



# Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Barbara Mitchell  
8-31-2025



## Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation Statement

### Contents

1.	<b>Introduction</b> 1.1 Legal requirements 1.2 Support in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan 1.3 Extent of the area 1.4 The Neighbourhood Forum 1.5 Aims of the Pre Submission Consultation	Pages 2 - 4
2.	<b>Background to the Pre Submission Consultation</b> 2.1 Why produce a neighbourhood plan 2.2 Overall Benefits and Problems 2.3 Consultation bodies 2.4 Local groups and bodies 2.5 Individuals	Pages 5 - 6
3.	Who consulted 3.1 Groups consulted 3.2 Different stages of consultations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing Vision and objectives</li> <li>• Engagement and policy development</li> <li>• Draft policies – how consultations helped shape Plan policies</li> </ul>	Pages 7 - 12
4.	Pre submission consultation and publicity 4.1 Pre Submission Consultation 4.2 Methods of engagement 4.3 Results of PSC consultation 4.4 PSC comments and LWNP responses	Page 13 - 15
5.	Summary of main issues raised	Page 16
6.	Conclusions	Page 17
Appendices	A Timeline & organisations contacted	Pages 20-28
	B Appraisal of comments - organisations	Pages 29-57
	C Appraisal of comments - individuals	Pages 58-74
	D Examples of materials – see list of individual files	Pages 75-99

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Legal requirements

The Consultation Statement for Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. The Statement meets the requirements of regulation 15 to set out an accurate and detailed record of the pre-submission consultation, required by regulation 14. It also contains an outline of all non-statutory engagement made by Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum in developing the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan.

Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement should include:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan.*
- (b) explains how they were consulted.*
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.*
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.*

### 1.2 Support in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan

The Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan has had considerable support from different sources, in addition to the resources of the Forum and its members. These have been essential in progressing the plan at all stages and have our grateful thanks.

- From the beginning ward councillors have given their full support, in chairing meetings and on occasion funding meeting costs: Councillor Javaid Akhtar, the former Councillors Christine Towler and Gerald Harper, and more recently Councillors Kayleigh Brooks and Abigail Marshall Katung.
- Throughout the process there has been encouragement and invaluable practical advice and support from the Leeds City Council Neighbourhood Planning manager Ian Mackay, and successive members of the team., The key evidence report on Housing and Population has been prepared and kept up to date by members of the team, most recently by Abbie Miladinovich and Kwame Steadman.
- Locality, the agency providing national support for neighbourhood planning, provided funding for the early stages of the plan which enabled the Forum to employ a professional planning adviser, Peter Baker, who later joined the Forum as a volunteer continuing to give his expert services pro bono.
- Locality also funded a Technical Support package which engaged the Aecom consultancy to complete an external assessment and provide a design guide for the neighbourhood area.
- Quentin Bradley, of Leeds Beckett University Urban Planning Department organised a series of talks and workshops in the early days of neighbourhood planning, which greatly helped comparing notes with other groups. At later stages of our Plan, post graduate students on the Masters course ran a series of projects on different aspects of the Plan which provided valuable evidence.

### 1.3 Extent of area

The Little Woodhouse Area lies to the west of Leeds City Centre, adjacent to Woodhouse Moor to the North, the estate of the University of Leeds and Leeds General Infirmary to the east, follows Kirkstall Road to the South and Willow Road/Burley Road/Hyde Park Road/Woodsley Road to the West.

It covers the land of the old St Johns Estate, which was bought by John Kendal in 1583 and left in Trust to support the church of St John. Its eastern edge follows the boundary of the former Leeds parish with the Headingley cum Burley parish. The lands were first developed with Georgian mansions and their grounds, then into Victorian villas and terraces, many still standing. A local shopping centre was established in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The 20<sup>th</sup> century saw the development of estates of council housing and more recently the growth of purpose built student accommodation blocks to the south.

The corridor between Kirkstall & Burley Roads contains small industrial premises, a cluster of media related businesses. They both form important traffic routes. Education dominates the economy of the area, through the neighbouring Universities, Park Lane Campus and Rosebank School. 76% of the population are aged between 19 and 29.

### 1.4 The Neighbourhood Forum

The Neighbourhood Forum Working Group initially grew out of the Little Woodhouse Community Association, itself an amalgam of local neighbourhood groups such as Marlborough tenants, Hanover Square residents, Moorlands residents. It began discussions in 2013 and held public meetings in 2014 and 2015 firstly to establish borders of a Neighbourhood Area (designated in March 2015) and subsequently to develop a Vision and Constitution as a Neighbourhood Forum, designated in February 2016.

