

LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

APPRAISAL OF COMMENTS FROM PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

KEY:	Comments from Drop-in Events (suffix P- Post-it note).	
20/5	Swarthmore 20 th May 2024	
5/6	Marks and Spencer Archive 5 th June 2024	
7/6	Willows 7 th June 2024	
10/6	Rosebank School 10 th June 2024	
11/6	Woodsley Community Centre 11 th June 2024	
12/6	Rosebank School Playground 12 th June 2024	

KEY:	Minor or no change involved or agreed	
	Justified disagreement	

SECTION/POLICY	FROM	COMMENT	APPRAISAL	
Introduction (and General Comments)	Garance Rawinsky	<i>Excellent website Minor text change to Georgian Mansions and Victorian Villas More stress on 20 minute neighbourhood (Forum 9 July)</i>	Changed. Add complete, compact, connected neighbourhood to climate change objective.	
	20/5 - 4	<i>Totally agree with all the Plan</i>	No change	
	20/5 - 3	<i>Very amazing and comprehensive plan – wonderful experience. Agree with the amazing ideas for the 9 year innovative neighbourhood plan.</i>	No change	
	20/5 - 1	<i>This will be positive overall for the local area and the local community. Little Woodhouse is a lovely area to live in but it could be with a better demographic balance which this plan might address</i>	No change	
	5/6 – 9	<i>(Overall) Excellent</i>	No change	
	5/6 – 8	<i>Very detailed but lacking an overall vision.? Only right at the start! Very detailed and well researched but problems like graffiti do not seem to be addressed and associated anti social behaviour (drug use)</i>	Issues such as graffiti and anti-social behaviour are non-planning issues and are covered within the Projects section. No change	
	5/6 – 6	<i>The policies all appear to be well considered for the benefit of all who live work study and play in the area</i>	No change	

Vision				
	20/5 - 6	<i>Good to see a vision for the area</i>	No change	
	20/5 - 5	<i>Agree with all of the aims, particularly pedestrian cycle and green infrastructure</i>	No change	
	5/6 – 1	<i>Overall – excellent. I am very happy with it</i>	No change	
	11/6 – 2	<i>Very good</i>	No change	
	11/6 – 3	<i>Overall the aims and policies are agreeable. I do support all the aims and policies. If they can be enforced it would be great but how do we go about it? It all seems quite daunting.</i>	No change	
	12/6 - P	<i>More leafletting in the area – who you are and what you do. (Woodhouse Moor event)</i>	<i>we did not leaflet in Hyde Park area (outside NP area), but maybe a fair point.</i>	
Objectives				
housing and community	20/5 - 1	<i>Housing – it's a highly desirable area to live in very near city centre LGI and both universities but the built environment is overly focused on student accommodation to the detriment of family housing social housing flats/apartments for young professionals – the Plan recognises this with its policies</i>	No change	
	7/6 – 15	<i>Too much development going on around Marlborough, Blenheim Court, Exchange Court and 16-22 Burlet St, it seems never ending. How can we stop it?</i>	NP aims to control development, not stop it. No change	
	10/6 – 4	<i>Neighbourhood noise</i>	No indication of source. No change	
heritage and character	20/5 - 5	<i>Very much agree with sustainability and accessibility as an aim.</i>	No change	
	20/5 -1	<i>Like the idea of extending and joining together the conservation areas into a Heritage Area</i>	No change	
green infrastructure	20/5 -1	<i>Covid flagged up just how important green areas are and the plan recognises that and include projects to extend and consolidate green corridors</i>	No change	
	7/6 – 9	<i>Really like the greenery</i>	No change	
community facilities and employment	7/6 – 12	<i>Likes the community she lives in, getting to know the shopkeepers and neighbours, sense of community</i>	No change	
movement	7/6 – 8	<i>Good location - Can walk into walk [city centre?] from here. Feels safe.</i>	No change	
HOUSING				

