

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS

- A one – day workshop exploring the issues for the City Council's Design Guide for Tall Buildings was held at the School of the Built Environment, The Brunswick Building, Leeds Metropolitan University in March 2005. This event was attended by various bodies and individuals – architects, Civic Trust Representatives, Councillors, planners, developers, landscape architects, planning consultants, specialists in - lighting design, quantity surveying, transportation engineering, fire prevention, structural engineering, urban designers and students together with City Council staff. The event proved a success and influenced the early work on the Draft Guide with regard to content and direction with many recommendations incorporated into the Draft SPD.
- Internal consultations commenced with a mini workshop session between urban design officers, planning officers and the Civic Architect. This was followed by further meetings with landscape design and conservation offices during 2006/7. Hard copies of the draft document were sent to the Statutory Bodies, Leeds Public Libraries, One Stop Centres and a limited number of people due to the availability of copies. Copies were also sent to all team leaders within the Planning Department. A reference copy and CD's were also available at Leonardo Reception for the general public. The draft document was also available on the department's website during the official consultation period which ended in February 2008.
- A presentation was made to the Leeds Chamber of Commerce during the consultation period when a counter response to the draft document was debated in public which provided further reaction and feedback.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

25 written responses were received including one anonymous contribution delivered by hand. The responses were mainly from the Leeds Chamber Property Forum Sub Group, Statutory bodies, the Civic Trust, developers, planning consultants and individuals e.g. a councillor and parish council representatives.

No.	Comment	LCC Comment and Action
1	Mr. A. Astin of Indigo Planning Ltd sought recognition of the appropriateness of sites on the edge of the City Centre for tall buildings and the removal of the presumption against tall buildings outside the City Centre. Particular reference was made to The First Bus site along Kirkstall Rd. which had been subject to consultation with officers and Members at a workshop in Sept. 2007 where it was agreed that tall buildings would be acceptable on this site.	The SPD in principle is against tall buildings outside the City Centre in order to prevent the 'pepper potting' of tall buildings on the urban and suburban landscape. The SPD does however; refer to tall building proposals beyond the PDA areas at the fringes of the city by stating that they will be considered on their own merits providing that they can be successfully integrated within the local context.
2	Andy Haigh of the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly stated that it did not wish to comment on this occasion	
3	Mr. B. Aspinell of Montpellier Estates requested that the southern cluster opportunity zone should be extended to acknowledge a previous outline planning consent for mixed use development up to 40 storeys on land bounded up by Meadow Road, Sweet St. and Jack Lane which was already within a PDA.	Diagram revised to include the site within the southern cluster opportunity area.
4	Mr. C.D. Hassell stated that the Barwick in Elmet & Scholes Parish Council was generally supportive of the retention of National and UDP policies but disappointed that PPS6 was omitted. They were concerned about peripheral high rise building and the poor public transport that could put the overall strategy 'at risk' but they were very supportive of the aims to achieve good public realm, sustainability, upgrading and renewable energy practices.	SPD revised to include reference to PPS6.
5	Mr. C. Martin of Savills representing MEPC referred to the large Wellington Place development where tall buildings are proposed e.g. 19 storey office building and 8-15 storey office buildings, and was of the opinion that Wellington place should be acknowledged as a tall building zone. MEPC supported the need for Tall Building Guidance but requested	Wellington Place/ Aireside contains 14 – 16 storey mixed use buildings so proposed buildings for this zone may feel part of the existing scale rather than tall buildings: the principle of maintaining the existing city block scale between the fringe

	<p>assurances that that the principles of the document accord with the soundness tests contained in PPS12- e.g. conformity with the LDF and RSS.</p> <p>MEPC questioned the use of storey heights and advocated metre heights instead.</p> <p>MEPC wanted reference to PPS6; less subjective references to views and the merits of the existing tall buildings; acknowledgement that tall buildings can have a positive impact; less prescriptive, arbitrary and restrictive zone diagrams; layering of protected areas to be simpler diagrammatically; tall buildings out of the PDAs where they are considered unsustainable; reduction in clusters coinciding with PDAs; removal of western 'string' and gateway for commercial reasons.</p>	<p>gateway/ PDAs and the centre/ supertower zone is to remain in the interests of shaping the city into distinctive zones of tall buildings.</p> <p>Agreed that references to office / residential storey heights are misleading – document to state that the use of proposed heights in metres will be more accurate and appropriate.</p> <p>PPS6 to be included. 'Zones of Exclusion' to be revised to 'Areas of Sensitivity' to acknowledge less prescriptive approach and the possibility that tall buildings can have positive impact if they show design excellence and visual compatibility with the locality and context. The SPD maintains existing council policies regarding tall buildings and PDAs.</p>