The Forum's 40+ members were drawn from across the community and included residents, businesses, voluntary organisations, education and student representatives. The ward councillors have been supportive throughout the process of setting up and conducting Forum meetings. The Constitution required the Forum to meet a minimum of 4 times a year, including an Annual General Meeting and allowed the election of a Steering Committee of up to 12 members to manage the process of drawing up the Plan. Draft policies were presented, discussed and approved by the Forum.

The early work of the Forum consisted of workshops and questionnaires identifying key issues from residents and others. Based on these findings, the drawing up a Vision and Policy Intentions Document, was supported by a planning consultant Peter Baker, with Locality funding. Further discussions by the Forum focused on different policy areas such as Housing, which drew also on the views of other stakeholders, such as the local primary school, or local residents within the proposed Heritage Area extension. Student representatives helped design and conduct a questionnaire to explore student priorities in PBSA design. Local survey work of forum members informed the Heritage and Green spaces policies, and Peter Baker continued to provide planning expertise, frequently pro bono. The Forum also shared quarterly meetings with the Little Woodhouse Community Forum which focused on immediate issues such as crime, traffic and waste management.



Other consultations with outside bodies helped refine the policies: e.g. LCC provided feedback in many areas and specifically the Housing and Population Evidence Review. Aecom consultants conducted an independent survey of the structure of the area. Leeds Beckett Planning Masters students based a series of project surveys e.g. Green spaces, Social structure, Housing needs. The housing and landlord body Unipol added their informal comments. Conversations with Hyde Park Neighbourhood Forum, Rosebank Primary School and also local faith leaders ensured a consistent understanding of aims across the wider area.

A Working Group drawn from the Steering Committee (Deryck Piper, Peter Baker and Barbara Mitchell) undertook detailed discussions and development of policies, reporting initially to the Steering Committee. The resulting drafts were presented to the Forum for agreement. This included the Park Lane Design Code, the Aecom documents, meetings following Pre Submission Consultation with the University of Leeds, LCC Conservation and Regeneration Teams.

## 1.5 Aims of Pre Submission Consultation

The Aims of the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan were developed in a series of local meetings and questionnaires from 2014 to 2015, leading to the designation of the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum in February 2016. These Aims and Objectives are expressed in the Vision – see website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

The Aims of the Consultation are to identify the comments of different parts of the community and other stakeholders and how they match the aims and proposed Plan policies.

## 2 Background to consultation

### 2.1 Why produced a neighbourhood plan

Little Woodhouse produced a Neighbourhood Design Statement in 2011. This highlighted the many heritage features in the area including Georgian mansions and Victorian villas and terraces, along with estates of post war housing and also identified several opportunities for development.

The number of purpose-built student accommodation blocks had started to rise in response to growing student numbers already in landlord-owned housing. The Localism Act of 2012 offered the opportunity of confirming a neighbourhood approach to planning in order to combine the different demands of longer term and shorter-term residents and to retain the character and quality of the area.

Other wider issues emerged during the planning, including the importance of carbon capture and access to green spaces, which reinforced the opportunity to shape new developments.

### 2.2 Overall Benefits and Problems of consultation

The process of consultation on the neighbourhood plan has produced benefits through better links with local organisations such as Universities and student unions, neighbouring planning groups, local owners and stakeholders such as Josephs Well, Park Lane Campus and more thorough cooperation with local Councillors and Officers.

Consultation throughout the planning process has provided a better contacts and knowledge exchange with the Little Woodhouse Community Association and the Little Woodhouse Community Forum and links with Leeds City Council departments and bodies such as the local Police, West Yorkshire Combined Authority and LGI Infirmary.

A significant problem was the emergence of the demands of a neighbourhood planning process over time. The area has a large proportion of transient residents (70%+), many of them students, which makes it difficult to capture a steady membership in the forum. On the other hand, the student representatives proved to offer enthusiasm and valuable insights, for instance in gathering student perspectives of PBSA design and views of the area.

The demands of expertise and time involved in drafting policy and gathering evidence have proved to be considerable. The valuable participation of our planning consultant, the contributions of Leeds City Council neighbourhood planning staff, and the Locality backing of an Aecom report, all proved essential to the shaping of the plan policies.

