

NOTES OF ON-LINE MEETING 10:00 FRIDAY 22ND JANUARY 2021 TO DISCUSS ISSUES AROUND FAMILY HOUSING AND ROSEBANK PRIMARY SCHOOL BURLEY ROAD LEEDS.

1) PRESENT

Cllr Kayleigh Brooks - elected member Little London & Woodhouse Ward
Akhtar - elected member Little London & Woodhouse Ward & Chair INWAC
- Head Teacher Rosebank Primary School
Chair Rosebank primary School, also Chair of Little Woodhouse Community Association and Chair of Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan Forum
Head Teacher, Rosebank Primary School
West Committee
the Private rented sector
Council, supporting Neighbourhood Planning and with a Policy remit on HMOs.
Jagdeep Kundhi - Housing Manager for Little London, Headingley, Hyde Park and Burley Area
Emma Lewis – Assistant Planner Leeds City Council, assisting Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan Forum with Housing Evidence based report.

Cllr Javaid
Miss Alice Smith
Dr Deryck Piper - Vice-
Hannah Pedley – Executive Assistant to
Marcia Cunningham - Localities Officer for Inner North
David Thorpe - Council Officer specialising in HMOs in Leeds and
Abbie Miladinovic – Senior Planner in Policy and Plans Group Leeds City

2) APOLOGIES

Cllr Abigail Marshall-Katung - elected member Little London & Woodhouse Ward.

3) The meeting was chaired by Dr Piper who requested people to briefly introduce themselves. It was agreed that the meeting be recorded and notes circulated as appropriate.

4) There was a short presentation from **Dr Piper** with ten slides putting Rosebank School in the context of the local area (slide show attached).
the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan boundaries with the school left of centre.
Comparing accommodation tenures in Little Woodhouse, Hyde Park/Woodhouse and the Leeds area.
Slide Three – Comparing accommodation types in Little Woodhouse Hyde Park/Woodhouse and the Leeds area.
Comparative population statistics (age groupings), Little Woodhouse, Leeds and England.
Slide Five – Map showing location of student HMOs and PBSAs in Little Woodhouse and Hyde Park. Slide Six – Graph showing student population in areas of Leeds over time.
showing location of PBSA in Little Woodhouse and Hyde Park (in pink).
population density map of Little Woodhouse.
application for PBSA adjacent to Rosebank School.

Slide One – map showing
Slide Two –
Slide Four –
Slide Seven – Map
Slide Eight – Student
Slide Nine - Proposed planning

The presentation demonstrated that:

- The proportion of students in the area has increased from 48% in 2007 to 76% in 2016 – an increase of 55%
 - Over 50% of the population is aged between 15 and 24 compared with the Leeds average of 12% -
 - Conversely, the proportion of 0-14 year olds in Little Woodhouse is half that of Leeds. -
 - Detached and semi-detached housing makes up less than 7% of the housing stock compared with 51.5% in Leeds as a whole. - Nearly
 - 90% of the population live in rented accommodation compared with a Leeds average of 40% - Purpose built flats (including student flats) accommodate 46% of residents compared with 18% city-wide.
 - In some areas of Little Woodhouse, the student population is nearly 90%, in other areas it is still less than 10% - Rosebank
- Primary is the 'last school standing' in the area, St Michael's College closed after 2000, and prior to that St

Anne Primary School in Hanover Square and the Girls School on Belle Vue Road were also closed with student flats built on two of those sites.

5) **Miss Smith** talked through the results of a Parents Survey she had undertaken in January 2021 on Housing issues in preparation for this meeting. There were approximately 350 children on roll, and replies had been received from parents of about 120 children, more than a third. In addition Miss Smith had also surveyed the children themselves. The school itself is thriving, it had a good Ofsted Inspection, results are improving, the school has a good reputation around Leeds and parents and children love the school and are very supportive. However, parents are struggling to find suitable accommodation near the school.

This term, and over the last few years, increasing number of parents have asked for support writing letters to support housing applications. These are parents living in one-bed roomed flats who have three or more children and have been on a waiting list for three to four years and are struggling. They are being told there is no suitable housing in the area and the houses in the area with more than two bedrooms are being occupied by students. There appears to be a lack of Social Housing in the area. Dr Piper's presentation had noted lots of accommodation being built in the area for students, but what is being built for families ? Families are feeling that their voice isn't being heard.