Policy H1: Aiming for a balanced community		<i>Housing – Though I think the presence of students is an asset to the area, there needs to be more room for families to provide a stable presence on the streets and build a mixed community</i>	No change.	
	20/5 - 9	<i>Housing – needs more strengthening on language about affordable and residential housing. Use words like “required” rather than “encourages” or “where possible”. Can we get agreement to designate the area as now being saturated with respect to PBSAs? Don’t understand</i>	Strengthened generally where it is appropriate to do so.	
	20/5 - 7	<i>The aim of the NP to support a balanced community is excellent</i>	No change	
	7/6 – 10	<i>Likes the idea of family housing</i>	Aim is to increase family housing. No change	
	7/6 – 14	<i>Parent noted lots of students</i>	No change	
	10/6 – 5	<i>More housing for families</i>	Aim is to increase family housing. No change	
	11/6 – 3	<i>How can we rebalance housing mix. I feel that we never re-balance housing mix. The area is now overwhelmed with student accommodation.</i>	The policies aim to rebalance housing mix. No change	
	11/6 – 4	<i>H1 generally support residential mix aim but note that HMOs next to each other can also reduce conflicts of interest. Micro-scale blocs can achieve this well.</i>	See repeated comment under H5	
Policy H2: Housing Mix	20/5 -7	<i>The ever increasing housing density in our area is undermining the aims of the neighbourhood plan. Social resources are strained – refuse collection and the growing population of rats are major problems that detract from the “good” place to live</i>	The effect of strained social resources is a reflection of the uses in the area and other resource factors rather than density. These effects are a matter for the Community Forum rather than the NP. No change.	
	5/6 – 7	<i>affordable homes and flats for elderly + family housing</i>	Affordable homes covered by H6. Elderly mentioned in 4.3.4, and added to list in H2.	
	5/6 – 5	<i>Housing mix – Affordability for developers and landlords will be an issue for build to rent in making 30% and 10% 4+bed and for between 3 and 2 bed + 10 units with one dwelling for family occupation Also rents may not be affordable – will families want to live in flats?</i>	Policy based on aspiration for more family accommodation. Rents only high because of student numbers. Policy may help to reduce rents. No change.	
	5/6 – 2	<i>Co-living should be seriously considered as it is “affordable”</i>	Is co-living something LWNF wants to see. Could be easy option for conversion of unwanted PBSA. Community led co-operative housing included in 4.3.4	
	11/6 – 4	<i>As PhD student broadly support the aim to have mix of resident.</i>	No change	

Policy H3: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation	20/5 - 11	<i>Well thought through. Would be good to see conditions for PBSA to have to contribute to the economic landscape of the neighbourhood through the provision of commercial units in ground floor active frontages</i>	Included as “active frontages” in the PBSA Design Code (PBSA 5). Could add “including, where appropriate, commercial units to contribute to the local economy”.	
	20/5 - 5	<i>could you add a sentence about active frontages designed in? Ideally shops/cafes/facilities open to the entire community not just student residents</i>	Included as “active frontages” in the PBSA Design Code (PBSA 5). Could add “including, where appropriate, commercial units to contribute to the local economy”.	
	20/5 - 5	<i>Not sure if feasible, but could there be requirements for PBSAs to contribute to the LCC bike scheme? I see students on the rented bikes all the time.</i>	Added to PBSA Design Code para. 3.3.1	
	20/5 - 2	<i>Housing – students are treated as “second class” citizens as the area they have to live in is smaller. If the design was the same for all the accommodation could be used by all</i>	It is generally accepted that student accommodation is different to general housing. Making it the same would be cost-prohibitive but see H4 for conversions. Creating different standards to LCC SPD would not meet the Basic Conditions. No change.	
	7/6 - 10	<i>Like the area, but students make a lot of mess, Especially at changeover.</i>	HC3 aims to reduce impact. No change	
	10/6 – 6	<i>I hope the students have to leave away from the family area</i>	HC3 PBSA area aims to reduce impact. No change	
Policy H4: Conversions to student accommodation	20/5 - 9	<i>Housing – needs more strengthening on language about affordable and residential housing. Use words like “required” rather than “encourages” or “where possible”. Can we get agreement to designate the area as now being saturated with respect to PBSAs? Don’t understand</i>	H4 (g): omit “where possible” No “encourages” in the document.	
	11/6 – 4	<i>agree to all points in H4. Would like to see specific provision for June July moving season.</i>	Included in H4 h) Also expanded in Design Code, applicable to H4 (para 6.3.5)	
Policy H5: Houses in Multiple Occupation	11/6 – 4	<i>H1 generally support residential mix aim but note that HMOs next to each other can also reduce conflicts of interest. Micro-scale blocs can achieve this well.</i>	Aim is to reverse the trend, not increase it. But text to H5 includes reference to LCC DM Note re HMOs, and need to take account of LWNP objectives.	
	11/6 – 4	<i>believe there should be a preference for HMOs when they are of high standard to encourage good conversions rather than poor.</i>	Reference to LCC Draft SPD added 5.2.3	
Policy H6: Affordable Housing	20/5 - 9	<i>Housing – needs more strengthening on language about affordable and residential housing. Use words like “required” rather than “encourages” or</i>	H6 Affordable Housing: “..will normally be required on site.....” and change “encouraged”	