In addition, timing engagement events around general elections, a referendum, the academic year and a pandemic stretched the overall timetable to a number of years.

### 2.3 Consultation bodies

The engagement strategy identified three main groups in the community:

- long-term residents



- transient residents especially students
- workers and owners/managers in shops and offices, studios, medical and university workplaces.

The aim of the strategy was to make all members of each group aware of the neighbourhood plan and provide them with the opportunity to participate in its creation.

In addition to these groups in the community, the consultation aimed to engage with other key bodies, in particular the Local Authority and other local stakeholders, e.g. education providers and landowners. The Pre Submission Consultation also included statutory bodies, other local authorities and voluntary organisations across the city.

## 2.4 Local groups and bodies

The local groups and bodies contacted include 200 local businesses, the Grand Mosque, the Health Centre and Rosebank Primary and Nursery School.

The Forum has ongoing contact with Hyde Park Source (local environmental charity), Joseph's Well (offices), Park Lane Campus (Leeds City College), the Rosebank School, the student union of the University of Leeds, the Urban Planning school of Leeds Beckett University, Unipol (student housing provider) and with Hyde Park Neighbourhood Planning Forum.

## 2.5 Individuals

The Forum has used printed leaflets to reach the households of long term and short-term residents, including students. More recently, a website with full documents has been also publicised. Workplaces and student accommodation blocks where direct access to mailboxes was not available, were approached to leave piles of leaflets for individuals to take. These methods have clear drawbacks because of the frequent lack of take-up.

To overcome some of the drawback of take-up, the forum has approached Representatives of the groups, especially students through student union representatives, and landlords through the umbrella body of Unipol. The Rosebank School Parents group also provided insights into local family issues, in particular housing, and this was reinforced with a survey carried out by the school and followed up with a meeting with the council.

**For a full Timescale of engagement see Appendix A below**

## 3 Who consulted

### 3.1 All groups consulted

The following key stakeholder groups were identified for the Pre Submission Consultation based on local knowledge and **previous consultation experience**:

- **Residents' associations and groups:** Little Woodhouse Community Association, Marlborough tenants, Moorlands residents. We have contacts in each of these groups and ask them to spread awareness.
- **Residents** (generally): All households leafleted about the PSC consultation. 4000 leaflets and 100 posters.
- **Landlords:** There are several landlords groups in the area contacted directly about the consultation and asked to circulate the consultation material among their networks. E.g. Unipol, Resident Landlord Association. Luminate group (Park Lane Campus), Josephs Well local business centre was contacted directly.
- **Local businesses:** An updated list of businesses to be leafleted and contacted directly by email (where possible). The list was updated in 2024 and leaflets delivered by hand to provide opportunities for discussion. The comments were on the whole supportive, though sceptical of success.
- **Places of worship:** Local places of worship contacted directly about the consultation and asked to circulate material amongst their networks. Leeds Grand Mosque, Hyde Park Methodist Church, and North Church, also St George's and All Hallows' and Leeds Chinese Christian Church which are on the borders of the Area.
- **Schools and nurseries:** We have ongoing contacts at Rosebank Primary and Nursery School who were contacted directly about the consultation and asked to circulate material to parents. We attended a parents' group to gather views (for a second time) and distributed leaflets at home time.
- **Ward Councillors:** Ward councillors have given good support throughout the development of the Plan and asked to circulate consultation material to their networks in **Little Woodhouse**. The Neighbourhood Area now falls entirely within the Little London and Woodhouse ward.
- **Neighbouring neighbourhood planning areas:** **Hyde Park, Kirkstall & Headingley** are designated neighbourhood planning areas and were contacted directly and asked to circulate the consultation material amongst their networks. We have ongoing attendance at the Hyde Park Neighbourhood Forum
- **Statutory groups etc** – Emails sent to 58 organisations -
- **Voluntary organisations** – All information circulated via the Doing Good Network on advice of Voluntary Action Leeds
- **Press** – Evening Post, West Leeds Despatch.
- **Website** – [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)



## 3.2 Stages of consultations

### 3.2.1. Developing Vision and objectives

The plan was initiated by a meeting of residents' groups in a **Public Launch on 28 October 2014**. The area was leafletted for each of 3 meetings (2000 addresses). The meetings were chaired by local councillors and attended by 20 – 30 residents, with representatives from two Universities and Student Unions, voluntary groups, the Leeds City College, and local business centre Josephs Well. Workshops and questionnaires were used to collect the views on Likes and Dislikes and discussed to identify Strengths Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats to develop the Vision, aims and objectives. See **Appendix A**

