in 6.5. 1 designs will avoid supporting structures in the river bed and that a high level of permeability 'will allow light to pass through to the river below to avoid adverse environmental impacts on biodiversity within the river'. We look forward to discussing design proposals with you and HS2 Ltd in more detail. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 83. 6.6 highlights the use of the HS2 route as a 'green corridor' for people. We suggest that options for a green roof on the integrated station could be investigated for the contribution it could make to green spaces for wildlife and people in the city centre and South Bank. Even if it were determined people could not access a green roof they could benefit from any urban cooling function it might provide. | Comments to be incorporated. | Incorporate a new bullet at Section 6.6: A green roof to HS2 could provide a space for wildlife and offer benefits to the South Bank through urban cooling. |
| 9 | Page 92. We support the move in 7.1.1 which would see 'A new expanded blue and green network is at the heart of a transformed and thriving South Bank' | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | Page 119. We support the move in 8.2.4 which identifies that 'Closer connections to nature in South Bank can be fostered through integrating green landscaping and trees into the street and open space designs' and that 'A 'green and blue' city is the smart way to manage storm and flooding events where integrated storm water management in the public realm can incorporate water as a natural part of everyday life in the city.' | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 9 | We are pleased to see many of the comments we made in our letter of 1 December 2016 on the South Bank Leeds Framework Plan reflected in the draft SPD. Whilst you may consider some of the detail in those comments is not appropriate for the SPD, we request that the above comments are read in conjunction with the comments we previously made in our letter of 1 December 2016. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 10 | The Forestry Commission is not in a position to input into the consultation process for Local Plans. However, the information below is provided to assist you in assessing the appropriateness of sites for future development, and to highlight opportunities for achieving your renewable energy obligations. | Reference materials noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | The proposed new HS2 alignment and associated infrastructure is projected to enter the South Bank strategic study area alongside the M621 at junction 4. Given the proximity of the proposed HS2 alignment to the M621, the impact of the construction and operation of this needs to be understood further, and adequate mitigation will need to be identified and agreed in the future to ensure the continued safe operation of the strategic road network (SRN). | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | Page 24, 2.9 Principle 2. This principle outlines the intention for large scale employment developments to cluster around public transport hubs, particularly Leeds rail station. It also proposes that town centre developments should cluster uses together (e.g. office, shops, restaurants, hotels). Whilst we support the principle of clustering development uses, we would comment that it will still be necessary for all developments to include a full assessment at planning application stage of the impact on the SRN and the identification of mitigation if required. We would welcome pre-application discussions at the earliest opportunity in order to facilitate this. | The requirement for evidence based decision making is not altered by adoption of the SPD. Transport Assessments and any necessary mitigation will still be requested where relevant. Engagement with Highways England on M621 and City Centre Package schemes and the work LCC are doing. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | Page 24, 2.9 Principle 3. This principle highlights that development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they contribute to the South Bank strategy of encouraging general traffic to circulate around the city centre rather than through it. We would comment that encouraging general traffic to circulate around the city centre rather than through it would have implications for the SRN. Any proposals to direct additional traffic on to the SRN would need to be fully assessed and mitigated. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | Page 25, 2.9 Principle 4 This principle highlights objectives relating to an accessible environment and multi-modal travel options. We support the principle of improving sustainable and multi-modal travel as development in the South Bank comes forward. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 11 | <p>Page 34. As stated above, the proposals to encourage general traffic to circulate around the city centre rather than through it would have implications for the SRN. The proposed South Bank road hierarchy in Figure 4.1 includes a section of the M621 as part of an extended Inner Ring Road. We accept that the M621 is integral to proposals for the South Bank and for the wider city. However, it is still part of the strategic road network and therefore is required to accommodate strategic movements.</p> <p>The SPD states that the principal function of the extended Inner Ring Road will be to support “a high volume of vehicular movement”. Therefore, the proposals would result in more traffic using the M621 than is currently.</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 34. The SPD also states that “a package of improvements to increase capacity along the extended route is currently being considered”. In terms of the section incorporating the M621, we would comment that the current Road Investment Strategy scheme on the M621 between junctions 1-7 that is being developed is to address existing congestion and reliability issues, is being developed not just to address the existing situation but also to support the ‘City Centre Package’ incorporating transport elements of the South Bank proposals to direct traffic away from the area, and City Square, and onto the ring road.</p> <p>We will continue to work with the Council to understand the impact of the South Bank proposals and to identify the mitigation required to facilitate these (the longer term proposals across the whole area).</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 34. We would suggest that the proposed rationalisation of road hierarchy in Leeds is closely related to the proposed charging Clean Air Zone for Leeds, which would affect vehicles in the area of the city within the Outer Ring Road.</p> <p>Depending on the exact boundaries of the Clean Air Zone, this is likely to result in increased traffic using the M621 – specifically HGVs, buses, coaches and taxis. This impact would be in addition to the South Bank proposals. Therefore, this would need to be fully assessed and mitigated.</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. | Include reference to the proposed Clean Air Zone. |
| 11 | <p>Page 34. The SPD outlines the aspiration to simplify the arrangement of the M621 junctions 3 and 4 slip roads by the City Council, either via an interim scheme or a more long-term intervention, to release land for development and improve east-west connectivity across the South Bank.</p> <p>We would comment that any applications for development that come forward as a result of released land should include a full assessment of the impact on the SRN and the identification of mitigation if required. We would welcome pre-application discussions at the earliest opportunity in order to facilitate this for those sites.</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. Engagement with Highways England on M621 and City Centre Package schemes and the work LCC are doing. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 35. The SPD outlines the objective to address connectivity between the South Bank and nearby neighbourhoods and refers to three key north-south crossings of the M621. These crossing points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cemetery Road overbridge at junction 2A • The Lane End Place underpass between Holbeck Moor Road and Beeston Road at junction 2A • The A653 Dewsbury Road overbridge at junction 3 | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. Engagement with Highways England on M621 and City Centre Package schemes and the work LCC are doing. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 35. Whilst we support the principle of improving connectivity across the M621 for sustainable modes, we would need to be consulted upon these proposals at the earliest opportunity. Schemes to improve connectivity across the M621 could reduce the capacity for SRN movements and could therefore have an adverse impact on safety. Therefore, any north-south connectivity proposals at these locations, or other locations that may affect the operation of the SRN, would need to be fully assessed and mitigated.</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. Engagement with Highways England on M621 and City Centre Package schemes and the work LCC are doing. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 36. We would comment that, as has been undertaken for the existing Park & Ride facilities at Elland Road and Temple Green, and for the proposed facility at Stourton, the impact on the SRN of any new Park & Ride would need to be fully assessed and mitigated. The impact of any long stay parking proposals would also need to be fully assessed and mitigated.</p> | Pre application discussions regarding LCC proposals. Meeting to be had regarding HS2 between LCC and Highways England. Engagement with Highways England on M621 and City Centre Package schemes and the work LCC are doing. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 36. The proposed parking strategy does not include details of development on temporary car parks. However, we would like to take this opportunity to reiterate our support for the Council’s policy of planning applications for the permanent use of a temporary car parking site to require an impact assessment in a situation where the temporary car park has, or is assumed to have ceased operation.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 89. Encouraging general traffic to circulate around the city centre rather than through it would have implications for the SRN. Any proposals to direct additional traffic on to the SRN would need to be fully assessed and mitigated.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 93. The illustrative plan of strategic green links includes a route crossing the M621 on the A653 Dewsbury Road overbridge.</p> <p>As stated above, we support the principle of improving connectivity across the M621 for sustainable modes. However, we would need to be consulted upon these proposals at the earliest opportunity. A scheme to improve active mode access across the M621 could reduce the capacity for SRN movements and could have an adverse impact on safety. Therefore, any strategic green link proposals would need to be fully assessed and mitigated.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 11 | <p>Page 96. A long stay car park for the new HS2 station with a potential projected 1,900 spaces is proposed between Kidacre Street and Meadow Lane, which would be accessed via the City Boulevard and the M621. We would comment that this level of parking for the new station could effectively serve as a car park for any user, not exclusively for HS2. Given its proximity to the M621, this would have significant implications for the SRN.</p> <p>We would also comment that this level of parking at this location could be counter to one of the SPD’s key objectives of implementing a sustainable parking strategy, with larger multi user Park & Ride type facilities being positioned outside the Outer Ring Road.</p> <p>Therefore, the impact of the HS2 station car park would need to be fully assessed (once the number of spaces has been finalised, or assuming a worst case scenario) and mitigated accordingly.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 12 | The document you make a number of references to access to the water and activities on the water. But nowhere does it mention boats or visitor moorings. If you want to make the waterfront a central place of activity for the city, then you want boats on the water. And if you want to attract boats then you need the facilities to make it an attractive destination for boaters. Leeds is not yet currently viewed as a major destination for leisure boaters and it does not have the same level of boater facilities as some other towns and cities on the waterways network. And because Leeds is not seen as a destination the city is losing out on the waterway visitor spend. | SPD can not require provision of boating facilities but can include a reference. | Add reference to boats and visitor moorings to Section 5.2.3 (p52). |
| 12 | What is required is more short term free visitor moorings to encourage boaters to stay in Leeds for a few days. And you will need to consider improving the capacity of the other facilities, such as water points for filling up water tanks on boats and sanitary stations for emptying cassette toilets and pumping out waste tanks. Currently the Leeds & Liverpool Canal lacks a sanitary station at the Leeds end of the canal. And if more visitor moorings are developed on the Leeds & Liverpool Canal where they are not affected by any rise and fall of the River Aire, then this is the logical location to improve facilities. | SPD can not require provision of boating facilities but can include a reference. | Add reference to boats and visitor moorings to Section 5.2.3 (p52). |
| 12 | These sort of issues need to be considered at the high level planning stage so that they are not forgotten about. We would also add that if increasing waterspace to improve flood resilience, it could offer a major opportunity to create new visitor moorings off the main river. | SPD can not require provision of boating facilities but can include a reference. | Add reference to boats and visitor moorings to Section 5.2.3 (p52). |
| 12 | On Page 84, the document mentions the water taxi between Granary Wharf and Leeds Dock. We would agree that this concept could be developed with additional stops. But also with larger water buses to increase the capacity. This would not necessarily be the current operator. | The text in Section 5.2.4 (pg54) already covers the potential to extend the water taxi adequately. This concept is also referred to in the Aire Valley AAP with potential locations identified further downstream but outside the SPD area. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | What is essential of course is develop and protect the infrastructure to facilitate this. And waterbuses or water taxis require stops. So the present and potential landings need to be considered and protected in the planning and design process. | The SPD would not be able to safeguard land for a specific use. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | On Page 52 freight on the River Aire is briefly mentioned. The Aire & Calder Navigation has been designated by the Canal & River Trust, the navigation authority, as a Priority Freight Route. With the development of the new Port of Leeds at Stourton, the South Bank Leeds area is well placed to take advantage of Last Mile Delivery by water where a navigable waterway can be used to get freight into a city centre, which is often the most problematic part of the journey. Again you need to identify suitable points for offloading small loads and protect them in the planning and design process. | The SPD would not be able to safeguard land for a specific uses associated with water freight. The text of pg52 could be expanded to add a bit more detail in relation to opportunities like this to make better use of the river for freight transportation. Policies Mineral 13 and Mineral 14 of the Natural Resources and Waste Plan protect wharves for freight movement. | Expand text of p52 to highlight opportunity for freight transport and last mile concept. |