		<i>"where possible". Can we get agreement to designate the area as now being saturated with respect to PBSAs? Don't understand</i>	to "supported", there and elsewhere, but "where possible" is sometimes justified.	
	20/5 - 5	<i>Weak wording – could developers find loopholes?</i>	See comment above	
	20/5 - P	<i>Clarendon wing should become affordable housing/ co-housing for students and hospital staff once it is redeveloped</i>	Outside the NP area. LWNP In conversation with LTH NHS Trust and LCC Regen re Innovation Arc. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>I am doubtful about the aspiration to have more long term residents because rents are so expensive unless you are lucky enough to live in social housing. I would like there to be more affordable flats for families and old people</i>	H6 goes as far as is possible (but is strengthened as previous comments).	
HERITAGE & CHARACTER				
Policy HC1: Little Woodhouse Heritage Area	20/5 -13	<i>I agree with an extended Heritage Area to capture the majority of Victorian buildings and streets. There needs to be more attention to publicising the conservative measures we need to take (landlords and owners) to preserve roof lines, windows, walls etc</i>	Included reference to Leeds Civic Trust leaflet "Living in a Conservation Area". Added to 9.3.5	
	20/5 - 7	<i>There are many good examples but they are increasingly eclipsed by a general atmosphere of neglect.</i>	Hopefully the HA Appraisal and Management Plan will help. No change	
Policy HC2: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	Garance Rawinsky	<i>Loss of York stone on footways, and suggested images & minor text change to Georgian Mansions and Victorian Villas</i>	Paving Included in HAA Appraisal, and added to 10.3.1. Also in HC1	
	5/6 - P	<i>I've looked inside some of the beautiful C19th houses where landlords have neglected maintenance for decades while they raked in fat profits from the rents. We need obligation on them to look after houses</i>	There are powers under the Housing Acts for LAs to serve Improvement Notices, but no powers under Planning Acts. No change	
Policy HC3: Design of Development	20/5 – 4	<i>New build should consider swift bricks much longer lasting than swift boxes and safer. Leedsswifts.com have lots of information</i>	Swift bricks are explicitly mentioned in para 11.3.4 and covered by HC3 j) under "appropriate habitats". RSPB link is included,	
	11/6 – 4	<i>Support retrofitting where this is done to reduce CO2 output but should be done based on data to make sure the intended effect is achieved.</i>	HC3 k) l - Retrofit now first choice, to accord with LCC LP Update	
	11/6 – 4	<i>HC3 generally agree but would want carbon climate consideration to be prioritised over aesthetic</i>	HC3 - Leave order as is, but added sustainability to first paragraph	
Policy HC4: Placemaking Opportunities	20/5 - P	<i>"West End Riverside" will there be access to riverside when all the developments arrive? Added: This should be a requirement</i>	Our boundary doesn't include sites south of Kirkstall Road. 18.3.2 (Employment) includes reference to links within LW to enable linking through to riverside. Included 12.3.6 Placemaking.	