The Neighbourhood Area was designated on 3 February 2015 and the Neighbourhood Forum on 16 February 2016. The Vision and Objectives were formally adopted on 15 March 2016. The Forum was redesignated in August 2021. The Vision and Objectives were reviewed and approved in March 2023. (See [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org))

### 3.2.2 Engagement and policy development

The means of engagement included:

- **Open Forum public meetings** – held regularly to develop the Neighbourhood Plan policies and quarterly in conjunction with Little Woodhouse Community Forum to address immediate issues of concern to residents. Residents, student reps, councillors and officers attend.
- **Steering Committee representatives** – in addition to elected members, representatives of students and other organisations e.g. tenants, have contributed their expertise and feedback.
- **Local resident workshops and consultations** – leaflets to households in the immediate areas e.g. Clarendon Quarter, Josephs Well, Marlboroughs at Park Dale Hall, the Moorlands and Kelsos area at M&S Archive and Artlink, Rosebank School, Swarthmore Centre and Woodsley Road Community Centre.
- **Liaison with University and Student Union officers and Unipol** – examples include information stalls and questionnaires about likes and dislikes, what factors are important in choosing student accommodation (LUU and LBU); Leeds Beckett University Master's degree projects on housing, heritage, green spaces, social and economic infrastructure as part of a neighbourhood planning module.
- **School events** – parents contact meeting – with questionnaire and workshop discussion. Regular liaison, particularly around housing issues
- **Outdoor – Stalls** at community events on the Rosebank Green and Unity Day; Heritage Walks around the area, guided walks for LBU students.
- **Visits and meetings** e.g., Leeds Grand Mosque, LGI developments, Hyde Park Source etc, attendance and liaison with Hyde Park Neighbourhood Forum
- **Publicity:** Emails, letters for non-email contacts, Leaflet drops, Questionnaires, booklets, posters and leaflets at information stalls, Heritage Walks advertised online
- **Website** [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

### 3.2.3 Draft Policies: how consultations have helped shape Neighbourhood Plan policies 2016 to 2024

#### Housing policies

At an early stage in 2017, an evidence base for housing and population was recognised as an essential key to understanding the housing needs of the area. This work was initially undertaken by a student representative under the supervision of Leeds City Council neighbourhood planning. This established the continued growth of student numbers in the area, rising from 50% in the 2000s to a present figure of 70%. following the growth in purpose built student accommodation blocks. The draft **evidence report on housing and population** was updated and extended by several members of LCC planning staff and most recently revised in 2023 by Kwame Steadman to include the 2021 Census results.

Two main areas of evidence were presented for further consultation in 2019:

a meeting with Rosebank School parents identified the significant difficulties for **families finding appropriate housing** in the area (expanded by a detailed survey carried out by the school)

contacts with student union outreach team established the main **priorities for students in looking for purpose built** accommodation. This led to a questionnaire with results that informed a draft design code for purpose built student housing.

Continued informal feedback from the Leeds City Council has been very useful in the formation of housing policies.

#### Heritage and design policies

The concerns for heritage in the Neighbourhood Area are well established, through the designation of three Conservation Areas, and many listed buildings, as summarised in the Neighbourhood Design Statement 2011. Heritage Day walks and published leaflets formed a valuable basis for community involvement (2013 – 2019). In 2018 a formal walking survey was carried out with local participation and recorded by a qualified professional consultant Peter Baker. Similarly, in 2020/1 there was a survey of local heritage assets, both inside and outside the conservation areas.

The resulting findings suggested the establishment of a **Heritage Area**, bringing together the existing conservation areas and other streets of mainly Victorian terraces, and identifying non designated heritage assets.

This work was thoroughly discussed with the **LCC Conservation Team** officer as part of the Pre Submission Consultation (March 2025) and received a positive response from Historic England.

During the planning process feedback from the **Park Lane Campus** of Leeds City College indicated the possibility of sale for the large Park Lane site (Jan 2018). A series of meetings between the Neighbourhood Forum and Park Lane representatives aimed to produce a design code that reflected the views of both residents and the college (2019 - 2022). Following the draft design code, the college represented by Joanna Gabrilatsou continued to give valuable feedback to ensure consistency as other parts of the Plan evolved.