6	<p>Coun.T. Leadley for Morley Town Council stated that planning committee members endorsed the SPD proposal to discourage tall buildings outside the city centre.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and considered as supportive in resisting developer's proposals to build tall buildings beyond the city centre.</p>
7	<p>Coun. T. Leadley (as private individual) stated that despite many changes in the previous 60 years the city is still recognisably Leeds and it is important that new buildings do not detract the existing character but enhance and add to the townscape- they need to be 'in scale' with their context and so prevent shadow zones/ dark façade areas.</p> <p>The document may require more reference to the implication of 'point loads' on existing roads, footways, sewers and public transport capacity. It is desired that new tall buildings be restricted to 12 – 14 storeys</p>	<p>The SPD seeks to protect the existing character/ conservation areas of Leeds city centre, its key views and settings. The implication of shadowing is raised in the document by the requirement for environmental impact studies to be submitted with proposals. Similarly the requirement for travel plans will raise the capability/ issues of public transport, roads and footways. The SPD is also positive in proposing tall buildings, even on sustainability grounds, but in the right locations in order not to compromise the existing character.</p>
8	<p>Dr. L. Smales regarded the guide as a positive step with design briefing and guidance documentation, well produced, readable and informative. Unfortunately it has taken a long time to produce, during which a number of tall buildings e.g. Bridgewater Place have been granted planning approval, consequently the guide seems to retrospectively justify the siting and visual impact of these structures (their location a product of the private sector's efforts to secure sites to build on) in contravention of good practice e.g. clustering. The result being more of reflecting an ad-hoc than coherent approach which will test the credibility of the SPD.</p>	<p>There is a legacy of tall buildings that were granted planning approval and constructed in the last 60 years and until the adoption of a tall building SPD there is always the risk that further applications will be regarded as ad-hoc. This has not been the case during the last 4 years because the 'developing' tall buildings draft SPD has informed applicants, officers and design reviews with regard to recent applications (e.g. Lumiere).</p>
9	<p>Mr. B. Uwechue of DPP referred to a contradiction of diagrams in which an exclusion zone coincided with a reinforced cluster zone.</p> <p>Mr. B. Uwechue put forward reasons for and requested that the former Balmforth Tannery site at A58/ Meanwood Road junction be included as a potential location for a gateway/ landmark/ tall building.</p>	<p>Diagram altered to clarify</p> <p>Proposed site considered to be outside the opportunities zones for tall buildings. The site is considered to be part of the Meanwood Valley character where a tall building would be considered inappropriate and likely to further 'pepper potting' of tall buildings.</p>
10	<p>Euan Kellie for Drivers Jonas requested that the presumption of the word 'impact' is negative and the document should acknowledge that impact can be positive - 'demonstrable negative impact' wording suggested. He urged the City Council to adopt a more pragmatic and non-prescriptive approach regarding tall building proposals at the edge of conservation areas in order not to stymie tall buildings if they have been designed positively respecting the skyline. He suggested that pre-application discussions should seek to agree specific technical studies and that some items were inappropriate to be included within the Environmental Impact Checklist.</p>	<p>Wording changed to acknowledge that 'impact' can also be positive, and items removed from Environmental Impact Checklist and placed within other section. The tall buildings guide draft endorsed existing conservation area policies of the Council which are considered essential for the protection of historic areas of Leeds city centre.</p>
11	<p>Mr. Ian Smith of English Heritage made 26 main comments with 7 main comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal document.</p> <p>He welcomed the production of the document and was of the opinion that it set out the basis of a robust strategy for tall buildings, identifying both the key constraints and opportunities. He focused on a number of areas where more clarity and further consideration is needed.</p> <p>He suggested that the document is interim until the overall spatial strategy and Local Development Framework are adopted. Locations proposed should be subject to the widest debate with disagreements to be resolved at EiP before an independent inspector.</p> <p>The Characterisation Study to the City Centre to inform the strategy of locating tall buildings; 'London view management framework' policies to be incorporated; City Council should set up CAD model of city centre;</p> <p>The existence of a tall building in a particular location will not justify the replacement of an existing tall building with a new tall building on the same site:</p> <p>Doubts re- scoring of existing views, random selection – better if from key open spaces and paths; suggested views out from station concourse; more explanation re- zones of exclusion; protection of views of Tower Works chimneys; inclusion of protected view of St. Johns Church and view of Parish church from N.E. and Crown Point Bridge, and view of Parkinson tower from Woodhouse Lane. Clarity between opportunities and restricted zones which are compromised on some diagrams.