	5/6 - P	<i>Cultural life linked to Film School (Kirkstall Rd)</i>	Added to 12.3.6 and 18.3.1	
	20/5 - P	<i>Better pavements in Woodsley Local Centre and more greenery please!</i>	Included in 12.3.6 and HC4. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Make Westfield Rd boulevard style with trees and diagonal parking to deter parking on Woodsley Rd especially on the pavements</i>	Street trees recommended in G1	
	20/5 - P	<i>Little Woodhouse Bridge – Gateway to Innovation Arc</i>	Covered by HC4. No change	
	11/6 – 4	<i>HC4 PMO3 [Woodsley?] particularly in favour of this</i>	No change	
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE				
Policy G1: Green Infrastructure Opportunities	20/5 -13	<i>I am strongly in favour of expanding the present green features of the area, one of its main assets and a help against future climate change. More awareness and resources are needed if this is to be achieved.</i>	Variously included in Projects,	
	20/5 - 9	<i>Green: not strong enough. Lovely ambitions but some aspirations need to be more strongly worded to compel or prevent further imbalance in the local planning landscape for this area</i>	1st para requires some flexibility as it might not be appropriate for all developments 2nd para – changed some “shoulds” to “musts”	
	20/5 - 8	<i>Green Infrastructure – I believe that access and lighting should also be looked at in this policy area as it is an issue locally and city wide</i>	Added to new para 15.3.4.	
	20/5 - 7	<i>More green spaces and green corridors are good aims.</i>	No change	
	5/6 – 1	<i>More trees please. More trees and shrubs</i>	Trees included in text and policy	
	20/5 - P	<i>More trees and flowers generally</i>	Covered by all Green Infrastructure policies. No change	
	20/5 & 5/6 - P	<i>Create a green corridor along Kirkstall Rd for walkers and cyclists – more trees and plants please (4 yeses please)</i>	Covered by HC4 -Placemaking, G1- Green Infrastructure, and E1 b) and c).	
	11/6 – 4	<i>G1 support keeping existing greenery</i>	No change	
Policy G2: Local Green Spaces	20/5 - 6	<i>Green spaces are very important</i>	No change	
	5/6 – 7	<i>Protect all green spaces</i>	No suggestion of additional spaces. No change	
	7/6 – 7	<i>Likes the green spaces</i>	No change	
	7/6 – 8	<i>Likes the green spaces</i>	No change	
	7/6 – 14	<i>The children like the animals especially the squirrels on Rosebank Millennium Green so green spaces very important</i>	No change	

