



Leeds Innovation Arc SPD

Report of Consultation

June 2023

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. In accordance with regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 this consultation statement summarises the process involved in preparing and conducting consultation on the Leeds Innovation Arc Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It provides a summary of the outcomes of the consultation, and how they informed subsequent changes to the document.

BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The Innovation Arc encompasses 125 hectares of the west of the city centre. This area brings together the city's anchor institutions – Leeds NHS Trust, the University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds Arts University, Leeds City Council – with one of the UK's strongest and most dynamic networks of private sector businesses. The area is home to some of Leeds' most important and recognisable buildings and heritage assets, its civic core, and a wealth of cultural facilities. It is the access point to the city from the surrounding residential areas to the west and north and has the potential to connect directly with regeneration underway at the South Bank.
- 2.2. This Supplementary Planning Document will set out the ambition, spatial vision and objectives across the Innovation Arc. The SPD will inform development projects across the area.
- 2.2. The SPD will be a non-statutory document which forms part of the Leeds Local Plan and expands upon existing policies in the Adopted Core Strategy, in particular Policies SP3, CC1, CC3 and P11. The SPD explains how policies in the Local Plan are to be implemented in the context of the SPD area. It will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications which fall within the area of the SPD.

CONSULTATION PRINCIPLES

- 3.1. The City Council adopted its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on the 21st February 2007. The SCI sets out the Council's approach for involving the community in the preparation and revision of Local Development Documents and planning applications. It outlines how the community can get involved in the planning process and how the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will facilitate this involvement. The main methods of community engagement are outlined in the SCI, including a list of key consultation structures and organisations in Leeds which the Council consults on in the preparation of plans. It also includes a list of community and stakeholder groups to be consulted as minimum requirements under the planning regulations.
- 3.2. In 2012, the Government implemented changes to planning legislation as part of its modernising planning agenda. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 came into force on 6th April 2012. The 2012 regulations revoked the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and any subsequent amendments. The above

changes in legislation simplified and streamlined the local plan document preparation process. In addition, the 'Duty to Cooperate' was introduced via primary legislation. This reduced the separate stages of front loading through public consultation. Whilst the SCI precedes these changes, the approach it sets out in relation to how the community and stakeholder groups will be engaged in the plan making process remains relevant.

3.3 This statement of consultation in line with Regulation 12 sets out:

- (i) The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document (Appendix 1);
- (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons (Appendix 2); and
- (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document (Appendix 2).

CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Public Consultation on the Innovation Arc Draft Supplementary Planning Document took place for a seven week period between 24 October and 12 December 2022. The consultation sought the views of local residents, landowners, businesses and other key stakeholders on the principal themes of the document, including the ambition, spatial vision and objectives for the area.
- 4.2 Consultation information and online survey forms were made available on the [Leeds.gov.uk](https://leeds.gov.uk) website and at [Leeds Innovation Arc | Inclusive Growth Leeds](#) website. In addition to this, members of the project team also hosted 10 public-drop in events at a range of venues and times across the consultation period.
- 4.3 In order to raise awareness of the consultation and encourage participation, the project team also carried out a further programme of engagement which consisted of Walking Tours, Online Workshops, School Activities and Social Media content across a variety of Leeds City Council platforms – further details of which can be found at Appendix 3.
- 4.4 Responses to the consultation were received in writing to innovationarc@leeds.gov.uk, through online survey forms and in writing at consultation drop-in events.
- 4.5 44 consultation responses were received in total. The responses reflect a wide spectrum of viewpoints from a range of stakeholders including local residents, landowners, people who work in the area, businesses, community-based groups and non-regulatory organisations. Overall, the draft SPD was well received and gained notable support and interest from a range of respondents.
- 4.6 The comments received are set out in Appendix 2 of this statement alongside the Council's response and any proposed modifications.

Summary of Consultation Responses

5.1 In summary, the key headlines arising from the consultation are described below:

1	Requests to alter the boundary of the Innovation Arc SPD	<p>While this document necessarily requires a defined geographic boundary, which needs to be limited in order to provide a robust basis for implementation, it is acknowledged that innovation extends beyond this geographic boundary and takes place across the city. The boundary has been altered slightly to include Leeds Arts University, City Square and Queens Square.</p> <p>The document will be amended to provide a city-wide context and to clarify the rationale for the planning boundary set out on page 37.</p>
2	Requests to include further context and narrative concerning the city's wider 'Innovation' story	Further text added to provide context to Leeds innovation story.
3	Requests to include an 'Implementation' section to provide greater clarity on the next steps to achieving the Vision.	An implementation section has been added to the Document.
4	Requests for greater emphasis on the River Aire & Canal connection linking the Leeds Innovation Arc to the South Bank	This connection has been emphasised in the text on page 111 and is shown on relevant plans.
5	Requests for specific guidance for key public transport routes and greater detail on how they would interface with future Mass Rapid Transit plans	The Document has been amended to include street-level principles in key areas.

6	Requests to remove the envisaged route for Mass Transit in this part of the city from maps and text relating to routes or specific streets.	Mass Transit routes are removed from the SPD. However, in recognition of the ambition for this area to be served by high quality public transport connectivity, a network map of public transport priority routes is identified. To provide additional guidance, public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
7	Requests for the Document to include 'above policy' sustainability principles	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.
8	Requests for greater detail regarding the proposed car parking strategy for the SPD area	The public transport section of the SPD has been re-drafted to consider the holistic needs of the city centre. The comment is noted but the purpose of this document is not to detail a car parking strategy for the area.
9	Requests for further icons and buildings/places to be added to the maps used within the SPD	Further icons added as requested.
10	Requests for further detail which celebrates the heritage and cultural assets within the Arc's boundary.	Text added which reflects and celebrates the unique character and identity of Innovation Arc neighbourhoods.
11	Further detail highlighting the importance of Leeds Arts University and the role the institution plays in the area.	Further text is added to highlight the importance of Leeds Arts University and the role the institution plays in the area.

Appendix 1: List of Consultees at Initial Consultation stage

Organisation Name
Leeds City Council
Leeds City Council Equality Hubs and wider network
Leeds City Council Voice and Influence Network
Chamber of Commerce Property Forum
Leeds BID
Leeds Civic Trust
Quality Places and Spaces
Leeds Teaching Hospital Trust
Bruntwood
Marrico
MEPC
MRP
McLaren
TCS
Quod
DLA Architecture
FLJ Ltd
MRP
McAleer Rushe
Zerum
Grainger plc
Cerda Planning
Space Made
Leeds Society of Architects
Nuffield Health
Swarthmore
Localities Inner South East Community Mailing List
Localities Inner North West Community Mailing List
Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum
Hyde Park Neighbourhood Planning Forum
Blenheim Primary School
Rosebank Primary School
Little London Community Primary School
West Oaks SEN Specialist School
Brudenell Primary School

Organisation Name
Leeds Arts University
University of Leeds
Leeds Beckett University
Leeds City College
MP Rachel Reeves
MP Hilary Benn
Councillor Ed Carlisle Hunslet and Riverside
Councillor Mohammed Iqbal Hunslet and Riverside
Councillor Paul Wray Hunslet and Riverside
Councillor Javaid Akhtar Little London and Woodhouse
Councillor Kayleigh Brooks Little London and Woodhouse
Councillor Abigail Marshal Katung Little London and Woodhouse
Historic England
HLF
Victorian Society
20th Century Society
Leeds Society of Architects
Civic Trust
Council for British Archaeology
Buttress Architects
Purcell
Carter Jonas
Spawforths
Adapt Heritage
Turley
Bowman Riley
Arctic Associates
Purcell
Donald Insall
Private Sector Organisations (Housebuilders, Consultants etc.)
Adjoining Local Planning Authorities
Ancient Monuments Society
Archaeological Trusts
Canal & River Trust
Chamber of Commerce
Civil Aviation Authority

Organisation Name
Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)
Crown Estates
Designated Neighbourhood Planning Forums
Education Establishments
Electric and Gas suppliers
Environment Agency
Environmental organisations
Fire and Rescue Authority
Forestry Commission
Freight Transport Association
Government Departments and Agencies
Gypsy and Traveller Community
Health and Safety Executive
Highways England
Historic England
Homes England
Home Builders Federation
Housing Associations
Leeds Chamber of Commerce
Local Enterprise Partnerships
Local Members of parliament
Leeds/Bradford Airport
Leeds Climate Commission
Marine Management Organisation
National Grid
National Health Service/Estates/ Integrated care systems (ICSs)
Natural England
Neighbouring Local Authorities
Network Rail
Office of Rail Regulation
Police and Crime Commissioner
Ramblers Association
Relevant bus and rail operators
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPBA)
Sport England
Telecom and Mobile Operators
The Coal Authority
The Theatres Trust
Town and Parish Councils
Utility Companies
West Yorkshire Combined Authority
West Yorkshire Archaeology
Woodland Trust

Organisation Name
Yorkshire Water

Appendix 2- Summary of Consultation Responses

Reference No.	Representation	Themes/ Page No.	Comment	Action (Y/N)	LCC Response
1	Action for Yorkshire Transport	122	Brief mention is made of the current bus services and we assume you are referring to the 1, 1B, 6, 8, 27 & 28. You mention the limited service in the evenings and at weekends, but you do not mention the current crises in the bus industry. This crisis involves a national shortage of bus drivers, the reduced journeys now being taken following the Covid 19 pandemic and severe cuts to Government spending and the cost of fuel. We think more needs to be added to suggest ways of encouraging a modal shift away from cars and onto public transport in these plans. For example, can bus stops be better linked to walking routes or can bus lanes be extended? Can the bus route avoid time delays through better road design?	Y	Document to be amended to include street-level principles in key areas. The Leeds Transport Strategy and Transport SPD are more relevant documents for the promotion of modal shift.
		92	Welcome the improved walking and cycling routes and are pleased that these are to be separated from each other following national guidance.	N	No response required. General comment.
		92	Would like to see restricted car parking and the development of a significant car free zone in this area. This would support the modal shift away from cars.	N	We currently have parking requirements for new development. This proposed amendment is outside of the scope of this draft SPD.
		60	The enhancements to the mass transit scheme look good but without the full network picture we are unsure at this stage as to how these will fit in with travel needs. Are these enhancements to be extended in the future towards Headingley? Such an improvement to public transport would help stop the decline in passenger numbers.	N	Details of Leeds Mass Transit Routes through the City Centre, and the appropriate form of any Mass Transit system, are yet to be defined but this document sets out guidance for all public transport within priority routes in the Innovation Arc area. As detailed plans for Mass Transit emerge, more detailed guidance may be developed to ensure that its potential benefits are maximised within the Innovation Arc.

		92	Mention is made about improving the traffic flow in several places. We are concerned that this will involve increases to the road space that will in the long term encourage more traffic into the area. Reducing congestion should also be about reducing the volume of traffic which could prove to be a cheaper solution.	N	This document does not propose creating greater road capacity
2	Arup	General	Are hugely supportive of proposals to accelerate and strengthen innovation-led economic growth in Leeds. The city has a nationally and globally set of innovation assets and capabilities, and a huge opportunity to drive more productive economic growth through innovation-led enterprise, business growth and investment, as we set out in our work for the city council on the future of Leeds City Centre. We are committed to continuing to play our part in this agenda.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The focus should be on accelerating productive economic growth, creating and attracting start-up and scale-up firms and investment from R&D intensive corporates, and achieving a step-change in the supply of innovation and office space. The consultation document sets out a wide set of aims and policies, encompassing sustainable transport, tackling climate change, culture, heritage and public realm. We are supportive of all these in principle and recognise that good place-shaping has an important role to play in innovation districts. But there is a real risk that focus, effort and resources become dissipated, and the economic opportunity is not realised fully. In particular there is a need to prioritise the planning and building of innovation and commercial space over residential development.	N	This document should be read alongside the city's Innovation Vision and Innovation Prospectus which provide more detail on economic development activities and strategies to grow innovation-led economic growth.
		General	In recent years some strategic sites in the proposed boundary for the Innovation Arc have been developed for high-density housing (much of it for students) as opposed to more productive uses. There is currently a significant shortage of office space in Leeds City Centre. Leeds is lagging behind competitors, and many occupier requirements are unfulfilled. This places Leeds at a disadvantage in seeking inward investment. At Arup we have experienced the consequences of this at first hand in recent years. The shortage of supply of office space has meant we have had to occupy poorly located, unsuitable, outdated space in our current premises for far	N	This document does not allocate sites, which is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy and

			too long. In our recent search for new premisses we found there were very few options of suitable space.		based on a robust evidence base.
	General	<p>The role of face-to-face communication in cities in supporting innovation-led growth could be set out more clearly and strongly.</p> <p>Because of the process of agglomeration, clustering and the growth of the knowledge economy based on intangibles, Leeds City Centre has become a nationally significant engine of economic growth. The Leeds economy is diverse and becoming increasingly so with important linkages and spillovers between sectors. Outside the City Centre Leeds has important assets and business locations such as White Rose Park, and a range of innovative manufacturing firms. This “related diversity” of the Leeds economy creates strength and resilience. These spillovers, linkages and networks operate in city centres and main employment hubs because of the high-density of face-to-face interactions they support (remote working is much less effective), and because of the wide access to a skilled workforce city centres and other main employment hubs offer.</p>		Y	While this document necessarily requires a defined geographic boundary, which needs to be limited in order to provide a robust basis for implementation, it is acknowledged that innovation extends beyond this geographic boundary and takes place across the city. The document will be amended to provide a city-wide context and to clarify the rationale for the planning boundary set out on page 37.
	General	<p>The role of the innovation ecosystem and business should be emphasised more strongly. Innovation-led economic growth needs to be underpinned by the right ecosystem of universities (and other knowledge producers such as hospitals and cultural bodies), entrepreneurs, corporates, investors of risk-capital, and government organisations. These actors need to work in a coherent way as more than the sum of their parts to maximise their positive impact in creating and scaling businesses and attracting investment. We believe that the innovation Arc initiative would benefit from stronger private sector involvement. One of the strengths of the Leeds MIT REAP team was it was a genuine cross-sector partnership with strong private sector involvement, and rebuilding business engagement in the city’s innovation agenda will be important. We also believe that there should be stronger emphasis in the document on the important role Leeds Teaching Hospital can play,</p>		N	This document should be read alongside the city's Innovation Vision and Innovation Prospectus which provide more detail on economic development activities and strategies to grow innovation-led economic growth.

			through its new hospital at the LGI, redevelopment / re-use of surplus land and buildings, and growing the impact of its innovation pop-up. Health innovation is a huge opportunity for Leeds		
		General	<p>There should be greater ambition by taking a city-wide approach.</p> <p>The original vision for the innovation district in 2016 was focused on how the Leeds Teaching Hospital (LGI), University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University and Leeds City Council could develop their estates and assets in the civic quarter. We are supportive of extending the geographic area of focus but believe that it does not go far enough. The Innovation Arc concept should be applied to the entire city for five main reasons.</p> <p>First, the innovation ecosystem is city-wide. As we learned in the MIT REAP programme, a condition for innovation-led economic growth is the right ecosystem of universities (and other knowledge producers such as hospitals and cultural bodies), entrepreneurs, corporates, investors of risk-capital, and government organisations. These networks do not stop at tight geographic boundaries; they operate on a city-wide scale. There are several organisations in Leeds that are very much part of the innovation ecosystem, including MIT REAP team members such as Munroe K, aql, and Arup, and many firms that are located outside the proposed innovation arc. There also important investments being made in creating new innovation assets, such as Ingenuity at White Rose, or the British Library North in Holbeck outside the proposed boundary of the Arc. There are also important education institutions outside the proposed arc boundary.</p>	Y	While this document necessarily requires a defined geographic boundary, which needs to be limited in order to provide a robust basis for implementation, it is acknowledged that innovation extends beyond this geographic boundary and takes place across the city. The document will be amended to provide a city-wide context and to clarify the rationale for the planning boundary set out on page 37.

		General	There is a network of innovation assets and development opportunities across Leeds beyond the current boundary proposed for the Innovation Arc. In particular we would highlight Temple and Holbeck (including the British Library) as a major omission. There is an urgent and high priority need for better pedestrian connectivity between Whitehall Riverside and Temple / Holbeck. We would also highlight White Rose Park as a major innovation asset and development opportunity with the Ingenuity Smart Cities Hub, and over 1m sq.ft. of development potential.	N	The areas proposed are either covered by existing Supplementary Planning Guidance or are not contiguous with the Innovation Arc draft SPD boundary and therefore would be challenging to include. The Council is working actively with stakeholders across the city to support plans to grow the innovation economy and where appropriate will consider the role of Supplementary Planning Guidance in achieving this, however it should be recognised that the right framework for the city centre may not be suitable for other areas which will require bespoke approaches.
		General	A wider boundary would be more inclusive with the potential to create jobs where people live, and to strengthen links with communities. The Innovation Arc should also embrace institutions such as Leeds Trinity University, Leeds City College (including its University Centre), and Leeds College of Building who play an important role in connecting people with jobs and helping businesses solve problems.	N	The Innovation Arc boundary as set out in the draft SPD does not limit wider partnerships and initiatives focused on growing the innovation economy or inclusive growth. These initiatives will be reflected in wider strategies, policies and implementation plans. The document has been updated and the boundary has been slightly amended to incorporate Leeds Arts

					University's Blenheim Walk campus. Leeds City College's University Centre is also within the boundary.
		General	Leeds has an identified need for office and grow-on innovation space, which cannot all be accommodated within the proposed boundary of the Innovation Arc. The economic prospects for Leeds are strong. Recent economic forecasts indicate that if the city maintains its historic trend rate of economic growth there will be a need for over 6m sq.ft. of additional office floorspace in the Leeds City Centre to 2030. But not all firms want to be in the city centre; well-connected out-of-centre locations offering good public transport and a campus style environment (such as White Rose Park and Kirkstall Forge) have a role to play. There is very limited grow-on space for medical technologies firms in Leeds was set out in the research that Leeds City Council and the University of Leeds commissioned in 2015	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Leeds should be ambitious about innovation-led growth and should be aiming to bring forward more development than can be accommodated within the proposed boundary for the innovation arc. While the 1m sq.ft. of innovation space proposed for the innovation arc would be a step-change, given the scale of job growth forecasts and the huge potential of Leeds, the city should be aiming for much more. In comparison, Manchester has already delivered 1m sq.ft. of innovation space at the Oxford Rd Corridor, with a further 4m sq ft. of space planned at ID Manchester. In addition there is 1.5m sq.ft .of space at Alderley Park. At Arup we produced the masterplan for the Wellcome Genome Campus in Cambridge which will create 1.4m sq.ft. of commercial and innovation space on a single site. To fulfil its potential and to compete with other cities, Leeds should take a city-wide approach to innovation-led economic growth.	N	This document does not allocate sites, which is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy and based on a robust evidence base.
3	Bruntwood	General	Bruntwood are supportive of the overall approach of the SPD and particularly the proposals for growth in the technology, digital and innovation sector. Bruntwood's growth ambitions align closely to those of the vision and ambitions of the Innovation Arc SPD.	N	No response required. General comment.

		General	We are very supportive of the premise that the Innovation Arc brings together the City's anchor institutions - Leeds NHS Trust, University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds Arts University, Leeds City Council – with one of the UK's strongest and most dynamic networks of private sector businesses. We are keen to be a partner in the future of the Innovation Arc, working with institutions, private sector partners and the public sector, utilising our strong track record in delivering innovation led development.	N	No response required. The role of the private sector in enabling and supporting the delivery of space for innovative businesses is acknowledged.
		General	The SPD takes a neighbourhood approach, setting out the vision and opportunities for each neighbourhood across the Innovation Arc. We recognise the value in demonstrating how the design and development principles manifest in these innovation neighbourhoods. We suggest that it is imperative that the neighbourhoods are integrated to achieve the agglomeration benefits that are sought. Bruntwood recognises that each neighbourhood needs to facilitate the other i.e. good physical access between – and support this being a priority action. This will allow the private sector easy access to the talent in the institutions as well as the other resources, such as lab space and conversely allow the public sector institutions access to the resources, talent and funding available in the private sector.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	We support the Council's focus on needing to ensure that the transformational projects coming forward in the West End neighbourhood need to be knitted together. Bruntwood are keen to actively engage at this level, recognising the importance in delivering a cohesive, well-connected neighbourhood in realising the vision and ambitions for the Innovation Arc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	We support the assertion within the SPD for development in Leeds City Centre West to support the net zero carbon targets and promote inclusive and economic growth. As a Gold Standard Low Carbon Company, Bruntwood is the first commercial property partner to work towards a net zero carbon future by 2030 with the UK Green Building Council. As part of this net zero carbon future, Bruntwood have committed that by 2030 all of its new buildings and major refurbishment projects will be delivered to achieve a zero-carbon energy performance standard.	N	No response required. General comment.