| 12 | A recent report "Delivering the Future - New Approaches to Urban Freight" can be found at: http://www.urbantransportgroup.org/resources/types/reports/delivering-future-new-approaches-urban-freight | Website resource noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 12 | The Leeds and Liverpool Canal towing path is already used as a trans-Pennine long distance walking route, as well as for many shorter walks. And riverside paths and towing paths alongside the Aire & Calder Navigation have the potential to be developed as a long distance walking route as well. We would endorse the need for an obvious riverside walking route through Leeds as this would link these two routes as well as providing the other benefits identified in the document. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Overall, the Leeds Civic Trust strongly supports the Supplementary Planning Document and is pleased to note that there are many areas where it incorporates our views, and those of other stakeholders, on earlier drafts. However, there are two specific areas where we feel there should be further work to ensure that the Framework delivers the South Bank we all feel is appropriate. • Although additional references to public transport have been added to the document since the previous draft, given that buses are and are likely to remain the main means of sustainable transport into the city centre, we feel that their treatment is still inadequate. There is also the particular issue (which is referenced in the document) of inadequate public transport provision currently in the South Bank. Therefore, we suggest that the provisions of the SPD be strengthened in this respect. • While we support the removal of all but buses, we feel that the case for the closure of Neville Street to all vehicles still needs to be made and that work to determine potential bus routing might inform any such discussions. It will be essential to model bus flow through the city centre before any firm plans are made for its closure. | Comment noted. Public transport network/ routes will be defined as work progresses through the detailed design | Retention of Neville Street as a bus route to be agreed. |
| 13 | Page 3. LCT supports the Vision for SB and welcomes the higher residential numbers now proposed – we feel there is potential for even more, especially family, housing. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 13. We welcome the expansion of SB to more logical boundaries but suggest that, notwithstanding talk of 'fuzzy' edges, inclusion of surrounding highways (M621 and A61 East St & John Smeaton Way) within the SPD would focus initiatives to enhance crossings (and so links to surrounding communities). | Section 4.2 and pages 56-57 promote key connections to allow better movement for pedestrians and cyclists beyond the inner ring road. Options for enhanced crossings on East Street and John Smeaton Way are already shown in the Aire Valley AAP. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Pages 14/15. We welcome the focus on people and space rather than buildings but it is important to ensure this is carried through in development control – encourage applicants to include the 'other side of the street' within their red edge so the building context is fully considered. | The principles clarify how the layouts of new developments should help deliver the regeneration framework and establishes strategic objectives which developments should respond to. It is considered beyond the scope of the SPD to encourage applicants to include the 'other side of the street' within their red edge so the building context is fully considered. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Pages 16-19. We note the strong support for green space & walking routes and look forward to seeing these drive the development structure in the area. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 23. Potential to update to current status. | Comments noted. | Chapter 2 to be updated to reflect that the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan has now been 'made'. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 13 | Page 24. We feel that public transport needs to be given greater prominence here – it is currently relegated below parking! We would not wish to see (i) being seen as justification for additional road building (although we appreciate this is unlikely given LCC aspirations). | Comment noted. Amended wording in SBRF Principle 1 on pg 24 which prioritises public transport within the city centre. | Amended wording in SBRF Principle 1 on pg 24 which prioritises public transport within the city centre. In addition amends to the Key Move to strengthen focus on public transport. |
| 13 | Page 24. (iv) this is an unclear statement – we assume the aspiration is to improve links between the centre and areas outside the Inner Ring Road, which we welcome. (viii) we welcome meanwhile uses but these should be more than just child-friendly – other interventions should be encouraged for all age groups. | Principle 3 Bullet iv) is about improving connections between the city centre and areas outside the Inner Ring Road. Bullet viii) does not preclude intergenerations for all age groups but it is considered that all meanwhile uses should be childfriendly. | Reorder bullet iv) to clarify |
| 13 | Page 25. (iv) we question whether the pedestrianisation of Neville Street be a principle? It is one approach to an aim to enhance N-S pedestrian routes but are there other options for pedestrians and/or public transport? We have been told that this is still to be finally agreed so it should not be a principle. | Proposal to improve the pedestrian experience and accessibility of Neville Street whilst retaining a public transport link through. | SPD response to be agreed |
| 13 | Page 28. We support this summary but there are many other challenges which could be listed, particularly with regard to community issues. | Comments noted. The challenges listed are not intended to be comprehensive and are considered to represent a suitable summary of the issues focused upon by the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 33. We are concerned that public transport is not well served in these Moves, with any references well down the page and below highway improvements. The order of the aspirations could be reviewed to create a more logical flow | The key moves are not in order of priority but will see if there is a more logical order (also relevant given comments from the EA regarding the Gren Network) | Reorder the key moves to ensure more logical flow. |
| 13 | Page 34. 'A653 creates a major east/west divide ...' but it actually runs north/south – is it better to refer to street names here? Roads in SB (& the city centre as a whole) should be reclassified so that there are no 'A' roads within the inner ring road – this would reinforce key move 1, with through traffic encouraged to use the inner ring road. | The road infrastructure of the A653 runs North South thereby creating a E/W divide. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 34. We are not convinced about plans for the Boulevard through Holbeck and feel that its route will need to be carefully considered if it is not to have an adverse impact on Holbeck, increasing its separation from HUV and the City Centre. | Comments noted. Work is ongoing to develop the design for the boulevard but the aspiration is to create a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists so it should not increase separation for Holbeck. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 35. There are other key crossing points that could be marked eg. around Saxton Gardens or the Canal at Globe Road – also barriers within the area which should be considered somewhere? This is an example where better, easier to read keys need to be included on the plans. There is potential confusion between Green Links and Cycle/Walking Routes – in some areas it may be appropriate for cyclists & pedestrians to share space (eg. both moving in the same direction & slow-moving bikes) but elsewhere they should be segregated (eg. faster bike routes and/or movement in different directions). Plans should be amended to differentiate between these. | Comments noted. The interventions are aimed at improving access through and beyond the Inner Ring Road and 7 key connections have been identified and highlighted. Whether space will be shared or segregated will be determined as the designs move forward the plan is intended to be strategic in its current form. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 36. Is it a 'Public Transport Strategy' – why 'Transportation'? Should a Leeds image be included for the P&R stop? It may be that the concepts of the Public Transport Box and the Pedestrian Precinct would be best separated. Buses will travel through the public transport box via Boar Lane and in future it may be that the pedestrian area will be extended to areas outside the public transport box eg. City Square. Should the centre be the 'Pedestrian Core' rather than the Pedestrian Precinct (which has a specific meaning)? | Wording of Section 4.3 p36 to be amended with reference to Core Strategy parking policy and Parking SPD document. | Amended wording for Section 4.3/p36. |
| 13 | Page 37. We suggest that this 'key move' should be recast to focus on public transport (and in particular buses). It may also be helpful to include reference to potential rapid transit in the South Bank. Intended outcomes could be: • access to frequent public transport for all parts of SB providing links to the railway station, the northern part of the city centre, P&R sites and South Leeds, as well as the northern suburbs (in the future this may be provided by rapid transit as well as conventional bus) • good connectivity for bus and future rapid transit at Leeds Station to provide a fully integrated transport hub. The diagram shows Neville Street as public transport route – we feel that this should be the case but accept that if the LISM proposes pedestrianisation, this plan should be amended to avoid confusion. Neville Street is a wide straight route and under current proposals buses will be diverted to narrower, more twisting routes which are potentially less suitable. | Amended wording in section 4.4 and public transport network map to ensure public transport facilities and improve public walking experience | Section 4.4 amended and inclusion of public transport network map. |
| 13 | Page 38. There seems to be a selective indication of greenspace, with several key locations omitted eg East Street, Quarry Hill, Mabgate, canal/river at West End, etc. Should the new Park be shown as planned by Vastint? From mtg with Trust, Mike Piet suggested different shades for existing space and planned public space. | Amend the base map to reflect the City Park proposal and review the greenspace shown on the plans in line with what is shown within the AVLAAP and SAP. | Scale of amendments to plans to be agreed mindful of the cost implications. |
| 13 | Page 39. Whitehall Waterfront has the potential to deliver many of the outcomes listed here. And areas under the Station could be highlighted – walkway above weir? | Comments regarding Whitehall Waterfront noted and not precluded by anything within the SPD. Potential to further highlight areas of the water under the station at 6.5. | Include an additional bullet / amend existing bullet to better reference water under the station. |
| 13 | Page 40. This is a rather arbitrary diagram as it does not pick up a number of heritage assets eg Town Hall, Civic Quarter & Headrow which would create a new linear 'Heritage Network'? However, the plan appears sound on SB, with the suggestions of adding residential all the way along the riverside and more digital eg. Duke Studios? Use of different (very slightly) coloured circles makes it difficult to follow the key – better to use shape and colour (also applies to other plans). | The plan is intended to be conceptual to illustrate the principles rather than literal. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 43. It may be necessary to review the Capital of Culture discussion if finally determined by date of publication – however, we support retaining culture as a key driver for SB. | Culture will be retained as a key driver. However, the SPDw will be updated in the light of the decision regarding European Capital of Culture. | Section 4.10 to be updated. |
| 13 | Page 48. We support the concept of a grid of streets including the principal east/west intervention of 'The Arbour'. We do have concerns over Neville Street. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 13 | Page 49. We support the principles set out here as we have argued for a green park with real scale (as shown in the illustrations!) – it should have the amenities appropriate to enable its use by a wide range of users including sports facilities (success of 5-a-sides at Wellington Place – link to school/colleges?). The park should link to the river and the Sovereign Street Bridge and, ideally, to the waterway at Leeds Dock, so providing an alternative east/west route through SB. Links should then flow out to nearby communities as proposed in this section. | Comments noted. | Reference to active recreation within the section on the City Park p49. |
| 13 | Page 50. We support the manifesto as set out here but feel that there should also be a reference to long-term management. | Comments noted and shared with Urban Design team. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 54. We feel that greater play should be made of the riverfront, with the SPD seeking to identify more generous waterfront public open space on the lines seen in other major riverside cities such as London’s South Bank or Bristol’s Harbourside. We have seen sketches illustrating a vision for Bridge End and this should be linked to the City Park, Sovereign Square and Yorkshire Place to create a more expansive waterside destination. These aspirations should also be reference elsewhere in the SPD including section 4.6 and 7.1. We welcome ambition but given EA/C&RT views on obstructing the flow of water is the addition of floating walkways an idea too far? | The exact amount of space allocated for the waterfront will emerge through detailed design and individual planning applications. By establishing the principles the SPD is helping to establish the strategy. | Plans to be updated to reflect the ‘masterplan’ for Meadow Lane/Bridge End within the document. |
| 13 | Pages 56/57. Figure numbers are incorrect but it is difficult to see the relevance of some illustrations eg. where would 5.12 be placed? | Potential to delete figure 5.12 as it does not relate to a proposed crossing enhancement. | Delete Figure 5.12. Look at numbering. |