- Insufficient space
- Run down properties
- Far from school and struggle getting buses and getting to school on time – particularly if going to secondary and primary etc

One of the questions on the survey asked how many bedrooms in the family home:

20% - Whole family share one bedroom

36% - One bedroom for adults and one for children

20% - at least 2 children share a bedroom

15% - Children sharing with grandparents or other family members.

When children are young, a two year old and a four year, it's perhaps acceptable for them to share, but in some cases we are talking about older children; boys and girls sharing rooms and going through puberty, 17 year olds sharing with five year olds. Leeds is a Child Friendly city, but this has to have an effect on the mental Health of the children, they have no space of their own to work quietly, no privacy and no space they can call their own. With the 20% of children sharing we are not talking about just two children, but frequently three or even four children sharing. There are parents sharing with a toddler/baby or children sharing with toddler/baby. That is not helpful in terms of sleep deprivation. These children are already living in one of the most deprived areas of the city and the effect of sleep deprivation as well impacts on their ability to concentrate and focus in class. It just doesn't seem fair when there appears to be lots of houses around but they are all for students. The school is aware that Landlords prefer to rent to students as you can get more rent from 4 students in one house than one family, so families feel they are being pushed out of the market because they cannot afford the level of rents landlords charge for larger 'family size' properties. One family was quoted £1,000 for a three bed roomed house and apparently some Landlords don't want Council Bonds. 70% of our families responding to the survey require 3 or 4 bedroom properties and they just don't exist in the area.

The size of the properties is the number one issue from the survey, but a number of other things came up as well. There is the case of a family with three children, two boys and a girl, living in a two bedroom house – a damp back-to-back property. One of the boys has severe asthma, made worse by the living conditions, which impacts on his school attendance and he, as well as the family, are struggling. The family have been applying and waiting for a change in housing for three years. There are a number of cases like this where families are living in properties which are seemingly uncared for by the landlord, but it is the only property available at a price they can afford. Are there standards or thresholds for how good a property should be for children growing up in the local area ? This is not acceptable and needs to be taken forward to future meetings. Some of these are families where English is a second language - or they have limited English, so they can struggle to get their views across and feel they are not being heard or listened to. They repeatedly ask about waiting times on lists and raise accommodation issues, but they are getting nowhere .

6) Women's Refuge. The school also has the Women's Refuge on Belle Vue Road in its catchment area and this raises other issues. Every year the school takes on a large number of children who are fleeing violence with their mothers and are placed in the Refuge. The school is able to provide a huge amount of support and nurture to both the children and their mothers and the Women's Refuge builds up a great support network for them as well. The children get settled into the new school, bearing in mind they have already been uprooted once in traumatic circumstances. When these families feel settled and confident once again, they are then moved out of the Women's Refuge, but there is nowhere for them to go in the local area so they are placed elsewhere. Miss Smith gave the example of one family who have been housed in Seacroft and travel across to school using two to three buses every day because the children were settled in the school and the mother doesn't want to move them again as the children are happy and confident in the school, have made friends and have built up their resilience. They have a house in Seacroft, but no support network, their support network and friends are in Little Woodhouse. These are the children that need support and protection and we need to be nurturing as much as possible. Ideally, if there was social housing in the area, the families could leave the Refuge and then be accommodated locally where they have their support network and the children could continue at the school. Another recent example is a mother who has recently moved into the Refuge with her children. She is an ex-civil servant and has been told she is number 160 or 200 on the waiting list for suitable accommodation for her and her three children in the local area. She also has no idea of how long that waiting list will be. Another example is the parents of a child who has SEN (Special Educational Needs) and requires 1:1 support. The parents are new to the country and struggled to find a school. The child is currently being supported at Rosebank School but needs two buses to get to school each day. The parent is left with a difficult decision on whether or not to uproot the child to a school nearer home.

7) Waiting Lists. Parents don't understand where they are on the priority list and why it is taking so long. The survey also looked at waiting times on the Housing list for a larger house. Of the survey respondents:

15% had been waiting less than 6 months

3% had been waiting less than a year

21% had been waiting for more than a year

15% had been waiting for more than 2 years

46% had been waiting for more than 3 years - this is the equivalent of 40-50 children whose families have been on a waiting list for appropriate housing for over three years.