		General	We commented on the Draft Leeds Local Plan in 2021 and recognise the connections between the new Local Plan and the Innovation Arc SPD. We are particularly supportive of the proposals for the Local Plan to be updated with a greater focus on seeking to deliver rapid reductions in carbon policies. From the perspective of an organisation that is keen to be a leader in delivering zero carbon buildings we remain happy to work with Leeds on some of the detailed issues that will emerge as the policy approach is developed.	N	No response required. Response to Bruntwood's representations on the Local Plan Update (1) will be incorporated into the Council's Consultation Report on that document.
		General	We are supportive of the 'retrofit first' approach particularly in aiming to reduce embodied carbon. Bruntwood acknowledge that retrofit is the aim where at all possible; we suggest that there is an opportunity to develop this whereby there is an acknowledgement and acceptance of new built if required, should still deliver low embodied and operational carbon. Bruntwood has a strong track record, rooted in its Net Zero Carbon Strategy in delivering highly sustainable schemes where embodied carbon is a primary consideration in the early design process	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	We would welcome the addition of West Village as a potential innovation hub, and consider that this will provide an opportunity support the 'Critical Mass' at West Village, identified on page 34 of the SPD. We consider West Village a key development in scaling up innovation use in the West End neighbourhood.	Y	The West Village will be identified on maps and plans as an innovation hotspot. This is an oversight in the draft SPD.
		General	We would be keen to see the promotion of green and blue roofs on all new build schemes coming forward. The promotion of inclusion of green and blue roofs could play a valuable role in enhancing biodiversity, contributing to SUDs provision and promoting the reuse of surface water run off for irrigation of planting areas.	N	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.
		General	Bruntwood are supportive of the mass transit proposals to support the creation of an integrated sustainable transport network for Leeds. We request that a potential route extension is considered to serve West Village. This will seek to maximise access to sustainable transport options for a growing area in the City. Bruntwood are supportive of a presumption against car dependent development, particularly within the West End neighbourhood. We recognise the value of removing cars from the neighbourhood in unlocking future interventions and development. We recognise and support the need for a holistic car parking strategy and an assessment of the use and function of existing car parks. Bruntwood	N	The public transport section of the SPD has been re-drafted to consider the holistic needs of the city centre. On this basis a more comprehensive network of public transport priority routes have been identified, including the Wellington Street corridor

			would be happy to work with Leeds in developing a car parking strategy.		
		General	Bruntwood are supportive of the overall vision having a people and culture aspect and understand the importance of people in delivering these aims. The focus on people and culture supports the integration of different types of people, nurturing change encounters through events and high quality public open spaces.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	We agree with the overall principles of the Vision Statement for the Innovation Arc but we request this is developed further to include greater clarity on the next steps in delivering the vision.	Y	An additional section on implementation has been added to the draft SPD
4	CEG	General	CEG is overall supportive of the City Council's ambition and Vision for the Leeds Innovation Arc area, as set out in the draft SPD. CEG welcomes the Council's aspirations for connecting a series of innovation neighbourhoods, formed around the institutions and major private sector partners. CEG also support the production of this SPD as a basis for securing funding from private and public sector sources	N	No response required. General comment.
		9	CEG suggest that the overall setting for the Innovation Arc Supplementary Planning Guidance should be explained more inclusively at the outset of the SPD. The SPD clearly outline the other policy guidance which is relevant to the Innovation Arc area and note the neighbouring areas of influence, for example the South Bank Regeneration Framework, South Bank Holbeck SPD, Temple Planning Brief, Eastgate and Harewood Quarter SPD and the Mabgate Development Framework. This will ensure that the Innovation Arc SPD does not overshadow what is happening in the rest of the city, as the draft SPD implies that innovation and inclusive growth in Leeds currently only takes place within the Innovation Arc's boundary.	Y	While this document necessarily requires a defined geographic boundary, which needs to be limited in order to provide a robust basis for implementation, it is acknowledged that innovation extends beyond this geographic boundary and takes place across the city. The document will be amended to provide a city-wide context and to clarify the rationale for the

					planning boundary set out on page 37.
		9	<p>Although currently referenced in passing throughout the document, CEG believe the Leeds Innovation Arc boundary should be reviewed to include Temple and should more clearly set out a vision for improved connectivity with the South Bank in general and development principles for how this can be achieved. The reasons for this are set out below.</p> <p>Firstly, Temple is a key driver of future inclusive growth in Leeds, and will deliver a place that people want to live, work, and play in. Crucially, it is the steppingstone from the communities of Holbeck, Hunslet and Beeston into the city, and connection to the opportunities therein. CEG note the synergies between the vision for the Leeds Innovation Arc and their aspirations for Temple, most notably with reference to Section 2.3 regarding the Innovation Ecosystem.</p>	N	The boundary will not be amended to include Temple South Bank as there is existing Supplementary Planning Guidance in this area.
		53	<p>the draft SPD also highlights the importance of connectivity within the Leeds Innovation Arc area and the surrounding area; however, the draft SPD predominantly focuses on the importance of connectivity with areas to the north and west. CEG believe that the SPD should be updated to also focus connectivity to the south and east.</p> <p>CEG believe that there is a real risk of Temple and South Bank being excluded from the City's plans, work and messaging around innovation and entrepreneurship, which in turn risks sending a negative signal to Government and private sector investors. The current proposed boundary for the Innovation Arc ignores the important role already played by businesses, institutions, and locations in driving innovation in all parts of the city centre and wider city. Additionally, the SPD fails to demonstrate linkages to other near-by investments, such as the Recreations Matthew Murray site and Elland Road. CEG believe that the current Innovation Arc SPD boundary is not inclusive and does not reflect the economic reality of the regeneration progress and development already taking place south of the River Aire and the Canal.</p>	Y	Text added to page 99 to support the strategic importance of these pedestrian and cycle routes.

			The vision for regeneration within the Innovation Arc is focused on enhancing connectivity and active travel. Cycle and pedestrian connectivity to and from the City Centre, as well as other neighbourhoods within the Innovation Arc, will be key in addressing this. The draft SPD points to improving access to the River, however it does not sufficiently acknowledge the importance of providing pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the River and Canal through crossings. CEG note that some of the maps provided show connectivity across the Canal and River Aire e.g., in Section 6.3, however it misses the opportunity to provide supporting text which sets out the strategic importance of these pedestrian and cycle routes, or the need for improvements to them. CEG therefore request that a new bridge over the canal for pedestrian and cycle access is set out as a strategic priority in the SPD.		
		59	CEG note that there is no mention of the energy network innovation currently under feasibility study in the area and how that might be implemented to the benefit of the City.	N	No response required. General comment.
		60	Have also noted some errors on the maps, with Temple marked in the wrong location. This should be updated.	Y	Map on page 59 amended accordingly
5	Coal Authority	General	records indicate that within the Leeds City Centre West area as identified there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, shallow coal workings and surface coal mining. These features pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	have reviewed the Supplementary Planning Document and can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the content of the document. We would however like to take this opportunity to draw attention to the downloadable GIS data that we provide to the LPA in respect of Development Risk plans. Any parts of the identified Arc area proposed for redevelopment should be assessed against these risk plans in order that any constraints or issues arising from past coal mining activity, which may impact on the quantum of development on the site, can be identified as early as possible. Any formal planning application submitted for relevant development on a site	N	No response required. General comment.

			in the Development High Risk Area should be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment.		
6	Environment Agency	50	We welcome the opportunity to explore improving the public's relationship with the river Aire and increased connectivity throughout the city. Any development within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and to the river itself, will need to be achieved with flood risk in mind. The development should be resilient to both frequent flooding and that arising from residual risk, taking into consideration any breach of Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme) FAS 2, the flows down Kirkstall Road, and from failure of the Leeds FAS 1 weirs, without increasing flood risk to others. It is also worth noting that Leeds FAS2 defences and floating riverbank fall within this area. From the information provided it appears that the majority of the development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will comprise of green open spaces and so is likely to be sympathetic to flood risk requirements.	N	No response required. General comment.
		50	Works within 8m of the river Aire (classified as a Main River) may require a Flood Risk Activity permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (England and Wales) 2016.	N	No response required. These matters will be dealt with in the usual way through the planning process.
		General	We broadly welcome the information which has been provided. While the document recognises the importance of the river Aire to the establishment of Leeds and seeks to invigorate the riverside environment, there isn't much detail about how this could be achieved.	N	Further details of proposals will be subject to more detailed feasibility analysis and to the developments coming forward on the riverside
		General	The Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the Humber Basin Management Plan (RBMP) combined with the Leeds Habitat Network set out the methodology to renaturalise our waterways and provide mitigation where infrastructure makes this difficult at present. Local Plan policies should reflect the ambition and legal requirements of WFD and the RBMP, and this should be reflected in the SPD.	N	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.

		General	The desire to create a new riverside path along the river Aire (to the south of the Innovation Arc) is a welcome step in reconnecting people with the river – it is a start of the city “turning back to face” the river. This should be considered as a first step in a range of future measures and plans that could improve the blue infrastructure within this SPD area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	In the short-term, measures such as the floating riverbanks newly installed as mitigation for the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme in the river Aire boundary of the Arc, should be extended where possible. These can provide habitat and visual interest to the hard walls that currently constrain the river.	N	Leeds City Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency on our Flood Alleviation Scheme Phase 2 (FAS2) to help protect 1,048 homes and 474 businesses. This will include the use of natural flood management (NFM) measures
		142	The document talks about the value and opportunity of the river. We suggest that the de-culverting of the Holbeck could provide a critical blue/glue and sustainable transport corridor to integrate the development ark into the deprived areas of Holbeck. A long-term vision is required to value our buried rivers and paved over riverbanks. They are assets and ideally should be the future focus of a green-blue and sustainable city which is attractive to people, businesses and wildlife.	N	The Hol Beck lies outside of the SPD boundary
		General	There should be a long-term aspiration to provide the river with enough space to develop natural banks, with associated habitat (and flood storage space). The river Aire is the critical connecting element of the Leeds Habitat Network and driving improvements and enhancements to this vital corridor is essential for the long-term resilience of the city. In order to do this, new developments must be stepped back from the river much further than they currently are, and entire riverside sites given over to green space to allow people to interact with the river	N	The SPD provides principles including the provision of new riverside spaces and places, and enhanced habitats, on the riverside.
		General	We would like the council to acknowledge that sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) isn't always appropriate where groundwater is sensitive to schemes that bypass the soil layers and discharge directly into groundwater. Sustainable drainage systems slow the rate of surface water run-off and improve infiltration, by imitating	N	No response required. General comment.

			natural drainage in both rural and urban areas. This can reduce the burden on sewers, reduce the likelihood of flash floods and improve water quality		
7	Historic England	General	Historic England is supportive of the approach outlined by Leeds City Council in the Leeds City Centre West: The Innovation Arc, Consultation Draft October 2022. The Supplementary Planning Guidance document puts heritage at the forefront of considerations for the future of the west of the city through The Innovation Arc project. Leeds city centre contains a wealth of designated and non-designated heritage assets, with Conservation Areas covering much of the site outlined for The Innovation Arc. The SPD provides an early vision and placemaking approach, touching upon the need for heritage to be considered as a key aspect in the project's future. The positive language used to address the historic environment in the document is welcomed and Leeds City Council clearly recognises the benefits and opportunities offered by the city's history and historic assets. The heritage-led approach and principles contained within the SPD, taken as a whole, should help ensure the future of the project prioritises the historic environment as an integral part of innovation and development.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The SPD outlines, at a conceptual level, a development and regeneration project in the city. It reacts to the issues and opportunities contained in the city centre, going on to develop a vision and strategy which can address them. It reflects on the quality of the historic environment and recognises the benefits that its regeneration and repurposing represent, naming several important historic buildings that could lead the way in the regeneration and identity of the west of the city	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The SPD outlines an exciting future for the city of Leeds and its historic environment. As the project remains at an early conceptual stage, with much of the detail of the development to come, Historic England foresee a great deal of value in being involved at the early stages. An early understanding of how the historic environment relates to individual projects can help to save time, risk and money in the long run, whilst highlighting opportunities to enhance projects. The Innovation Arc provides an opportunity to build a strong relationship between Leeds City Council and Historic	N	No response required. This offer of support is greatly welcomed and the Council looks forward to progressing the heritage-led regeneration opportunities set out in the draft SPD alongside Historic England

			England, which could offer the space for our teams to work in collaboration during the project, providing consistency to communication, support and development. We would be more than happy to maintain regular contact and support in the future of this exciting project for the city of Leeds.		
		9	Historic England (HE) welcome the ambitions of the project and the recognition of the heritage buildings and assets upfront in this piece of work.	N	No response required. General comment.
		14 & 15	We value the statement on the 'city's rich cultural heritage' that will be 'utilised to bring these sectors to life and differentiate Leeds' innovation offer'. With this project in the early conceptual stages it is a great time to highlight the importance of heritage in the identity and offer of the city. We support the refurbishment, adaptation and reuse of the existing building stock of Leeds mentioned in the vision statement but highlight the need for a considered approach. This brings to light an opportunity for HE to work closely and consistently with Leeds City Council, providing advice, support and expertise during the progress of this exciting project.	N	No response required. Further discussions will be held with Historic England in relation to any specific projects or proposals that may come forward.
		16& 17	The Overarching Principles set out good foundations for the future of the project and Leeds' historic environment. We respect the retrofit first approach and see this as a key consideration in the climate emergency. You can find some further useful information on HE's climate strategy here, https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/features/climate-change/our-strategy/ , and a joint heritage sector statement here, https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/statements/climatechange/ . Additionally, the 'Rooted' principle provides a strong pillar to ensure heritage is a key aspect of the projects progress and the future identity of the city of Leeds. Further still, the term 'Heritageled innovation' and its explanation provide an interesting approach for heritage not to become a supporting act of innovation but an integral part of it.	N	No response required. General comment.

		18 & 19	<p>HE are glad to see that Heritage and Identity feature as a key part of the Innovation Ecosystem and look forward to seeing how this will guide and ensure the future of The Innovation Arc project utilises heritage as a key aspect of Leeds' identity. It is also worth noting how the historic environment can be a key player in the other aspects of the city beyond identity. An example of this is showcased in HE's published research on the link between Wellbeing and the historic environment https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/wellbeing-and-the-historic-environment/</p> <p>The historic environment makes a significant contribution to not only the distinctive character of Leeds but also to its economic well-being and the quality of life of its communities. Historic England has published a range of research reports and information on the contribution of the historic environment to the economy, society and the environment as part of its Heritage Counts project: https://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		28 & 29	<p>It is encouraging to see the historic environment play a key part of the spatial analysis, especially reflecting on the impact of past regeneration and the impact it has had in the 1970s city ring road. Presumably a past issue that the documents seeks to address and prevent from happening in the future through a guiding approach to the historic environment.</p> <p>The SPD is correct to pull focus on the 40ha of Conservation Areas, which make up 30% of The Innovation Arch site, and includes around 200 listed buildings. This highlights the area as containing a wealth of history and its assets for considered reuse and regeneration, giving them a new lease of life and respecting their historic value. We welcome that Leeds City Council confirm that they intend to adopt a considered approach mentioning the historic assets as a key part to the character and distinctive townscape. Further still, the setting and legibility of these buildings and assets has been identified as an issue in some places, and that there is a need to improve not only the historic buildings but their context – even directing the reader to the protected views in the Design Guide SPD (2017).</p> <p>This is an approach HE would be fully supportive of and are keen to see how this plays out in the development of the detail of the</p>	N	No response required. General comment.

			project. This provides an exciting future for Leeds' historic environment as currently none of the Conservation Areas covered by The Innovation Arc have Conservation Area Appraisals or Management Plans in place. Having appraisals for the conservation areas involved in place would be hugely beneficial, they would provide a clear statement of each areas special interest, character and appearance with which to guide proposals. It would also help to identify what other buildings, structures and spaces make a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Areas and should, where possible, be retained. The NPPF (para 207) makes it clear that the loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in harm to that area.		
		32 & 33	Significant heritage assets are noted on the summary of opportunities. Going forward it would be good to build on additions to the two buildings identified, the EC Stoner Building and the Original LGI building, and the detail of how they will be approached. This may take a combination of a strategic site-level approach and bespoke site-specific approaches.	N	No response required. General comment.
		36 & 37	We agree with Heritage and Identity being rooted in place and open to change and the need to celebrate our heritage. It would be good to see heritage as more of a threaded device throughout this page, rather than contained to a single principle. This will chime more with the flexibility of heritage to cope with change and as a key factor to future innovation.	N	These principles are not standalone, however the Council feels that the interdependencies between principles are adequately explained elsewhere in the document.
		40 - 43	HE welcomes the reference to policy P11 that will ensure the protection of the historic environment going forward. Further to the previous point (36-37), we would like to include that heritage can be an integrated part in the development of The Innovation Arc project, rather than isolated areas of protection.	N	These pages summarise existing policy
		50 & 51	Though we are sure this is an early approach to the sustainability of the project it would be useful to add historic buildings to the strategy. Retrofit can be key to the whole life carbon costs of	N	These pages provide references to existing policy, the additional guidance to

			buildings and it would be good to see the historic environment mentioned by name in this section.		supplement this is provided elsewhere in the document
		70 & 71	We are pleased to see a statement that refers to us by name and our ability to be involved in the early stages of development projects. We understand that Leeds General Infirmary provides a particular challenge in the progress of the project and the connection of the city. We would be more than happy to start a dialogue around this area, as well as on the project more generally, to ensure a smooth running progression and a project that can deliver on the encouraging aims surrounding the historic environment and future of Leeds.	N	No response required. General comment.
		72 & 73	It is encouraging to see heritage mentioned in another principle of the 05 Development Guidance section and the term 'heritage-led innovation' defined as a way to integrate heritage with innovation. It would be good to see heritage mentioned in the other principles - Movement and Connectivity, Public Open Space and People and Culture.	N	There is certainly overlap and dependencies between the principles in this document. The Council considered how changes might be made to reflect this as suggested, but ultimately felt that the document sets out each principle clearly without further amendment.
		74 - 77	It is good to see policies mentioned that protect the historic environment of Leeds and that The Innovation Arc project will utilise the great deal of conservation areas and listed buildings it encompasses. HE agree that heritage should not just be about preservation but enhancement and reuse, becoming an opportunity rather than a hinderance to innovation and the future of Leeds. Although it is hard to comment on the impact on the historic environment at this early stage of the project, it is encouraging to see particular buildings earmarked as having important futures in the progression of the project, and that they will be developed on a case-by-case basis. This warrants support and regular communication from HE in the ongoing stages of the project and we would be keen to set up a framework that ensures the smooth running of The Innovation Arc as it progresses.	N	No response required. The Council will discuss with Historic England the best opportunities for early and ongoing engagement.

		84 - 89	<p>HE welcomes the idea that university buildings of historical note can be the anchor of future development. It is inspiring to see a heritage asset form a focal point to a neighbourhood with innovation at the core of the development.</p> <p>86-87: It is good to see a strategy that will sets the optimisation and utilisation of existing buildings rather than only encouraging new buildings.</p> <p>88-89: HE thoroughly supports the heritage and identity parameters that spotlight heritage as the beating heart of the neighbourhood, encouraging the reuse rather than demolition of existing buildings. We are keen to see how this plays out in the development and detail of the project.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		90 - 95	<p>HE welcomes the idea that heritage, again, plays a significant role in the identity and anchoring of the neighbourhood. We realise that Leeds General Infirmary provides a particular challenge in the development of the project and the connection between the north and south of the site. We recognise that this will mean interventions that will impact the historic environment. This would be a particular area where we would need to be considerate but yet open to change and enhancement for the future of the city. This could provide an opportunity for HE to work in collaboration with Leeds City Council to ensure the best solution to the challenge is met as a team.</p> <p>We are encouraged to see further buildings noted as opportunities for heritage-led innovation. 93: We are happy to see heritage feature in the Movement and Connectivity principle, and hope that it will be an opportunity rather than a restriction to connectivity. Heritage can play a key role in the health and wellbeing when considering active movement and we would see heritage as an opportunity rather than hinderance in this area. This approach is supported in the Core and Supporting Uses principle which hints at the overlaps between heritage, health innovation, culture and education.</p> <p>94-95: Heritage could be seen as a hinderance in this area and we are very pleased to see that Leeds City Council have not taken this approach and instead see the value of the historic environment. Much like the Heritage and Identity principle of the previous neighbourhood, we support the improvement of the historic environment and its surrounding context and understand the value</p>	N	No response required. General comment.

			<p>this will bring to the identity of Leeds and practical aspects such as sustainability. We are glad to see the surrounding context mentioned in clarity in this section and it would be beneficial to see this opportunity in other cases.</p>		
		96 - 101	<p>The West End provides a simultaneous challenge and opportunity. We support the knitting of new and old, with the revitalisation of existing building stock and the mention of the historic grid. The complexity of the heritage working together with the new provides a challenge in the identification and survey of potential sites and their futures. We direct you to our list of planning services to help support the future of this area https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/ourplanning-services/support-for-place-making-and-design/ This is another area that warrants consistent conversation in order to point Leeds City Council to support, advise and services that we may offer to aid the future of this project through a collaborative approach.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		102 & 103	<p>The document has shown heritage to be key to the ongoing development of this project in an interesting and inspiring way; it would have been good to see it interwoven at this holistic level and statement.</p>	Y	An additional line has been added to this statement reading "Reflecting and celebrating the unique character and identity of Innovation Arc neighbourhoods".