| 13 | page 58. We welcome the Concentric Model for movement around the city, with the objective of limiting routes through the centre by providing an ‘in & back out’ traffic system. There is discussion of traffic calming measures on the City Boulevard and we would wish to see these introduced as soon as possible on other City Centre routes – should the whole area be a 20mph zone? There is considerable detail about the South-Eastern route of the proposed City Boulevard but very little discussion about the South-Western section (Jack Lane to Whitehall Road). We understand that this is being considered as a component of wider work undertaken to examine the future road network which will be appropriate in Holbeck area. We suggest that consideration be given to routing the Boulevard closer to the railway line, so providing a more direct route which avoids the need for traffic to track as far west into Holbeck. Will there be a need to issue an amendment to the SPD to incorporate the final route and layout of the boulevard? There will be a need to ensure that any land needed is protected from development which could compromise realisation of the boulevard. | Council is exploring the option of 20mph zones and will look to implement them across the city centre where deemed appropriate. | Reference 20mph zone situation in Section 4.1. |
| 13 | Page 59. This figure does not really relate to public transport and is confusing in showing both new and existing Loop/Boulevard – would it be better to show the strategy in one colour/dash and the loop section to be abandoned differently? | Comment noted. | Amend figure 4.4 to show south bank area and key transport network. Amended text on City Centre road widths. |
| 13 | Page 59. We support the intention to route the Boulevard along Black Bull Street rather than Crown Point Road as the latter bisects the city park. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 59. The discussion of public transport here is inadequate. There should be a diagram showing proposed bus routes and key interchanges. This should be tested to ensure that they will enable bus routes to be operate which meet the proposed requirements (see note re 4.4 above & bullet point 9 on p33). The identification of roads as bus routes will be crucial to their design. If proposals are agreed for future rapid transit, then these should be incorpor-ated into the SPD to ensure that the proposed routes are protected – these may be corridors not previously considered for rapid transit or corridors where land has been protected for previous schemes. Such protection might include location of services to avoid the need for costly work in the future. | Comment noted. | Amend figure 4.4 to show south bank area and key transport network. Amended text on City Centre road widths. |
| 13 | Page 60. Again, there is confusion with regard to the A653 being N/S or E/W but, as suggested, it would be better to refer to road names rather than numbers. We welcome plans to simplify the M621 junction as we feel that the current fast slip-roads are not appropriate for a route into slow-speed roads – deceleration should take place as cars leave the motorway. A junction rearrangement could release development land to help fund highway works? | The A653 runs n/s and creates a E/W divide. Coments regarding the M621 junction noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 62. We welcome the commitment to uninterrupted pavements but wide vehicular bell-mouths are still demanded by LCC Highways on current schemes, even those within the pedestrian core. | Comment noted. These are indicative layouts. Detailed layouts will emerge as work progresses to ensure legible and safe public transport provision. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 64. We have some concern about using median space for cyclists – how do they get to this? The explanation of what will happen in Victoria Road/Meadow Lane is confusing, as is the section on Kidacre Street. If the intention is to enhance public transport & walking/cycle provision, this is something we would support. There are also incorrect headings on these Figures. | Comment noted. | Amend figures and check figures match up on p64. |
| 13 | Page 66. We welcome use of Heritage Buildings as a catalyst for new development but the policy should apply to all appropriate buildings – it is likely to be more sustainable to adapt than to demolish and start again. Buildings of different ages also give a cultural identity. | No change to SPD. The NPPF and Core Strategy policy P11 make clear our approach to heritage assets | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 74. We welcome the introduction of sustainable development strategies but this should also include the development of a mixed residential/commercial community which will obviate the need for travel to work or play. | Section 4.8 promotes the culstering of complementary uses and a mix of uses in close proximity to create walkable neighbourhoods with longer periods of activity. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 78. We support the principles set out in this section but suggest that the location of the HS2 station should be amended to match the presently proposed position over Neville Street in order to avoid confusion. The Design Principles here are all illustrated as affecting the HS2 site to the south of the existing station although the text does refer to proposals to the north which are not shown on the diagrams – the principles should also apply to these areas. | Comments noted. | Amend the indicative location of the HS2 station on the design principles (shift west). |
| 13 | Page 78. In addition to transforming New Station Street, reference should be made to changes at City Square and Aire Street – the Whitehall Road link could also be important although it is off the plan. | City Square improvements are referenced at section 7.2.1 and the Whitehall Road link features on the LISM plans within section 7.2.1. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 13 | Page 79. We welcome the permeability principles but these should be illustrated as being north/south through the viaduct as well as east/west | The graphic is meant to illustrate optimum east west permeability through the viaduct. It is not intended as a detailed plan to show all potential connections. Pedestrian routes through the railway arches feature in the graphic at Section 6.6, the explanatory text at 6.4 and the LISM plans within section 7. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 80. The location of HS2 is particularly confusing here, together with the location of the integrated concourse – would it be better to just show an ‘oval’ over the two stations to illustrate the shared concourse idea? Should the principle here relate to the integration of the two stations, with the issue of north/south off-station movement covered in 6.2? | Comments noted. | Look at Image in the light of the new viaduct location. Also note potential amend to Neville Street. |
| 13 | Page 81. We welcome plans to open up the Dark Arches and reveal the historic elements. Far greater play should be made of the arches to the east of Neville Street where there is potential to link up with Sovereign Square and provide an attractive route to City Square from South Bank – there could be benefits in opening up the Mill Goit as a historic feature. To the west of Neville Street, the arches should be used to provide attractive routes from City Square and the retail core to Granary Wharf, Holbeck Urban Village and the established communities beyond South Bank. There is some confusion between the ground floor routes and the last bullet about ‘amenity space on roof of station’ – does not this fit better with 6.3? | Benefits of opening up the Mill Goit referenced. | Move bullet regarding additional amenity space on the roof from 6.2 to 6.3. |
| 13 | Page 82. We agree that there is potential to increase access to the water but this should include areas under and to the north of the existing station. | The graphics in the section do focus on the HS2 viaduct but the text makes a general reference to the river. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 83. It is essential to have easy access to all appropriate modes of onward travel in order to minimise end-to-end journey times but, if this the case, areas to the north of the existing station and viaduct should be highlighted. Key to usage of the cycle facilities will be easy and safe access to the City-Connect routes – the location of the present Hub is not ideal from this point of view. There is not much discussion here of the need for appropriate arrangements for taxis & private hire pick-up/drop-off or for buses – also impact of coaches during rail replacement services? The diagram shows buses on Neville Street! | Comments noted. The graphic representation covers the HS2 viaduct but the accompanying text relates to the whole station and will be covered through detailed design work. ambition outlined in the SPD. | Amended wording in the last bullet point to include reference to drop off and pick up along the transport network in the city. |
| 13 | Page 84. We welcome plans to integrate the station fully into the public realm – the aim should be to make the viaduct disappear and the best way to do this is to ensure that lighting levels within any undercroft or underpass are as bright as daylight outside, with light levels reduced at dusk so as to replicate a lit night ambience. | Lighting strategy and importance of lighting in the underground realm highlighted at 6.8. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 85. In addition to extra platform capacity, the strategy should accommodate (or at a minimum, not preclude) widening the eastern viaduct to four tracks. | Comments noted. The SPD is not considered to preclude the widening of the eastern viaduct to four tracks. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 90. We welcome all the Principles established here with the following exceptions: iv) we have an issue with the full pedestrianisation of Neville street vi) it may be difficult to deliver an additional bridge at Bridgewater Road while maintaining navigation clearances – long ramps would be required vii) reference should be made to additional/enhanced through platforms as if more services were to run through the station, there would be less need for more terminal platforms ix) any cycle hub must be better located than the present facility. | Comments noted. The issue relating to through platforms is one of detail - the SPD refers to adequate capacity to allow for the anticipated growth in demand. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 91. We welcome most elements shown on this masterplan including, in particular, the following: • new road bridge to potential MSCP at Whitehall Road – however, if this is to be taken forward, current planning consents will need to be amended • rearrangement of road access at Aire Street, including ‘public’ use of the space occupied by the Princes Exchange car park – we welcome the suggestion that the ‘point’ of Aire Street/Wellington Street could be blunted to provide better access but note that this could only be delivered in partnership with the current site owners or by CPO • the pedestrianisation of New Station Street • Sovereign Bridge and the link to the City Park & Hunslet Stray • downgrading of Meadow Lane • creation of complementary riverside public spaces at the junction of the river and the canal (Yorkshire Place) • a pedestrian route under the station with views of the weirs. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 91. However, we have concerns about other elements including: • proposals for Bishopgate Street and the full closure of Neville Street • access to Albion Street from New Station Street – this is a key location for a ‘Tokyo’ crossing and could be shown as such (together with one at City Square) • bus routes and stop locations throughout • taxi and private hire drop-off and pick-up sites • potential pedestrian bridge at Granary Wharf – difficult to provide navigation clearance at this point above the lock. | Comment noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 93. We welcome the concept of ‘The Arbour’ as an east/west route through South Bank but we feel that this will need to be carefully designed so as to attract users through a series of well-considered spaces where slight changes of direction may be required – attractive buildings, public art or tree planting, as well as a consistent public realm treatment, could be utilised to draw people along the route. Although shown to its full extent on Fig 7.1, Sovereign Square has shrunk on this plan – we would not wish to see the northern section towards the railway viaduct lost to other uses. Should the City Park be redrawn here to reflect the more recent aspirations for the Vastint site and links to the riverside at Sovereign Bridge? The Hol Beck diversion is still shown although we understand this is no longer an option? | Comments noted. | Base map for the city park is to be updated. To review open space as illustrated on 7.4. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| 13 | Page 94. We welcome the diversity of spaces proposed for SB, with particular support for those linked to the river. Is the paragraph number correct? | Paragraph numbering incorrect. | Update para 7.2.1 to 7.1.2 |
| 13 | Page 95. We suggest that proposals for Bishopgate Street should be reviewed as we feel this is not an appropriate gateway to Leeds – far better to direct people towards City Square or Albion Street using New Station Street rather than down steps to a narrow street full of taxis (and buses?) only to have to head back up to City Square or Boar Lane to get into the northern city centre. Those heading to South Bank are more likely to use other exits from the station platforms or the escalators shown from the concourse down into the Dark Arches. | This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. However it is considered that with the right treatment Bishopgate Street could be an appropriate gateway to Leeds. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 96. We do not feel that development of an integrated station ‘requires’ the closure of Neville Street – it is certainly an option and one chosen by the Board but there should be further discussion of the pros & cons. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 98. While we support the need to consider potential routes for a future MRT system, we feel that it is far more important to consider how buses will be routed around SB and the integrated station. This will remain the principal public transport mode for many years to come (particularly if P&R is encouraged) so will need to be carefully considered – the aspiration to double bus patronage and increase frequencies on core routes could mean more buses running more frequently and places such as Boar Lane are already very congested. We have a particular concern with the junction immediately north of Leeds Bridge at the Cosmopolitan Hotel. If all north/south buses are to pass through here (whether over Leeds Bridge or via Sovereign Street from Victoria Bridge) this will be a very busy site with buses turning almost continuously given the number of routes operating on 10-minute frequencies (plus P&R from Elland Road, Temple Green and, in due course, Stourton). Add to this the fact that this will be the only way to reach the Trinity and ‘Bibi’ short-stay car parks and this has the potential to be the most congested location in Leeds. | Public transport proposals for the city will emerge through the detail design. Existing loop traffic will be reduced through proposed junction improvement works in the city centre. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 98. Buses directed away from straight simple routes mean longer journey times, so discouraging use, and additional expense to operators in terms of fuel and more buses needed to maintain a short interval timetable. Diversion of all routes to Leeds Bridge could lead to problems if this were to be closed as a result of an incident or planned works. Already special arrangements are being made to allow the Elland Road P&R bus through contra-flow while the bridge is southbound only during repairs (with staffing implications), presumably because an alternative route would be too slow. We feel that Neville Street should remain a bus route and be utilised to provide under-cover interchange with rail services. We acknowledge that this may be a challenge in terms of noise and fumes but there are mechanisms to resolve such issues and low emission or electric buses are on the way. | Comments noted. Common statement for future of Neville Street needed. The future position for Neville Street is to improve the pedestrian experience and accessibility and retain a public transport route. | Changes to reflect the role of Neville Street to be agreed. |