This is a big issue and needs a joined up solution to move it forward. How are building priorities decided as we seem to be building lots of student flats in the area and this is creating resentment amongst some families who can't get suitable properties. The 'community' aspect of a mixed area, with students and families living alongside each other and interacting positively with each other is being lost as families see priority apparently being given to students.

8) The Child's Voice. Rosebank Primary school firmly believes that the child should have a voice as well, so a survey was sent out to the children as well. They mentioned sharing rooms, but they were also very positive as well:

- They love their school.
- Passionate about their area.
- They want better for the environment and they want to help the wildlife and care for the green space
- They want a residential area that feels like a home rather than a visiting place
- less rubbish, building a sense of community, they want to transform the place, but the reality is they feel their families are being forced out, there is no place to live, they are not valued as part of the community

Their other priorities:

- Litter and Graffiti 40%
- Dangerous driving 40%
- Anti social behaviour 29%
- Place for children to play safely
- Homelessness
- Pests and Rodents due to litter and take-aways
- Parking near the school
- Feeling like the council don't care.

Parents responding to the survey would like to come to a meeting like this so they can be heard, and ask questions about why things are the way they are, what are the reasons, why are they not feeling valued; they would happily give their views as well. Hopefully this meeting is just to get the ball rolling and to highlight the issues we are facing on our local community. Miss Smith also noted that while she had been in this meeting, a parent had forwarded a letter to her from their Landlord informing them that as they now had four people living in a one-bedroom flat (they have a son and a three month old baby) their tenancy would not be renewed. The reason given by the landlord is the size of the accommodation and the fact that the building is predominantly occupied by Postgraduate students – so where do they go ?

9) **Cllr Javid Akhtar**, Councillor for Little London and Woodhouse area, thanked Miss Smith for the excellent presentation. He stated that Ward Councillors would be supporting the case put forward by Rosebank Primary. The Ward Councillors had been pushing for HMOs to be converted back into family houses and suggested Section 106 monies could be used to support this. It was good to start with a local meeting like this, but going forward this could be perhaps widened to include the Little London area and involve Cllr Debra Couper LCC Executive Member for Housing and Communities and he also suggested involving the MP Hillary Benn as well.

10) **Abbi Miladinovic**, LCC Senior Planner (planning policy input) noted the frustrations expressed in both presentations. There was quite a high housing target for the city over the next 15 years. She outlined the City's strategic approach for a core housing mix that was preferencing developing more smaller properties in Leeds. However, this wasn't necessarily the right approach for the Little Woodhouse area. She suggested that the school should champion this policy by supporting the developing Neighbourhood Plan. This would be specific to the Little Woodhouse area and would be able to take into account the issues raised at this meeting. This issue should be included as one of the leading policies in the developing Neighbourhood Plan, and once the plan was 'adopted' and became part of the Planning policy for the city, it would be given the same weight as the Council's Strategic Policies, but because it would be a more recently developed policy, it would take preference over the core housing mix policy. Dr Piper responded by suggesting that one of the things coming out of this meeting was that the housing needs for this area were hidden. People have somewhere to live, but clearly it is not suitable. As Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Forum for the local area he admitted they had been struggling to get the sort of detailed information that this meeting had provided. Analysing data could only provide so much information but the presentation by Miss Smith was very powerful and demonstrated that there was in fact a housing crisis in this area. Dr Piper was copied in to all the Planning Applications for the area, and the vast majority of them involved either new build student flats or conversions into student flats. The Neighbourhood Plan could provide the medium to long term way forward, but were there any short term solutions ?

11) **Jagdeep Kundhi**, Housing Manager for Little London and Woodhouse area provided some stats for the current housing situation:

Across city wide, there were 54,000 LCC rented properties. Of this, 1.28% (690 properties) were currently void and 30,000 applicants were on the waiting list, so the demand for accommodation was high.

Within the Little London, Hyde Park, Headingley and Woodhouse area (which includes Little Woodhouse), there were 2,500 LCC rented properties. From April 2020 to present day they had 54 properties reletted in this area, and when a property does become vacant there is a very high demand for it..