8	Leeds Arts University	1	SPD document you have highlighted your consultation processes for the production of the SPD (Below) Other than the workshop in August 2021 could you please outline what additional consultation and stakeholder engagement has taken place particularly with the Anchor institutions involved?	N	Prior to the first phase of consultation on the draft Innovation Arc SPD (October 2022) Leeds Arts University were engaged alongside the University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University and the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust through a workshop held in August 2021 and a second workshop held in November 2021. Further engagement was offered during the public consultation period in October and November 2022. A second phase of consultation will be undertaken in 2023 prior to adoption of the SPD.
		9	Highlighted in the SPD document (Extract Below) it would seem that Leeds Arts University is included as one of the City's Anchor institutions. It therefore seems contradictory for Leeds Arts University to be the only Anchor institution to not be included within the boundary of the SPD, Could the Council please provide an explanation of the decision making process regarding the boundary designation and also who made this decision?	Y	Document to be amended to alter the boundary of the area to incorporate the Leeds Arts University Blenheim Walk campus
		24	The SPD showcases example buildings and facilities of all Anchor Institutions with the exception of Leeds Arts University, Although we may be a smaller specialist institution in comparison to the other anchor institutions, we have also relatively recently made a significant multimillion-pound investment in the construction of our newest campus extension. This provides leading specialist facilities to support our students' education, creativity and practice. I would request that as an anchor institution this is reflected within the SPD document for parity	Y	Additional text added to this page to amplify the Leeds Arts University developments.

		General	<p>Within the SPD document there seems to be very little detail about impacts and changes to traffic flows, public transport, cycle lanes and pedestrian crossings particularly on the A660 which runs directly outside of our University Building. The improvement focus seems to be on Blenheim Terrace and Woodhouse lane outside Leeds Beckett and the University of Leeds. I also note that the proposed route for the mass transit scheme has been prioritised on the A660.</p> <p>Over the past 10 years we have raised significant objections directly with the Council over proposed schemes that would have increased traffic volume and flow on Blenheim Walk. Firstly, the now defunct trolley Bus scheme proposed creating an extra lane on the road and most recently the Connecting Leeds proposals for two-way traffic system on the same section of highway. Both proposals would have had a significant detrimental impact on Leeds Arts University and its students.</p>	N	This document does not set out detailed scheme design. These will be brought forward at the appropriate point in time and will be consulted on in the proper manner.
		General	In addition to the significant safety concerns, noise, congestion and pollution impacts on the University and neighbouring residents also need to be seriously considered and mitigated before any further decisions are taken in relation to the innovation ARC and Blenheim Walk are finalised.	Y	The document has been revised to identify and define Blenheim Walk in the same way as Blenheim Terrace as a public transport priority route
9	Leeds Civic Trust	General	The Trust welcomes the ambition and direction of the SPD's vision. Hitherto the concept of the Innovation Zone has seen somewhat nebulous - we support the development of an SPD to flesh out the concept and provide the planning guidance to make it into reality. However, it is considered that the development guidance and neighbourhood opportunities set out in the SPD do not yet fully realise the potential and opportunity set out in the vision. The SPD appears uneven and in need of further development.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Given its name, the document seems to lack information and focus on innovation and research, and to be more about creating better spatial links and attractive public space. What does this have to do with innovation? How is innovation defined? And what is the evidence that current spatial arrangements are hindering innovation? Most if not all of the things the SPD wishes to achieve seem to be worthwhile in themselves and not particularly innovative. Should we be looking to use the area to explore new ways of living and working, thus broadening the definition of	N	The Leeds Innovation Prospectus, which should be read alongside this Document, provides more detail on these non spatial matters.

			innovation so that it is not exclusively about R & D and innovative business.		
		General	<p>Overall, the boundaries of the area seem sensible. However, there are a number of areas where even a fuzzy boundary could be revised:</p> <p>would it be logical to also include Queen Square as a heritage area having a similar combination of uses.</p> <p>Leeds Art University and Notre Dame College lie immediately adjacent to the SPD area</p> <p>Is there a reason why the block containing the Majestic and Old Post Office is excluded, the buildings house medical and teaching spaces.</p>	Y	Document to be amended to alter the boundary of the area to incorporate the Leeds Arts University Blenheim Walk campus, Queen Square and City Square
		General	The draft SPD does not appear to fully take on board the wider connecting Leeds strategy objectives for sustainable transport including the need for significant traffic reduction and public transport improvements. Buses are hardly mentioned in the document despite being key to the city's transport strategy. There is no actual traffic plan other than to focus traffic on the ring road motorway, however, this is fed by major arterial roads through the Innovation Arc such as the A660	Y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		56	Some strategy to reduce the volume of traffic coming into the area is essential but this should not be at the cost of accessibility. The SPD says that 'as development comes forward, the use and function of existing public car parks may need to be assessed'. While there could (should?) be a strategy to actively reduce parking, the document tiptoes around one of the major issues in the north central area, namely the adequacy (inadequacy?) of car parking facilities for hospital patients and visitors (particularly if the New Hospitals draw in patients and visitors from a far wider catchment area). Access to any new hospital car park requires careful consideration as current plans show entry from Portland Way and exit to Portland Street and thence Great George Street - this would clash with plans to enhance Great George Street, push more traffic through narrow streets in the city centre and potentially confuse	N	Further guidance has been provided in the revised SPD on the priority routes for public transport in the Innovation Arc. The Connecting Leeds Strategy and wider plans will deal with a holistic approach to connectivity in the city centre. The detailed points on access to the hospital site would be dealt with through the planning process.

			visitors from afar who would find themselves in a very different location to where they arrived at the site. Access issues are further complicated by the blue light routes and any potential MRT route		
		61	<p>The plan on page 61 gives a glimpse of how MRT might contribute to connectivity in the Innovation Arc. As indicated, a MRT route linking the South Bank and the railway station to the Infirmary and universities is likely to be of major benefit. The route proposed is an obvious choice but does have major drawbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • passing through City Square would detract from plans to develop that as a public space • there would be potential conflict with buses, taxis and general traffic on much of the route (whereas experience elsewhere suggests that segregation is key) - also conflict with ambulances and traffic entering the Infirmary • it would not serve the retail quarter well. <p>The obvious alternative of Park Row and Cookridge Street has recently been reconstructed to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists but it should not be discounted.</p>	y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		General	<p>Both of these surface routes would have the major disadvantage that, in addition to conflicting with buses, access traffic, cyclists and pedestrians in this busy area, they would be severed during major events (e.g. cycle races) taking place on The Headrow or elsewhere in the city centre, which are precisely the times when better public transport is most needed. Many cities have MRT systems which</p> <p>operate over a mixture of surface and underground. Rather than settling for an MRT system which is second or even third best, should consideration be given to an underground route for MRT between the railway station and the area around the Rose Bowl?</p>	N	Details of Leeds Mass Transit Routes through the City Centre, and the appropriate form of any Mass Transit system, are yet to be defined but this document sets out guidance for all public transport within priority routes in the Innovation Arc area. As detailed plans for Mass Transit emerge, more detailed guidance may be developed to ensure that its potential benefits are

					maximised within the Innovation Arc.
		General	The Trust strongly supports the principles for re-balancing road space and establishing a hierarchy of streets that create attractive walking and cycling routes and a network of pleasant landscaped and naturally secure streets. It would be good to see some examples/ideas of how it could actually be done to illustrate broad principles.	Y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		General	The Trust very much welcomes the imaginative plans for decking over the Inner Ring Road to create new city parks at Woodhouse Gateway and Great George Street (similar proposals have been developed to create a park over the M8 in Glasgow). This will be a fabulous way of reconnecting inner West Leeds to the core centre. However, the Woodhouse Gateway proposals do not articulate the Connecting Leeds ambitions for the Albion Street-Woodhouse Lane sustainable transport spine, including bus priorities. This key route from the central core to the Parkinson Building is a townscape progression of fundamental importance to the character of Leeds and should be a key asset of the Innovation Arc. Any City Park above the motorway at Woodhouse Lane should be set within the context of a wider townscape repair plan. This could allow for some new buildings to frame spaces, which could potentially partly fund the new public realm. This approach should be considered elsewhere along the Inner Ring Road such as around the Arena and North Street	N	This route is highlighted as a public transport priority route in the revised Innovation Arc SPD and public realm gateways and spaces are identified along the corridor. Further work will be undertaken through future schemes to repair this streetscape through new and enhanced public realm. Development plots are not allocated or identified in this SPD, although there are allocated sites in the SAP along this route.

		General	The proposed Key Green Strategic Route from Woodhouse Moor to Holbeck, Temple and South Bank is extremely positive and the focus on the potential of the E.C. Stoner Building is imaginative and welcome. A clearer proposal for delivery of a link over the River Aire and Canal from Wellington Place to Holbeck would be useful. There is also a need to reflect the South Bank Regeneration Framework and Holbeck Urban Village Strategy, linking into proposals such as The Arbour from Temple Works to Aire Park and Leeds Dock. Although located in the South Bank, the British Library for the North at Temple Works is likely to be a major asset to the Innovation Arc in providing a resource for research and innovation and so links to this needs to be highlighted prominently in the document.	Y	Amend document to emphasise the connection across the Canal and River Aire and onward connectivity into proposed green routes in the South Bank, plan on page 65 shows key green strategic route from Innovation Arc into the South Bank. Added emphasis on this on page 99 (West End movement and connectivity).
		44	References to more (undefined) housing in the area do not provide guidance on how this should showcase innovation and research. It risks developers just promoting yet more of the same sort of edge city centre high rise development. There is no consideration of the role of (further) purpose-built student accommodation although this is the dominant residential use within much of the SPD area.	N	Existing planning policy guides PBSA and this Document does not seek to allocate sites or prescribe uses within the Innovation Arc.
		General	The references to refurbishment and repurposing of older buildings are welcome but there is nothing specific to reflect how this will contribute positively to the overarching innovation and research brief. Could there not be a recycling/repair district for instance, which would be true innovation and could create more hands-on economies that match the ambitions of repurposing? Whilst this is outside traditional (spatial) planning, the SPD is specifically about wider holistic proposals.	N	It is anticipated that more detailed proposals will be brought forward in time in response to the principles and vision set out in this SPD.
		General	The Development Principle re Sustainability and Carbon Neutral Development is weak: 'In line with existing LP policies, proposals should ensure sustainable development is a core objective'. Surely this does not match the overarching ambition of the Innovation Arc. As a minimum, the SPD should reflect the aspirations set out in Local Plan Update 1 even though it may not be statutory policy in advance of adoption of this SPD. There is very little of substance about local socio-economics in the SPD and, whilst the SPD Vision is	N	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.

			to be an inclusive strategy, there is little about how it can impact positively on adjoining deprived areas.		
		General	Other Planning initiatives are not fully reflected in the SPD, such as changes suggested by the Local Plan Update. The SPD, for example, still shows the City Loop going through City Square. There is no mention of the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area and potential Plan which covers part of the SPD area. This is a distinct residential neighbourhood which is often ignored. Improvements to the link over the ring road at that point are also a key aspiration of the Little Woodhouse NP.	Y	Additional plan added on page 49 and text to detail Neighbourhood Planning context and relationship.
		General	<p>The Heritage and Identity section could include some additional opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blenheim Terrace (almost all Grade II): opportunities to improve front "gardens" with more tree planting • 12-16 Clarendon Road (Grade II): opportunities for improvements to the rear elevations facing the proposed city park • 2-9 Woodhouse Square and Waverley House (Grade II): continuation of the east/ west route (Gt George Street) provides an opportunity to enhance their setting • Joseph's Well (unlisted NDHA): existing office suites with opportunities for additional development, residential or commercial. 	Y	The document has been revised to identify these opportunities.

		15	<p>There are a number of drafting issues which should be reviewed more carefully - we have not examined all plans and text in detail but these below have been noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • page 15 refers to the three largest universities in Leeds being located in the Innovation Arc - however, would Leeds Trinity at Horsforth be the third largest? • the plan on page 77 has no key to the numbers although the text alongside describes features 1-8 • the plan on page 81 showing cultural hubs has a rather selected list <p>- lines fly over the Grand/Howard Assembly Room and City Varieties but include smaller venues such as the Hyde Park Book Club</p>	y	Plan on page 77 has been amended to include numbers. The plan on page 87 (was 81) is indicative and not an exhaustive list of assets. Text on p16 (was 15) to be updated for accuracy. P150-1 is the Spatial Analysis document prepared at a point in time. So it wouldn't be appropriate to update it to update the planning status map. The text on the cover of the spatial analysis (Appendix 2 confirms the information is correct at time of production Aug-Dec 2021).
			<p>on pages 150/151, site D is shown as 'Monks Bridge' not 'Monk Bridge' - it is assumed the planning status map will be updated to take account of new applications/consents and starts on site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on page 155, the plan should be redrawn to reflect severance of the Loop at City Square and not show The Loop running along The Headrow (unless this is a change of plan?) - are there really significant level changes between Wellington Place and the river as shown (but there are elsewhere e.g. above Burley Road, within Leeds University Campus and NE of Arts University)? • generally, the text often refers to locations which are not named on adjoining plans e.g. page 91 and Leeds School of Arts - this will make the document less useful to outside investors. 	n	P150-1 is the Spatial Analysis document prepared at a point in time. So it wouldn't be appropriate to update it to update the planning status map.
		General	Throughout the document, illustrations of buildings and spaces show heritage locations - given this is supposed to be an SPD for Innovation and the future, it is perhaps telling that no more recent buildings were thought worthy of inclusion. We feel that there are some exemplary examples of modern architecture that could reflect more modern Leeds e.g. Broadcasting Place, Nexus, Wellington Place (with Lifting Tower to show sensitive integration), The Majestic or the new Bragg Building where modern has been grafted onto old.	Y	Document to be amended to reflect these opportunities and assets. Imagery added to reflect modern buildings.

10	Little Woodhouse NF	General	Welcome Joining up placemaking and economic considerations – is welcome	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Welcome the Vision of ‘liveability’ – welcome principle to apply to city living ie Affordability, mix of housing, active travel	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	In support of the Vision of housing mix for diverse range of households	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Recognise the importance of Needing for places to work, rest and play for workers in city centre	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Recognising current lack of visibility/access to universities and LGI from the west	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Welcome the Concept of gateways – entry points from the west in particular	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Welcome 2 new city parks – and their locations	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Welcome the Principle of sustainability and adaptability, refurbishment adaptation and re-use of heritage	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	Refer Little Woodhouse, please, not “Woodsley”, and Rosebank (Millennium) Green, not Rose Bank Park	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
		General	Gateway entry at the end of Wellington St /St Paul’s St– current unsatisfactory footbridge crossing and look at Burley Road and Kirkstall Road (competing vehicle, cycling and walking)	Y	Footbridge connection at Marlborough to be clarified in document, and pedestrian and cycling connectivity enhancements mentioned to extent of boundary on Burley Road/Kirkstall Road.
		General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are residential areas to be sufficient in amenity spaces for residents and what is the impact on current green spaces • How will residential areas accommodate housing mix for diverse households? • How will community facilities be provided eg health, schools, play spaces? 	N	Amenity provision and community facilities will be addressed through the planning process. The draft SPD specifically addresses the deficit of green space provision and seeks to identify potential locations for new green spaces
		General	Need for parking strategy – what would be aim?	N	The SPD identifies the need for a holistic car paking strategy, particularly within

					the West End neighbourhood. The parameters and aims of the strategy are yet to be defined as this is outside of the scope of the SPD, but will be aligned to the aspirations set out within the Leeds Transport Strategy.
		General	Opportunity to provide wider housing mix on Clarendon site when vacated eg for families, older people, community-led co-housing and/or for additional care/ rehabilitation accommodation = opp for research in healthy living communities in city centres and Better links between Little Woodhouse communities and universities and LGI	N	This document does not allocate sites for specific development. The Clarendon Site will be considered as part of a future Development Brief for the wider Leeds Teaching Hospital Trust estate.
		General	Would welcome Better waysigning and green infrastructure along routes to encourage walking and cycling and Improvement to Gateway entry points, especially Little Woodhouse Bridge (aka Gt George St), Little Woodhouse Street/Clarendon Way, Mount Preston Street and Entry points over inner ring road – Burley Rd, Kirkstall Rd, 2 pedestrian bridges	N	No response required. Improved wayfinding and green infrastructure to encourage walking and cycling is acknowledged in the SPD.
11	Leeds Teaching Hospital Trust	General	We support and share the Council's vision and objectives that the Innovation Arc is a worldclass hub for research and innovation that does not currently maximise it's potential. We welcome the Innovation Arc Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as a major landowner, employer and anchor institution as part of our collaborative Innovation Partnership. The SPD will allow the Trust to demonstrate to developers and investors that LCC are supportive of our Innovation Village vision and provide a backdrop to support funding bids in the future.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The SPD also supports our Innovation Pop Up which brings together clinicians and entrepreneurs to work together to trial and test cutting edge science and technology – to help the rapid adoption and spread of innovations across the country. Our ambition is to	N	No response required. General comment.

			grow this into a thriving community as part of the Innovation Village.		
	General		The SPD for the wider Innovation Arc aligns with our vision for the Innovation Village to provide a high-quality innovation-led mixed-use development of approx. 1m sq. ft. (92,902 sq m) incorporating both heritage assets and new build opportunities. The mix of uses within the Innovation Arc is to be worked up in due course but it has the potential for up to 4,000 jobs and depending on the mix up to 750 homes.	N	No response required. General comment.
	27, 70, 91		It would be helpful to add further commentary on the Innovation Village concept - we have suggested that this is included/referenced explicitly within the Vision Statement on page 14 and 15, within the Future section on page 27, page 70 and page 91. It would be helpful to add that the Old Medical School has the potential to be the first phase of the Innovation Village.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested on page 70 and 91.
	General		Please amend the name of Leeds NHS Trust to Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust throughout the document.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
	24		Page 23 refers to £450m – delete the reference to a figure and simply state “The redevelopment of the Leeds General Infirmary (LGI) is a...”	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
	24		Page 24 refers to £450m - delete the reference to a figure and simply state “LGI is the redevelopment of the Leeds General Infirmary (LGI).	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
	24		Page 24 refers to the term ‘Innovation District’ please replace with Innovation Village.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
	24		refers to ‘releasing 5 ha of land for commercial investment - please amend to be ‘releasing 5 ha of land for mixed use commercial led investment’ and add in a wider definition of the ‘Innovation Village’.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
	28		Vehicular, servicing and emergency access. We welcome the sentence ‘A number of key routes are used for blue light and service access to the hospital’ and request our key operational requirements are supported by adding to this sentence ‘A number of key routes are used for blue light, patient, staff and service access to the hospital which need to be supported and improved.’	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.

		29	We note that 5% of the green space in the Arc is within the University of Leeds ownership and agree that the significant green space within the University of Leeds campus is not easily accessible or commonly known which is often missed. This is an opportunity. We therefore do not support the aspiration to increase the amount of green space within the Arc within our ownership and create a new 'city park' by capping the A58. The opportunity within the Arc is to improve the quality and accessibility of the existing green space. LCC has some excellent examples within the City such as Cookridge Street. In addition, there is a 'plaza' of green space proposed and as identified on page 29 the pavilion courtyards of the Gilbert Scott building represent an opportunity subject to viability. In the short-term Thoresby Place will provide access to Jubilee Wing whilst the new hospitals are constructed however this area (which is in LCC ownership) is a significant opportunity to improve the green space and setting of the heritage assets of Old Medical School, Gilbert Scott building and St George's Crypt.	N	The overall quantum of green space within the area remains low, as set out in the draft SPD. The draft SPD proposes that new city parks are provided at two locations: across the A58 at Woodhouse Lane, and adjacent to the A58 in the area surrounding the current Clarendon Wing. A park is illustrated at this site in the Teaching Hospital Trust's masterplan for the site, however detailed proposals would require greater feasibility testing and would need to be considered within the broader context of development plans for the area.
		30	Please add an icon for the new hospitals within the diagram.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested, but icon is added to map on page 33.
		32	The comments above regarding the removal of the new City Park above should be considered and included at page 32	N	No response required. See comments against points above.
		58	Please remove reference under key gateways to 'capping the A58 to create new City Park.'	N	No response required. See comments against points above.
		65	Please delete the icon and reference to the New City Park within the diagram.	N	No response required. See comments against points above.
		70	within the planning brief box. Please add a bullet which recognises the viability challenge in bringing forward heritage assets for sustainable uses in line with the climate emergency agenda.	N	It would be inappropriate for this document to provide comment on any potential viability challenges

		76	under Original Infirmary and Corson's pavilion Wing - (Grade 1) please amend to; 'Buildings should be maintained to ensure they can be sustained and appreciated by future generations'. It would be helpful to support the first phase of our Innovation Village if the Old Medical School (Grade II*) and the setting of Thoeresby Place were explicitly referenced on this list.	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
		86	The diagram on page 86 appears to show a walk/access route through the new hospital and alterations to pedestrian and vehicular access to the existing LGI which is in direct conflict with our operational requirements. This is also shown in the diagrams on page 91, page 103, and the overall context plan within the Appendix Overall Context Plan	N	The diagrams illustrate the principles of permeability through the site, the detail will be defined in the planning brief for the site.
		General	A primary cycle route and a "potential creative corridor" has been shown along Clarendon Way which is a private road. This is currently used by Heavy Goods Vehicles and Passenger Service Vehicles for staff serving both the University and the Trust and as such this would be a significant negative impact upon the operational activity of the Trust.	N	The proposals in the document are at an early stage and any further development of these proposals will be sensitive to the operational requirements of the Trust and the Universities.
		90	Page 90 - 'In the event of the new hospitals being built' please replace with 'The surplus estate created by the new hospital development at LGI provides a development opportunity.'	Y	Document to be amended as suggested on page 91.
			Please delete the aspiration for the City Park paragraph within this section as justified within the comments overleaf.	N	No response required. See comments against points above.
		93	please remove reference to £500m and replace with 'Anchored by the investment in two new hospitals'	Y	Document to be amended as suggested.
		General	We suggest opportunities to improve accessibility and permeability are worked on collaboratively in the Planning Brief and the further work planned for Great George Street.	N	No response required. General comment.
12	McLaren	General	Whilst reference is made throughout the draft SPD to the importance of the role played by the University of Leeds, and the fact Leeds Innovation Arc should be a desirable place to live with a strong community offer, there is no specific reference to the importance of locating student accommodation close to the University, thus encouraging sustainability principles.	N	The draft SPD does not provide any specific site requirements or allocate sites for specific planning purposes.