</p> <p>North-south spine gives impression that its an area for future tall buildings;</p>	<p>Locations proposed for tall structures accord with existing policies- suggestion for wider debate with disagreements to be resolved before an independent inspector is not very different to the existing planning application system which allows for public consultation, debate and the opportunity to go to Appeal.</p> <p>A view management framework has been incorporated to protect existing street views and settings.</p> <p>The existence of a tall building will not justify its replacement with a new tall building – this accords with CABA Guidance.</p> <p>Scoring of views considered to be too subjective and has been omitted.</p> <p>All suggested views e.g. View out of Station Concourse and view of Tower Works Chimneys now included.</p> <p>North South spine omitted to prevent impression that tall buildings will be allowed in this zone.</p>

	<p>Env. Impact. study reference to 2000 ODPM guidance. Key parameters and design principles to be conditions of any outline consents; applicants to demonstrate cumulative impacts of tall buildings/ results to characterisation studies; pre application discussions to include Eng.Heritage where proposals likely to influence historic core/ cons.areas. With regard to the Sustainability Appraisal key points:- surprised that potential tension between development of tall buildings and protection of historic environment not identified as key sustainability issue/ need to refer to characterisation studies; no assessment of tall buildings in the locations identified and their effect on sustainability objectives; observations re – scoring.</p>	<p>Suggested Env. Impact study reference to be corrected.</p>
12	<p>Mr.John Davies Transport Planner representing Metro commented that the inclusion of the City Centre Urban Design Strategy could be misleading and out of date when compared to the City Centre Area Action Plan preferred options. Comment made regarding Cluster blocks outside the city centre are much more difficult to serve by public transport.</p> <p>Mr. Davies suggested developers should fund relocation and reinstatement of bus stops affected by construction.</p>	<p>City Centre Urban Design Strategy plan omitted mainly to simplify diagrams relative to Prestige Development Areas.</p> <p>It is logical that cluster blocks outside city centre will minimise traffic entering the city centre but the design guide does not encourage cluster blocks to be situated outside the city centre – but only up to the edge of the city centre. The aim is to comply with SPG 5.</p>
13	<p>John Pilgrim Senior Planning Executive of Yorkshire Forward supported in broad terms the strategy outlined within the document. Comments were received suggesting improvements to the layout, and matters concerning Guidance, Design, Views, Clusters, Environment, Implementation and the contribution of tall buildings to the economy. The graphic design style was questioned e.g. need for consistent approach re styles and colours, major diagrams on single page, small text around images... Distinction made between key information and supporting principles/ guidelines.</p> <p>More emphasis on role as communities in the sky as well as physical form. Clearly defined zones welcomed and gateway landmark sites can assist in defining the city boundary. Need for ensuring microclimate and humane environments within around clusters is achievable. Document should highlight the requirement for tall buildings to adapt to climate change and how renewable energy and combined heat and power can be facilitated.</p> <p>More emphasis required regarding influence of climate around tall buildings e.g. influence of wind and shadows with more technical guidance.</p> <p>Greater emphasis on relationship of between tall buildings and the street with word 'aim' removed from sentences to imply more direct approach from developers who should be required to supply physical and virtual models. Comment that special regional panel of design experts should assess proposals with findings reported to planning committees.</p>	<p>Graphics formula follows general approach used for CCUDS and Neighbourhood for Living documents. Some inconsistencies re graphics detailing accepted and will be removed and improved as with text size. Comments inconsistent with other views received.</p> <p>Acknowledged but content in guide is considered adequate. The document refers to key principles and does not propose to be a technical guide but intends to inform planning officers and committees of design matters and implications of tall building planning applications.</p> <p>The Design Guide recognises that wind tunnel testing data and definitions e.g. 'brisk walking' categories can be misleading. More stringent testing will be demanded to anticipate climate change for the life of a tall building.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council's Design Review Panel with CABE design guidance considered to offer design expertise for Planning Committees and local communities to shape their own environments.</p>