During the gap in activities forced by Covid, a Locality Technical Support package with **Aecom consultants** enabled the design aspects of the Plan to be strengthened, providing an area **general design guidance and character analysis (Jan – Nov 2021)**. These documents provided a greater depth of guidance particularly on environmental aspects.

### **Green spaces policies**

In June 2021 – 2022 a Green Spaces survey was conducted by members of the Forum, documenting movement and greenery primarily along pedestrian and vehicle routes, leading out from the east end of the area towards the local centre in the west. This was followed by a shorter survey of mainly pedestrian routes from south to north up the escarpment.

As well as identifying the ten **Local Green Spaces** The survey suggested a **green corridors** approach improving on the green spaces in private gardens and identifying small areas that could be developed as pocket parks. The corridor between Burley Road and Kirkstall Road offers many opportunities for tree and green planting.

The routes identified make a significant link between the city centre outwards, making more green spaces available to city centre workers. The development of the City Vision for Leeds includes an **Innovation Arc** and **West End Riverside**, both of which share borders with the Little Woodhouse Area. In 2023 -2025 links have been made with the development teams working on both these areas and offer promise for the future.

### **Economy, education and community policies**

- **Leeds Transformational Regeneration / A Vision for Leeds**

The proximity of the city centre to the Little Woodhouse area has a great influence on the economy, as a source of employment, shopping and entertainment for residents. The area offers routes to and from the centre and an important resource of green spaces for city centre workers. In 2025 the Mott MacDonald framework for Walkable Neighbourhoods has been applied to establish how closely the Little Woodhouse area meets most of the criteria.

The Plans for the Vision of the City include development opportunities in the Innovation Arc and West End Riverside, alongside changes to the LGI site. The development of these plans is important for the future of Little Woodhouse and the establishment of contacts with the development teams have already identified common aims for the areas (2023 ongoing).

- **Local businesses**

The economy of Little Woodhouse divides between

the **commercial area** between Burley Road and Kirkstall Road, including many media related businesses. At the far eastern end of the area there is a smaller cluster of businesses and Josephs Well, a business centre for small businesses. The participation of Mark Pullan proprietor of Josephs Well was especially helpful to the Forum's discussion of the role of business in the area.

the **retail area** of small shops and food related businesses in the Local Centre of Woodsley Road/Hyde Park Road and extending along Burley Road

the influence of **education areas**, principally the University of Leeds and other university and health related institutions, also the Park Lane Campus of Leeds City College, and the sole remaining school, Rosebank Primary and Nursery School.

Contacts were collected in 2016, 2021 (by LBU students) and 2024 (as part of the PSC) though responses were disappointing. The PSC approaches included email where available and hand delivered leaflets to all. This enabled discussions with a number of the small establishments who expressed support for the aims of the Plan though sceptical of its success.

- **Landlords' responses**

Throughout the planning process, contact was maintained with Unipol through Forum meetings and several discussions with Unipol officers. It was useful to compare the results of the LW Student questionnaire on student priorities with the national results of the larger Unipol survey.

Contacts also extended to landlord's forums during the PSC exercise. Several responses to the PSC were received, expressing objections to the area of preferred PBSA and to LW policies restricting conversions to premises to suit all households, rather than to student only studios.

- **LBU planning students**

From 2021 to 2024 the participation of Leeds Beckett University Masters students in Planning was particularly valuable across many policy areas. Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan was used as a case study in neighbourhood planning and provided scope for project work in many policy areas, including housing needs and affordable housing, heritage and non-designated heritage assets, green spaces and sustainable communities, as well as engagement and website approaches. These provided a valuable pool of ideas and evidence and enabled the student perspective to be included across most policy areas.

- **University of Leeds**

Contacts with universities mainly relied on student union representatives in the early years, though contact with the sustainability team was maintained through local volunteer activity.

The PSC contacted a wider number of university departments, including the Estates team, which contributed an extensive response to the consultation. This included a suggested new policy highlighting the importance of the University to the community structure of the Plan and also identified issues around the designation of a preferred PBSA area and to the policy about conversions to student studios.

These suggested changes were given careful consideration by the Forum and discussed in a joint meeting between the Forum working party and the University Estates in July 2025, a positive exchange of ideas resulting in several modifications to Plan policies.