			It is noted Springfield House is shown as being within the Woodhouse Gateway zone where “Woodhouse Gateway has the potential to become a nationally significant innovation neighbourhood anchored by the city’s largest universities University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds Arts University. The neighbourhood would focus on the universities’ core specialisms including health robotics, AI, computing and support the health innovation emerging from the LGI and Great George Street neighbourhood, and commercial heart of the West End.” It is important reference is made to the potential for student accommodation in this zone to support the aims and aspirations of the City as it looks to promote the health and well being of the Universities.	N	The draft SPD does not provide any specific site requirements or allocate sites for specific planning purposes.
		General	It is also noted Springfield House has been wrongly identified as The Faversham	Y	Document to be amended to identify Springfield House correctly
13	MEPC	General	The landowner supports Wellington Place being recognised in the Innovation Arc as the key development in the West End and as part of the innovation ecosystem for this area of the City.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner welcomes the general aspirations for improved permeability across the Innovation Arc and links in the West End between Wellington Place and Park Square area through the principal route from Queen Street.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner supports improved connectivity across Wellington St at the junction with Queen St/Northern St and would welcome further discussions with the Authority, including the Highways Department, to understand how proposals to improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity for users accessing the estate can come forward. As detailed above the funding of such interventions will need to be carefully considered.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner welcomes and supports continued pedestrian connectivity across and through Wellington Place including to the proposed Riverside Walkway and the new connections to Doncaster Monkbridge via the new viaduct connection and the future proposed footbridge across the River Aire to provide access to the Leeds Liverpool Canal.	N	No response required. General comment.

		General	The landowner notes that the natural green edge as shown indicatively on the plans for the riverside development plots generally reflects the landscaping approach secured through the outline planning permission for Site 2 and the recent approval for 9WP. MEPC would like to continue to work with the Authority collaboratively in bringing forward the Riverside Walkway proposals connecting to the former Yorkshire Post site.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner notes that Tower Square and the proposed new public square fronting the Viaduct (Viaduct Square) has been identified on the Public Open Space Strategy Map as 'Play' areas. Whilst these areas will be fully accessible for the public, including families with children, as well as use for occupiers of the estate, no play provision or equipment will be provided on the estate and is not being promoted as part of the public realm and open space at Wellington Place. We therefore request that an amendment to this plan to remove this reference on this plan.	Y	Document to be amended as necessary
		General	The concept of Creative corridor and creative occupier at Wellington Place is generally supported as part of the wider mix of occupiers. As detailed above there are already a number of creative and tech occupiers on the estate which aligns with the vision for a wider mix of similar types of occupiers.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner fully supports Wellington Place being identified as an anchor designation for active frontages and people coming to use the ground floor uses across the estate which includes a mix of food and beverage offers. As part of improving the offer and access to the estate the landowner supports the promotion extending the hours of operation for the food and beverage offer on the estate to support the vitality of Wellington Place and the wider West End within the Innovation Arc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner supports proposals for improved wayfinding across the Innovation Arc and in particular between other areas of the West End, including to Park Square. It is important that the Wellington Place estate's branding with the signage and wayfinding through the existing and future development plots is retained in supporting the identity of the estate which is now well established in its own right.	N	No response required. General comment.

		General	Cycling is promoted as a key mode of sustainable transport at Wellington Place and the cycle network around the estate on Whitehall Road, Northern Street and Wellington Street is well established and is being delivered with future developments, including the delivery of 9 Wellington Place that will see the extension of the cycle lane on Whitehall Road. However, MEPC would like to make the point that the central/inner areas of the estate are pedestrian focused, with cycling within these areas needing to be managed from a safety and environmental perspective for users.	N	No response required. The plan in the draft SPD suggests pedestrian permeability
		General	The landowner supports Wellington Place being seen as a generator for wider innovation and creative industries alongside the existing Government and private sector occupiers on the estate with a focus on expanding these uses elsewhere in the West End and within the broader Innovation Arc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The landowner supports that overarching aim of the SPD in promoting the regeneration of the area and in supporting funding bids and decisions to bring in wider investment opportunities, including investments and improvements to the public realm and proposals for the new City Parks. It will be important for the Authority to document how the proposals for public realm/highways improvements within the Innovation Arc will be funded, and whether this will necessitate a review of the adopted Leeds Community Infrastructure Levy 123 list.	y	Further detail is provided in the revised draft SPD relating to CIL/S106 and other funding mechanisms
		General	As a material planning consideration for the determination of future planning applications once adopted, it is important that the SPD is flexible and responsive to future market changes and is used as a reason to delay development coming forward.	N	Re using the SPD to delay development coming forward - this is not a role of the SPD. The market determines that.
14	Munroe K	General	Ingenuity is the name given to the smart city innovation cluster (community) being catalysed for Leeds and the City Region by founding partners White Rose Innovation Agency and Nexus. Together with a host of other partners they have the aim of developing, delivering and using smarter an inclusive urban environments, products and services. These partners come from industry, academia, government and our communities. (Ingenuity branding will be applied to the cluster, the programme of activity, and the community hub and testbed at WRP.) We believe in the	N	No response required. General Comment

			<p>power of collaboration to solve our urban challenges as well as foster innovation.</p> <p>Ingenuity was born out of MIT REAP, the two-year programme engaging senior public and private sector stakeholders in the creation of a strategy to accelerate development of our regional innovation ecosystem.</p> <p>Our towns, cities and regions present an abundance of problem-solving opportunities; from net zero and mobility to housing and an ageing population. There is the need for a lot of new ideas, innovators and entrepreneurs in order to solve these challenges. We will be inviting civic organisations to bring forward their real-world challenges and connecting them with our expert partners and wider smart city innovation community. Co-creating new visions and solutions and driving them into testing and implementation via a quadruple helix approach. Ingenuity will catalyse innovation in the Smart Cities Space by creating physical as well as digital space for people willing and able to share and combine their knowledge, talents and passions. A Space for innovators, entrepreneurs, community groups, researchers, students, community groups, businesses, investors, government and more.</p> <p>Ingenuity will also support the city's ambitions of becoming a 'digital city' and an inclusive city. It will provide the supporting infrastructure and assets required to grow the digital sector and promote Leeds as a smart city, that is, a city that maximises the potential of all its assets: people (skills, endeavour), information (from all parts of the city), businesses and things (devices, technology), that when combined are more than the sum of its parts.</p> <p>Start-ups play a critical role in driving innovation. They exist at the cutting edge. By nature, they are working to create the 'next big thing', looking to spot new trends and maximise insights on future customer demands so that they can gain elusive first mover and competitive advantage. They excel at sniffing out new ideas and opportunities and, as such, can act as lead indicators for more established players. By lowering the threshold for new entrepreneurs, we can create a more inclusive and resilient</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>innovative ecosystem.</p> <p>The Ingenuity programme of events will kick off in 2023 in collaboration with a host of partners. The programme will develop and evolve to deliver a range of innovation projects and challenges focussed on solving pressing smart city challenges.</p> <p>A physical space is planned to open at the White Rose Park in mid 2024 with construction anticipated to begin in 2023 subject to obtaining planning consent. Players in the smart city space are contributing their expertise to the design and the Morley Town Fund is providing a match funding £1.7m capital grant for the hub.</p> <p>From First Direct, the UK's first digital bank, to present day sports media giant DAZN, disruption and innovation runs through the DNA of White Rose Park. An inspirational place where business and academia meet, the vision for a knowledge and talent based-White Rose Park is bold and exciting.</p> <p>Leveraging resourcefulness and technology to create smart urban services and environments that boost the quality of life and prosperity of citizens and businesses, and are more efficient, sustainable and inclusive. Ingenuity is 1,500m² of purpose-designed space for people to connect, be inspired, uncover opportunities, experiment, prototype and work on projects, with White Rose Park and its tenants providing a real-world testbed for smart city innovations.</p> <p>Ingenuity emphasises user engagement and multistakeholder participation in the development and testing in real-life settings of innovations. White Rose Park will form a real-world testbed environment for smart products, services and technologies related to work, education, building performance, mobility on the park, transport to the park and more besides. Through our work with Leeds City Council, there is potential to utilise a wider range of settings in South Leeds and beyond.</p>		
		General	<p>Munroe K are very supportive of the proposals to bring forward the development and occupation of innovation and commercial space in the city centre, linked to the universities and hospitals. However</p>	N	<p>No response required. General Comment</p>

			we think the ambition should be greater and wider, encompassing a wider set of innovation assets, innovative businesses and commercial development opportunities across Leeds		
		General	the innovation ecosystem is city-wide. As we learned as part of the MIT REAP programme, innovation-led economic growth needs to be underpinned by the right ecosystem of universities (and other knowledge producers such as hospitals and cultural bodies), entrepreneurs, corporates, investors of risk-capital, and government organisations. These actors need to work in a coherent way as more than the sum of their parts to maximise their positive impact in creating and scaling businesses and attracting investment. But these networks do not stop at tight geographic boundaries, they operate on a city wide scale. There are several organisations in Leeds that are very much part of the innovation ecosystem, including MIT REAP team members such as Munroe K, aql, Arup, firms such as DAZN, HSBC, or Hisense in south Leeds that are located outside the proposed innovation arc. There also important investments being made in creating new innovation assets, such as Ingenuity at White Rose, or the British Library North in Holbeck, both outside the proposed boundary of the arc. There are also important education institutions, such as Leeds City College, Leeds Trinity University, and Elliot Hudson College outside the proposed arc boundary.	N	The areas proposed are either covered by existing Supplementary Planning Guidance or are not contiguous with the Innovation Arc draft SPD boundary and therefore would be challenging to include. The Council is working actively with stakeholders across the city to support plans to grow the innovation economy and where appropriate will consider the role of Supplementary Planning Guidance in achieving this, however it should be recognised that the right framework for the city centre may not be suitable for other areas which will require bespoke approaches.
		General	there is a network of innovation assets and development opportunities across south Leeds that will be linked to those in the city centre by rail (with the new White Rose Station) and mass transit, as set out in the diagram at Annex 1 (attached). This provides a growth opportunity for Leeds at far greater scale than just part of the city centre, and one that is more inclusive in the potential to create jobs where people live, and strengthen link with communities. The Innovation Arc should extend throughout south Leeds, and the proposals should include measures to improve transport connections, including better walking and cycling routes from the West End office district, across the canal and river to Holbeck and Elland Road and beyond to White Rose.	N	This would require a significant extension of the existing boundary. As set out above, this SPD is not the appropriate document through which to take forward the proposal outlined.

		General	Leeds has an identified need for grow-on innovation space, which cannot all be accommodated within the proposed boundary of the innovation arc. The limited grow-on space for medical technologies firms in Leeds was set out in the research that Leeds City Council and the University of Leeds commissioned in 2015. Several investors and businesses have also highlighted the issue (see “Leeds needs a science park to keep talent in the region”, Yorkshire Post 10 July 2017 '“Leeds should establish a science park to keep talent in region' Yorkshire Post). While there is an important role for city centre innovation space, innovative firms in medical technologies, life-sciences, and advanced manufacturing also need larger format grow-on space in well-connected, attractive campus environments, such as at White Rose Park	N	The Innovation Arc boundary as set out in the draft SPD does not limit wider partnerships and initiatives focused on growing the innovation economy or inclusive growth. These initiatives will be reflected in wider strategies, policies and implementation plans.
		General	Leeds should be ambitious about innovation-led growth and should be aiming to bring forward more development than can be accommodated within the proposed boundary for the innovation arc. While the 1m sq.ft. of innovation space proposed for the innovation arc would be a step-change, given the scale of job growth forecasts and the huge potential of Leeds, the city should be aiming for much more. In comparison, Manchester has already delivered 1m sq.ft. of innovation space at the Oxford Rd Corridor, with a further 4m sq.ft. of space planned at ID Manchester. In addition there is 1.5m sq.ft. of space at Alderley Park. The Wellcome Genome Campus in Cambridge proposes 1.4m sq.ft. of innovation space on a single site. To fulfil its potential and to compete with other cities, Leeds should take a city-wide approach to innovation-led economic growth, include the range of development opportunities and innovation assets in South Leeds as a core part of the vision, strategy and inward investment messaging for the city.	N	This document does not allocate sites, which is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy and based on a robust evidence base.
		General	<p>We are hugely supportive of the vision for strengthening innovation-led economic growth in Leeds, leveraging the city’s growing network of nationally and globally significant innovation assets, and achieving a step-change in the development of commercial innovation and office space.</p> <p>We recognise the huge opportunity in Leeds City Centre, particularly in the area surrounding the main campuses of the University of Leeds, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds Arts University, the Leeds General Infirmary, and the established city centre office</p>	N	No response required. See comments against points above.

			<p>district. It is important for the city that this area fulfils its potential, and we are very supportive of the proposals set out for this location in the consultation document.</p> <p>But the opportunity for Leeds is much bigger. There is an innovation ecosystem that we are part of, and a growing range of innovation assets and related development opportunities across the city, particularly in south Leeds. This includes White Rose Park with its ambitious and realistic plans for growth, and the Ingenuity Smart Cities innovation hub. The innovation arc should be extended to include this wider opportunity, or at the very least should be contextualised as part of a city-wide approach. Otherwise there is a risk that projects and places outside the proposed innovation arc boundary will lose out in terms of public and private sector investment, and people in these areas will miss out on the local education, employment and enterprise opportunities that can be created.</p> <p>Most importantly if Leeds is going to grow to its full potential and do so inclusively it needs to leverage all its assets and achieve a scale of development which it can only do through a city-wide approach to innovation. At Munroe K and White Rose Park we are already playing a significant role in innovation-driven growth, and our role and impact are set to increase substantially in the years ahead. Leeds should grasp this opportunity.</p>		
15	National Highways	General	References to SP3 in the SPD should be amended to reflect changes to the Core Strategy. SP3 relates to development location strategy, however it is stated in the Core Strategy that this has been deleted and superseded by Core Strategy Objectives and Spatial Policies.	N	SP3 is the Role of Leeds City Centre. This is an accurate policy reference

		General	<p>"In terms of Policy CC1, the quantum of development outlined in the SPD is incorrect and should be updated. Policy CC1 relates to City Centre development and states that it will be planned to accommodate at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 655,000 sqm office floorspace – 31,000 sqm net additional retail space (comparison) – 10,200 dwellings* – Supporting services and open spaces – Improvements to the public realm <p>The asterix relates to the fact that the 10,200 figure was from the 2014 version of the Core Strategy."</p>	Y	Comment noted. It is correct that the asterisk to Policy CC1 says that The 10,200 figure related to the original 2014 version of the Core Strategy. '. Suggested change to the text:-. In the SPD document add brackets next to 10,200 dwellings "(see reference to SP6 and SP7 for housing requirement arising from Core Strategy Selective Review)" Same amendment at page 68
		General	<p>We would note that the SPD sets specific principles for walking and cycling, and it is clear that improvements to these sustainable modes of travel are considered to be important within the proposals. To further emphasise the commitment to this, the JSJV would suggest that the SPD should make reference to the LCC Connecting Leeds Transport Strategy. The Transport Strategy sets a vision for Leeds to become a city “where you don’t need a car, where everyone has an affordable zero carbon choice in how they travel” and aligns with the National Highways Net zero highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan.</p>	Y	Document to be amended as necessary to include reference to Leeds Transport Strategy.
		General	<p>"We would suggest that the Innovation Arc SPD should make specific reference to Appendix 3, the Transport SPD and any applicable policies in the Leeds Local Plan Update: Publication Draft Consultation 2022. We would recommend that National Highways seeks clarification on how the proposals will align with the policies set out in the three aforementioned additional policy documents. We would suggest reiterating that National Highways requested changes to the Transport SPD and that an update on the status of the Transport SPD would be beneficial."</p>	Y	References to the Publication Draft Local Plan Update will be included in the revised draft SPD eg pg 45.

		General	Once adopted, it is clear that the SPD would carry statutory weight. We would suggest that it would not be appropriate to just review the planning applications as they come forward as the proposals would generally already be seen as acceptable if they are within an adopted document. It would therefore be difficult for National Highways to object or seek mitigation at this late stage. We believe it is vital that the aspirations of the SPD are demonstrated on the SRN prior to the document being adopted. (Further expansion) Engagement between National Highways and LCC should commence at the earliest opportunity to agree scope of assessments (in line with the DfT Circular 02/2013) and any mitigation measures that will be required.	N	The sites allocated within the SPD have already been assessed for highways impact. The SPD can not allocate sites for specific development as this is outside the scope of the document. Any other development coming forward subsequently will be assessed as all windfall planning applications usually are.
16	Natural England	General	While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment, but may nonetheless have some effects.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	<p>This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should 'take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure'. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this.</p> <p>Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised</p>	N	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.

			<p>through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • green roof systems and roof gardens; • green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; • new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</p>		
		General	<p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment</p>	N	<p>This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.</p>

		General	<p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p>	N	This is a matter for Local Plan policy in the first instance, as the Innovation Arc SPD cannot go beyond existing policy.
		General	The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity	N	Planning Applications in the area will be assessed against the NPPF planning policies. No further changes to be made to SPD.
		General	<p>A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again</p>	N	No response required. Requirement for future consultation noted if necessary.
17	Nexus	General	In terms of our need to scale the Nexus community, attracting new innovative start-ups and supporting our scaling members, we are exploring partnerships with landlords bringing forward refurbished and new space over the next 2 years. This presents an opportunity	N	No response required. The need for grow-on space is acknowledged.

			<p>for Nexus to be a catalyst in the West End neighbourhood of the Innovation Arc, bringing new hard and soft infrastructure for innovation and growth. We are looking at this expanded footprint through the lens of our cluster-driven strategy.</p> <p>Beyond support for our scaling members, there is a continuing need for Leeds to develop grow-on space.</p>		
		General	<p>We also see space as a key enabler of the innovation pathway including for testing technologies and solutions. We are keen to see the Arc provide testbed capabilities as this would speed up the innovation process and enable the Arc to act as a magnet, demonstrating the art-of-the possible via expositions and events. Testbeds in other environments and communities could be part of a network to increase the scope and foster engagement.</p>	Y	<p>It is anticipated that more detailed proposals will be brought forward in time in response to the principles and vision set out in this SPD. While this document necessarily requires a defined geographic boundary, which needs to be limited in order to provide a robust basis for implementation, it is acknowledged that innovation extends beyond this geographic boundary and takes place across the city. The document will be amended to provide a city-wide context and acknowledge opportunities for space in other environments and communities.</p>
		General	<p>The Arc needs to be open, transparent and inclusive to ensure engagement. Designing the Arc (and testing this design with all the stakeholders) in an inclusive manner, will ensure that the relevant needs are met and making this transparent within the Arc and across the city. What do organisations need and where can they find it? How can they engage with one another and how will innovation be facilitated in a meaningful and inclusive way? Outreach roadshows can be used to speed up engagement and innovation.</p>	N	<p>The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters. To be discussed.</p>

		24	<p>We are strongly supportive of the aspirational nature of the vision for the Innovation Arc but make four observations.</p> <p>Firstly, whether re-writing the vision from a citizen perspective may help from an inclusion standpoint by bringing it to life and making it meaningful for citizens. Alternatively, retaining a vision that appeals to all stakeholder groups and writing separate narrative for how each group stands to benefit. For example: on talent, highlighting opportunities for citizens within the Arc; on homes, highlighting how the Arc will improve communities' quality of life, education, social mobility, etc.; and on innovation space, accepting the need to attract investors in tech, describing 'vibrant and creative spaces' that appeal to social innovators and entrepreneurs, and ideally that appeal to both audiences (tech and social).</p>	Y	The revised SPD has amended the presentation of the Vision to make this more easy to read and understand. This SPD should be read alongside the city's Innovation Prospectus which is a live document setting out the city's ambitions for innovation led growth which explains how it will serve the citizens of Leeds. The document has been amended to make this link clear.
		24	<p>Secondly, Nexus and the University have important roles to play alongside other stakeholders in achieving the Arc vision ("where cutting-edge academic research and innovative, entrepreneurial businesses come together to create and commercialise new economic opportunities"). The opportunity is to focus this on our challenges, to join up and amplify the work we are all doing along the innovation pathway from research (e.g. Horizons Institute) to commercialisation (e.g. Impact Acceleration funding, Northern Gritstone investments, Innovate UK calls, Innovation@Leeds, Nexus members). Public and private sector partners co-developing and testing solutions and driving them to implementation and scaling. An open innovation process for the Innovation Arc and permeating innovation ecosystem.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		24	<p>Thirdly, including data-driven decision making as a key objective. Ensuring policy interventions are measured and reflected in changes in data dashboards, so that it is transparent for both companies and citizens to hold them to account (democratisation of data).</p>	N	This is outside the scope of the SPD as the document cannot go beyond existing policy. The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters.