14	<p>Michael Watts of Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners commented on behalf of Dandara Ltd that the draft SPD does not give sufficient consideration to the economic viability of implementing the various principles and practices of sustainability and climate change which the document promotes, and that requirements should not be universally enforced.</p> <p>Dandora Ltd objects to the automatic requirement for tall building applications to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment as they are contrary to the EIA regulations wording and schedules.</p> <p>Dandora Ltd supports the continuation of the north south spine but express concern at the potential problems that could emerge should a design move away from the competition winning entry for 'Criterion Place'. Therefore it queries the appropriateness of such specific references. Dandora Ltd requests that ambiguity exists for this site since it was not part of an 'exclusion zone' but is affected by protected view zone 9.</p>	<p>The SPD seeks to dovetail with existing mandatory technical standards influencing design and construction e.g. Building Regulations, Codes for Sustainable Homes. It does however maintain the worthwhile aspiration of encouraging developers to employ more than the minimum technical standards.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that wording needs to be changed to incorporate a scoping opinion stage in order to establish whether an EIA is required. Environmental Statements to be independent. References to the competition winning entry are considered necessary to inspire developers since it is considered to be a very good essay in design and a good example of promoting sustainable travel by its position close to the railway station and bus routes. The 'Zones of exclusion' are about protecting the setting of important buildings and spaces. Protected views is an alternative geometric technique in protecting particularly street scenes and are valid on their own.</p>
15	<p>Michael Barningham of Natural England considered the Sustainability Appraisal to be adequate. With regard to the SPD - Relationship to the street – need to make reference to a better link to open space around the buildings into the local green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>This links into the Leisure objectives in the SA section 4.15.</p>
16	<p>Mike Piet for the Leeds Civic Trust welcomed the SPD –its Key Strategic and Key Design Principles– but is it too late? There was much concentration on detail with every punctuation mistake spotted. Many points of detail were identified regarding inconsistencies/ wording/ coordination/keys within the document e.g. text/ colours/ images some</p>	<p>'Document proofing' abilities of Leeds Civic trust members are appreciated and will be of great assistance in correcting inaccuracies and maintaining consistency.</p>

	<p>which were considered out of date, but more fundamental issues were also considered. Definition of tall building and storey heights questioned.</p> <p>Issue about hard and fast restrictions which will leave Development Control with the ability to say yes or no.</p> <p>Grades of 'sensitivity' supported rather than 'Zones of Exclusion'. Suggest strategic views should be agreed beforehand and then modelled. Civic trust were of the opinion that the guide was too complicated – earlier sections could be moved to appendices. Better differentiation required between existing buildings and those with full planning approval. 10 urban design principles should be incorporated together with CABE advice. Star ratings questioned and better to concentrate on views with greatest impact.</p> <p>Strategic issues: - Better to identify key objects in the views that are important. Need to consider spaces south of the River Aire e.g. Holbeck Urban Village. Scientific/ calculation approach suspect since value judgement will overrule. Selection and justification of key views questioned. Need to include views from railway looking out of the city.. Some conservation areas not shown e.g. Granary Wharf. Locations – Sites at Westgate point, Bridge End suggested. Agreed with clustering but should be sensitive to Waterfront Conservation areas. Design Detail: - Buildings not up to 'scratch' should be refused. More emphasis should be given to quality of environment at street level.</p> <p>Suggested city model to enhance understanding.</p>	<p>Tall building definition still considered to be best definition without creating further ambiguity. Definition re storey heights to be redefined to recognise difference between residential and office storey height. Civic Trust seem to have missed the point- one of the main aims of the document was to create hard and fast restrictions not just for DC but also to inform developers in order to eliminate grey areas. 'Zones of exclusion' to be changed to 'zones of sensitivity'.</p> <p>10 Urban Design principles to be included. Star marking considered to be too subjective and will be removed.</p> <p>Strategic views and their justification had been previously agreed with the Civic Trust but agreement of views re scoping for EIAs to be incorporated into SPD. New protected views e.g. out of the city from railway station concourse, and Holbeck Italianate Towers, and all conservation areas to be included.</p> <p>Document makes adequate reference of the importance of the connection of a tall building with the ground. The environmental quality at street level will however be reinforced with additional requirements regarding the avoidance of strong wind situations around buildings. Idea of City model considered but restricted by limited availability of funding.</p>