| 13 | Page 99. Legibility will need to be a key consideration in the design of the integrated station and its signage if people are not to be confused by the various exits and entrances – eg. taxi users will need to be directed to the right rank for their destination if taxis are to avoid driving through the heart of the city. | Comments noted. Importance of legibility covered at section 6.1 p.78. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 100. We welcome the strategies for the HS2 viaduct and note that this will need to be carefully designed as the line drops from a high level to below ground to join the existing rail corridor in Hunslet. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 106. We support the principles behind the character areas discussed in this section. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 110. We welcome the principle of placing taller buildings around the station in order to maximise the number of occupiers with easy access to the high quality public transport that will be provided. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 111. This sketch has noticeably lower buildings than those shown on subsequent drawing (Fig 7.20) – it is from a different stable so should it be removed? | Misinterpretation of the drawing which is a sketch of the subsequent plan - buildings represented are of the same scale. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 117. We welcome the seven delivery principles as a whole but have comments on some of these as set out below. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | Page 122. The statement on ‘movement between the existing station and HS2 being supported by a high-quality pedestrian environment’ seems to be a reference to the original separated stations – now they will be integrated is this relevant? | Comments noted. | Amend 8.5.1 so that it refers to ‘movement within the integrated station’ |
| 13 | Page 124. We welcome the commitment to engagement with stakeholders in taking forward the Framework but greater and more open collaboration could still be introduced – blank-paper workshops could draw in the freely offered talent within the city. An alternative approach to Bishopgate Street and New Station Street could be an opportunity for such a workshop. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 13 | The following comments cover various parts of the Framework: • if an A5 document is to be the principal hard copy version, some plan keys need to be redesigned with a larger font • there are a number of grammatical, spelling and formatting errors which we assume will be corrected as part of the editing process. | Comments noted. Proofing and grammar checks carried out. | Review the format of the final document. |
| 14 | Please note some attention is required to the numbering of figures throughout. | Noted. | Review numbering of figures throughout. |
| 14 | Page 62. Section 5.3.4 on Street Design mentions the aspiration of more trees and planting and cites the benefits of trees including experience, protection from the elements and enhancing character. Section 8.6.1 on a greener Leeds also recognises the fundamental benefit to citizens of proximity to nature. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Page 62. We think this falls substantially short of adequately stressing the importance of delivering much greater number of trees in the city. Turning through the pages of the SPD document at speed reveals that, for about 80% of the document, trees are evident on every page, either as artists impressions, diagrammatic, or in images of relevant existing examples internationally. The lack of written ‘policy’ on trees seems at odds with this. | Trees are referred to several times in the document in relation to street design, the city park, public spaces, climate change resilience. As such a specific tree policy is not proposed . | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 14 | <p>We would recommend that the document is much more assertive and prescriptive regarding the delivery of more trees within the street scape. The redevelopment of the Southbank area of Leeds presents a rare opportunity to design-in successful strategies for greening of the city. For example, as the transport network is rationalised and some roads are downgraded to provide more public space, common service trenches could be introduced to keep services to one side of the road, and trees to the other.</p> <p>The myriad public health and wellbeing benefits of trees and green infrastructure are well documented and should be given much more weight within this document. Furthermore, there are obvious associations with improved air quality and flood resilience – both issues which are highly relevant to Leeds at the moment.</p> | The draft SPD is considered to cover the issues of trees within the streetscape in relation to a number of different aspects of the document. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 72. It is good to see the issue of flooding resilience identified within the document, but we feel the SPD could go further than the generalised approaches identified in section 5.5.3. For example, a more explicit reference to the requirement for public space water retention features to be integrated into the design of the new City Park, would make a lot of sense given the park's proximity to the river. This would also create a potentially highly attractive family leisure amenity within the park.</p> | Detailed design of the park is due to be carried out by Vastint and will be controlled through the planning application process. The part area is small and as such some compromises will need to be made. The SPD can not introduce new policy requirements and can not therefore require public space water retention features to be integrated into the design of the park even though this may be desirable. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Figure on page 93.</p> <p>Has the advantage of following a good pedestrian/cyclist desire line from the city centre to the south west of the city but we see serious challenges with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. 200m of 'underground' route with no natural light will be an unattractive prospect for pedestrians and cyclists • Potential to glaze the ends and create a possible retail arcade is flawed – the lack of natural light would make for an unattractive 'mall' environment which would not compete with other much more successful retail destinations in the city • Figure 7.4 shows this route as a strategic green link – is this potentially misleading given the inherent challenge in maintaining landscaping in an underground environment? | Comments noted. The detailed treatment of Neville Street is still to be agreed. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 90. We believe a more successful pedestrian route could take the line of the pedestrian link under the existing station shown between Bishopsgate and Sovereign Square, turning right at the KPMG building along Pitt Row and then taking a shorter route under the HS2 platform structure directly into Yorkshire Place. This gives a more attractive route with shorter 'tunnel' distances and more easily seen exterior destinations at the end of the underpass sections, to help with navigation and wayfinding.</p> | Comments noted. The detailed design is still evolving. Section 6.4 refers to reopening a route under the arches linking Pitt Row with Bishopgate Street. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 90. This route would also allow for better delivery of a strategic north-south green link given the potential for daylight to access the southern end of the pedestrian underpass leading into Sovereign Square, and similarly to access the ground level from either side of the HS2 platform structure at different times of the day. (a plan showing this alternative route can be provided if required).</p> <p>In addition, the current proposal for bus traffic to take the circuitous route from Swinegate, along the southern edge of the existing station, along Pitt Row and joining Sovereign Street, presents too many twists and turns which would slow services, and also render the pedestrian route as shown in conflict with a heavily used route to the bus interchange.</p> | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 90. We feel it would make more sense to save the lengthy harsh underpass environment of Neville Street for North-South bus services. Indeed in Figure 7.9 (P98) Neville Street is identified as a potential mass transit route - we think this would be a successful approach. A pedestrian route as proposed above could cross the river from Yorkshire Place using the potential bridge location identified in the station masterplan, and thus avoid using Neville Street altogether.</p> | Comments noted. This is a guidance document. The detail will come from the design as work progresses. | Role of Neville Street is to be agreed. |
| 14 | <p>Page 90. The construction phase of HS2 also needs to be considered with regard to North-South pedestrian movements. Neville Street will be a dead end for approx. 5 years where it meets the HS2 construction site. If earlier investment in the alternative route we propose is undertaken in advance, we feel this would give a better chance of maintaining a viable route through the site during construction phases.</p> | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 95. The level change on the graphic/plans of Bishopsgate Plaza presents inherent challenges for less able users, and whilst a passenger lift is identified on the plans, this would likely struggle with the volume of users at peak times and cause delays.</p> | Comments noted. The detailed design is still evolving. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Page 95. In addition the North-East orientation, with the surrounding massing, suggests that the plaza will often be in shadow and could be an unattractive location that will not generate dwell time and incidental uses.</p> <p>As a route to the city centre the Bishopsgate plaza also has failings in that users are led down to Bishopsgate only to then be funnelled backup to Boar Lane via Mill Hill. Meanwhile access to the city centre to the North and North West is limited only to the existing entrance onto City Square, which will become a key pinch point given the projected increase in passenger numbers.</p> | Comments noted. The detailed design is still evolving. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Pages 90 & 95. We propose that the provision of much greater permeability between the station and City Square is investigated in more detail, using a reconfigured Ground Floor of the Queen's Hotel, which currently acts as a barrier to movement in this direction. Given the huge scale of transformation proposed for the station and the city environment to the South, it seems a missed opportunity not to fully explore the potential to punch through the hotel at ground level and provide increased flow and legibility for station users.</p> | Comments noted. The SPD makes reference to a strengthened relationship between the Queens Hotel and the station including a potential shared entrance but reconfiguring the ground floor is beyond the scope of the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | <p>Pages 47/48. We fully support the creation of a major tree-lined pedestrian E-W route in the Southbank area. However, as it is currently drawn we feel it misses the opportunity to align with Back Row and extend right up to the major landmark/heritage asset Temple Works. This is suggested in Fig 5.3 (page 48 – not to be confused with Fig 5.30 on P68) where the Arbour is identified as a green axis connecting Temple Works to Leeds Dock. It seems this alignment has been pushed out on the station masterplan, but this could quite easily be brought back into place. In addition, could this be aligned with a paved route through City Park to provide a strong visual link with Salem Chapel? This section of the Arbour then becomes visually bookended by two heritage landmarks.</p> | Comments noted. The detailed design is still evolving. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 14 | Pages 100-103 and throughout chapter 6. We agree with the aim for optimum permeability across the HS2 platform structure, however a note of caution needs to be sounded regarding the provision of multiple city spaces around and under the rail corridor. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Pages 100-103 and throughout chapter 7. The aim of creating increased public space is a good one, but new public realm will only be successful if viable uses and activities are found to occupy these spaces. There is danger of creating empty and unwelcoming hard landscaped spaces, further challenged by being within a viaduct, if uses leading to vitality are not effectively delivered. | Agreed the spaces need to be related to intended uses and activity in the area and connected by the viaduct routes. They are therefore likely to be delivered in connection with development rather than independently | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Pages 100-103 and throughout chapter 8. It is therefore encouraging to see attention given to viaduct strategies in section 7.2.2 and 7.2.3, with some concept proposals identified. We strongly support further work to be done in this area and would urge LCC to commission a detailed study to identify best practice internationally. The city needs to further explore how it could more assertively prescribe certain uses in these locations, to ensure that these viaducts can bring benefit to the city, rather than bring further challenges. The experience of failed attempts to improve the pedestrian experience of Neville Street must not be repeated. The evolution of London Southbank's urban undercroft skate park is an interesting example http://www.lsb.