		14	<p>Fourthly, we feel the vision statement is quite long and could be tightened by separating out delivery. For example:</p> <p>Leeds Innovation Arc will be a nationally important and internationally recognised economic and knowledge engine where cutting-edge academic research and innovative, entrepreneurial businesses come together to create and commercialise new economic opportunities.</p> <p>To deliver this vision, over the next 20 years, the Innovation Arc will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlock one million square feet of new innovation space in Leeds city centre • Support the restoration and re-use of major heritage sites, creating one million square feet of refurbished space in nationally significant historic buildings • Bring forward two new green parks, totalling over 4 hectares of new public space • Develop around 200,000 square metres of new and improved public realm • Support new neighbourhoods that will create around 3,000 new homes" <p>By achieving this vision, the Arc will be a place where the best talent wants to work, live and play employers want to locate and invest; and a place that directly benefits the residents of Leeds.</p> <p>The City's three priorities of delivering inclusive growth, health and wellbeing and responding to climate change will be at the forefront of everything that the Innovation Arc seeks to achieve both through direct intervention and fostering an environment where the latest advances in technology can be developed to tackle these objectives.</p>	Y	Vision statement has been reviewed to ensure readability, meaningfulness and inclusivity.
		24	<p>It is important to have a system in place to assess what the innovative technologies are trying to address, followed by an effective way of measuring their impact before and after. This means effective engagement with all the relevant stakeholders by using, for instance, a quadruple helix approach (society, public sector, academia, industry). Effective engagement improves the pace of innovation and facilitates more successful adoption of the developed technology.</p>	N	No response required. The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters.

		General	From a societal point of view, this means having spaces to enable engagement and outreach to make it as inclusive and robust as possible. Thus, the propensity for adoption grows, making it more attractive again to engage with the end-users in general. When aiming for inclusive growth, testing technology with the citizens it aims to attract or serve as users will help provide early insights on how to adapt and further evolve the technological pathway as well as give new insights for future ideas for innovations	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	For the public sector, it is important to look at factors such as flexible legislation, being agile in terms of implementation, facilitating and looking at funding for initiatives and demonstrators to be run throughout the city, setting the right example in terms of due diligence and safeguarding the values and ethics surrounding innovation. Having a robust dashboard in place will then allow you to measure its effects and how this influences the ecosystem as a whole, providing new insights and opportunities in the process as well. This will also facilitate the necessary data-driven decision-making process when looking at future policy interventions. The public sector can also make sure that innovation links to the SDGs when procuring solutions. Furthermore, the inclusion of SDGs within the innovative process can be incentivised via prototyping funds or innovation grants.	N	The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters.
		24	From an industry perspective, making sure there is the right investment environment as well as having the infrastructure to prototype, test and develop will increase the propensity to innovate and scale within the region. Having the right engagement with the wider ecosystem and linking this to a fail-fast environment, helps de-risk innovation and provides them with new entrepreneurial opportunities. Ensuring the threshold to become an entrepreneur is as low as possible is key for inclusive growth and should be considered when developing programmes as well as places. Speeding up the innovation pathway is a great magnet and USP for the Innovation Arc and it will act as a catalyst for the further economic development of the city.	N	The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters.

		General	Universities and other research institutions require knowledge gaps to address, being provided the opportunity to investigate relevant and urgent challenges, and for informing solutions that can then be implemented within industry leading to the demanded technological or societal innovation. For innovation to thrive, academic knowledge of the art-of-the-possible is essential for developmental and design purposes. It helps bring the ideas and aspirations of entrepreneurs to life via both spinouts and spin-ins. They have the knowledge and skills to educate both new as well as existing organisations while also continuing to provide access to talent and skills. They play a valuable part in lifelong learning and innovation.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	<p>Linking these different stakeholder groups together and understanding/translating their needs is how world-leading research is afforded a better opportunity to thrive and then evolve into impactful solutions and opportunities within the Innovation Arc and beyond, that can then serve as best practice and allow for scalability and transferability nationally internationally. Working with organisations that already serve as innovation hubs will help coordinate and advise on the right directions when it comes to the development of ecosystems where technological (and social) innovation can thrive.</p> <p>We believe there is an opportunity to consider the Innovation Arc as an Investment Zone. A proposition that “catalyses a high potential knowledge-intensive growth cluster, including through leveraging local research strengths” could include how innovative technologies and solutions might be used within the new public realm, infrastructure and buildings in the Arc</p>	n	The Government has signalled a change in approach to the Investment Zone scheme. The Council will work separately with stakeholders to identify and develop any future potential Investment Zone bid.
18	North Yorkshire County Council	General	We acknowledge that Leeds is one of the key drivers of the city region’s economy. Additionally we recognise the need to keep local plan up to date and ensure that it provides appropriate policy responses to local and climate challenges. We do support the principles of the proposed improvements to the existing local plan policies and the addition of new policies of achieving net zero ambitions. From a landscape perspective we support the policies and supporting text particularly relating to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure.	N	No response required. General comment.

		General	We also welcome the use of a SPD to achieve effective place making including an integrated and coherent approach to securing improvements to public spaces, roads, walking and cycling links, public transport routes and green spaces.	N	No response required. General comment.
19	University of Leeds		<p>The Masterplan identifies areas within the city campus where development could, and has subsequently taken place (eg Nexus). The Next Generation Transport (NGT) mass transport strategy was planned to run along Woodhouse Lane at the time of preparing the Masterplan.</p> <p>The Masterplan and future masterplans are essential to ensure the University makes efficient use of the city centre campus. While the university has other campuses in more peripheral locations in Leeds, the city campus is key to delivering the University's education and research objectives. In the last fifty years, student numbers have risen from 6,000 to more than 39,000, with only a modest increase in the campus area. As part of the 2015-25 Masterplan, 19 new development sites were identified. These sites complement the existing buildings, many of which are listed, within the mature university campus.</p> <p>While the Masterplan is now somewhat dated, it is a useful reference for identifying potential future developments / development zones on the campus. The Masterplan identifies the 'South Campus' area adjacent to Nexus as the largest remaining development area on the campus. It also identified certain aims such as enhancing 'Gateways' into the main campus, improving public realm and connectivity between the campus and the surrounding area which are consistent with the draft SPD.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
			The University submitted representations to the Council on the draft Tall Building Design Guide (TBDG) in September 2019 (please see Appendix One). In summary, the representations highlighted the need to make efficient use of the main city centre campus to deliver the University's education and research objectives within the context of the emerging Innovation District. The site context plan submitted with the representations showed how central the South Campus area and the Nexus scheme are to the Innovation District.	y	Page 76 of the SPD has been updated to reference the emerging new Masterplan and the close dialogue required between the Council and the University as plans develop, including the potential for a review of the SPD if required.

			While we understand the draft TBDG is not progressing, some of the key messages in those representations are relevant to the current consultation on the draft SPD. It is important that the SPD does not unreasonably or unnecessarily prevent or restrict the ongoing delivery of essential, high-quality buildings within the city centre campus especially the South Campus. Also, as the current Masterplan is coming to the end of its lifespan, it's important the SPD explicitly commits to a review in future years to ensure consistency between the University's and the Council's objectives for the 'Woodhouse Gateway'.		
			The University welcomes the references to future master-planning exercises that will be done for the main campus. It is requested that the draft SPD acknowledges that the current ADP University Masterplan (2015-2025) is coming to the end of its lifespan and a further Masterplan will be prepared in the coming years.	Y	Document to be updated as necessary on page 70 (now 76)
			The University is currently embarking on the development of a new masterplan for the campus which will embrace the principles of the Innovation Arc, such as creating active frontages, good connectivity across campus, and encouraging the creation of neighbourhoods with students and staff being able to "live, work, play" in close proximity. The University is supportive of the placemaking principles contained in the draft SPD and agree they will bring vitality to the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
			The new Masterplan will be prepared in the context of the draft SPD and the shared ambition of the Council and University to be a Net Zero organisation by 2030. It will also support the University's academic strategy and new approaches to education through a redefined curriculum which will complement the Innovation Arc.	N	No response required. General comment.

		<p>It is requested that the text about the University of Leeds in Section 5.4 (Core and Supporting Uses) on P. 70 is amended to include the additional text inserted in bold below:</p> <p>“The University’s post-covid estate strategies and adaptation to hybrid working and studying may offer the opportunity for consolidated and rationalised spaces particularly within the University campus. Surplus accommodation and new development opportunities arising should be coordinated to support the overall vision and objectives of the Innovation Arc. This could centre on alternative uses within EC Stoner to activate this building, making it the hub of the innovation neighbourhood. It is also anticipated that new building development opportunities will be identified through a masterplanning process. The current Masterplan (2015 – 2025) for the University’s main campus is nearing the end of its lifespan. The University will be preparing a new Masterplan in the near future. The new Masterplan will be prepared in the context of the Innovation Arc SPD. The council and the University will remain in close dialogue about the Masterplan. A review of the SPD may be necessary to ensure consistency between the University’s and the Council’s objectives for the Woodhouse Gateway”.</p>	Y	Document to be updated as necessary
--	--	--	---	-------------------------------------

		<p>The Woodhouse Gateway hinges on the future use / treatment of the EC Stoner building, the Physics Deck and the spaces around it within the South Campus area. The future use and plans for the EC Stoner building, Chancellor's Court, the Jerusalem Chapel and the wider South Campus area are key to delivering the objectives of the SPD in the 'Woodhouse Gateway'. The creation of a new City Park and play areas in particular, re-purposing of the Jerusalem Chapel and provision of new innovation space instead of the Physics Deck are key objectives of the SPD.</p> <p>It's important to note that, due to their scale and location, the EC Stoner building (c. 19,000sqm) and the Physics Deck (c.7,000sqm) are key buildings on Campus and will be key to the future of teaching, research and support services. In preparing the new Masterplan, the University will be carrying out detailed studies of some of the very large buildings, including E C Stoner and the Physics Deck. The University will need to look at these buildings in the context of the capacity within the campus to support teaching and learning, research and support services as well as innovation space. The scale of these buildings is such that they could not be used solely for innovation purposes.</p> <p>The University are concerned that the future uses envisaged by the SPD within the EC Stoner Building and the Physics Deck (or a redevelopment scheme in this area) are solely related to 'innovation'. The University support the principles of incorporating active frontages and generating activity to draw people through the campus in these buildings. However, due to the scale of these buildings, they must support all of the University activities including teaching, research and support services. The University consider that it is not appropriate to specify or include overly prescriptive detail on the future use of certain buildings such as EC Stoner at this stage. Therefore, it is requested that the text in Section in 6.1 (Woodhouse Gateway) is amended as follows (the bold text below is the requested amendment):</p> <p>"The EC Stoner Building is currently an important building for the provision of academic and support facilities for the campus. It may have has the potential to anchor the neighbourhood as a</p>	Y	Document to be updated as necessary
--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

			destination for heritage-led innovation, supported by Nexus and surrounding new and existing heritage / cultural buildings.”		
			<p>Linked to the above, in the ‘Core and Supporting Uses’ Section in 6.1, the following amendment is requested:</p> <p>“The Physics Deck is currently an important building for the provision of academic and support facilities on the University’s campus. It may have potential to become a New build innovation space or provide new academic, support facilities or other complementary uses such as residential accommodation for the campus to replace existing Physics Deck. This should be designed to incorporate active ground floor uses providing key frontage to Hillary Place and Vernon Road and would also help to improve the setting of the proposed National Poetry Centre”</p>	Y	Document to be updated as necessary

		It is noted that there is reference to the opportunity for the continued provision of sporting facilities on campus which can be used by the University community and the wider public. This is supported by the University. The health and wellbeing of their students, staff and neighbouring communities is of great importance to the University. The provision of sport and leisure facilities including open greenspace plays a key role in this. The SPD acknowledges the provision of greenspace throughout the campus some of which is designed in the Site Allocations Plan. The University's current focus is on investing in their off-campus sport and leisure facilities (Eg Weetwood and Bodington such as the Brownlee Centre, Cycle Track and the recently completed Football Hub	N	No response required. General comment.
		The University note the objective to create a new City Park with sport and play facilities in the South Campus area and including Central Village Residences off Woodhouse Lane. The ADP Masterplan identified the South Campus as the main development site left on the campus. Since then, the Central Village Residences have been acquired. The University is concerned that any proposal to deliver, for example, further student accommodation, educational or support facilities in the South Campus area or adjacent to Central Village Residences could be resisted on the basis of the SPD's objective to create a new City Park in this area. The University is concerned that their future Master-planning exercise and the identification of opportunities for 'live, work and play' will be undermined by the extent of the 'City Park' designation in the SPD's Overall Strategic Plan. It is requested that the label identifying the City Park in the Overall Strategic Plan is amended to insert '(the extent of the park will be subject to a future University Masterplan)'.	Y	The City Park is a priority objective in the draft SPD. Any proposals will be subject to detailed feasibility and design, and the document will be amended to make this clear on page 88.
		It is also requested that the 'Public Open Space' Section in 6.1 (Woodhouse Gateway) on P.88 is amended to include the following as the second bullet: 'The objective to create the new City Park will be balanced with the University of Leeds requirement for new facilities and accommodation within the South Campus area which will emerge from a future master-planning exercise'.	Y	The City Park is a priority objective in the draft SPD. Any proposals will be subject to detailed feasibility and design, and the document will be amended to make this clear.

			Finally, the University is very supportive of working, playing and living in the same area and supports the delivery of further types of residential accommodation within the Innovation Arc. It is noted that the provision of further student accommodation is not specifically referred to as an appropriate 'Core' or 'Supporting' use in the Woodhouse Gateway section. It is requested that the draft SPD is amended to specifically refer to the potential to provide additional student and other forms of residential accommodation within the Core and Supporting Uses Section under the Woodhouse Gateway.	n	The SPD can't allocate further residential sites and it is not the role or the objective of the SPD to identify residential uses. The Local Plan policies which the SPD derives from recognise the role of residential uses in the city centre, and that proposals for residential use are considered against these and other relevant development management policies. By including reference to residential use in the SPD will not give it any additional weight
20	Wilton	General	Wilton supports the extent of the SPD area as drafted, and particularly inclusion of Phoenix/Gallery House in recognition of the direct contribution that this building can make to achieving the vision and objectives of the SPD area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	The SPD's ambition to create a nationally important and internationally recognised economic engine, and the potential for innovative and entrepreneurial businesses to come together to create and commercialise new economic opportunities, and a place where employers want to locate and invest, is very much supported, and links to Wilton's aspirations for the redevelopment of Phoenix/Gallery House. It will be important to ensure that such ambition is supported by planning and investment decisions on the ground in order to give certainty to developers and investors that the SPD's aspiration can be delivered. As the SPD recognises, market forces will inevitably play an important role in facilitating future development and there is support for recognition of the role of the private sector within the SPD. Where appropriate there is a need to ensure that the SPD is sufficiently flexible to adapt to commercial requirements and specific development opportunities and constraints at the point at which they arise. Flexible application of the SPD will be the best way to facilitate growth and support innovation and change to	N	The Innovation Arc SPD will provide supplementary guidance to the Local Plan and development proposals will be considered within this context. The SPD will be used for development management purposes as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications which fall within the boundary area.

			<p>maximise regeneration effects throughout the SPD area. A greater recognition of this need for flexibility should be added to the document to avoid undermining and unintentionally stifling potential development opportunities.</p>		
		Page 14	<p>In particular, whilst the adaptation and re-use of existing building stock (as referred to at page 14) should be encouraged and supported where appropriate, there needs to be a recognition that this is not always the best approach in order to meet commercial requirements and maximise associated regeneration benefits, or even to deliver the most sustainable or carbon efficient building in the long term. This is sometimes better achieved through redevelopment and application of the most recent environmental technologies and building standards and efficiencies which retrofitting cannot always achieve, and which ultimately might contribute less to sustainability objectives and net zero carbon targets in the long term. Such recognition should be included within the next draft of the SPD.</p>	N	<p>Whilst the SPD will support the adaptation and reuse of existing building stock, it is acknowledged that in some instances this may not be appropriate and will be assessed as per the usual planning process.</p>
			<p>The potential for public realm improvements across the area is supported, which Wilton sees as key to harnessing the potential and regenerative benefits of the civic quarter alongside refurbishment of the Town Hall, and the repair and enhancement.</p>	N	<p>No response required. General comment.</p>

		General	<p>Wilton supports the establishment of strong principles within the SPD to provide consistency, which is important for investor confidence and ultimately the success of the SPD, as well as the need for the document to be adaptable and applied flexibly in order to most appropriately respond to, and capitalise on, the opportunities presented by the ever-changing scope and demands of the innovation industry.</p> <p>As set out above, whilst the conversion and retrofitting of existing buildings (as referred to on page 16) will be the most appropriate approach in some cases, this should not be at the expense of alternative approaches, including the redevelopment of sites and buildings, where this provides otherwise acceptable development in terms of sustainability and climate change and directly contributes to regeneration overall and other associated SPD objectives. It should also be recognised within the SPD that the wholesale redevelopment of sites and buildings can have beneficial effects over the long term when considering efficiency and selection of materials, future flexibility and longevity, and may therefore be preferable. It is requested that this be reflected in the next iteration of the SPD to provide certainty that alternative, but more appropriate or equally sustainable, approaches will be supported where these meet SPD objectives in order to maximise the potential for delivery of the SPD's aspirations.</p> <p>Wilton supports the recognition within the SPD of the importance of heritage-led innovation and its aspiration to reveal and celebrate its significant heritage and cultural assets through the development of the area to enhance existing character.</p>	N	Response as above
		General	<p>The spatial analysis undertaken within the SPD rightly identifies the contribution that the immediate surroundings of Gallery/Phoenix House make to the heritage, public realm, connectivity, culture and vibrancy and townscape character of this part of the SPD area, and the corresponding recognition of the potential opportunities within the immediate vicinity to support the opportunities for improvement to the quality and connectivity of spaces in the city, drawing upon unique characters and key destinations.</p> <p>Additional reference could be made to aspirations to significantly raise the design quality of buildings alongside the public realm in this area, as well as encouraging the use of other mechanisms such as the granting of café licenses to bring more animation and vitality</p>	N	No justification to focus design quality in this area only. Achieving this is reflected in existing planning policies and supporting guidance for all development. Consideration of uses eg cafes will be look at case by case in the planning application process. Granting of

			to this part of the city, which would help to strengthen and deliver the wider aims and objectives of the SPD.		'licences' is not part of planning.
		General	<p>In order to ensure that the SPD delivers against its objectives there will be a need for the SPD to be consistent with the rest of the adopted, and emerging, Local Plan.</p> <p>Wilton supports the commitment set out within the Local Plan, and the SPD itself, for proposals to place sustainability at the core of development, and to consider and mitigate as required matters of carbon dioxide reduction, sustainable design and construction, renewable energy, water efficiency, managing flood risk, minimising waste, biodiversity and the installation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points.</p> <p>The latest policy changes proposed to respond to the climate emergency as set out within the Local Plan Update Part 1 are currently subject to consultation, and it will be important that consultation responses made to these changes are considered and incorporated within the final draft SPD. In particular, it will be important to ensure that sustainability requirements and other environmental standards can be accommodated in line with available technology and building practices, and without undermining the viability of proposals coming forward which will otherwise undermine the regeneration effects that the Innovation Arc SPD is seeking to achieve.</p>	N	The draft SPD cannot include as-yet unadopted policies from Local Plan Update (1). As such, any policies that are adopted through LPU1 will need to be reflected through an update to the Innovation Arc SPD at the appropriate time