17	<p>Peter Dixon of Savills for Asda welcomes the SPD strategy and considers that the analytical material is comprehensive and impressively thorough but is concerned that the guidance is being prepared out of sequence with the Local Development Framework, and may not be consistent with other DPDs and SPDs and would not satisfy the requirements of PPS12 because of its relationship to other emerging planning policy. Asda consider there is scope to reduce the document by focusing on principles without covering general application which involves needless duplication which could lead to contradiction and confusion. It should be precise, clear and user friendly. The townscape analysis could be distilled into an annex so that there is more clarity around the central themes. Key diagram illustrating broad zones with potential for tall buildings will provide more clarity.</p>	<p>SPD initially had been prepared as a SPG but was incorporated into the Local Development Framework structure of documents. This has delayed the production of this document which is in accordance with previous and revised UDP policies.</p> <p>The general application and the townscape analysis are considered very important -not to be demoted into an annex. Its aim is to provide background which is important to the proper consideration of the context of the city – a vital tool for achieving tall building design quality.</p>
18	<p>Peter Hall of Indigo Planning on behalf of Legal and General suggests that the arbitrary 14 storey 'rule of thumb' should be deleted.</p> <p>The protected view zones prohibit all tall buildings with no allowance for flexibility with regard to the objectives of protecting that view – it is considered unacceptable to apply such a prescriptive approach in the absence of statutory protection. L & G consider that the West End of Leeds including Wellington Street is afforded the appropriate recognition as a development area deserving status as a Prestige Development Area where Tall buildings will be welcomed. The shaping the city diagram which has a restricted height zone should be deleted since there is no clear reason or objective.</p> <p>L&G objects to the onerous requirement that Landmark/ Gateway proposals that exceed the surrounding scale must demonstrate a significant landmark/ gateway contribution compared to tall buildings being determined on their own merits.</p>	<p>14 storeys scale within the centre of Leeds is considered to be large for the city centre and worthy for special attention particularly with regard to the urban silhouette of Leeds. Whereas previously any tall building definitions may have referred to storey heights any such interpretations have been superseded by CABE's definition which is the same as the one used in the design guide.</p> <p>The objective is to protect key views and settings of Leeds from the negative visual effects of tall buildings – normally within the sky background - similar to London's protected views management. Shaping the city is seen as important to prevent pepper potting of tall buildings within the city centre and West End. Consequently the need for restricted height zones between permitted zones of tall buildings is critical to that aim whilst at the same time visually defining the 3D form of the city into a valid composition.</p> <p>This is not onerous particularly when more than one developer is proposing a tall building for say a gateway area which would inevitably end up with a few tall buildings competing against each other and each claiming landmark status with visual confusion as a result. Demonstration that a tall proposal will contribute as a landmark or gateway will provide a test and proof that it is right for the local context.</p>
19	<p>Richard Frudd of Indigo Planning for National Grid Property Ltd made submissions relating to NGP landholdings within the southern boundary of the city centre – particularly the New Wortley site and Kidacre Street site</p>	<p>The SPD is specific and clear with regard to the PDA,s/ gateways and the potential cluster zones. It is considered that proposals outside these areas</p>

	<p>which are considered to be gateway locations and or fall within a Prestige Development Area and therefore qualify as suitable to accommodate tall buildings as part of the north south spine at the city's southern entrance.</p>	<p>will create further unacceptable pepper potting of tall buildings. The north south spine is a legacy from the 60's and will not be accepted as a justification for the location of a tall building. The diagram is to be removed to prevent this ambiguity.</p>
20	<p>R.Tinker of the West Yorkshire Group of The Victorian Society welcomed the draft guide and its general intent. Concerns were expressed about recent tall buildings being erected in conflict with the draft SPD. E.g. Broadcasting Place Tower.</p> <p>It was suggested that a zone of exclusion to the Parish Church should be extended as far as the Corn Exchange, and City Square be added to the list of zones for exclusion. The proposals to re-clad existing tall buildings was considered to be weak in redressing past mistakes.</p>	<p>The SPD appears to be retrospective due to previous approvals for the Broadcasting Place site, but the construction is just outside the protective view of the Parkinson Tower and adjacent church spires and qualifies as part of the 'strings and clusters' theme.</p> <p>The area of the Corn Exchange/ Market is to be incorporated into the zone of sensitivity around the Parish Church. The zone will not be extended up to include City Square because it has been compromised by tall buildings.</p>
21	<p>Rose Freeman Planning Assistant on behalf of The Theatres Trust was of the opinion that proposals did not yet affect the Trust's work regarding the protection of theatres.</p>	