In the last 12 months the stats for LCC properties managed by Housing Leeds within a 2 mile radius of Rosebank were as follows:

- LCC had a total of 101 one bedroom properties and only 15 had become vacant and they had all been relet. They had received an average of 350 bids for these properties.
- LCC had a total of 106 two bedroom properties and only 7 had become vacant, with an average of 142 bids.
- LCC had a total of 65 three bedroom properties and only 3 had become vacant, with an average of 160 bids.
- LCC had a total of 18 four bedroom properties and only 2 had become vacant. No bids were accepted as the properties went to applicants on a direct letting list.

- LCC had no five bedroom properties and only one 6 bedroom property, which was currently occupied.

Jagdeep wasn't aware of any building planning for extra LCC housing.

Jagdeep explained that Housing Leeds and the Housing Association have their own procedures for allocating housing, but residents could 'bid' for both council housing and Housing Association properties. There were systems already in place for annual reviews to assess the standard of properties and it was important that applicants contacted the local housing officer or lettings team to update their applications, if their circumstances changed, to have their priority reassessed. Jagdeep has a team who can go through residents' applications with them to check they are up to date. This would include having their Priority re-assessed. Also, if it was a Council property, his team could be contacted reference any property repairs required. Usually every Council property would get an Annual visit to make sure everything was OK, but this had been temporarily suspended as a result of Covid 19. Miss Smith noted that as all applications had to be 'on-line' up to 50% of her parents would struggle without the necessary technology. Some parents struggle with understanding on-line forms and the school (for example) regularly helps parents with on-line applications for secondary schools. This could be because of no internet/wifi, or dealing with the jargon or poor language skills. Dr Piper gave the example of a street opposite him, Consort Terrace, which was composed of large Victorian terraces. These would make ideal family homes (3-4 bedrooms) but many of them had either been turned into flats, or student HMOs. He was aware of two 'Miscellaneous properties' (Council Houses), both of which were inhabited by families with children. In other areas of Leeds these would still be predominantly family houses, but in this area had been taken over by students and young professionals.

12) **David Thorpe**, represented the Leeds private rented housing sector and Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMO). He mentioned the Article 4 Directive introduced in 2012, which meant landlords who wanted to convert homes to HMOs required Planning Permission, but in some areas this was shutting the stable door after the horse had bolted as many homes had already been converted. He agreed with Abbi that including a relevant policy in the developing Neighbourhood Plan was the best way forward. Dr Piper interjected to say that the Article 4 Directive was working in this area – over the past few years he'd been aware of 4-5 applications for HMO licensing and they had all been rejected.

Cllr Brooks noted that HMO Licenses had to be renewed every five years. Previously this could be fairly automatic, but the Council was now checking the property to ensure it was suitable for HMO accommodation and were introducing policy guidelines on minimum size standards for HMOs

David explained that there were not that many licensed HMOs in the Little Woodhouse area and the issue of non licensed HMOs was a priority they were investigating over the next five years in terms of standards, planning permission and criminality. HMO licensing revision started in 2016 and was ongoing. Updating the HMO licensing policy might free up properties due to the high number of unlicensed HMOs in the area but it was unclear how wide spread this was. Dr Piper noted that the Council had an 'Empty Homes' team that identified empty homes and worked with the owner to get the back into the housing market - could this help in the Little Woodhouse area ? Cllr Brooks felt that empty houses were more of a problem in areas of the city where the demand for housing was much lower, but she would contact the team for their comments.

13) **Marcia Cunningham**, LCC Localities Officer for Communities, suggested whether it would be possible for the council to purchase run down properties that were currently on the market to make them more affordable and better living standards for families if building new accommodation as not an option. Cllr Brooks went on to suggest a short term idea could be to build closer relationships with private landlords who may be looking to reduce the number of HMOs that they currently manage. Abbi mentioned that the Housing Growth team would be the team that identifies future social housing sites.

14) Actions/next steps

Cllr Akhtar suggested to invite Hilary Benn MP and Assistant Director of Housing to the next meeting.

Jagdeep Kundhi to provide signposting information for parents (with translated material) for clearer understanding on where to get guidance and advice to Miss Smith at the school. This would include material in different languages.