- **Park Lane Campus, Leeds City College, Luminate Group**

Park Lane Campus joined the Forum at an early stage and in early 2018 involved the Forum in its thinking about the potential sale of the Park Lane site. The Forum organised walkabouts and workshops with the tenants of the nearby Marlborough estate and Hanover



Square and developed ideas for a design code extending to the potential uses and design of the site.

An extensive series of discussions between the Forum working party and the College representatives resulted in an agreed set of proposed design principles. (PBSA design code v6 2020, v10 2022). Contacts continued with a very useful checking of changes to future policies to ensure consistency across all Plan documents. The success of this exchange was confirmed by email from Joanna Gabrilatsou in September 2025 and contacts between us are continuing.

- **Rosebank Primary and Nursery School**

Close links with the school enabled the Forum to check the views parents matched the vision and policy intentions (nov 2019). It also highlighted the pressing issues of housing for families of an appropriate size and affordability. In early 2021 this issue was followed up by a more extensive survey by the school, which has provided importance evidence for the housing policies in the Plan. The emphasis of the Plan shifted to focus more on the supply of housing development appropriate for larger households.

## 4 Pre submission consultation and publicity (Reg 14)

20 May – 2 August 2024

### 4.1 Consultation Events

The Pre Submission Consultation (PSC) was launched on Tuesday 20 May 2024 and took place initially for a period of 9 weeks to end on Friday 19 July 2024. This was extended to a further 2 weeks ending on Friday 2 August 2024.

Leaflets advertising the points of Plan policies and dates of Drop-In meetings were distributed to all household and businesses in the Neighbourhood Area.

Drop-In sessions with an exhibition of policies and full copies of documents available:

Monday 20 May 4pm-7pm at Swarthmore Centre, Woodhouse Square

Wednesday 5 June 1pm-4pm at M&S Archive Western Campus, off Clarendon Road

Tuesday 11 June 5pm – 8 pm at Woodsley Centre, Woodsley Road

Tuesday 9 July 5.30pm – 7.30pm at the Civic Hall, Calverley Street.

**For examples, see Appendix D12**

### 4.2 Methods of engagement

There were a number of opportunities for us to utilise the relationships built up during previous consultations and with informal and formal networks in **Little Woodhouse**.

#### Targeting

Targeting of key groups took place in **Little Woodhouse** as part of the Regulation 14 consultation and built on the targeting that took place during the informal consultation conducted. Key groups and means of contact used as part of the consultation are set out below.

#### Information leaflets

We ensured that no groups are excluded from the consultation process by leafleting every household and business and placing posters up in the neighbourhood area.

We contacted representatives from key groups in the community which represent the views of people who are more likely not to have access to the internet, for example the local Community Forum, the local school and Grand Mosque.

#### Drop In sessions

Consultation period offered several Drop-In sessions around the Area, giving participants the opportunity to look through the proposed policies and to offer their comments. There was a display of policy papers, an area map and brief questionnaire for people to leave

comments. This provided access to those without internet access, or with limited internet accessibility or who preferred face to face discussion or time to see the policies on paper.

### Online consultation

The pre-submission consultation was also based online. During the period of the consultation there were over 500 viewers and 1500+ views. An independent questionnaire was set up though only a small number took up this option.

### Networks

**Little Woodhouse** is known for having active and engaged residents as well as having a large student population. Networks of residents, landlords, and businesses in the area were used to promote the plan and raise awareness of the consultation.

### Constraints

We acknowledge that there are constraints which needed to be addressed to ensure that the consultation was effective. Examples include large student accommodation blocks and other gated residential blocks. We used email approaches and in person visits to reception areas to mitigate some of these difficulties.

### See Appendix A.1 Timeline of engagement

#### Appendix A.2 Organisations contacted

#### Appendix A.3 Note on Meetings

## 4.3 Results of Pre-Submission Consultation

### Communications Strategy – activities

- Leaflets: 5000 (4000 delivered)
- posters: 100, plus 20 panels of laminated display boards
- Drop in sessions: 20 May – Swarthmore 19 attended drop in, 14 at forum meeting; 5 June – M&S Archive: 21 attended; 7 June – Willows Green – Pop Up – 20+ from Willows and passers-by; 11 June – Drop In at Woodsley CC – 14 attended; Outdoor stall - WOW festival 29 June - 20-30 on Woodhouse Moor; 9 July – Drop In and Community Forum – Civic Hall
- Meetings: Unipol, landlords' group; Parents group and playground stalls 10-12 June Rosebank School; U of L Sustainability event – 24 June – 20-30 contacted;
- Post and hand delivery visits: 200 local businesses, mosque, health centre, school
- Email: vol orgs, statutory consultees and local authorities, development companies and landlord & business organisations, press WLD, YP, Leeds Civic trust, vol orgs repeat
- Website views: May – July 560 visits and 1585 views; completed online questionnaires - 14