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Southbank-Undercroft-Restoration-Proposal.pdf Can cultural use be designed in to spaces or do groups need to be encouraged to colonise it themselves, to avoid rejecting contrived approaches? | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Pages 100-103 and throughout chapter 9. We would particularly urge the council to prioritise space within viaducts for community activity such as sports use, to better serve a growing city centre residential community. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 14 | Pages 100-103 and throughout chapter 10. Riverside public space on the south bank of the Aire is shown to be high quality and extensive to the west of the HS2 platform structure, but is reduced in width and reverts to hard landscaping on the east side of the viaduct. With a small adjustment to building footprints as proposed, this could be extended to provide a high quality green link adjacent to the river, between the City Park and the southern ends of Sovereign Street and Neville Street bridges. The benefit to the city of a world class riverside environment cannot be underestimated. | Comments noted. The detailed design is still evolving. The SPD is clear about the aspirations for the waterfront. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Page 3. We welcome the approach that puts people first, with the emphasis on connectivity, greenspace and biodiversity, with the River as a key resource. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Page 24. We welcome the Principles in particular: SBRF 1 - Create a green network that connects through a legible system of streets, paths, urban spaces and parks. Make the waterfront a central place for activity SBRF 3 - The delivery of the framework concept of promoting well designed streets and public spaces and enhancing the green and blue network as a means of galvanising development . . . The connected open space network and strategies for successful openspaces. The ambition for the River Aire set out in the sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 on 'Making the most of a natural asset' and 'access and integration of the waterfront'. Including encouraging active use of the river and where development occurs on sites next to the river the development addresses the water and responds positively and fully to opportunities offered by the waterfront. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Pages 48, 52, 68. Natural England additionally welcomes the following: 5.2.1: 'Increase biodiversity by creating new habitats for wildlife and pollinator resources'. 5.2.3 Recognition of the River Aire as 'one of the most important ecological networks'. 5.4.2 Recognition of the benefit of creating 'a new piece of green infrastructure ... to establish awareness and footfall around an area of the city that has yet to be completed'. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 15 | Page 49. Natural England welcomes the creation of the City Centre Park, it is less clear how and where green infrastructure is going to be created throughout the South Bank. In our December 2016 comments we highlighted the opportunity to link Middleton and Park Woods as well as the woodland running south-west from New Wortley. | Need to identify where the existing ancient woodland referred to is. | SPD response to be agreed. |
| 15 | Page 74. There is a minor reference on page 74 and in the section on the new station for HS2 (section 6). We recommend the Guidance should have a stronger emphasis on green roofs and walls and the environmental and ecological benefit they bring to the built environment. For example the contribution they make to: - biodiversity, - climate change and reducing urban heat islands - recreational opportunities - sustainable drainage | Comments noted. | Include text relating to green roofs within Section 5.5.4 Sustainable Development Strategies (p74) |
| 16 | It is considered that the SPD will contribute to the successful regeneration of the South Bank area of the city. The integration of HS2 facilities within the regeneration proposals will enhance operational efficiency and connectivity with existing transport networks, including Trans Pennine rail. It will be important to ensure that there is provision for future enhancements to Trans Pennine rail infrastructure. | Comments noted. | no changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | The draft SPD does not appear to generate any direct cross boundary issues with North Yorkshire. However, we note the potential wider economic benefit that could be generated for the Leeds City Region and the Northern Powerhouse by the successful regeneration of the South Bank area of the city centre. | Comments noted. | no changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | The regeneration proposals for the South Bank area of central Leeds are welcome in principle. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 16 | We would encourage the City Council to consider opportunities to achieve alignment with NYCC's Plan for Economic Growth and Strategic Transport Prospectus for North Yorkshire where appropriate in order to achieve the widest possible benefits. | Comments noted. | no changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | Aviva support the overall aspiration for the South Bank articulated within the Framework, and the approach for guiding development and investment in the area contained therein. It is evident that the environmental context to the Crown Point Shopping Park (CPSP) is going to undergo significant change during the coming years, irrespective of whether HS2 is delivered or not. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 17 | <p>Landsec support the City's objectives to further the regeneration of this important part of the City. Most notably, Landsec support LCC's ambition to double the economic impact of the City Centre, and in order to assist this, by transforming the South Bank into a major destination for investment. Landsec would, however, be concerned that in achieving these ambitions, the City Centre's retail and leisure role should not be diminished, and it is important that the South Bank should not be treated as an extension of the existing retail and commercial leisure role of the core of the City Centre.</p> <p>Landsec are, therefore, especially supportive of the SPD's stated vision that the South Bank should be a destination for "sustainable living, learning, culture, creativity and leisure" with the emphasis of the leisure role as being about recreation, rather than commercial leisure which is already provided for and concentrated in the core of the City Centre.</p> | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | <p>Landsec are, therefore, supportive of the SPD subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Main town centre uses (most notably retail and commercial leisure) should only be permitted within the South Bank area where they satisfy the sequential and impact tests of National, and Development Plan, policy. - That for the purposes of the sequential test, the South Bank Area is not "in centre" and whilst some areas north of the River Aire could be defined as "edge of centre", the majority of the South Bank area to the south of the River is "out of centre" - The heart of the City Centre, defined in the Core Strategy ("CS") as the Primary Shopping Quarter ("PSQ"), should remain the key focus for new retail and commercial leisure uses. <p>In light of the above, Landsec believe that greater clarity is required in the SPD that main town centre uses that attract from a wider catchment than the South Bank should be prioritised in the PSQ, where they can be accommodated</p> | <p>There are two boundaries in the city centre that are relevant to the application of the sequential test for main town centre uses. The primary shopping quarter (PSQ) is relevant for consideration of retail applications (A1 uses) but for other main town centre uses, including commercial leisure, the city centre boundary as defined under Saved UDP Policy CC2 defines the centre for the purposes of the sequential. As a result all proposals for main town centre uses other than A1 retail are not required to undertake a sequential test within the city centre boundary irrespective of whether they are located within the PSQ or not. Main town centre uses are acceptable in principle subject to site-specific allocations. Commercial leisure is only an issue outside the city centre boundary. The SPD boundary does extend beyond the city centre in some locations but the SPD says very little about these areas so there is not considered to be a conflict.</p> | <p>The SPD cannot designate areas where retail would be acceptable as this is going beyond existing policy. Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>The SPD must have regard to National Planning Policy (in the form of the NPPF) and the adopted Development Plan (CS). The NPPF is clear that main town centre uses, which include retail and leisure amongst others, should take place wherever possible within existing town centres. For the purpose of defining a town centre, these are to be defined in Local Plans, and will include the primary shopping areas and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses which fall within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. Only where suitable and available sites are not available within such locations, should development take place outside town centres, and in these circumstances they should follow a sequential approach.</p> | See above response. | See above proposed amendments. |
| 17 | <p>When assessing applications for retail or leisure uses proposed outside of town centres, then they should be subject to an impact assessment and should only be allowed in those circumstances where they do not have a significant adverse impact on established town centres. In the case of Leeds, the CS (Core Strategy) defines a PSQ, which by analogy is that defined in the NPPF as the "primary shopping area" (as well as areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses adjacent to the primary shopping area) and contains the main concentration of retail and commercial leisure uses. It is, therefore, the "town centre" for the purposes of the definitions of in, edge and out of centre in the NPPF.</p> | See above response. | See above proposed amendments. |
| 17 | <p>The CS applies a sequential assessment that is permissive of small scale, local retail, food and beverage and A2 uses outside of the PSQ. In terms of the Council's sequential and impact test, small local facilities are defined as being over 200 sq m in terms of retail, or over 1,500 sq m where they are other main town centre uses (including A2-A5 and D2). Consequently, in the case of the South Bank area, as with other parts of the City outside the PSQ, retail and leisure proposals should be limited to those that are purely of a local nature, serving a local neighbourhood</p> | Agree for A1 retail but not for the other town centre uses for the reasons given above. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | <p>The policies of the CS prioritise main town centre uses within the City Centre Boundary (defined in the CS), and taken together, Policy CC1 and CC2 of the CS presume against retail or commercial leisure development in the South Bank Area unless opportunities in the PSQ have been taken up.</p> | <p>This only applies to retail (A1 use class) proposals. Part g of Policy CC1 states that all other town centre uses will be supported within the city centre boundary subject to amenity and compliance with other plan policies.</p> | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 17 | <p>LCC's Site Allocations Plan ("SAP") identifies a number of development opportunities within the South Bank area, for office, housing and mixed uses. There are no retail or leisure uses promoted or encouraged within the South Bank area in the SAP.</p> | <p>his does not mean that proposals for other uses are unacceptable. Leisure uses are specific supported in the south of the city centre under Core Strategy Policy CC2. The AVLAAP identifies some mixed use site (outside the city centre boundary) as appropriate for leisure development. Need to make sure there is no conflict between SPD and any proposed allocations in the SAP</p> | <p>Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>In summary, with the occupation of small scale operations, retail and commercial leisure uses should only be permitted where it can be proven that they cannot be accommodated in the City Centre and that they will not undermine existing or planned investment, or the vitality and viability of the City Centre as a whole.</p> | <p>Comment is relevant in relation to retail proposals, not leisure uses.</p> | <p>Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>It is important that the SPD is clear that retail and other main town centre uses relating to leisure and food and beverage are permitted only in those circumstances where they cannot be accommodated in the City Centre, and where they do not harm it.</p> | <p>Most of the South Bank is included within the City Centre boundary. Comments are relevant to retail proposals although not leisure uses as identified above.</p> | <p>Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>Landsec are continually looking at opportunities to improve their offer at Trinity. Should the focus for new retail and/or other main town centre uses shift away from the PSQ towards the South Bank area, this will make it difficult for existing schemes, such as Trinity, to attract investment and for the PSQ to maintain Leeds city centre's role as one of the country's leading shopping centres.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| 17 | <p>Pages 24/25. Presently, there are areas of the SPD that remain unclear in respect of the South Bank area not being appropriate per se for retail and leisure uses (other than small scale uses). For example, the SBRF Principle 1 and Principle 2 indicate that new centres, as well as town centre uses including shops are permitted within the South Bank area. Similarly, in relation to SBRF Principle 4 (relating to the redevelopment of Leeds City Station) it is suggested that added "amenity" should be included within any redevelopment of the station, and later in the SPD it is suggested that large scale retail spaces could be incorporated into the railway viaducts (see page 101). Whilst it is clearly appropriate for the Station to have catering and small scale retail serving rail passengers, it is not appropriate for the Station to become a retail/leisure destination in its own right.</p> | <p>Principles 1 and 2 promote clustering and reference Policy P7 of the Core Strategy. Clarify the SPD position on retail with respect to Section 4.8 and the LSIM character areas. Leisure is an appropriate use within the City Centre boundary (which includes most of South Bank).</p> | <p>Amend 101 so that it promotes 'Leisure and commercial spaces' rather than large scale retail. Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>Pages 24/25. The only apparent recognition that retail and leisure (including food and beverage) should only be allowed where they meet the appropriate (sequential and impact) policy tests is at page 33, where it is suggested that the area should continue to nurture "...the growth of independent food, beverage and other retail within the area subject to planning policy" (Quod emphasis).</p> <p>We, therefore, respectfully suggest that this limited recognition of planning policy and most notably the importance of the sequential test and impact test applying to any retail or leisure uses in the South Bank area should be strengthened.</p> | <p>See above response.</p> | <p>Amend 101 so that it promotes 'Leisure and commercial spaces' rather than large scale retail. Amend figure 4.8 - remove small nodes and leave the large circles. Where retail is referred to e.g character areas in Section 7.3 include the caveat 'subject to planning policy' and/or ancillary.</p> |