Cllr Brooks actions:

- To approach Cllr Debra Coupar, LCC Executive member for Housing and Communities, to ask for guidance on how to move forward in the short and medium term and to share this with the attendees. Suggested it would be useful to include the Housing Growth team in this conversation.
- Guidance from Cllr Coupar to find out if it would be possible to join up with Little London Primary to widen the area and to speak with Little London Primary.
- Set up a parent meeting/zoom in the next couple of weeks to gain parent views – attendees to be invited would be Cllr Coupar, Hilary Benn MP, Alice Smith, Deryck Piper and Cllr Brooks (Cllr Brooks to ask Cllr Coupar and Cllr Hilary for suitable dates and other possible attendees).
- To email Empty Homes to get an update on figures
E: EmptyHomes@leeds.gov.uk Tel: 0113 378 4702

Alice Smith

Email parents with an update from the meeting.

Notes from emails and surveys for meeting 22 Jan 2021

Over the last few years, increasing number of parents have asked for support writing letters to support housing applications: • Insufficient space • Run down properties • Far from school and struggle getting buses and getting to school on time – particularly if going to secondary and primary etc

Recent survey where parents of approximately 1/3 of school population responded (affecting approx 100 children) Existing properties 20% - Whole family share one bedroom 36% - One bedroom for adults and one for children 20% - at least 2 children share a bedroom 15% Children sharing with grandparents or other family members. Boys and girls sharing rooms and going through puberty. Parents sharing with toddler/baby or children sharing with toddler/baby 70% of our families surveyed require 3 or 4 bedroom properties.

- Impact on sleep deprivation – ability to focus in class – privacy – mental health –

Other reasons families are looking for properties • Quality of home – Houses full of damp, uncared for by landlords 3 children – 2 bedrooms. 2 boys and a girl. Damp back to back property. Son with bad asthma. Been waiting for a change in housing for 3 years. No-one seems to take any notice.

Concern about families being uprooted and moved further afield Women's refuge – left violence/left schools and friends/ build support network – moved away to another area of Leeds – new start again. No support. Problems Social Housing list is too long. Ex soldier and in the women's refuge – 160 – 200 on waiting list in our local area.

A parent of child with autism diagnosis – requires 1:1 support. New to the country. Struggled to find a school. Choose Rosebank but needs two buses to get to school each day. No houses near. Uproot the child again? Parents don't know where they are on the priority list and don't understand why it is taking so long. No help to access suitable housing How long waiting?

Other notes from the survey Problems with getting 3 bed houses near school. Rent more than £1K for 3 bedrooms and most are for students. Not enough social housing for people in need. Landlords don't want council bonds No houses for 3'4 bedrooms come up for families Not getting any help when they put in requests. No available properties Too many student properties Children sharing bedrooms with grand parents

On a waiting list for bigger house: Less than 6 months 15% Less than a year 3% More than a year 21% More than 2 years 15% More than 3 years 46%

Children's survey – Child friendly Leeds Sharing rooms Love their school. Passionate about their area. Want better for environment. Want a residential area that feels like a home rather than a visiting place – less rubbish, more care for wildlife and building a sense of community/

OTHER PRIORITIES Litter and Graffiti 40% Dangerous driving 40% Anti social behaviour 29% Place for children to play safely Homelessness Pests and Rodents due to litter and take aways Parking near the school Feeling like the council don't care.

Parents Survey on Housing Issues: summary of findings

The survey was undertaken in January 2021 by the Head Teacher of Rosebank Primary School. Forty parents responded, this equates to between 100-120 children, about a third of children at the school.

(Q1) Based on **postcodes** supplied, 20 (53%) out of 39 responses lived in the immediate Little Woodhouse Area and 16 (41%) from adjoining areas. 3 (8%) out of 39 came from further afield.

(Q2) – **Journey to school** - 33 respondents (85%) had up to 15 minutes' walk to school, 2 (5%) had journeys up to 30 minutes, and 4 over 30 minutes (10%).

(Q3) – **What are the problems with getting a house nearer to school?** – out of 35 responses to this open question, 12 (34%) said lack of affordable housing including 11 problems finding suitable size of housing for families, 8 (23%) mentioned too much student accommodation, 5 had no problems (3 because they lived close to school), 3 cited problems with traffic or the weather, 2 said lack of help.

(Q4) – **How many bedrooms do you need to cater for your family?** Out of 38 responses, 11 (29%) said two bedrooms, 14 (37%) three bedrooms, 11 (29%) four bedrooms and 2 (5%) more than four. None said they only required one bedroom.