### Community feedback

Recorded Attendance:		Question sheets returned:	No. of Comments on area map:
20 May Swarthmore	19	13 – with comments	11
5 June M&S Archive	21	9 -	7
			33



7 June Willows outdoor	16 +	-	16
10 June Rosebank parents' group	9	9 (1) 5	-
10, 12 June Rosebank playground	40 +	-	6
11 June Woodsley Community	14	4 2	1
29 June WOW festival outdoor	21 +	-	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>35 (1) = 34 25</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Question sheet: Do you support these aims and policies?</b>			<b>No of comments per policy section</b>
Housing		33 1 DK	24 (inc 1 outside area)
Heritage		33 1 NR	11
Green		34 - 1 not strong enough	45 (inc 6 outside area)
Community & Employment		31 1 DK 2 NR	18
Movement		32 1DK 1NR	31
Overall plan			14
Outside scope of plan/ possible projects			16
<b>Total comments</b>		<b>Completed sheets = 34</b>	<b>159</b>

### Responses from organisations

Ref	Name/Organisation	No of pages	Under consideration
PSC1	G Rawinsky	1	Favourable; character areas suggestion
PSC2	National Gas/ Avison Young	3	No comments: no assets identified
PSC3	Coal Authority	1	No specific comments
PSC4	Natural England	4	No specific comments
PSC5	YPP/DPP	6	H3 (PBSA) and H4 (Conversions)
PSC6	University of Leeds/WSP	12	H3 add Western campus; add new policy
PSC7	Historic England	2	Welcome Heritage Area esp shopfronts
PSC8	Luminate/JLL (Park Lane Campus)	14	H3 & H4 and HC3 convertibility
PSC9	Leeds City Council	9	General welcome and collaboration; criteria for "balance", feasibility/conversion Structure of plan & appendices, mapping and project planning

## 4.4 Consultation comments and LWNP responses

These detailed responses are shown and LW responses are shown in attached Tables in Appendices B and C

## 5 Summary of main issues raised

- **Balanced housing provision**

Some responses objected to two main areas of housing policies:

The strategy to encourage the retention and creation of housing appropriate for households over increased student accommodation, allowing different types of household, including students and families, to have access to the housing stock.

The objections included the creation of a specific Purpose Built Student Accommodation area in Policy H3 and the requirement for conversions to be to normal residential standards in Policy H4. Full details are in Appendix B.

However the Forum view is that these are central aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan and should be retained. However, the specific PBSA area has had three exceptions added in response to some of the objections. Additional paragraphs were also added to the text to better explain the justifications for the policies.

- **Heritage Area and Non designated heritage assets**

There was some concern that the Heritage Area proposal (Policy HC1) might degrade the existing conservation areas. However, it was accepted after discussions with both the LCC Conservation Team Officer and with the Estates Department of the University of Leeds, that the heritage area appraisal provided sufficient justification, for special consideration, also bearing in mind the precedent of the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan.. The classification of some heritage assets was, however, modified after these discussions (Policy HC2).

- **Green Infrastructure**

No objections were raised to these policies. Positive discussions were held with the West End Riverside development team about future development as part of the Leeds Transformational Regeneration Partnership, resulting in additional coverage of connections to the south of Kirkstall Road as part of the Placemaking policy (HC4) and Green Corridors policy (G1)

- **Economy, Education and Community**

The University of Leeds raised the importance of the university to the overall economy of the area. In preference to adopting a new policy, which may need further consultation, the Forum proposed changes to justification and policies C1 (Community Facilities) and E2 (Mix of Uses) recognising the importance of and emphasising support for education development within the area. This received a positive response from the University and their proposal to continue a partnership to discuss future changes within their overall estate was welcomed.

**Details of these and all other comments, and the Forum's responses are included in Appendices B and C of this Consultation Statement.**

## 6 Conclusions

The Forum met on 16 September 2025 to give approval to the changes to the draft Neighbourhood Plan arising from the Pre Submission Consultation and to agree to submit the Plan to the City Council for Examination.

The Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum has followed a robust consultation process throughout the stages of planning and in the Pre Submission Consultation. This has resulted in a range of policies aimed at building a sustainable community for the future.