22	<p>Simon Smithson of Carey Jones on behalf of the Leeds Chamber Property Forum commented that storey heights not a good indicator as huge difference between office and residential.</p> <p>Suggested 10 Urban Design Principles be included and questioned selection and grading of existing views – how will a tall building affect the view? Some key local panoramas missed e.g. .River Valley from East Street, Parkinson Vista from Woodhouse lane, Civic Hall/ Town Hall.</p> <p>OS bases out of date. Plan, records, dates and details of existing buildings would be useful.</p> <p>Exclusion zones should be changed to Sensitivity Zones where some rules already broken. Overall zone map would be useful. Some protected views questioned e.g. Wellington Street (3), Briggate looking north (10), Headrow (12), River (18). Did not agree with views out of the city. Generally asked if Leeds is saying no to progress.</p> <p>Strategy requires 3d virtual and physical model to test strategy and help define block heights in zones, and test skylines.</p> <p>Welcomed Cluster idea but questioned lack of western cluster. More comment required re wind / local turbulence issues. Also welcomed chapters on Sustainability and Climate change and Relationship to Street</p> <p>Questioned some of the images and examples used with regard to design detail/ re-cladding/ uses. In general the document should not rule out proposals that can prove their value, quality and worth promoting the city.</p>	<p>Storey heights to be redefined. 10 Urban Design Principles to be included. Grading of views to be omitted. Parkinson View from Woodhouse and river valley views to be included.</p> <p>Document to incorporate plan indicating tall building/ application positions and storey heights. OS system to be reviewed.</p> <p>Exclusion Zone definition to be changed and zones corrected to avoid conflicts.</p> <p>Protected views in the main considered justifiable but no10 will be reviewed.</p> <p>Agree that virtual modelling will be useful tool – but subject to available funding.</p> <p>More technical requirements will be introduced re wind turbulence.</p>
23	<p>Steven Warren of Estelle Warren Ltd. commented that the document may be regarded as too complicated by concentrating on specific views. Better to identify sensitive city elements e.g. conservation areas, green spaces and listed buildings to consider impact upon. Also a hierarchy of sensitivity suggested, with identification of key/ general views from agreed viewpoints. The identifying of sensitive views will require a thorough study to stand the planning process. Methodology identifying what is being protected is required. LI/ IEMA guidelines may be of assistance.</p>	<p>Sensitive city elements identified – particularly settings which give character and create the 'place'. Methodology selected is very simple in terms of preventing tall buildings from occupying sky backgrounds to those views. Suggested comments could be considered for scoping report purposes to compliment the document thus incorporating more safeguards.</p>
24	<p>Steve Waterhouse of Leeds City Council CSD requested that proper waste management arrangements are catered for e.g. proper storage/ containment/ collection procedures whilst at the same time encouraging recycling/ reduction and re-use of waste.</p>	<p>Document refers to the need for developers/ architects to consult Leeds City Council Cleansing Services officers regarding waste management arrangement.</p>
25	<p>Anonymous comments received – Introduction to be more general with reconsideration of some words and paragraphs. Key opportunities paragraph excellent.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
26	<p>Sue Ansbro of White Young Green for Leeds Property Forum sub group Quality Spaces and Places commented that the document was welcomed but should be read as guide and not a policy document, or be too prescriptive or subjective.</p> <p>Many comments coincided with Simon Smithson's comments (see 22) who also represented the Leeds Chamber Property Forum. They will not be repeated within this box. The Forum requested that the document must not be a totally restricted policy and that the key was flexibility if it can be argued that a tall building is relevant in a particular instance. With regard to views, there should be some commentary about whether the introduction of tall buildings on to those views would be positive or negative. Advice in relation to the use of verified view cameras may need to be considered. It was considered that the document should perhaps review the key drivers for tall buildings that impact on their design.</p> <p>Query to City Square not identified as a place of 'sensitivity'. Page 34 – views queried and that some may benefit from a tall building.</p>	<p>The Guide is Policy SPD as part of the LDF. It contains guidelines which should be followed and from which tall buildings will be judged.</p> <p>Comments regarded as a request for too much flexibility and looser visual control of the city centre. Document will be altered to acknowledge that tall buildings can be positive than rather negative, but in order to sculpture the city and strictly preserve the character of Leeds, tall building proposals, which will be within the sky background of the key views, will not be acceptable.</p> <p>Notes and chapters on the Design of tall buildings are sufficient to prompt visual excellence without being too prescriptive.</p> <p>City Square already contains tall buildings and blocks- some of low visual quality: View of the former Post Office building across City square, however, is a proposed protected view.</p>