		General	<p>Wilton supports the aspiration to improve and rebalance the street hierarchy, and to create attractive walking and cycling routes as a network of pleasant and landscaped streets, and the commitment to delivering these improvements through Council implemented interventions coupled with off-site contributions to more substantial physical interventions where these can be justified relative to individual development proposals.</p> <p>Wilton particularly supports identification of The Headrow as a key East-West connection and a strategic walking and cycling route and a focus for high quality public realm, as well as the identification of Victoria Square as a key public space to be considered and enhanced by future developments. Implementation of a clear wayfinding strategy throughout the Innovation Arc is supported, which could be strengthened through the use of a cohesive and high-quality palette of materials for the public realm.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	<p>Wilton supports the retention and reinforcement of existing land uses where appropriate, and the delivery of appropriate town centre uses as defined by current planning policy, and for uses to promote, harness and celebrate innovation where appropriate.</p> <p>More explicit support could be given to the inclusion of active ground floor uses and activation of the street where appropriate through the introduction of food and beverage uses and other active frontages, as well as mechanisms such as the granting of café licenses to bring more animation and vitality to this part of the city centre, as well as requirements for new developments to achieve the highest standards of architectural and landscape design.</p>	N	Same point as above
		General	<p>As set out above, Phoenix/Gallery House has a direct relationship with adjacent heritage assets, as well as the City Centre Conservation Area. This presents a real opportunity to elevate design standards in this area, and to challenge the existing architecture to better reveal these assets through the quality of the design of surrounding buildings and public realm, and more explicit reference to this opportunity should be included within the SPD.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of Phoenix/Gallery House, rather than providing a pastiche design, will be designed sensitively and of sufficient quality to enhance the historic setting through sensitive use of complementary materials and the arrangement of the scale and massing in the context of the street frontage and surrounding buildings.</p>	N	Same point as above

			Wilton supports aspirations within the SPD to fully utilise and improve physical links to existing cultural and community assets to create vibrancy, which will tie in with and further contribute to its aims.		
		General	<p>Phoenix/Gallery House falls within the 'Great George Street' neighbourhood, where Wilton supports the vision to transform Great George Street into a vibrant and active east west connection and the improvement and increased accessibility of connecting routes.</p> <p>Phoenix/Gallery House is not specifically identified as a development opportunity on the Great George Street Strategic Plan, or the City Wide Strategy for Innovation plan. Wilton would welcome this addition in recognition that the building does not currently contribute positively to the aims or aspirations of the SPD, and its potential to directly contribute to these aims through provision of a building of much greater design quality and environmental performance as well as elevation of the quality of the public realm and animation of the street.</p>	Y	Phoenix House has been added to the overall SPD plan

21	West Yorkshire Combined Authority	<p>The SEF's Vision sets out our 'Boosting productivity' priority which will be achieved by helping businesses to grow and invest in the region and their workforce, to drive economic growth, increase innovation and create jobs.</p> <p>The proposed approach in the SPD, including a vision where 'cutting edge academic research and innovative, entrepreneurial businesses come together to create and commercialise new economic opportunities' is welcomed. The range of uses set out in the 'Core and Supporting Uses' section which will facilitate this vision, is also supported.</p> <p>We recognise and welcome the unique opportunity presented by the redevelopment of the Hospital Campus in the context of the Innovation Arc. The emphasis on health innovation within the overall innovation space provision has the potential to make a significant contribution to delivery of the regional Healthtech Strategy.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		<p>The SEF's Vision sets out our 'Enabling inclusive growth' priority which will be achieved by enabling as many people as possible to contribute to, and benefit from, economic growth in our communities, towns and cities.</p> <p>The focus upon inclusive growth throughout the SPD, including a reference within the 'Overarching Principles' section, is welcomed.</p> <p>With regard to the 'People and Culture' Section, it is welcomed that there is a recognition of the critical correlation between the success of the Innovation Arc and the extent to which it is inclusive and enhances relationships to nearby communities.</p> <p>With regard to employment and skills, the SPD would benefit from more explicit references to how academic anchor institutions will work to ensure workforce skills are met in a way that benefits all communities</p>	N	No response required. General comment.

		<p>The SEF's Vision sets out our 'Tackling the Climate Emergency' priority which will be achieved by growing our economy while cutting emissions, caring for and enhancing our environment.</p> <p>With regard to the 'Sustainable and Carbon Neutral Development' Section the following comments are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of this section is welcomed and supports the Leeds City Region's Clean Growth Action Plan (Sept 2019) and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and Delivery Plan (March 2018) • We welcome consideration on how transitioning to a low carbon economy can be 'just' by providing the opportunities and support for individuals to retrain in the skills necessary. • The SPD would benefit from consideration of how energy costs for premises can be reduced, considering the current cost-of-living and doing business crisis, including further detail on how efficiency measures and low carbon energy generation supports business development and job creation. 	N	Specific detail regarding how energy costs from premises can be reduced is outside the scope of the SPD.
		<p>The SEF's Vision sets out our 'Delivering 21st Century Transport' priority which will be achieved by creating efficient transport infrastructure to connect our communities, making it easier to get to work, do business and connect with each other.</p> <p>The West Yorkshire Transport Strategy 2040 aims to put in place the right transport conditions - building on the City Region's strengths and tackling underlying issues - meeting increasing demand for travel in a sustainable way while also realising the ambitions for inclusive growth contained in our SEF and district local plans.</p>	N	No response required. General comment.

		<p>With regard to the 'Movement and Connectivity' Section the following comments are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of guidance that reinforces the need to install electric vehicle charging points is welcomed. However, consideration should be given to the types of charging installed, so as not to inadvertently promote private car access, as well as the design of chargers to ensure provision is inclusive, easy to use and is not designed or installed in a way that could be detrimental to pedestrians, cyclists, or other road users. • We welcome the emphasis on walking and cycling in the SPD, rebalancing the street structure to establish a hierarchy of streets that create attractive walking and cycling routes. Focussing upon walking and cycling ensures that active travel will be the primary means of moving to/from the arc and within it (especially for the short distance trips e.g. hospital – university) . • It would be beneficial to also reflect on the benefits of improving modal integration within the area through this process, specifically strengthen the relationship between walking, cycling and bus access to increase accessible and support sustainable transport choices to further reduce car reliance and help us achieve our net zero carbon ambitions in West Yorkshire. • The SPD correctly identifies the inner ring road and the hospital campus as a barrier to those walking and cycling between the University Campus and the City Centre. This can be mitigated by focusing upon addressing key routes between the two (Willow Terrace Road, Calverley St, Clarendon Way and Woodhouse Lane). Potential changes to enhance these routes for active travel include removing parking from these routes, narrowing roads as far as possible (which will create a wider walking space), improved landscaping and the addition of cycle routes where possible. • The text on page 56: 'The movement and connectivity strategy promotes travel via other methods than the private car, which will be focused on the A58(M) Inner Ring Road.' would benefit from being strengthened by amending 'promotes' to 'prioritises'. • Referencing provision of the forthcoming Combined Authority funded Bike Share stations in Leeds to promote the ease of cycling, and the promotion and use of car clubs to minimise the need for private cars, would be welcomed. • The strategic walking and cycling routes identified on Page 58/59 	Y	<p>P56 text has been amended to read "prioritises" (now p105). Bike Share scheme not referenced due to lack of detail at present. Walking and cycling routes are shown elsewhere in the Document in the specific area plans.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

			is welcomed, however the Plan would benefit from showing the actual routes rather than the conceptual arrows.		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leeds Central Station: Consideration of the interface between active travel provision and other transport modes is welcomed. It is important to stress that Leeds Central Station should be identified as a key transport hub and gateway. The SPD would benefit from setting out the approach to accommodating space for interchange facilities near the station to support sustainable modes of transport including cycling, buses and mass transit. 	Y	Document to be amended to include street-level principles in key areas, including connections into Leeds Central Station.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass Transit: The Combined Authority welcome the support for West Yorkshire Mass Transit expressed in the Vision, supporting its future integration with rail and bus access locally, and the role of reduced travel times in attracting investment to the area. At page 61 of the SPD the text confirms that the details of Mass Transit routes through the City Centre are yet to be defined. This is correct; the Combined Authority are currently undertaking a detailed options appraisal process, reviewing various routes within the City Centre. This process will ultimately identify a preferred route option which is based on a robust assessment of appropriate evidence and stakeholder and public engagement. • Allowing for the status of the current design process for Mass Transit, as discussed with Leeds City Council Officers, the Combined Authority are concerned that an envisaged route as shown on the accompanying plan at page 61, and repeated on plans throughout the document, is premature. This route is clearly defined in the SPD and includes locations for stops, a level of detail suggesting a more advanced design process. Whilst the text confirms the route is envisioned, there remains potential for misinterpretation by readers of the document including the view that this route is fixed by the SPD. Therefore, the Combined Authority requests that this route is removed from the document and the accompanying text amended to remove reference to specific streets or locations for Mass Transit. By amending the SPD in this way, it would also ensure the policy approach in the SPD is consistent with the emerging Policy in the Local Plan Update. This is not to say that Mass Transit wouldn't be routed through the Innovation Arc area or that Mass Transit shouldn't be referenced within the document. Further, the Combined Authority remain supportive of the potential benefits Mass Transit can bring to the City Centre as a whole. 	Y	Mass Transit routes are removed from the SPD. However, in recognition of the ambition for this area to be served by high quality public transport connectivity, a network map of public transport priority routes is identified. To provide additional guidance, public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		The approach to urban design set out is welcomed, however the SPD would benefit from clarifying the level of standard that will be expected from new development by using the Place Standard, Healthy Streets or similar principles-based assessment tools.	n	It's not the role of the SPD to set out detailed design parameters or standards. Development proposals will be considered against the existing local plan policies and relevant supporting guidance.

			<p>With regard to the 'Public Open Space' Section the following comments are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of this section is welcomed and supports the Leeds City Region Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and Delivery Plan (March 2018) • Recognition of the health and wellbeing benefits that public open spaces provide is welcomed. • The capping of sections of the A58(M) Inner Ring Road is a welcomed innovative approach which will bring green space, block noise and pollution and improve connectivity. • With regard to the Hospital Campus development, maximising opportunities for greening of public spaces would be highly beneficial, such as where there are vertical blank walls, the area outside the Martin Wing, and Thoresby Place. People visiting the hospital, patients and those walking through the Hospital Campus would welcome small, landscaped areas in these spaces, some of which are in City Council ownership. 	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	<p>General points for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an opportunity to strengthen the wording throughout the Development Guidance section, such as amending the term 'should consider' to 'must' or 'strongly advise'. • Within section 4.2 Strategic Priorities under point (d) the reference to 'West Yorkshire Strategic Economic SPD' should be amended to 'West Yorkshire Strategic Economic Framework'. The SEF does not hold SPD status. • The Innovation Arc SPD area falls within the Leeds Core City Spatial Priority Area (SPA). SPA status identifies areas of regional significance, supports building cases (and prioritisation) for funding opportunities, and builds status and investor interest in key locations to support inclusive growth. Further details of SPAs can be found on the WYCA website. The SPD would benefit from making reference to SPA status and the strategic advantage this can bring. 	N	No response required. Opportunities for greening within the Great George Street Neighbourhood are acknowledged.

	Access Committee for Leeds	General	<p>It is appreciated that you may have already engaged with expert groups of disabled people. Including the AUAG (Access Use-Ability Group) and Disability Hub to inform strategic planning and policy to ensure the access, equality and participation of older and disabled people are fully considered and addressed within the major development.</p> <p>There are so many aspects of this plan that may directly impact on the lives, independence, participation, health and wellbeing of older and disabled people, I am sure you would agree that this major project should uphold the highest 21st Century Leeds standards for social inclusion and equality.</p>	y	<p>Following meeting with the Access Committee for Leeds consideration was given to the existing policy and guidance relating to improving accessibility in the city. Changes have been made to the SPD to reflect and positively reference the Accessible Leeds SPD which provides more detailed guidance on inclusive design and has relevance to this work. An EDCI screening has been completed for the Innovation Arc SPD prior to the second stage of consultation.</p>
22	Survey Response 1 Clarion Housing Group	Opportunities	<p>Top 3 opportunities:</p> <p>Spaces and facilities to support innovation</p> <p>New residential neighbourhoods</p> <p>Facilities and spaces for the community</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Careful consideration needs to be given to the provision of real affordable homes for individuals and families. The development framework needs to be supported by policies for developers to deliver energy efficient, sustainable homes of diverse tenure and which help build real communities across the city.	N	The SPD document is not intended to add to existing policy.
		Sustainability	<p>Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted</p> <p>There should be more nature and biodiversity</p> <p>Public transport should be improved</p>	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	<p>The greening of the city is of paramount importance along with the provision of safe walkable communities that promote alternative modes of travel to the car. In general the city needs to be better served by modern efficient transport that better connects the talent in the city to opportunity.</p>	Y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.

		Movement and Connectivity	More space and improved routes for pedestrians Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Improved public transport (bus/mass transit)	Y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		Public open space	what types of features would you like to see: Play equipment Space for performance and events Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	The city is abundant with great buildings and architecture. Sadly the journey and signposting to them has been poor. The proposals needs to support a better overall experience through the city.	N	The SPD suggests walking permeability around the city centre and within the boundary.
		Community business and innovators	The key issue is our ability as a city and region to connect talent to opportunity. the infrastructure around our city needs to be improved in line with our ambitions to reduce car use and create a more sustainable, energy efficient environment. We are making progress but there is a lot to do. Our ability to attract investment, recruit and retain the best talent from all over the world is reliant on us continuing to provide high quality public spaces and transport to create a world class environment.	Y	Public Transport priority street design principles will be added to the document to reflect this.
		Vision	The vision is ambitious and reflects the needs for us to create a space for the incredible talent that exists in the city already to stay and grow. Within the study area there are some incredible assets. The vision should ensure that those assets shine through and provide a backdrop to an ambitious future that blends old and new, celebrates our history and sets the scene for a creative, productive future for everyone.	Y	Vision statement to be reviewed to ensure readability, meaningfulness and inclusivity.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to engage: In person events Webinars	N	No response required. General comment.
23	Survey Response 2	Current Interests	I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity More leisure opportunities Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Housing is okay but needs to be affordable and also only if it's sustainable.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	There should be more trees and plants There should be more nature and biodiversity There should be more parks or green areas Public transport should be improved	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	I suppose it cuts across the motorway which we are going to have to ignore. However this could be covered over in a tunnel. The fumes from this are surely going to have a negative environmental impact, whether it's carbon or otherwise.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	When I visit the area I usually walk.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel: Improved connectivity around the river and canal Opening up areas that feel private or inaccessible Improved public transport (bus/mass transit)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	The south entrance to the station closes at 10pm which is kind of ridiculous, because you have to walk all the way round to the front. In doing so you go under the railway bridge through Neville Street and it's horribly congested and polluted and unsafe at night.	Y	There is a planning application to extend the opening hours of the station southern entrance
		Public open space	What types of features would you like to see: Trees Space for performance and events Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	They should be lit and welcoming at night. Woodhouse Moor is still not lit and is dangerous at night. People should be able to use these spaces in the evening, especially in winter. Encourage people to use green spaces at all times of the day.	N	Woodhouse Moor is not within the plan boundary

		Heritage	A lot of these buildings could have events in them, or they could be better funded and supported to hold more of them	N	No response required. Outside of the scope of this document
		Heritage	More jobs need to be created in these institutions because people are leaving to go elsewhere for creative and cultural jobs.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	You need to have a big ticket draw to this area. Just because there's an art gallery or a museum isn't good enough. It's like, what's on at the art gallery or museum? The fact it's there is one thing, but there must be more to it than that. You wouldn't go to "a gig", you might go to a particular concert by an artist. The same applies to this.	N	No response required. Outside of the scope of this document
		Community business and innovators	I feel like you can promise whatever you want over a long enough timeframe. The latest advances in technology sounds a bit wack. You want to be more specific. Would you hire someone with this on their CV? It's too vague. What are you actually doing? You know what I mean?	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	Well firstly an old technology is a light rapid transport system, which Leeds doesn't have, unlike most other cities of its size in Europe. That needs sorting out. Secondly if it is home to these things what things are they? Point them out.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to engage: Information on a website In person events Webinars Email	N	No response required. General comment.
24	Survey Response 3	Current Interests	I meet people & socialise there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc. I access medical treatment and care there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	New uses for heritage buildings	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Make access to the area easier for motorists!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted Other (please specify): Better road systems for motorists	N	No response required. General comment.

		Sustainability	Demolish the city centre and re build a better layout with wider roads, more parking and an underground rail network	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	How do you visit the area: Car (personal or private hire)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 improvements needed: Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Other (please specify): Better road system	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Trees Seating and picnic areas Water features	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Invest the the parks we already have and stop wasting public money on idiotic ideas	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Demolish old buildings that can't be modernised, centralise services into a new 'Hub'	N	No response required. General comment.
		General	A complete waste of public money dreamt up by idiots!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to engage: Information on website	N	No response required. General comment.
25	Survey Response 4	Current Interests	I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportuities: New uses for heritage buildings Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	It is widely documented that the problem is not in the number of housing units but in the lack of affordable housing. Most new housing is designed discretely of any access to local amenities like schools and GP practices, combined with very poor transport and accessibility. Housing in the centre of Leeds is not going to improve this condition: people do not necessarily work in the city centre, especially in Leeds where the city centre is rather small. A lot of work opportunities are actually in the outskirt business areas, resulting in journeys that involve depending on two buses at least across the city centre. Particularly acute is the excess of student	N	No response required. General comment.

			housing which is extortionately expensive and badly designed. You should do surveys that would reveal that students themselves do not want to live in them and have media networks set up to avoid moving in them.		
		Sustainability	Top 3 opportunities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	The priority should be on bus services that directly go East to West (and vice versa) and North to South (and vice versa) without having to 1) wait up to half an hour for a bus and 2) walk across the city centre to link up from one direction to the other.	Y	Document to be amended to include street-level principles in key areas. The Leeds Transport Strategy and Transport SPD are more relevant documents for the promotion of modal shift.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel: Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Features I would like to see: Trees Biodiversity and planting Other (please specify): Adequate street lighting for winter (which should include walking across Woodhouse Moor)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Focus on covering over some of the inner ring road to create acoustic and spatial sense of continuity	N	The SPD suggests changes and improvements to open public spaces.

		Heritage	Older buildings should systematically be repurposed and retrofitted rather than replaced. This is one of the most basic rule of sustainability, one that reduces the exploitation of natural resources and creates local jobs (including local jobs for builders specialised in repairing). There should not be a hierarchy of heritage and non heritage buildings. All should be protected, and the rampant building of unsustainable tower blocks should be stopped immediately.	Y	The SPD promotes sustainable development amplifying Policies EN1 and EN2. Specific focus is given in the document to refurbishment and retrofitting
		Heritage	Leeds has a vibrant performance arts life but lacks representation of still arts. The new space by the arena should be a cultural and arts venue, not a conference venue (there are plenty already).	N	This site sits outside of the Plan boundary
		Heritage	Cosmetic interventions will not mend what is broken. Your approach should be more systemic.	N	The document gives prominent focus to the regeneration of heritage buildings and sites and considers holistically the roles of these sites in the function and character of the city centre
		Community business and innovators	To me, innovation should be about employment, with less focus on the creative/banking/legal industries and more focus on nurturing and training a future workforce that is representative of Leeds as a whole and given a meaningful place in society. There are a lot of exclusions in certain types of employment, particularly in making, repairing, recycling, repurposing. These need to replace current socioeconomic models.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	The growth should be in respect in a workforce that can contribute to society outside hipster ideals (and without need for university qualifications), and giving it a place at the centre (of the city's socioeconomics) instead of getting tucked away in the margins of car dependent suburban outskirts.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	We don't need new technologies (especially as they are not actually sustainable), we need new business paradigms that focus on new business models (circular economies, recycling, repair, etc).	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to engage in future:Email	N	No response required. General comment.

26	Survey Response 5	Current Interests	I live there I work there I own a business there I access skills and training there I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: Spaces and facilities to support innovation New uses for heritage buildings Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Stop building huge towers as they are an economic sink hole and creates a harsh microclimate.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Sustainability priorities should be: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more trees and plants There should be more nature and biodiversity There should be more shaded places There should be more parks or green areas Rainwater and drainage should be managed through planting Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling Other (please specify): Reduce car use and pollution	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Congestion charge for through traffic. Too many cars use Headingley lane and this is forcing families out	N	The Leeds Transport Strategy and Transport SPD are more relevant documents for the promotion of this.