Policy G3: Improving Existing Green Spaces	20/5 - 9	<i>Green infrastructure – Improve/ increase facilities for children playgrounds especially in the lower end of the steps between Westfield Rd and the Millennium Green behind Rosebank School</i>	Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Could be disagreements about exact locations unless there is clear public preference.	
	20/5 - 7	<i>More please! The green space at the bottom of Park Lane is yet another victim of a highrise student PBSA development</i>	Particularly valued green spaces are designated as Local Green Spaces. Incidental green spaces are explicitly covered in para.16.3.2. and included as “other spaces” requiring improvement in Policy G3	
	20/5 - 4	<i>Needs more tree planting in some of the green spaces especially the Willows</i>	Trees are implicit in “planting”, which is well-covered, but trees now explicitly included in text.	
	20/5 - 4	<i>Quiet areas are important (outdoor)</i>	Para 16.3.1 covers a variety of purposes for green spaces including sitting and relaxation. quiet areas added..	
	5/6 – 9	<i>I should like to emphasise air pollution could be ameliorated by greenery, especially in bridge area over the motorway, our side of St George’s</i>	Included in G3,	
	5/6 - P	<i>The decorative tiles are a nice example of public art – repeatable?</i>	Use of public art is promoted by G3. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Would like Rosebank to be cleaner</i>	Rosebank Millennium Green is maintained by the community. No change	
	20/5 - P	<i>This wooded area with steep steps is very unpleasant and poorly maintained (Rosebank)</i>	Rosebank Millennium Green is maintained by the community. No change	
	11/6 - P	<i>Woodhouse Moor clean and well kept but it seems like only one gardener – cant LCC afford more gardeners?</i>	Outside the area. No change	
	11/6 - P	<i>Green spaces = Rotting benches need replacing on estates</i>	Seating mentioned in 16.3.2.	
	7/6 - 1	<i>Likes the greenery and the flowers Doesn’t feel safe walking across the Willows in winter when it’s dark</i>	Added to 16.3.2	
	7/6 - 2	<i>More trees on the far side [of the Willows] along metal fence to block off carpark and the wind</i>	G3 is general, with specific improvements subject to consultation.	
	7/6 - 2	<i>A playground may bring asbo</i>	Non-planning issue. No change	
	7/6 – 3	<i>Willow Close – could they sort out the flags, they could just be turned over and re-set</i>	Highway maintenance issue. No change	
	7/6 – 3	<i>[Willows] Replace the seats – plastic would be OK</i>	LCC Parks issue. No change	
	7/6 – 4	<i>[Willows] Trees on the far side would be good</i>	G3 is general, with specific improvements subject to consultation.	

	7/6 - 5	[Willows] <i>There is a tree too close to the house – needs to come down</i>	Tree management matter. No change	
	7/6 - 11	<i>Improving paving and seats on Willow Close</i>	Added to 16.3.2	
	7/6 - 11	[Willows] Trees along the far fence are a good idea	G3 is general, with specific improvements subject to consultation.	
	10/6 – 7	Planters, terrace gardens, trees planted, more greenery and parks for children	Covered by all Green Infrastructure policies. No change.	
	12/6 – 4	<i>More clean quiet spaces</i>	G1 aims to create Green Infrastructure corridors and G3 aims to improve existing spaces, both of which may result in more clean quiet spaces. No change	
	12/6 - P	<i>Dog Park</i>	Sole comment on this and relates to Woodhouse Moor (outside the area).	
	11/6 – 4	<i>G3 would like to see emphasis on biodiversity</i>	Biodiversity included in the policy,	
Green Infrastructure Projects				
P-G2 Play Spaces	5/6 – 7	<i>Kids need playspace. When I went to an event at Rosebank the Rosebank Rd was closed off and kids were playing football. I leant that they never went up to Woodhouse Moor to play and it was a rare treat for them to kick a ball around outdoors. I'd like the youth work on Rosebank to be supported so that kids can appreciate nature.</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	5/6 – P	<i>Improve facilities for children generally: play space and youth work. Would be good if they could play on Rosebank Rd</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	5/6 – P	<i>Benson Park should have improved play facilities and disabled childrens swings and toilets</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	7/6 – 4	[Willows] <i>Kids playground would be OK</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	7/6 – 5	[Willows] <i>5 a side football pitch would be good not too expensive</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	7/6 – 7	[Willows] <i>Need safe environment where kids can play out safely</i>	<i>Play Included in G3 as a general point but no specifics. Project P-G2</i>	
	12/6 – 4	<i>Benson Court owners walking dogs in childrens park More child friendly parks More family attractions student free</i>	<i>Project P-G2</i>	
COMMUNITY and EMPLOYMENT				
Policy C1: Community Facilities	12/6 – 4	<i>More police patrolling</i>	Non planning issue. No change	