| 17 | <p>In view of the above, we strongly recommend the clarification in the SPD that notes that any main town centre uses, which are not small scale or offices, should be the subject of the sequential and impact tests of National and Local Planning Policy.</p> <p>Whilst Landsec fully support the vision for the South Bank area, it is important that this clarification is made explicit in the document in order to ensure that any retail or leisure uses is only permitted in this area where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proven, without doubt, that they cannot be accommodated within the PSQ and, 2. They will not cause any undue harm to the vitality and viability of the City Centre's PSQ or any current or future planned investment within the PSQ. | <p>We need to review Section 4.8 and all references to retail to ensure that the SPD is not permitting retail where a sequential test would be required under Policy CC1 and the NPPF.</p> | <p>Potential to amend plan in 4.8 so it is more of a standard land use plan (see other response below). The broad circles are ok e.g education cluster, commercial cluster, but the smaller nodes are too conceptual to be applied to a base map which might be interpreted literally.</p> |
| 18 | <p>Thank you for circulating the Draft South Bank Leeds SPD. We have no specific Officer comments to make on this document, other than that we request that nothing is taken forward which would preclude other authorities from accessing the wider opportunities offered by H52 as part of the Growth Strategy.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 19 | <p>Page 24.</p> <p>' Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone's daily life – and the design of where we live and work plays a vital role in keeping us active.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people and create environments that make the active choice the easy choice for people and communities. - Sport England in partnership with Public Health England, have produced the Active Design Guidance. This guidance builds on the original Active Design '(2007)' objectives of improving accessibility, enhancing amenity and increasing awareness, and sets out the Ten Principles of Active Design. - The guide features an innovative set of guidelines to get more people moving through suitable design and layout. It includes a series of case studies setting out practical real-life examples of the principles in action to encourage planners, urban designers, developers and health professionals to create the right environment to help people get more active, more often. - The Active Design Principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. -The guidance can be viewed here: https://www.sportengland.org/media/3964/spe003-active-design-published-october-2015-high-quality-for-web-2.pdf - Active design should be imbedded into the SPG (SPD?) as a core principle | <p>Comments noted. The issues is not specific to the SPD area,</p> | <p>Potential to reference active design in the SPD.</p> |
| 19 | <p>Pages 48 & 49.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The NPPF explains that Local Planning Authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area, including strategic policies to deliver (inter alia) the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities. - Paragraph 171 falls within the section of the NPPF that sets out advice on the evidence base that Plans need, and deals with Health and Well-Being. It advises; - "Local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation, and places of worship), including expected future changes and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being." - This advice is amplified in the section of the NPPF that deals with promoting healthy communities. Paragraph 73 states; - "Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision." - Leeds City Council has recently produced a Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) that looks at the demand and supply for pitch sport in the area. This PPS provides the Council with a robust and up to date evidence base on which to plan for the provision of sport facilities to meet demand. - In particular the PPS identifies a demand for a number of Artificial Grass Pitches. This SPD provides the opportunity to meet the actions identified in the PPS. - The PPS should therefore be used as an evidence base to inform the provision of sport facilities within the SPD area. | <p>The SPD cannot require that an artificial grass pitch is provided in the area. The AVLAAP refers to active recreation being one of the functions of the park. It is for applicants to respond to these requirements but there may be other ways to promote active recreation that are compliant with policy.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 19 | <p>Page 54.</p> <p>1- We note that figure 5.6 Section 1 shows canoeists using the water.</p> <p>- There is a growing number of participants in watersports, estimates include some 7.8 million people participate in such activities including sailing, windsurfing, rowing, canoeing, power boating, jet skiing and water skiing.</p> <p>- Watersport may be able to utilise existing infrastructure left over from previous waterside industries and developments</p> | <p>At a strategic level, Leeds already has policies to improve health, security, social infrastructure etc. For example, the Core Strategy has Objective 14, "Support the improved public health and wellbeing of Leeds' residents and workforce." It has policies on community facilities (P9), green infrastructure (G1), trees (G2), green space provision and protection (G3-6). These do not need to be repeated in the SPD. The SPD is about delivering on a range of community needs, including sport amongst other things. Section 5.2.1 "A new City Park" notes that the park should be capable of being used for sport. This doesn't have to mean laying out of a permanent sports pitch.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 19 | <p>Sport England would be pleased to offer the Council more information on the points raised above. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Playing Pitch Strategy • Active Design. <p>Should further information be required to inform the development of this SPD, please contact Richard.Fordham@sportengland.org 0207 273 1987.</p> | | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 20 | <p>As you will be aware, the entire SPD area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.</p> | <p>Policy Minerals 3 of the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan defines a Surface Coal Mineral Safeguarding Area (shown on the Local Plan Policies Map) and a policy relating to prior extraction of coal. This does not need to be repeated in the SPD.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 20 | <p>As you will also be aware, the SPD area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.</p> <p>Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas.</p> <p>Within the Plan area there are 3 recorded mine entries and a range of other mining legacy features including thick coal outcrops and unrecorded probable shallow coal workings.</p> <p>Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. No development should take place over mine entries even when treated. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not always a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.</p> | <p>The allocation of sites for development is through the adopted Aire Valley AAP and emerging Site Allocations Plan rather than the SPD. These plans include site requirements that relate to mine entries and other land instability issues where appropriate. Under Saved UDP Policy GP5 all applications for development are required to resolve instability. It is not considered necessary for the SPD to repeat these policy requirements.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 20 | <p>The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make in respect of the content of the SPD. However, we would expect any proposed development sites to be considered against the downloadable data provided to the LPA by the Coal Authority in respect of Development Risk and Surface Coal Resource plans. For those areas proposed for development where coal mining legacy has been identified to pose a risk we would expect this to be reflected in the text.</p> | <p>This has been considered through the preparation of the development plan document (see above) which have allocated sites for development in this area.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 21 | <p>We still consider that the draft SPD contains a significant amount of guidance, which does not reflect the content of proposals that are coming forward within the area. Whilst we welcome the freedom and flexibility this brings, and recognise that certain key sites will inevitably be more advanced than others, we would welcome guidance and certainty about how the South Bank will progress in the future.</p> | <p>The SPD seeks to establish a flexible framework to guide proposals. It is considered beyond the capability of the SPD to provide certainty about how South Bank will develop as some decisions will be led by the market.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 21 | <p>We also consider that given the timeframes for delivery of HS2 the SPD could offer more guidance on the shorter term desired outcomes for the area.</p> | <p>Temporary uses are considered in the document at 5.4.2, 8.4.2 and 8.4.4. It would be difficult for the document to go further into specific uses within the scope of an SPD.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 21 | <p>We also do not believe that the SPD goes far enough in terms of drawing the themes and key proposals in the existing / emerging documents together into a cohesive whole. It should aim to cement the approach being adopted across the area and to offer a unified face to both current landowners and future investors.</p> <p>This is important at a time when there is uncertainty about both major infrastructure decisions and the nature and strength of the market across the South Bank to have a single vision for the future development and growth of the area.</p> <p>Existing documents including the Core Strategy, draft Southbank Framework Plan, the Holbeck South Bank Urban Village SPD, The Local Plan Site Allocations Plan, The Aire Valley Action Plan DPD, the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan and the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan as outlined in chapter 2.</p> | <p>The peripheral area is covered by the Holbeck SPD and the Aire Valley Area Action Plan. These provide sufficient clarity in planning policy terms and are cross-referenced in this document at section 2.</p> | <p>For greater clarity amend the plan on page 13 to show the areas covered by Holbeck SPD and AVLAAP.</p> |
| 21 | <p>We would suggest that the SPD should include a road map to outline 'where we are' in terms of what is and has come forward and what the Council is planning to encourage additional development, particularly those assets in its control, to realise the Vision set out within the document. This all needs to be considered against the backdrop that ultimately developers and market drivers will influence how and when development sites come forward.</p> | <p>Although a useful suggestion a meaningful road map could only be provided for LCC assets and it is likely to become out of date quickly as timescales change.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 21 | <p>Page 9. We would like to correct the statement at section 1.2 which states that is the former Tetley brewery site is Vastint's only UK investment outside of London. It is their second investment in the UK and the first outside London.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>Amend text at Section 1.2 p9. To state...it is Vastint's second investment in the UK and the first outside London.</p> |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 21 | Page 16. We support the reference in section 1.8 (consultation) to the desired preservation and reuse of the Tetley building in the interest of reinvigorating the industrial heritage of Southbank. | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Page 16. It should be acknowledged that Vastint Leeds UK Phase 1 proposals, whilst not including the Tetley building, per se, have, we believe, supported this aim (outlined in 1.8) and introduced a City Park setting that enhances and celebrates The Tetley as well as the Salem Church. | The SPD is positive about the role of the City Park but it is not considered necessary to comment on the impact of the proposals on the Tetley and Salem Chapel. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 27-29. We note the preface to section 3 outlines that "this section sets the scene for the framework by providing an overview of the key challenges and opportunities". However there is currently no mention of the opportunities for the area, indeed the title of this Chapter is called 'Existing Challenges'. We would suggest that the Council highlight the key opportunities of the area: Paragraph 3.5 (Connectivity) - we would urge the Council actively pursue an approach which sees a reduction in the dominance of the use of the car and the strategic road network. This will inevitably lead to a cleaner and safer environment and one which promotes a healthy living environment a key component of both the National Planning Policy Framework and the Leeds City Council Development Plan. Paragraph 3.6 (Transport) – the Council should set out the opportunity to introduce a positive approach to connecting areas deprived of public transport through the provision of fast links to park and ride locations. Paragraph 3.10 (Perception) – The wording here is currently overly negative. The Council should include positive wording surrounding the opportunity of the South Bank area, including the overall number of new homes and employment spaces proposed and the associated workforce encouraging the City to look South, and thereby the potential for increased spend in the established City Core, and encourage movement between the two areas. | Comments noted. | Re-wording in section 4.4 around connectivity and accessible public transport network. |
| 21 | Pages 34/35. We welcome the move to review the movement and access framework across the Southbank area (section 4.1 and section 4.2). | | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | While we welcome the opportunity to reduce traffic on these roads (Black Bull St, Hunslet Lane, Great Wilson St, Meadow Lane) and improve connectivity and support the premise of the City Boulevard, we also feel it is important that the City Boulevard does not become a transport superhighway which restricts connection to, from and through the site. We would also request that Figure 4.1 is improved as it is currently very difficult to read. | Comments noted. | Update Figure 4.1 to make it clearer to read and interpret ate. |