		Movement and Connectivity	How do you visit the area: Walking Bus Cycle	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Enhanced cycle routes and storage Other (please specify): Cutting car use!!!! (Why is that not here already!?)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Movement in Leeds is hampered by traffic from out of the area. As far as I can see these proposals do nothing to tackle car use through areas like Headingley. Why not? It's okay LCC focussing on creating such 'innovation areas' but residents have to put up with extreme through traffic and associated social and air quality issues of people getting to the city centre. Residents have a right to clean air in sustainable areas and this proposal does nothing to tackle the issues of car use on Headingley lane and Woodhouse Moor.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	What features would you like to see: Trees Grassed areas Water features Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Improve connections to Woodhouse Moor. Use Woodhouse Moor better and not just as a temporary car park for LCC events	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Respect their setting and stop new buildings causing harm. Try getting the planners to apply the legal framework and give them special regard.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Make the area more pleasant to live and access	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	You talk of addressing conflicts of movement but no details. Zero consideration it seems of cutting or reducing commuter car use or HGVs from using Headingley lane and Woodhouse Moor. You NEED to address this!!!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	Informal co-working spaces. No point coming to city centre (and braving the Headingley traffic on a bike) to work when we have better areas in our neighbourhoods.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: In person events Webinars	N	No response required. General comment.
28	Survey Response 6	Current Interests	I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc. I access medical treatment and care there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more trees and plants There should be more nature and biodiversity There should be more parks or green areas Rainwater and drainage should be managed through planting Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged Public transport should be improved Other (please specify): More access for disabled	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	How do you travel in the area: Car Private hire due to disability.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 things to improve travel experience: Opening up areas that feel private or inaccessible Other (please specify): Vehicle access and parking	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Why are you demonising the car?	N	The document promotes sustainable travel, but does not propose reducing vehicle access to the city centre or

		Public open space	Trees Grassed areas Play equipment Space for performance and events Biodiversity and planting Other (please specify): Measured walking paths	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Stop wasting money (even if they are on special offer) on outdoor gym equipment that is never used... Try marking out measured paths so people can start keeping fit by walking and seeing their fitness improve with no cost. NO ARTIFICIAL PITCHES destroying the environment.	N	The design of the green spaces identified in this document will be developed separately and appropriate consultation will take place.
		Heritage	Restore the lions and outside historical features from our past that we should be proud of.	N	The City Council is separately investing in the Town Hall
		Heritage	A circular tram line constantly running through the arc.	Y	Details of Leeds Mass Transit Routes through the City Centre are yet to be defined but this document sets out an envisaged route. As detailed plans for Mass Transit emerge, more detailed guidance may be developed to ensure that its potential benefits are maximised within the Innovation Arc.
		Community business and innovators	No more housing unless schools, doctors, dentists are also built within EASY walking distance.	Y	New development proposals will be tested through the planning process
		Future Engagement	Best way to future engage: Information on website	N	No response required. General comment.
29	Survey Response 7	Current Interests	meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there	N	No response required. General comment.

		Opportunities	Spaces and facilities to support innovation New uses for heritage buildings More leisure opportunities	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Almost all of the new housing is on Brownfield land so that is excellent and should be maximised. We need to think tall on such central brownfield sites where appropriate. We must also be mindful of architectural quality since the aesthetic of tall buildings can define a city's image. The innovation arc can share key infrastructure via heat networks and funding highest speed internet etc... It can also create jobs and encourage agglomeration of skills.	Y	Any new developments coming forward in the area will be assessed as part of the planning process, including massing and scale. The district heat network is also being separately progressed and the feasibility of expansion of this network will be reviewed.
		Sustainability	There should be more parks or green areas Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	The idea for a park over the Inner Ring road is superb... It should include a Cycle Superhighway along it's route too. Heat networks could be expanded.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Bus Car (personal or private hire)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Improved connectivity around the river and canal Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	More ways to cross the river, canal and under the railway are needed as they all form a natural barrier to connectivity.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Trees Grassed areas Sports pitches and equipment	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Superb to put one on top of the inner ring road. A better connection from Sovereign Square to the city centre core under the railway is needed	N	No response required. General comment.

		Heritage	Leeds was once ambitious enough to be awarded the home of the Royal Armouries, a truly Internationally important museum. Could Leeds push itself to the next league by attracting a British Museum North? Two internationally important museums in one city would make Leeds a destination on the tourist map and help foster innovation and culture for generations... Imagine a trio of British Library North, British Museum North and Royal Armouries	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	It's superb but must also link to the talent pipeline coming from the universities... Do they have the relevant courses and student numbers to provide future local staff? Are Leeds schools also prepping students for those courses?	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on website Email	N	No response required. General comment.
30	Survey Response 8	Current Interests	I own land or am a property developer there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity Spaces and facilities to support innovation More leisure opportunities Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	How do we find out about these homes and when can individuals purchase before corporates quickly buy everything?	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	There should be more trees and plants There should be more nature and biodiversity There should be more parks or green areas Rainwater and drainage should be managed through planting Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Leeds is the capital of Yorkshire and we should act that way. Big screens like the Picadilly lights at key points of the development powered by renewable energy would not only shine bright on Leeds with the mini metropolis feeling but also bring in investment and funds for other uses.	N	This is outside the scope of this document

		Movement and Connectivity	I usually travel by car when visitng the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 things to improve travel experience: Improved connectivity around the river and canal Other (please specify): A route for cars to pass through the city.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	For residents like myself living in Alwoodley, the thought of not being able to visit town and park my car nearby is disappointing. Shopping is difficult right now because of the way the city has shaped to push cars further out but like myself; If I need to drop my wife off at the university and with difficult traffic system already this can be a tedious and time wasting effort. Not everyone is able to scooter or cycle to town, we should have some way to manoeuvre through town and the areas in development without having to loop all the way around the city and get caught up in traffic that we could avoid.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	What features would you like to see: Trees Art and sculptures Seating and picnic areas Water features Biodiversity and planting Other (please specify): Rooftop beehives, wheelchair access and variety but without creating pockets of darkness where yobs hang out.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	These areas are full of students and the crime rate is significantly higher than other areas in Leeds. Security is important lighting and accessibility for emergency vehicles. Theres also the problem of having large groups of people or gangs in pockets of public places that can be avoided or displaced by the design of the landscape.	N	The design of new public spaces will be progressed separately and subject to feasibility
		Heritage	Recognition of important people from around the world, murals of important figures that have changed the face of our planet and of course Leeds!	N	Arts and culture are promoted in this document, including the potential for public art to animate spaces.

		Heritage	The future is what we should be focusing on as a collective. As alumni from Leeds Arts University I hope to see technology and that's not just in the form of large Piccadilly lights advertising media but more innovation and community focused projects. I'd like to see colour, ambient lighting, signposts with different languages, the little things matter the most. Priority for wheelchair users, accessibility, good messages and most importantly entertainment without the drink and drugs!	N	Arts and culture are promoted in this document, including the potential for public art to animate spaces.
		Community business and innovators	Traffic is a huge problem. We still need to drive through town, parking is a huge problem with taxis stopping anywhere and everywhere. London has cleared this up with cctv flagging anyone parking on double yellows. Allow the flow of traffic so that working people can still swiftly move through the city safely and in a timely manner.	Y	Document to be amended to include street-level principles in key areas. The Leeds Transport Strategy and Transport SPD are more relevant documents for the promotion of modal shift.
		Community business and innovators	Yes but provide local people with opportunities. Allow for individuals to purchase property without selling them off to a large buyer.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events	N	No response required. General comment.
31	Survey Response 9	Current Interests	I work there I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there I access medical treatment and care there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity Spaces and facilities to support innovation More leisure opportunities	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Need to ensure that some of it really is affordable so that it doesn't become an exclusive enclave for the wealthy. Similarly, none of it should be gated.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: There should be more nature and biodiversity Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Need car free development and significantly improve public transport, walking and cycling options. Should encourage (mandate?) zero emission deliveries and servicing. Need to get away from burning fossil fuels to heat buildings.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	How do you normally visit the area: Walking Cycling Bus	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	More space and improved routes for pedestrians Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Stop throughtraffic in the area (access only). Get building all the planned walking and cycling connections. Don't back down on City Square closure!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Top 3 priorities: Grassed areas Play equipment Sports pitches and equipment Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	The overall quality needs to be improved. Need things for people to see and so nice planting and biodiversity, plus outdoor gym equipment and sports facilities.	N	These proposals are made in the Public Open Space section of the Plan p64-67
		Heritage	Lots of events to go to. Well lit / make them a feature. Keep them affordable to access.	N	This sits outside of the scope of this document
		Heritage	Car free Sundays, tied in with lots of events taking place to open up the city centre to people walking and cycling in safety and enjoying themselves.	N	This sits outside of the scope of this document

		Community business and innovators	I'd like to see something about placemaking, notably reducing the dominance of traffic to unlock its potential as a sustainable and inclusive location.	N	Through the Principles and Development Guidance in the document there are proposals to significantly enhance the sustainability of the area and the pedestrian experience. This includes new green spaces and public realm and the activation of spaces through arts and culture
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events Email	N	No response required. General comment.
32	Survey Response 10	Current Interests	I study there I meet people & socialise there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity Spaces and facilities to support innovation Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	I think the 3000 new homes will be positive for supporting city centre activity and supporting the housings needs of Leeds too. However, I find this area of the city, to be less commercially active as well as not featuring as many leisure spots as other parts of the city centre, so with more housing I think these other factors need to be brought alongside to allow it to thrive. From being such a student heavy area within the northern boundary, a part of the housing could be designated to students to support living needs there. Also, making more of the housing accessible from a disabilities perspective, especially with the hospital in the central location of the boundary.	N	Any new developments coming forward in the area will be assessed as part of the planning process, including massing and scale and access/demand to community facilities.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: There should be more parks or green areas Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged Public transport should be improved	N	No response required. General comment.

		Sustainability	Definitely deliver the proposed new city parks and promote more pedestrian areas through this part of the city. Ensure all the buildings in this area source their electricity from carbon free sources.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 things to improve travel experience: Improved connectivity around the river and canal Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	A mass transit line that runs through this area from north to south would be great for quickly connecting the north to south of innovation area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Top 3 priorities: Trees Art and sculptures Seating and picnic areas	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	The Wellington Place area could benefit from an open green space too and not just the central north part of the boundary.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Multipurpose to support all aspects of a place. So, living uses, commercial uses etc. Also using them as identification points for the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	events at these spaces to bring community together	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	Building that look interesting and unique and reflect such innovation and thought. More design elements then just special bricks and different window designs.	N	The SPD can not enforce design.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events Email	N	No response required. General comment.

34	Survey Response 11	Current Interests	I meet people & socialise there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity New uses for heritage buildings Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Ensure the homes are affordable and for ordinary, local people not investors/landlords or the wealthy. Nice looking social housing that is not cramped together, with plenty of green space and houses that are affordable and aimed at first time buyers only! Houses that are eco friendly too with solar panels etc	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more nature and biodiversity Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Retro fit existing houses. Turn scruffy back streets into traffic free, garden/allotment/community spaces with plants, trees and safe spaces for children to play.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually drive when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	More space and improved routes for pedestrians Improved connectivity around the river and canal Improving safety and making the area more welcoming Improved public transport (bus/mass transit)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Kirkstall Road and the main roads off of the gyrator at Armley are fume filled, busy and make the area in the west seem disconnected. There is very little green space just buildings and roads. Safe bridges and walkways to connect the areas and avoid having to stand at crossings would be great	N	No response required. General comment.

		Public open space	Top 3 priorities: Art and sculptures Sports pitches and equipment Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Look to the city parks in Nice and Barcelona. People travel from all over the world to go there. They are places where all generations can meet and feel safe regardless of the time of day. There is equipment for children, art and seating for people to meet up. There are events that unite everyone. There are areas for teenagers to play sports and keep out of trouble.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Have grassed areas around them where people can sit and enjoy the architecture. Have them open later like in Europe where museums and galleries open on an evening and families and all generations are encouraged to go there rather than sitting in a pub! Have coffee shops and events that open in the evening. Ensure they are free and accessible!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Ensure it is accessible and affordable for all! If you are a Leeds resident, events should be free or subsidised. Encourage schools to have trips there. Make them non pretentious with affordable cafes to encourage families from areas of deprivation to visit.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	The gardens next to the Hepworth are fantastic. The old industrial buildings have been repurposed and the gardens are biodiverse, calming and well maintained. It's an area that used to be scruffy and full of concrete and felt a bit lonely. The recent light installation and Christmas fayre were a triumph....families with children running around, older people sat chatting and the cafe, gallery and market open until into the evening.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	I work for a charity that provides art, music and media lessons for adults with learning disabilities and adults that live in areas of high deprivation. We have to pay a high amount of rent to hire a small office in Beeston. Accessible and affordable office space for arts/community based companies/charities would be welcomed where we can collaborate and have access to some of these new spaces.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on website Email In person events	N	No response required. General comment.
35	Survey Response 12	Current Interests	I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity New uses for heritage buildings New residential neighbourhoods	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more parks or green areas There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Improving safety and making the area more welcoming Improved public transport (bus/mass transit)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Art and sculptures Seating and picnic areas Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	Best way to future engage: Information on website	N	No response required. General comment.
36	Survey Response 13	Current Interests	I live there I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there	N	No response required. General comment.

		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity New residential neighbourhoods More leisure opportunities	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	I feel that more housing within and around the city centre would help the area feel more "alive". I live within the arc and at the moment, at evenings and weekends once offices have shut the area becomes very quiet with many cafes only opening during the working week. More people living around the area would hopefully convince more amenities to remain open. It would be nice to have a mixture of middle and high density mixed used development within the area such as tenement style complexes alongside the many planned high rise buildings.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 opportunities: There should be more trees and plants Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	The city really needs to think about how the existing and new cycle lanes link up. There are many sections of the routes that just make no sense at the moment and are actively dangerous to cycle on (one example being at the corner of queen street and wellington street where it is impossible to turn right safely and legally from the cycle lane!). Buses are frequently delayed by car traffic in the city, greater bus prioritisation would help to make buses a more desirable mode.	Y	Document to be amended to include street-level principles in key areas. The Leeds Transport Strategy and Transport SPD are more relevant documents for the promotion of modal shift.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Improving safety and making the area more welcoming Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.

		Movement and Connectivity	It can frequently be alarming to travel on foot through these areas. Leeds seems to have a high proportion of traffic lights that do not have pedestrian signals meaning you have to guess if a car is about to start accelerating towards you (Which they often do with little sympathy). more pelican, toucan, and zebra crossings would certainly help along with hard infrastructure such as continuous pavements and traffic calming measures to slow the flow of traffic. Pavements are often cluttered with vehicles and bins forcing pedestrians onto the road. Pavement parking is illegal in Greater London, I believe this is something that should also be implemented in Leeds. Cars already get the vast majority of highway space, and motorists seem to have no issue dumping their personal property on the pavement or cycle paths blocking everyone else.	N	No response required. Outside of the scope of this document
		Public open space	What features would you like to see: Trees Grassed areas Space for performance and events	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	New green space is always welcome. People usually find a use for it regardless of what is there. Perhaps having areas of open grass which could be used for a variety of activities (cricket, football, frisbee, picnics etc) would be ideal rather than defined pitches.	Y	The City Park is a priority objective in the draft SPD. Any proposals will be subject to detailed feasibility and design, and the document will be amended to make this clear.
		Heritage	I think Leeds does a good job of highlighting the historic buildings. Setting them in landscaped areas may help to highlight these buildings.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Improved transport to the area may help to draw additional artists and visitors to the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Traffic free walking and cycling routes can really improve the feel of an area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	There is no need to overcomplicate things. Good infrastructure and streetscaping is a solved problem. Don't try to force technology into a situation where it isn't needed. Lets just get the basics right.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events Email	N	No response required. General comment.
37	Survey Response 14	Current Interests	Live nearby	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity New residential neighbourhoods More leisure opportunities	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Very heavy university / student presence how will this work with new resi? Will it all become student accommodation? Will nonstudents want to live in an area currently so dominated by students?	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more parks or green areas Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Some great architecture around there already use heritage buildings. More green space, Leeds lacks parks that feel inclusive and accessible. I attend Woodhouse Moor Park Run but I'd never visit the part for another reason. Homes need to stand out / create new communities / be attractive to multiple audiences.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually travel by bus and car.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Opening up areas that feel private or inaccessible	N	No response required. General comment.

		Movement and Connectivity	Area around university feels inaccessible to those who aren't students. Signage across Leeds is poor, people never know which lane to be in. Never known a city where people get so lost! Increase in pedestrianised streets beyond shopping streets Stevenson Square Manchester for example.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	What features do you want to see: trees grassed areas water features	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Green spaces are needed. Much of these, out of city centre, proposed areas are quite deprived. Creating the green space is easy, people feeling comfortable to use it is much harder. Having previously lived in Meanwood, I wouldn't use Woodhouse Ridge or Sugarwell as a female alone.	Y	The Document refers to the Our Spaces Strategy which takes a People First design approach, including the promotion of safe and inclusive spaces. These principles are amplified through the principles for public realm in this document.
		Heritage	Repurposed require private sector intervention. Can't all be community spaces hotels? bars / restaurants? Would love to see something like Makie Mayor (MCR) or Altrincham Market. Like assembly underground but bigger and more family inclusive.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Making culture accessible culture doesn't need to mean museums which might not be for everyone. People can take in culture in all ways. Year of Culture 2023 is wonderful, but as a Leeds resident, I do feel its very arts based and for someone who isn't overly arty I'm yet to see where I can engage.	Y	The development guidance includes a principle to create opportunities to promote diverse culture that is welcoming to all, and to engage fully with and involve communities in new developments and events to encourage active participation. These principles will be

					incorporated into future plans and activities
		Heritage	Can the uni lead investment in its surrounding area leaving the LA to support other areas?	N	The University of Leeds are set to develop a new masterplan for their estate which will provide an opportunity to consider existing buildings, planned developments and the surrounding city and communities.
38	Survey Response 15	Current Interests	I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit green spaces and public spaces there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New residential neighbourhoods Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Build mixed tenure and multigenerational affordable accommodation; more variety than straight up/down tower blocks. Include roof terraces. Create a site or conversion opportunity for Pride of Place Leeds.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged Public transport should be improved	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually use the bus or walk when visiting the area	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top ways to improve travel experience: Improved public transport	N	No response required. General comment.

		Public open space	Top 3 features: Seating and picnic areas Space for performance and events Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	Leeds lacks an LGBTQ+ Centre.	N	For Leeds Innovation Arc to be truly successful it must be inclusive to all. While this Document does not allocate specific sites for specific uses, the principle of inclusivity is amplified through the document and will provide guidance to future development and plans that come forward in the Innovation Arc.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on website Email	N	No response required. General comment.
39	Survey Response 16	Current Interests	I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New uses for heritage buildings New residential neighbourhoods Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	LGBTQ+ housing	N	This document does not allocate sites, which is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy and based on a robust evidence

					base. However, this document does amplify a principle of inclusivity, and this will provide guidance to future development and proposals that may come forward within the area.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually travel by car into the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top things to improve travel experience: Enhanced cycle routes and storage.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Top 3 priorities: Trees Grassed areas Seating and picnic areas	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	LGBTQ+ housing	N	This document does not allocate sites, which is done through the Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy and based on a robust evidence base. However, this document does amplify a principle of inclusivity, and this will provide guidance to

					future development and proposals that may come forward within the area.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events Webinars	N	No response required. General comment.
40	Survey Response 17	Current Interests	I work there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: Spaces and facilities to support innovation New uses for heritage buildings Facilities and spaces for the community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more nature and biodiversity Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling Other (please specify): All of the above!	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	How do you usually travel into the area: Walking Car (personal or private hire) Other (please specify): Train or park and ride (Temple Green) then walking to UoL	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Best ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Top 3 features: Trees Play equipment Biodiversity and planning	N	No response required. General comment.

		Public open space	Would be great to connect a green walking (& cycling) route up from the Train Station	N	"Station to innovation" is a key move set out in this document which will include enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes along this corridor. Green streets is also promoted in this document. The detail of any proposals to enhance this route will be subject to feasibility work.
		Heritage	Helping to encourage all to feel like they are open and welcoming	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	Accessible (welcoming, available, no/low cost) spaces they bring people together. A Nexus with a public angle would be great.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	You could include something about the built and natural environment acting as inspiration. It's very broad, but that makes it hard to distil and understand, there is something about a unifying purpose or goal. I work in innovation, so feel comfortable with the wording, but this needs testing with public representation what do we mean here?	N	The Vision set out in the document has been amended to make it easier to read and more accessible to the general public.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on website In person events	N	No response required. General comment.
41	Survey Response 18	Current Interests	visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there Other (please specify): I am Chair of Little Woodhouse Community Association (LWCA) and the Arc includes some of our area. I am also Chair of Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum, and again, the Arc includes some of the Neighbourhood Ploan area (Clarendon Road and the residential area to the east of that)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity New uses for heritage buildings New residential neighbourhoods	N	No response required. General comment.