	20/5 - 6	<i>The area needs more community resources – meeting places, social gathering etc</i>	Covered by last para of Policy C1. No change	
	5/6 – 8	<i>Let's see more cafes and good eating places like Haftsin (Persian) and Forista and Burley Road Like to see French or Algerian.</i>	Non-planning issues. No change	
	5/6 – 7	<i>Protect local community centres</i>	Included in C1. No change	
	20/5 - P	<i>Increase the award winning Rosebank School as they are under pressure from more students from central Leeds</i>	Rosebank included in C1. Operational matters not for NP. No change.	
	7/6 – 14	<i>Children like their school (Rosebank)</i>	Rosebank School included in C1. No change	
	12/6 – 1	<i>Support to get the mentally ill of the streets</i>	Non-planning issue. No change	
	12/6 – 3	<i>Help the homeless – mentally ill hanging around the city centre</i>	Non-planning issue. No change	
	11/6 – 4	<i>would like to see specific numbers /targets added if possible for contributing public service use from developments and mitigation from developers.</i>	Would need to justify any targets. How? Better to consult with local community at the time, as required. No change	
Policy E1: Employment opportunities	11/6 – 4	<i>also local entertainment/cultural amenities, pubs etc encouraged</i>	These are commercial uses which the policy encourages, albeit with emphasis on creative media sector (from which other uses will flow). No change	
Policy E2: Employment/Residential mixed use	20/5 - 8	<i>Employability – I find it hard to understand the narrative around mixed use in the area, especially those identified on Map10 as one of the sites is only housing at the current moment – not correct</i>	Change title to Mix of Uses. Mixed use areas on Map 10 do include uses other than housing.	
	20/5 - 7	<i>Support for local mixed employment is good – as far as it goes</i>	No suggestion about how it could go further. No change	
Policy E3: Local shopping facilities	11/6 – 4	<i>where commerce can't be encouraged, new cultural uses should be prioritised</i>	Change “local centre uses” in the policy to “shopping parades”. Uses in the Woodsley Road Local Centre are covered by Leeds Local Plan	
Community Projects				
P-C1 Graffiti	5/6 – 2	<i>Section 106 money should be earmarked for graffiti removal All developments which involve planning applications should have this no matter how small. The odd £1k will always help.</i>	Included in Projects which provide priorities for CIL money. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Graffiti – what the hell can you do about it?</i>	Included in Projects which provide priorities for CIL money. No change	

unallocated	5/6 - P	<i>Toilets, disabled toilet and changing places for the Moor and Hyde Park should be negotiated with the University and M&S archive, as in breach of the Equality Act</i>	Outside the area. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Woodhouse Moor – Beside the upper 5 a side football ground (the former bowling green) there could be a quiet area. The flower beds are already there. They could be planted with perennial flowers and shrubs. Some seats could be provided.</i>	Outside the area. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Please negotiate with the Leeds Business School, University Law Centre, Marks and Spencer Archive for the use of their toilets/disabled toilets/changing places/disabled parking places for the use of the general public using the Moor as Leeds City Council is in breach of the Disabled Persons Act 2010</i>	Outside the area. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Idea for community forum – discuss Woodhouse Moor facilities with Uni and M&S as well</i>	Outside the area. No change	
MOVEMENT				
Policy M1: Safe Movement	20/5 - 9	<i>More segregated cycling and cycle traffic filters throughout the area. Also need for safe cycle parking facilities</i>	Policy M1 covers cycle safety without specifics which would need to be identified through the Leeds Cycling Strategy	
	5/6 – 8	<i>Need to feel safe at night</i>	Lighting implicit in “safety”, but add “at all times” to M1	
	5/6 – 7	<i>Make roads safer! Control speed</i>	Highway matter. No change	
	5/6 - P	<i>Augment mentions of air pollution mitigation. Especially near inner loop bridge</i>	Add sentence to 21.3.1 and adjustments to 21.3.3	
	5/6 - P	<i>Where are the monitoring stations (for air pollution)?</i>	Can be found on-line. None near LW now.	
	20/5 - P	<i>Need more pedestrian crossings along Kirkstall Road</i>	Added to 21.3.7?	
	5/6 - P	<i>Chiqain (sic) needed on Moorland Road</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>Idea for Community Forum – discuss with Highways – danger spots eg Moorland Rd, narrowing road, 20mph throughout, widen pavements and add greenery</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>Control speeding vehicles on Moorland RD and others. I’ve seen cars doing in excess of 60mph!</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	