(Q5) – **Do you have enough bedrooms for your family in your current house?** Out of 44 responses from 38 respondents, 13 (34%) had a bedroom for adults and one for children, but 7 (18%) had only one bedroom for the whole family. Eight (21%) had more than 2 children sharing a bedroom and 3 (8%) had more than three sharing. Six respondents mentioned other problems, including adults and children sharing and boy and girl sharing.

(Q6) **If you could move nearer to school would you be looking to rent or buy?** The overwhelming majority 34 out of 36 responses (94%) answered Rent rather than Buy.

(Q7) **Would you consider moving school to find a suitable house near a school?** The 36 responses were evenly divided between Yes and No.

(Q8) **What are the other barriers to accessing suitable housing in the area?** 33 responded to this open question, though of these 6 answered No or Not sure. Of the remaining 27, the majority 13 mentioned a shortage of houses for families, 7 mentioned preference for students, and 6 the price of accommodation. Also mentioned - damp, long priority/waiting lists, sale of council houses to landlords, landlords refusing to rent to families with kids and lack of help to access housing.

(Q9) **If you are waiting for a suitable house, how long have you been waiting?** Out of 34 responses, 5 (15%) had been waiting less than 6 months, 2 (6%) less than a year, 8 (24%) more than one year, 20 (59%) more than 2 years including 15 (44%) more than 3 years.

(Q10) **What are the other key priorities for you in improving the area?** Out of 32 responses, 12 (37.5%) ticked dangerous driving, 11 (34%) litter and graffiti, and 9 (28%) anti-social behaviour. Other responses mentioned: some local neighbours, pest and rodent issues, alcohol and drugs and homeless on streets making people feel unsafe, and the need for safe play space.

(Q11) **Other information or concerns to mention to councillors:** 15 responded with concerns: 7 related to housing, 3 to litter/bins/flytipping, 1 parking, 1 bus travel, 1 antisocial behaviour, 1 burglary, 1 more information on getting finance support.

Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Public Engagement report Rosebank School

Rosebank School Parents Group – consultation 26 November 2019 at Rosebank School

Consultation with Rosebank School Parents group

10.00am – 11.30am Tuesday 26 November 2019

Introductions

- 11 parents and 1 staff member attended. Deryck Piper and Barbara Mitchell from the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum introduced themselves and thanked everyone for helping towards the preparation of a **Neighbourhood Plan** for the Little Woodhouse area.
- A Neighbourhood Plan is composed by **local people** with the aim of developing or improving the area
- The process should involve as many local people and organisations as possible, public consultations and a local referendum of registered voters before it is **“made” (adopted) as a planning policy**.
- It **must fit in** with National Planning Policy and Local (Council) Plan (Leeds Core Strategy).

Briefly, BM explained the part a **Neighbourhood Plan** would play in the planning process:

- Applications come from a householder or developer to change a building or build a new one
- Others can comment or object to the proposals (recent example in Burley Road next to school)
- The Local planning authority (Leeds City Council) considers the application, looks at Planning policies (including a Neighbourhood Plan) and any comments and decides whether to approve or not
- If approved the developer may still need to meet conditions made by the planning authority.
- If refused the developer may appeal to a Planning Inspector and ultimately national government.

In **Little Woodhouse**, the kinds of policies people have mentioned so far include:

- **Housing** – a better mix of housing for everyone, how much student accommodation
- **Heritage** – keep the local character of buildings in the area, establish a “Heritage Area”
- **Green spaces** – improve the green spaces, encourage more planting
- **Local facilities** – identify community assets eg schools, shops, local employment
- **Transport** – buses, pedestrians, cycles, parking
- **Streets** – litter, waste, bins
- **Healthier environment** – more greenery, safe streets, less air pollution, noise nuisance, graffiti

The group were then asked to fill in a **short questionnaire** asking them what they liked, didn’t like and what they thought would improve the area. 10 questionnaires were completed (see below for responses).

Likes – the most responses were for Community (8), Local facilities (7), and Location/easy access to city centre, school, university, shops (6), Green spaces (4) buildings, own house, transport links (1 each).