| 21 | Page 35. We would urge that the Council include a note highlighting that new development should provide a suitable quantity of covered cycle parking areas together with showers, lockers, changing areas and drying areas to ensure cycling is a realistic alternative choice. | The parking and Travel Plan SPDs already makes requirements for suitable cycling facilities. The SPD shouldn't be seeking to replicate existing documents/guidance | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Page 37. We strongly believe that the pedestrian area should be extended to include the City Park. The City Park is a vital component of the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the area and will clearly have opportunities to aid the free movement of pedestrians, arguably more so than elsewhere in the South Bank, so it is inconceivable to us that the park is not included. The Council will note that Vastint's proposals for the City Park in relation to their Phase 1 scheme comprises of 2ha of land and includes both hard and soft landscaping, the Hunslet Stray, pedestrian and cycle routes, limited vehicular access and parking as well as outdoor areas associated with the proposed flexible commercial uses. Vastint is committed to providing the continuation of the linear City Park through their Phase 2 scheme, and this therefore should be reflected throughout the SPD. | LCC will continue to work with Vastint to ensure highway is not dominant in the city park setting. | Wording on section 4.4 amended and figure 4.4 image updated. |
| 21 | Page 38. We note at Figure 4.5 the reference to the City Park, and whilst we acknowledge that this is for illustrative purposes only, we believe that given the advanced stage of Vastint's proposals in relation to the City Park which have essentially been approved by the City Council, that their proposals should be shown in this drawing and elsewhere in the document. This will avoid confusion and any disconnect as further proposals come forward. | Comments noted. | Update plans throughout to reflect City Park configuration as proposed by Vastint in conjunction with Master plan for LCC assets at Meadow Lane. |
| 21 | Pages 34 & 38. we have appended a copy of the Phase 1 Masterplan for the City Park at Annex 1 and urge that this be replicated within Figure 4.1 and indeed any other relevant figures. | Comments noted. | Update plans throughout to reflect City Park configuration as proposed by Vastint in conjunction with Master plan for LCC assets at Meadow Lane. |
| 21 | Page 40. While the benefits of historic buildings are recognised, the retention of heritage assets needs to be balanced against the overall objectives of the area to see a step change in housing and employment growth, especially as many of these buildings are low rise industrial buildings some of which may be in a significant state of disrepair. | No change to SPD. The NPPF and Core Strategy policy P11 make clear our approach to heritage assets | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Page 41. 4.8 indicates that within the former Tetley Brewery site the predominant uses will be commercial with residential uses to the west, and a mix of residential, commercial and retail to the east. We would urge the Council to be open minded in uses on sites and ensure that due consideration is given to the prevailing market conditions and viability at that time. We also request that a clearer version of Figure 4.8 is included. | Comments noted. | Figure 4.8 to be reviewed and potentially amended. |
| 21 | Page 42. We note that Figure 4.9 suggests that the former Tetley Brewery site could be a potential location for water retention. In addition, we note the shape and elongation of the City Park is contrary to that proposed by Vastint in Phase 2 proposals. The identification of the site as a potential water retention area does not appear to have been based on any robust evidence. We understand that this will require significant additional analysis to ascertain overall location, viability and impact and would suggest that any land identified for such a use is completed in consultation with the landowner. | SPD should not be proposing specific requirements such as this without clear justification and evidence for the need. It has significant implications for site development and flood resilience can be addressed in different ways. | Delete the City Park as a potential location for water retention - or move to our landholding at Meadow Lane? |
| 21 | We welcome the inclusion of reference to the important role of culture in placemaking. Recognition needs to be made, however, that cultural activities, whilst bringing value in many ways, including economic, to a place are often not able to pay market prices for land or buildings. So where these uses are requested, it needs to be acknowledged that this will have an impact on the viability of a development. | The SPD is supportive of cultural uses and promotes culture as means of placemaking. Delivery will need to be through the market and subject to viability. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 21 | Pages 46 & 47. We welcome the connectivity this (links in figure 5.1) would bring for the site to its wider context and appreciate that this would help to knit the site into the South Bank Framework; however, and as we note previously, we believe that Figure 5.1 should be updated to reflect current proposals on the former Tetley Brewery site, to avoid any confusion. | Comments noted. | Figure 5.1 to be updated. |
| 21 | Page 49. There is no reference to our client's proposals for the city park site. We suggest that Vastint's proposals should be referenced in and supported by the SPD, given their significant contribution to the creation of the City park. In addition, the overall uses and functions of the Park have yet to be fully determined. | Comments noted. Vastint's proposals are referenced at p9 and the potential for the part to be delivered by a number of landowners is noted at p49. The SPD is intended as a flexible framework which could be delivered in a number of ways. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 48 & 49. The uses identified at 5.2 should not prejudice Vastint's overall aspiration for the site but simply act as guidance. In particular, we believe that formal sports facilities are in conflict with all the other uses and aspirations for this city park. Such facilities take up large amounts of space, fence off areas and become the preserve of the few, rather than a more inclusive, flexible open park where e.g. football can still be played, using jumpers for goal posts, enabling the same space to be used for other activities – passive or active at other times. In this regard we request that reference to 'sports facilities' per se is removed from the SPD to avoid raising expectations that cannot be met. | The uses identified at 5.2 are intended as guidance. Reference to be made to opportunities for active recreation as opposed to sports facilities. | Replace sports facilities with opportunities for active recreation in the City Park section. |
| 21 | Page 52. We welcome the emphasis on making the most of the River Aire (Section 5.2.3) and believe that it is imperative that the City Park and the river, the City's largest natural asset, come together to celebrate and enhance both each other – linking both green and blue infrastructure.. This should be made clear in this section. | Comments noted. | Amend text to make clear it is important to link the City Park and the river at section 5.2.3. |
| 21 | Page 50. On a cursory note, we see the image of a bike sharing scheme at Image 5.3, however there is no reference within the text. We would welcome clarification on this. | A bike sharing scheme has been introduced in Leeds but it is not specific to the SPD area. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 58-65. As developers, Vastint Leeds UK cannot stress enough the importance of ensuring that any changes to the road network and / or motorway junctions do not reduce the capacity of the existing highways network. Highways capacity is a critical element in any planning proposal and has been the source of delay and cost for earlier proposed development in the South Bank. Early discussions between the Council and Highways England will be imperative in delivering the proposed movement and network changes. We would also wish to be a part of those discussions. Whilst we would welcome and support the principle of making the city centre less car oriented, in the current climate we would urge caution about any proposals which would likely result in lengthy negotiations and delays as a result of the more traditional views of highway capacity and development. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 58-65. We also believe the SPD should be more strategic and propose to make amendments to a number of currently traffic dominated roads, including Crown Point Road which will be bound by the City Park on its northern and southern sides. It is essential that Crown Point Road becomes part of the City Park, rather than a dissector or a barrier, if left unchanged this is an inevitable consequence. We would argue that Crown Point Road needs to be downgraded and made much easier to cross and better linked in to its proposed (and approved in part) surroundings. We recognise that this would require further discussions with the Council highways team which are already underway, and which we welcome and look forward to working together to agree a new layout for Crown Point Road that works for the users of the park, existing and future businesses and future residents, as well as pedestrian and cycling commuters. | Current diagrams are indicative/ aspirational. LCC will continue to work with Vastint on Crown Point Road to ensure highway is not dominant in the setting of the City Park. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 58-65. As above, we would like to reiterate that we believe there has been an omission in that there has been no reference to the re-design of Crown Point Road, which is a key route through the site and dissects Vastint's landholding from east to west. The Council will be aware that the City Park as proposed by Vastint through their Phase 1 scheme, abuts Crown Point Road and it is Vastint's commitment to continue the linear form of the City Park through their Phase 2 scheme to the south. As such Crown Point Road in its current form is incongruous with the overall function of the park and will significantly restrict movement between the two phases and the overall flow of the City Park. It is Vastint's strong belief that detailed consideration should be given to the design of Crown Point Road and that any amendments proposed continue to be discussed with Vastint. We would welcome a form of words is included at this stage which acknowledges the City Park proposals and that the Council will continue to work with the landowner to develop a solution which respects the setting of the City Park and supports as free movement as possible through the different spaces of the park. | Comments noted. | Include reference of the redesign of Crown Point Road where it crosses the City Park at page 61/62 or 63. |
| 21 | Page 58. Reference is made to the City Boulevard at 5.3.1, and whilst we support the concept of the City Boulevard, we would note the feasibility of turning the existing "loop" into a 2-way boulevard plus cycle and footway provision will be a challenge, but we welcome the ambition and look forward to being part of the discussions and deliberations with the Council and other stakeholders to find the optimum solution for all in the South Bank. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Page 58. Given current requirements to model the impact of developments in the South Bank on the junctions of the M621, we urge LCC to consider the impact of these changes on the junctions and to ensure that the costs for any improvements to these junctions as a result of this 'inner ring road' aspiration are not placed on new development sites. There needs to be recognition that the changes to the ring road will have an impact regardless of new developments coming forward. Any future work to the junctions as a result of the proposed amendments to the inner ring road should be co-ordinated wherever possible to minimise disruptions with emerging development proposals. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 58-65. Street redesign proposed will undoubtedly enhance the urban fabric of the South Bank area, but we query the methods that will be used to fund the extensive public realm improvements that are proposed and the effects that this may have on commercial returns, particularly on sites where there is already a challenging financial picture. | Comments noted. No developer contributions proposed. Additional support to deliver infrastructure improvements has been sought by the Council. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Page 61. The reference on page 61 to "Great Wilson Street will be closed" should be clarified as this implies that the whole street will be closed rather than only the section between Victoria Road and Meadow Lane. | Comments noted. | Amend text at p 61. |
| 21 | Page 64. It should be made clear that the section of Kidacre Street north of Great Wilson street is for pedestrian and cycles only. | Comments noted | Amend text to make it clear that the Section of Kidacre Street north of Great Wilson street is for pedestrian and cycles only. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 21 | Pages 74 & 75. It is also acknowledged that section 5.5.4 provides a series of guidelines on design for sustainable development, i.e. through minimising wind funnelling, micro climate via living environment, combination green and blue roof, geothermal wells, development above energy and heating network. These are noted however any requirements should be balanced against an applicant's own aspiration to deliver energy efficiency on site and should not preclude a development from meeting energy savings through other avenues. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 77-87. We welcome and agree with the Design Principles set out in Section 6. In relation to section 6.9 (Delight and architectural quality) we would urge the City Council to ensure that the station, as stated "draw inspiration from the character of Leeds and strengthen the local identity". The initial images in the document, however, do not appear to demonstrate this in any way. | Comments noted, however the image is meant to be representative only. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 89-117. We note the detailed drawings in section 7 of the SPD. While we appreciate that the detail gives specific guidance as to the intended outcomes for the South Bank area, we also suggest again that the images are updated to reflect our client's current proposals at the former Tetley Brewery site, especially in light of their detailed nature. This would highlight any potential conflicts and present a more realistic framework for delivery. | Comments noted. | City Park layout amended on the LISM images. |