	5/6 - P	<i>20mph along Moorland Rd – there have been 2 major crashes in the last few weeks</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>Traffic lias it is dangerous at the moment as drivers out ghts at Hyde Park Rd/Moorland Rd instead of mini roundabout to slow traffic and give pedestrians more chance to cross</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Make St Johns Ave going north one way as drivers cut the corner – narrow the exit</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Make St Johns Terrace one way going south and narrow the road as it is unsafe to cross at the moment due to people driving too fas and cars taking priority</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>More priority for pedestrians at the traffic lights to the University/Clarendon Rd</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
		<i>Traffic lights at the bottom of Woodsley Rd instead of pedestrian lights to control traffic and help pedestrians</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Stop traffic rat running through Westfield Rd</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Clarendon Rd and the whole Little Woodhouse area should be 20mph maximum throughout to reduce accidents and prioritise walkers and children</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>Traffic lights at Park Lane to slow traffic down</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	5/6 - P	<i>Change zebra crossing to traffic lights on Park Lane</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Have pedestrian control lights on the corner with Joseph's Well</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Tackle dangerous junctions in key busy areas with calming measures 20mph zone throughout and lights where possible</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	20/5 - P	<i>Make the Inner ring road into a canal like in Amsterdam</i>	Outside LW area. No change	
	7/6 - 6	<i>Need ways through the area for bikes away from traffic</i>	Cycle safety included in M1: specific ways of achieving that are Highway matters. No change	
	7/6 – 9	<i>Too many cars parked around the area. Some houses have too many cars</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	7/6- 16	<i>Willows Approach- Is parking permits a possibility?</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	

		<i>Parking in the turning bays makes it very difficult</i> <i>Stranger parking -People from flats opposite (on Burley Rd) have permit parking so excess cars park in the Willows.</i> <i>Parking on corners- blocking road for Access Bus. Could street wardens visit?</i>		
	10/6 – 4	<i>The traffic sign should be 20 (outside the school)</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	10/6 – 7	<i>One way system around the school, speed bumps</i> <i>Park at side of Doctors re development</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	11/6 – 4	<i>More bus walking and cycling appreciated and support LTNs to achieve this.</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	
	11/6 – 4	<i>also wheelchair users should be explicitly considered with pavements</i>	Covered by the word “accessibility”	
	11/6 – 4	<i>M1 should be actively prioritising active transport over driving</i>	add “...should promote active travel, where appropriate giving priority to.....”	
Movement Projects				
P-M1 Buses	20/5 - P	<i>Bus route up and down Woodsley Rd and Clarendon Rd</i>	Included in P-M1?	
P-M4 Waste Management	5/6 - P	<i>Do landlords pay council tax? They should meet the cost of street cleaning etc</i>	Tenants, not landlords, pay Council Tax. All-student households are exempt.	
	11/6 - P	<i>Woodsley Rd/BelleVue Rd junction – now becoming a dumping ground</i>	Part of project.	
	7/6 – 12	<i>Doesn't like bins on streets and rubbish</i>	Part of project.	
	7/6 – 17	<i>Dustbins left on paths, bins on streets</i>	Part of project.	
	10/6 - 2	<i>The rats epidemic is extremely serious all the people agree</i>	Part of project.	
	12/6 – 2	<i>Overflowing bins not put back in – have to walk in the road</i>	Part of project.	
	12/6 – 4	<i>Mr Tee restaurant littering</i>	Part of project.	
	12/6 – 5	<i>Royal Park pub park opposite</i> <i>Pick up needles in kids new park</i>	Outside NP area. Pass to Burley NP.	
	12/6 – 6	<i>More community officers patrolling ward away drugs</i> <i>Stop students littering around hyde park Drugs -Asbo</i>	Non planning issue Outside NP Area	

Aug 2025