		Opportunities	<p>I have read the complete SPD on the website, not just the abridged versions. Page 8 includes the phrases 'Where the best talent wants to live', 'Directly Benefits Residents of Leeds', 'An increase in new homes' but nowhere could I find any detail of where and how these new homes might be provided. I think this is a really good idea, (the innovation arc) but the SPD doesn't have any detail about this ambition for 3,000 new homes. It would be good to have some sort of confirmation that these 3,000 home don't include an overwhelming majority of student accommodation although I'm aware that the Core Strategy doesn't distinguish between student accommodation and residential. Clarendon Quarter on St John's Road (LS3) provides 'key worker accommodation' where the rent is set at 80% of the commercial rent for the area and there is a cap on income to live there. It would be good if the 3,000 new homes could include elements such as this given that the LGI is within the Arc and we are aware of the pay levels of some NHS staff. Family homes would also be a great idea, but that near to the city centre I don't hold out much hope for that.</p>	y	<p>The quantum of homes referenced in the SPD is the number of units across allocated sites or sites that are either subject to an extant planning consent or planning application. The SPD does not allocate sites which is done through the Site Allocations Plan. While the SPD does not specify the typology or market of housing permitted in the area, the document does amplify a principle of liveability, and does promote affordable housing, a mix of tenures, sizes and types of dwelling to ensure a diverse neighbourhood. This amplifies Core Strategy SP3, which promotes expanding city living with a broader housing mix (including family housing).</p>
		Sustainability	<p>Top 3 priorities Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more parks or green areas Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged</p>	N	<p>No response required. General comment.</p>

		Sustainability	<p>I note that 'Public Transport' is one of the boxes to tick, but this is really outside the remit of a SPD and is dependent on Tracey Brabin as West Yorkshire Mayor taking back control of buses. I note the two proposed pocket parks and am particularly interested in the one to the west of Great George Street as our Developing Neighbourhood Plan is looking t that area with a view to joining up some of the green spaces currently occupied by the Clarendon Wing, so pushing at an open door there. Retrofitting of existing buildings is key to this issue, any new build in this area will inevitably be high rise (because of the land values near the city centre) and high rise can ONLY be constructed using steel reinforced concrete, which is not carbon friendly. There is currently a cycle path over the pedestrian bridge adjacent to St George's church (west end of Great George Street) but it then disappears once it's to the west of the A58 and goes into an area where it is not clear who has priority (Pedestrians, cyclists or cars) and cars, being bigger, usually win.</p>	y	<p>The revised SPD includes an Innovation Arc strategic route along Great George St and across the A58, then extending to the north up Clarendon Rd, and to the south on Hanover Way. In addition, a public transport priority route is shown along Park Lane and Burley St, extending into Little Woodhouse. The 'strategic route' prioritises walking and cycling and sets an ambition for enhancements to these connections, while the public transport priority route prioritises public transport connectivity. Public realm enhancements and pedestrian prioritisation is shown between Woodhouse Square and the city centre along Great George St</p>
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	<p>Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Opening up areas that feel private or inaccessible Other (please specify): Look at pedestrian bridge near St George's Church as, visually' it is a 'barrier' although it is also a very busy pedestrian link in to the City Centre</p>	y	See response above noting changes addressing this comment.

		Movement and Connectivity	Leeds University Campus is 'permeable', but unless one is confident about walking through an overwhelming student area, it 'feels' like there are barriers. Partly this is due to the entrances onto the campus (especially the Parkinson Building entrance) which would not encourage nonstudents to walk through. The Clarendon Road entrance is better, but no signposts to city centre (for example) you have to know where you are going. Leeds Beckett Campus is even less permeable in that you can actually walk through from the LGI end to Woodhouse Lane, but it is not immediately obvious this is the case and one ends up walking up stairs hoping there will be an exit at the top. The LGI is completely impermeable to through pedestrian traffic and just acts as a 'block'. The 'Innovation Arc' has a plan for a pocket park around the pedestrian bridge near St George's Church (West end of Great George Street) but the humpbacked nature of this bridge makes it a visual barrier. Both Eastwest and NorthSouth would benefit from improved pedestrian and cycle routes.	y	Pedestrian permeability is shown across all the sites mentioned. These will be subject to development/re-development plans coming forward to enable these routes to be delivered.
		Public open space	Top 3 priorities: Trees Grassed areas	N	No response required. General comment.

		Public open space	I was tempted to include 'seating and picnic' areas, but these can attract antisocial behaviour (which is quite sad). Sight lines are very important in 'opening up' spaces if you can see where you are going and where a route will connect to, you are more likely to then use it rather than sticking to established routes. My organisations (LWCA and LWNPF) are particularly interested in the proposed pocket park at the west end of Great George Street, but recognise that whilst the Clarendon Wing is still there, unlikely to be progressed. Green spaces are even more useful if they can be connected to Green Corridors, so the Innovation Arc needs to seek to actively connect these beyond the arc boundary as your map seems to suggest. The Rosebank PARK is actually the Rosebank Millennium Green. St George's Field is a large area of green open space which is virtually impossible to access if one doesn't know it's there, it has few entrances/exits and these are unusually well hidden it could almost be deliberate. It's almost a 'lost' green space. A 'lost' entrance into Leeds University and the LGI is Little Woodhouse Street) the continuation of Kendal Lane across Clarendon Road. This could be the site of a third 'pocket park' as it is clearly an historical gateway that currently goes nowhere and is used for unofficial car parking.	y	St George's Field is identified in the Document as a hidden green space, and proposals for enhanced pedestrian routes in the Document seek to link this green space to wider existing green spaces and proposed new green spaces including the parks across the A58. Proposed new green spaces are subject to more detailed feasibility analysis and design, but could act to stitch together a network of green spaces across the area and beyond.
		Heritage	It is interesting to not what HAS been included and what has NOT. Notable omission include the Swarthmore Adult Education Centre on Woodhouse Square (south side) and the City College Park Lane site. Also, in terms of 'heritage' the area to the west of Great George Street (over the pedestrian bridge, is actually called 'Little Woodhouse' and NOT Burley/Woodsley. The original 'Little Woodhouse' is underneath the Clarendon wing of the LGI. Page 60 has a picture of the Jerusalem Chapel but the photograph is actually St George's. The Gilbert Scott building on Great George Street is particularly exciting, especially if the onsite car parking could be removed and replaced with green landscaping. You've probably worked out by now that I am particularly interested in the Great George Street axis and the area between that and Clarendon Road as that is the part of the 'Arc' that overlaps with the LWCA and LWNPF area.	y	The Park Lane campus is identified in the revised SPD. Little Woodhouse has been identified on plans. The erroneous caption on p118/119 (now 130/131) is noted but has not been amended on the basis this is an earlier piece of analysis informing the SPD.

		Heritage	It would be good to think that creativity and culture did not stop at the border of the Arc but extended beyond. To that end it would be interesting to see if the Primary Schools which are just outside of the area, Rosebank, Blenheim and Little London could be 'connected' somehow (not geographically) perhaps by encouraging unofficial/informal partnerships with the educational establishments of the Arts University, Leeds University and Leeds Beckett. The Innovation Arc needs to be inclusive rather than exclusive.	N	The Leeds Innovation Prospectus may be a more appropriate document for these non-spatial matters.
		Heritage	Leeds University grew up as part of the original Yorkshire College and from there expanded into residential streets which it either demolished or took over. It then expanded into the old Boys Grammar School site. I wouldn't like to think that the delineation of the Innovation arc gave the University carte blanche to continue expanding into (for example) Hyde Terrace, Hyde Place, Springfield Mount and Hyde Street. It hasn't got a good record as far as St George's Field goes, so this must be seen as an equal partnership with all stakeholders, including long term residents. The full SPD mentions 'Levelling up' (page 14 3.1) but I suspect that will be dead in the water by the time this SPD is promulgated. The section about Public Transport on page 62 is rather disingenuous, it talks about the good public transport links without noting that NONE of them go either North South or West East through the site, are only routed along the main roads (ie no bus services go into the estates) there is a picture of a bus on Clarendon Road (we wish !) and many of the bus stops noted on the plan have NO BUS SERVICE. It would be good to be aware of the actual bus network in the area (the No 5 bus route is the only one that penetrates into the LWCA area, all the others skirt it) and update this section to reflect the reality that resident face.	y	The role of public transport as key to connectivity has been further amplified in the revised SPD through an additional section on public transport priority routes.
		Community business and innovators	Not applicable, but we note there is a cluster of 'media' related industry (focussed on the remnants of Yorkshire ITV and Emmerdale) along Kirkstall Road to the West of the Innovation Arc area. We are	N	No response required. General comment.

			(still) interested in what uses might be made of the Gilbert Scott building on Great George Street.		
		Community business and innovators	<p>Overall very positive about the Innovation arc as long as it is INCLUSIVE and not Exclusive (ie the boundaries of the geographical area should be fluid rather than 'hard'. Particularly pleased to support the restoration and reuse element of the plan and the two proposed parks. Top focus on the 3,000 new homes, but as noted before, there is a singular lack of detail about this, unless it is just taken from the existing SAP ?</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE, ALTHOUGH I AM SUBMITTING THIS ON BEHALF OF LITTLE WOODHOUSE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION AND LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, IT IS PROBABLE THAT OTHER MEMBERS MAY ALSO SUBMIT RESPONSES AS WELL WHICH SHOULD BE GIVEN EQUAL WEIGHTING WITH THIS SUBMISSION</p>	N	The quantum of homes referenced in the SPD is the number of units across allocated sites or sites that are either subject to an extant planning consent or planning application. The SPD does not allocate sites which is done through the Site Allocations Plan. While the SPD does not specify the typology or market of housing permitted in the area, the document does amplify a principle of liveability, and does promote affordable housing, a mix of tenures, sizes and types of dwelling to ensure a diverse neighbourhood. This amplifies Core Strategy SP3, which promotes expanding city living with a broader housing mix (including family housing).
		Community business and innovators	if the area had retail opportunities including coffee shops, bars and restaurants, this might encourage mingling, cooperation and the transfer of ideas between neighbouring innovative businesses	N	No response required. General comment.
		Future Engagement	<p>Best ways to future engage:</p> <p>In person events</p> <p>Webinars</p> <p>Email</p>	N	No response required. General comment.

42	Survey Response 19 Mott Macdonald	Current Interests	I work there I meet people & socialise there I visit or take part in arts and cultural activities there I visit shops, cafes and restaurants there I visit green spaces and public spaces there I travel through there to reach other areas, like Little London, Hyde Park, Burley, Holbeck or Kirkstall etc. I access medical treatment and care there	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: New activity in public spaces, such as popup food and drink or cultural activity Spaces and facilities to support innovation New uses for heritage buildings	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Housing and residential provides the opportunity to bring demand and footfall to the city. We would like to see more housing that reflects the whole Leeds community	N	No response required. General comment.
		Sustainability	Top priorities: Existing buildings should be reused and retrofitted There should be more trees and plants There should be more nature and biodiversity There should be more shaded places There should be more parks or green areas Rainwater and drainage should be managed through planting Green roofs, green walls, solar panels and urban allotments should be encouraged Public transport should be improved There should be more or better space for walking and cycling	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	How do you usually travel in the area: Walking Car	N	No response required. General comment.

		Movement and Connectivity	Ways to improve travel experience: More space and improved routes for pedestrians Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Improved connectivity around the river and canal Opening up areas that feel private or inaccessible Improving safety and making the area more welcoming Improved public transport (bus/mass transit) Enhanced cycle routes and storage	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	Top priorities: Trees Grassed areas Art and sculptures Play equipment Seating and picnic areas Space for performance and events Water features food and beverage Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	We would like to see heritage buildings brought into use, activated and used appropriately for the people of Leeds. Public space should enhance buildings and engage visitors with the whole surrounding making it easy to move around on foot and on wheels	N	Heritage restoration and re-use is a key priority set out in the SPD and forms a number of key moves across the three neighbourhood areas.
		Heritage	Creativity and culture should be encouraged and supported to flourish as a way of engaging and inspiring residents and visitors	N	No response required. General comment.
		Community business and innovators	We are a business with an office and 285 staff working, and many living, in the Arc area. The Wellington Place development is excellent and has brought a real sense of place to this end of the city. It would be good to see the entire area delivering more green space, more use of the riverside and possibly more space for collaboration and coworking that is less formal but more of a professional location than bars and restaurants. It would be good to see the agglomeration effect of having all levels of govt, business and educators close by and working together. We have the opportunity to deliver real innovation in placemaking across the	y	Proposals for more green space are outlined in the draft SPD.

			area and it would be great for residents to contribute to that effort, either professionally or as brilliant neighbours.		
		Community business and innovators	<p>fully support the vision for the Innovation Arc, but in fact we would like to see even more bold aspiration to drive this area as a hotbed for innovation and brilliance. We suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Neighbourhoods should have the amenities they need to flourish as communities for residents, workers and people visiting or passing through ● Connections need to unlock access to amenity and remove psychological and physical barriers ● Use this opportunity to link walking and cycling provision smoothly ● Design at the human level with safe, attractive, and legible spaces ● Consider flood mitigation, employ drainage methods wherever design happens to ensure the land acts as a sponge not a funnel ● New parks and public spaces need to be inclusive, safe and sustainable – the right planting and species, the right lighting, the right facilities for the right place ● It is possible to do urban design well around difficult spaces and complex existing assets, services and utilities what a fantastic innovation challenge 	y	The suggestions put forward echo many of the proposals outlined in the draft SPD, including improved permeability, enhanced pedestrian and cycling routes, new and enhanced public realm and green spaces, and the neighbourhood approach to the principles and ambitions put forward in the SPD

		Community business and innovators	This is a golden opportunity to introduce methods and tools that will drive Leeds towards its goals of net zero, and of solving the productivity problems. Low carbon buildings, SuDS driven green space and the use of digital tools to manage assets e.g. Mott MacDonald's Moata are all opportunities here.	N	The proposals put forward in the SPD will be subject to more detailed feasibility analysis and design.
		Future Engagement	Best ways to engage in the future: Information on a website In person events Webinars Email	N	No response required. General comment.
43	Survey Response 20 Luminate Education	Current Interests	I work there I own a business there I own land or am a property developer there I study there I access skills and training there Other (please specify): Luminate Education Group provides Further and Higher Education to students across Leeds and beyond.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Top 3 opportunities: Spaces and facilities to support innovation New residential neighbourhoods More education spaces	N	No response required. General comment.
		Opportunities	Housing should be provided within the Innovation Arc boundary to ensure that workers, students and the community can access the places that they visit and rely on within the area without having to travel unsustainable distances. For instance, homes should be provided for those working in the Innovation Arc; homes should be provided for those who study in the Innovation Arc and homes should be provided for those that rely on a variety of services eg healthcare, education, research etc within the Innovation Arc.	Y	The document identifies the ambition. The detailed design and any proposals for new development would be appropriately judged through the planning process. This is a level of detail which this document

			Therefore a range of different types of housing from students and key workers should be promoted.		is not able to address at this stage.
		Sustainability	Top 3 priorities: There should be more nature and biodiversity Public transport should be improved Other (please specify): High quality sustainable buildings to suit various needs from education to R&D; and homes to other community facilities	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	I usually walk when visiting the area.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Top 3 ways to improve travel experience: Clearly signed routes to destinations in the area and beyond Improved connectivity around the river and canal Improved public transport (bus/mass transit)	N	No response required. General comment.
		Movement and Connectivity	Enhanced connectivity as per the full list above are all important in achieving this connectivity. Furthermore, given the location sits within the Innovation Arc, more radical ways of connecting this part of the city with the rest of the city should be considered and pushed forward. Eg light rail transit and possible monorails should be explored. The latter would avoid the need to take up more land space given many solutions are typically land hungry.	Y	Details of Leeds Mass Transit Routes through the City Centre, and the appropriate form of any Mass Transit system, are yet to be defined but this document sets out guidance for all public transport within priority routes in the Innovation Arc area. As detailed plans for Mass Transit emerge, more detailed guidance may be developed to ensure that its potential benefits are maximised within the Innovation Arc.

		Public open space	Top priorities: Trees Sports pitches and equipment Seating and picnic areas Biodiversity and planting	N	No response required. General comment.
		Public open space	All green spaces and suggestions in the list above are important. Luminare would encourage opportunities for high quality outdoor spaces that its students and staff can use for rest, reflection and study.	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Luminare supports the reuse of heritage buildings for a variety of uses. Already, Luminare's Printworks campus (grade II listed) is a success by providing a different and inspiring environment to conventional FE facilities. Sometimes, such locations come with compromise and potentially increased costs, so future uses need to be considered in terms of their financial viability and if the space is suitable for the end use under consideration	N	No response required. General comment.
		Heritage	Luminare offers a range of culture related subjects including art, performance and media. Some of those subjects are taught at our Leeds City College Park Lane Campus; and further courses at its Quarry Hill and Mabgate campuses. It is essential that community and professional level cultural facilities are located within the Innovation Arc so that they are easily accessible to Luminare's students. It also allows collaboration between local cultural facilities and organisations with Luminare.	N	No response required. General comment.

		Community business and innovators	<p>Luminate is a growing education provider across the City. It responds to the increasing growth in FE population and the types of studies they require which includes apprentice support, vocational and traditional ALevel studies. This results in continuing demand for new space and this is being provided as part of the opening of its Quarry Hill campus; and the new development planned at its Mabgate campus. This should continue within the Innovation Arc too. Currently Luminate is planning a refurbishment of its Park Lane campus and considering future options for the University Centre site following its relocation to Mabgate. It is suggested that an exercise is undertaken to identify all existing and potentially available space within the Innovation Arc. This should identify the type and quality of space so it can be easily understood by end users if it is suitable for education space such as teaching, laboratory and office space. It is likely that as companies review their accommodation schedules following the Covid pandemic that more space becomes available.</p> <p>There are a number of barriers including:</p> <p>Planning system and resourcethe</p> <p>SPD should provide sufficient flexibility and guidance that can ensure that new development and change of use can come forward easily within minimal delays. A Local Development Order should be considered to simplify and speed up the planning process for a variety of uses.</p> <p>Information on available spacesAs</p> <p>per above question, a schedule/directory of available space should be made available so that end users can identify immediately available space so that businesses and institutions such as Luminate can secure spaces to operate and grow without delay.</p>	N	The proposed directory lies beyond the scope of this SPD
--	--	-----------------------------------	---	---	--

		Community business and innovators	<p>Luminate is a strong supporter of the Innovation Arc and the overall vision of the SPD. However, it appears to omit one fundamental element that supports and contributes to this important knowledge and R&D quarter within the city, ie it omits the Further Education sector. Luminate delivers ALevels, Tlevels, BTechs, Apprenticeship and other courses for the 1618 age group. This age group is essential to providing next steps into higher education. As well as Luminate (and other FE colleges in Leeds), it also misses out some of the HEIs such as Leeds Trinity University. Specifically, Luminate's Leeds City College Park Lane Campus sits just outside of the Innovation Arc boundary to the west of Hanover Street. It's University Centre building sits just inside the boundary to the east of Hanover Street. Both are important contributors and stepping stones within the Innovation Arc.</p> <p>The contribution that further education brings to the Innovation Arc should be recognised and not underestimated. The Innovation Arc concept appears to communicate that innovation only occurs within higher education whereas it's people that come up with innovative ideas, whether on the shop floor, office, workshop, laboratory, etc. will have come through FE colleges and/or are apprentices. These are individuals that that contribute to innovation such as productivity and solutions.</p> <p>Bringing the FE colleges and other HEIs eg Trinity will enhance the opportunity to make the Innovation Arc inclusive and to ensure a good spread of those from different backgrounds and social classes to have access to the education and jobs within the Arc.</p>	y	Further details of Luminate's plans added to revised SPD. Maps and plans amended to show the Leeds City College Park Lane Campus.
		Community business and innovators	<p>Bringing technology into open spaces and on public transport to provide connectivity is important for the Arc to truly demonstrate it is an innovative area. Eg ensuring real time information within public spaces and on public transport and along pedestrian/cycle routes should be provided. Furthermore, providing charge and connectivity points on picnic benches and open spaces which can encourage outdoor learning and research should also be encouraged.</p>	N	These suggestions lie beyond the scope of this SPD

		Future Engagement	Best ways to future engage: Information on a website In person events Webinars Email	N	No response required. General comment.
44	Cllr Carlisle	General	Cllr Carlisle queried the status and future of the Methodist Church on Oxford Place/Westgate and asked what the Council could do to support this building's re-use	Y	Methodist Church to be added to maps and highlighted as 'Significant Heritage Building'
		General	How can the area further promote skateboarding or parkour, and how might this be used to bring vibrancy and activity to areas within the boundary	N	The comment is noted and all aspects of play will be considered in the area. However, the SPD does not detail specific details of schemes. This level of detail will be brought forward in the planning stage.
		General	are there opportunities for bouldering walls within developments or play parks	N	The comment is noted and all aspects of play will be considered in the area. However, the SPD does not detail specific details of schemes. This level of detail will be brought forward in the planning stage.
		General	How could street art be promoted as part of the city canvas, and how might this be promoted through links to Leeds Arts University to create profile for the city	y	Street art is supported within the SPD document.
		General	Could links be made to the University Technical Centre in Hunslet, are there opportunities to draw the UTC into the innovation activities	y	UTC is now referenced within the SPD document.
		General	Are there opportunities for artisanal/maker spaces or a quarter where this could happen in the area	y	Maker spaces are supported within the SPD.