| 21 | Page 110. We also note that Section 7.3.3 (Potential Massing) implies that the tallest buildings should be located closest to the HS2 interchange. The SPD should not seek to restrict the use of tall buildings in other locations and should provide a flexible approach to allow each development to be considered on its merits in this regard. Tall buildings have the potential to add visual interest to the skyline and to provide landmarks to assist orientation and legibility of the neighbourhood. Furthermore, the use of tall buildings on the former Tetley Brewery site would, and has already, assisted in the maximisation of space for City Park which is a key component of the South Bank strategy. | Flexible approach on Tall Buildings is embedded in the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Pages 98 & 99. We also strongly resist the location of the bus interchange shown on Figure 7.9 (Potential Mass Transit Routes) and 7.10 (Transport Links). Based on the above location, and Vastint's proposals approved by the City Plans Panel on 12th October 2017 under reference 17/02501/OT, the location of the Bus Interchange will be in the centre of the City Park. This is clearly not a compatible use. Whilst it is acknowledged that the location is indicative we would request that the location of the interchange is moved further south at the intersection of Meadow Lane and Great Wilson Street. This would provide the benefits of increasing legibility, as it provides movement options both north and south and east and west. | Comments noted. | Base map for the city park is to be updated in which case the location of the bus interchange will no longer be within the park. |
| 21 | No consideration is given in the document to the "no HS2" scenario and how this would affect development in the South Bank. We consider that if the framework is to have longevity as a forward planning document, as well as the flexibility this requires, it should consider the question "What if there is no HS2?" The current framework is heavily reliant on HS2, and the South Bank market will be very different if that major infrastructure did for some reason not come forward. An alternative approach does therefore need to be considered. | The framework is flexible but given a safeguarding direction has been issued for the HS2 route and station this is the context in which the SPD is being prepared. Would not wish to present a scenario which potentially conflicts with the safeguarding direction. In the event of HS2 no going ahead the document could be revised or withdrawn | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | Ongoing engagement between the Council and Highways England will also be very important for providing certainty for developers with respect to the proposed network and movement changes, so as to prevent source future delays and costs for the delivery of proposed development in the South Bank. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 21 | We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the contribution that the land at the former Tetley Brewery site and Vastint Leeds UK can make towards the finalisation of the South Bank Leeds Regeneration Framework SPD. As a key landowner within the area continued engagement will be imperative as the SPD progresses, given the importance of this document in future decision-making. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Our submission is that the proposals raised in the document are inadequate. In order to capitalise on this development, the integration of transport modes and especially sustainable public transport modes is fundamental. Dotted a number of clusters of bus stops over an expansive and major development with effectively two railway stations is not an integrated transport hub and will be detrimental to the viability of the South Bank and the city as a whole (page 96). A major bus station, preferably the major bus station for the whole of Leeds needs to be planned to form one of the key areas of the South Bank development. This will create the strategic and strong interchange that we contend is required. At the moment, the framework is facilitating the loss of a once in a lifetime opportunity to integrate public transport in Leeds is being lost. | The detailed design is still to be undertaken. Access to multiple modes of travel is addressed at 6.6. The relocation of the bus station is beyond the scope of the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | We welcome the focus on prioritising public transport, cycling and walking. This needs to be effective continuous priority that does not end at red lights, pedestrian refuges and barriers. The non-motorised modes need integrating with other transport modes. | Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Page 98. Provision in the framework also needs to be provided explicitly for the integration of future mass transit, be it light rail transit or bus rapid transit based. At the moment such consideration is lacking in the proposed plans with a lack of segregation from other transport modes. The map on page 98 does not reassure us that sufficient consideration is being put towards the introduction of rapid transit. We note the challenges that Dublin has faced with its latest tram extension having a challenging introduction due to entirely foreseeable issues with cyclists and buses using sections of the network. | Comments noted. The detailed design is developing and is mindful of future mass transit ambitions but the challenges introducing mass transit are acknowledged. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Consideration may also want to be made for a city centre focused rapid transit system using driverless vehicles on segregated space to connect the disparate parts of Leeds centre. This could help provide something unique that clearly marks that you're in the centre of Leeds. | Comments noted but considered to be beyond the scope of the SPD. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | The ability to move within the railway station also does not appear to be recognised in the framework. The furthest carriages at the new HS2 rail station will be located south of the Bridgewater Place building such that a walk to the proposed station platforms near platform 1 will be over 10 minutes. Passenger travellators as found in airports, and escalators, need to be included as an integral part of the proposals but appear neglected in as they currently stand. These can be placed in the public domain as found in cities around the world. | The detailed design is still to be undertaken and travellators can be considered as part of this. Comments noted. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |
| 22 | Pages 34, 58, 59. The biggest challenge for bus based public transport accessing the city centre is crossing the inner ring road and the proposed city boulevard (page 34) would compound the challenges already experienced. The proposal should instead make further provision for public transport only access routes to central Leeds. | Comments noted. The boulevard seeks to create a balance between movement access and place. Detailed design is still to be carried out but it should not present a barrier to public transport accessing the city centre. | No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment. |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 22 | <p>Pages 34, 58, 59. We are concerned about the development of the city boulevard. While the movement of the city loop out of many parts of the city centre is welcomed, it remains far too close to the city centre and does not need such inner-city access. Considerations of improving air quality need far greater consideration here. A charge on all vehicles using roads in this part of Leeds needs to be levied such that the full costs on public health are passed on to those who choose to drive in the city centre.</p> <p>Demand for road space for private vehicles will remarkably evaporate and the need for road provision be much reduced. We also contend that the provision of substantial car parking associated with this proposed development should be vigorously resisted: there is ample research to show that commercial viability is not compromised by the quantum and management regime of car parking provision, but an education programme to this effect is required.</p> | <p>A clean air zone is being consulted on and will address issues relating to air quality. The introduction of a congestion charge is beyond the scope of the SPD.</p> | <p>cross reference to be made to the clean air zone within the SPD.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Pages 34, 58, 59. The proposal that the city boulevard should be designed to 3.65m carriageway width standard is inappropriate (page 59). The roads should be narrowed to 3.3m with speed limits at 20-30mph to reflect that these are areas where people live and work. Where bus stops are placed, consideration should be made to provide more space on the road to make it easier to move buses around. We would encourage varied road surfaces such as cobbles that help to widen the road to enable slow speed manoeuvres but restrict speed.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Detailed design of the highways are still to be developed.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Pages 34, 96-99. The proposed development of walking and cycling routes is welcomed. Where feasible, these should be designated, segregated routes created in a continuous route that is not run against general traffic. Cycle routes should be clearly marked to avoid conflict in pedestrianised areas particularly where pedestrians may be waiting to use a transport mode such as a bus.</p> <p>We note that the strategic long stay car park will receive a covered walkway into the station (page 96). This needs to be considered for other modes such as buses which will be key for moving large numbers of residents, workers and visitors around the South Bank and the rest of Leeds.</p> | <p>The aspiration of the city is to ensure that cyclists have priority over other transport modes, move around the city safely. Aim to create enjoyable and direct routes, where necessary road space will be allocated to cyclists to enable this. The exact routing will emerge as work progresses on the detail design. The SPD is a guidance document providing indicative layouts of which will develop through the detail design.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Page 35. We note that there is no strategic cycle and pedestrian route west of the south Bank towards Armley gyratory (page 35). With the Leeds-Bradford Cycle way already complete, there is an opportunity to enhance the health and economic benefits of this useful resource.</p> <p>We note that cyclists will require space to park their bikes and request that space is provided for short and long term parking of cycles in this area.</p> | <p>requirement for secure cycle parking noted at section 6.6</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Page 89 onwards. There have also been comments raised with regards to the provision of a tourist information office and we would welcome efforts to locate effective provision in the development area considering the number of visitors who will be using this station.</p> | <p>Level of detail considered to be beyond the scope of the SPD.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Members have noted that the proposed layout for the HS2 station does not facilitate a fast interchange or possible proposals for HS3. It is proposed that consideration is taken to realign the HS2 station on an axis that is parallel to the existing railway station.</p> | <p>The framework is flexible but given a safeguarding direction has been issued for the HS2 route and station this is the context in which the SPD is being prepared. As such the orientation of HS2 is beyond the scope of this SPD.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>We strongly agree that it is important for each entrance to the station to be served by high quality public realm. However, they must be functional, comfortable areas that are accessible for all. Strong wayfinding must be provided that can accommodate the requirements of all visitors including clear signage and help points. In addition, waiting areas such as bus stops should have an appropriate environment with seating, heating and air conditioning provided to help maintain comfortable conditions and enhance integration.</p> | <p>The comments are considered to be addressed in the SPD.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Page 99. We disagree that the proposed points of access are acceptable based on the proposals mapped on page 99. The ongoing use of the pick-up point by the Wetherspoons at Leeds railway station is unsuitable. We would recommend that Quebec Street is used with a time limited short stay car park and turning circle at the city square end to move vehicles away from the busy and small turning area that is located on Princes Square.</p> <p>We are concerned about the loss of the bus interchange on New Station Street and note the lack of suitable replacement facilities being proposed.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the car pick up and drop off proposed to the north of Sovereign Street and are concerned that it doesn't fit in with the intentions to remove private cars from the city centre.</p> | <p>Princes Square is an indicative location. The exact location of drop off/ pick up will emerge as work progresses on the detailed design. Comments noted and will take these on board as work progresses on the detail design.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Page 37. We are concerned with regards to this question. A number of references are made throughout the document including Figure 4.4, page 37 that suggest that Neville Street will become a key public transport corridor. Neville Street is currently a busy bus route. We would consider that space should be allocated towards buses, preferably with restrictions on engine type (hybrid/electric) and potentially guide wheels (although we note that these can create difficulties). We encourage further discussions with ourselves and bus operators to map out the routes that will be operated as the framework for the south bank development is implemented.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 23 | <p>As part of the Chamber's objective of improving the City Centre's Waterfront, and making it central to the transformation of the City Centre, we support the draft SPD's objectives of connection to the City's waterways, and activating the Waterfront. We are pleased to note that the geographical coverage of the draft SPD has been extended to include both the North Bank and South Bank of the Waterfront, and recognising it as a significant amenity that is centrepiece in linking the existing City Centre with the South Bank.</p> <p>We are especially pleased to note the emphasis in the draft SPD on the three key objectives of the Chamber's Waterfront Strategy, namely the improved accessibility, attractive and activity along the Waterfront.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |
| 23 | <p>In summary, we support the draft SPD's focus on making the Waterfront the centrepiece of a larger City Centre, and we look forward to working with the Council on bringing this to fruition and hope that the SPD will help to crystallise the growing importance of the Waterfront in the Council's decision making for development coming forward in the area.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to the draft SPD specific to this comment.</p> |