Don't likes – most responses were issues about Rubbish (6), Housing (6) incl student (3), crime and safety (4) and traffic (3) and parking (3), play area (1), how to meet people (1)

Improvements – more housing for families rather than students (6), green spaces improvements (4), parking and buses (3), places and events to meet (2), library (2), landlords to pay clean up costs (2) less noise (1), install CCTV (1), more free toilets (1), national housing policies (1).

Summary of responses (10 questionnaires completed)

	Community, people, neighbours	8	6 : 3 said student housing was issue, 1 – people don't know how to meet	6 – more houses, for families, affordable 2 – more places, events to meet
	Buildings	2		1 – national housing policies
	Location/access	6 : city centre 3, uni 2		
	Facilities	7: school 7, GPs 2, shops 1		2 – library 1 – more toilets
	Green spaces	4	1 - play area	4 – park, play area, Rosebank school
	Transport	1	4 : 3 mentioned parking, 3 traffic issues	3 – parking, buses
	Environment	0	4 – crime and safety concerns 6 – LCC, rubbish, litter, street cleaning, glass, dog fouling, drainage	4 – cameras 1, noise 1, landlords 2,

The questionnaires were completed individually, followed by the group sharing and discussing the points raised: some issues repeated the questionnaire responses, and further ideas also emerged.

Summary of discussion points:

Likes:

- easy access to city, univ
- convenient place
- the community (what's left!)
- the school
- the health centre
- parks
- good neighbours
- post office (though good access now lacking)

Don't likes

- more crimes, robberies
- dirty streets
- too many student flats
- dog fouling (owners)
- new buildings, spoiling lovely green area
- car parking management (mosque)
- commuter parking all day
- litter, especially broken glass and needles
- safety
- pot holes, wheelie bins on road
- clean up at year end
- pavements with wet leaves danger
- takeaways - litter and parking problems

Improvements

- parking charges for non residents
- glass bottle bank
- needle collection
- more police on the streets
- more family houses
- library
- play spaces, play equipment
- mend pot holes
- enforce fines for litter (same as LS6)
- newsletters aimed at international students, eg disposal of appliances
- make landlords responsible for paying for clean up
- traffic management – wardens, CCTV
- collect garden refuse
- funding for upgrade school playground
- more tree planting
- regular volunteering slot
- consistent place for training adults

Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Public Engagement report Rosebank School

Rosebank School Parents Group – consultation 26 November 2019 at Rosebank School

Responses from questionnaires:

N. =10	Postcode **	What do you like about your area? (up to 3)	What do you not like about your area? (up to 3)	What would you like to change to make your area better?
1	Not given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community Easy access to city centre School, GP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Street, not house Lot of student house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More houses for families Clean park
2	LS6 1**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cars – commuter parking traffic too many cars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic wardens to control the parking
3	LS4 2**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community school people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> safety park/play area more houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more houses/garden – safe library
4	LS6 1**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community school doctors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> safety park/play area more houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more houses greener gardens, safer library
5	LS11 5**	Horsford <ul style="list-style-type: none"> garden school university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic jam the bus is late less street cleanliness the case of car parking 	
6	LS6 1**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> friendly and peaceful neighbourhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> people don't know how to meet each other dogs foul footpath from Woodsley Rd leading to school parking areas (pay and display) tree leaves in winter time (how to clean) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bus route through Woodsley Road improve bus 19 and 19A to the train station find places where people can meet
7	LS12 2**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community – mixed very friendly good transport links schools, shops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> too many student flats becoming area for students and not families 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more housing (affordable) not flats make the landlords pay to clean up after students instead of residents

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rubbish (especially when students leave) 	
8	LS6 2**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the community • green space for children • buildings • easy access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student, new builds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stop new building for students, more for families • more play areas for children and families • more community based events for families to attend • noise zones • permits parking
9	LS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nice neighbours • ideal location near the university, the primary school and the city center • vast space of parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreasing sense of being safe and secure during the Christmas seasons with many violent crimes nearby • Broken glasses on street • Poor drainage and sewage system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install security cameras in the public areas • Install new facilities in the Woodhouse park • Refurbish the house and playground in the Rosebank Primary School • Provide more free toilets
10	LS6 1**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to city center • Friends/community • My house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constant rubbish/litter • Crime • Traffic issues • LCC – mismanagement no accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studentville landlord attitudes • National policy on housing private contractors • freehold