## Appendices

Appendix A	A.1 Timeline A.2 List of organisations engaged A.3 Meetings (See <a href="http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org">www.littlewoodhouseplan.org</a> )	In main report Pages 17 - 24
Appendix B	Appraisal of comments from PSC – organisations	File LWNP CS AppB 24 pages
Appendix C	Appraisal of comments from PSC – individuals	File LWNP CS AppC 12 pages
Appendices D1 – D12	Examples of materials	Files LWNP CS AppD1 – AppD12
	D1 Leaflet 2016	File LWNP CS App D1 – D6
	D2 PowerPoint 2024	
	D3 Leaflet 2024	
	D4 Poster 2024	
	D5 Pictures - community	
	D6 Pictures – PSC 2024	
	D7 Questionnaire summary 2014	File LWNP CS App D7 – AppD12
	D8 Groupwork 2016, 2015	
	D9 Questionnaire parents 2019	
	D10 Agenda, info & discussion 2021	
	D11 Questionnaire students 2024	
	D12 Notes and questions for consultees PSC 2024	



LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## CONSULTATION STATEMENT

### APPENDIX **A**

Timeline,  
List of organisations engaged  
Meetings

## Appendix A.1 – Timeline of Neighbourhood Plan engagement and key events

Date	Key Events	Key outcome	
<b>2013</b> June Sept	Inner North West planning group / Leeds City Council (LCC) Neighbourhood planning briefing  LW Community Forum - working group set up Discussions LWCA with South Headingley CA	Local discussions on value of NP and area borders	
<b>2014</b> April  May-June  28 Oct	LWCA working group meetings & LW Community Forums  Application for designation N Area – Consultation Rosebank open air event  Public Launch of interim Forum – workshops, questionnaires	Launch of Interim Forum Steering Group    <b>Public Launch of Neighbourhood Planning</b>	
<b>2015</b> 2014 - Mar 3 Feb 18 March 21 July November	Locality – bridging grant - consultancy  <b>Designation of LW Neighbourhood Area</b> Public meeting – Vision – workshops, questionnaires Public meeting – Vision & constitution approved Application for designation of Forum - Consultation	<b>Designation of Area</b>  Draft Vision & Forum Draft Constitution	
<b>2016</b> Jan-Mar 16 Feb 15 March  Apr Jul Oct	Locality grant – evidence, analysis, strategy  <b>Designation of LW Neighbourhood Forum</b> Forum Launch and AGM – Constitution formally agreed  <b>Vision and Objectives adopted</b> LW Community Forum meetings Outdoor event - Rosebank Business and stakeholder lists	  <b>Designation of Forum</b>   <b>Vision and Objectives</b>	

<b>2017</b>			
Jan April	LW Community Forum meetings	Research proposal EBR	
June	Public Outdoor event – Rosebank		
Sept	Heritage Open day – Developments in Cons areas		
Jul Oct	Bridge project – stakeholder meeting	<b>Policy Intentions</b>	
Nov Dec	Public LWNP Forum – PID discussions	<b>Document (PID) v1</b>	
<b>2018</b>			
Jan-Mar	Locality grant- Policy intentions (PID), heritage		
Jan – Mar	Public PID consultations – Park Dale Hall, Clarendon Q, Woodsley CC, M&S Archive, Swarthmore, Artlink	Vision and	
20 June	Public LWNP forum & AGM – <b>Draft policies v2</b>	PID draft policies v2	
July	Conservation Area walkabout and draft	Draft Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA)	
Sept	Informal feedback from LCC planners		
Sept	HOD – Queen Victoria walk		
Oct	Public forum – Park Lane site future		
Dec	Workshops – Park Lane site future		
<b>2019</b>			
Jan-Mar	Locality grant- design codes Park Lane		
Feb	Consultation workshops – Park Lane walkabout		
Mar	LUU outreach team – workshop & questionnaires	Student questionnaire	
13 May	Public forum and AGM – progress CAA, Park Lane PBSA		
Various –	Discussions with Leeds City College - Park Lane	Draft Park Lane design code v4	
Sep	Heritage walks – developments in conservation areas, 200 years of people’s housing, preserving heritage	Park Lane v5	
Oct	Responses to Park Lane		
Nov	Rosebank School Parents meeting – questionnaires		

<b>2020</b>			
Jan-Mar	Locality grant – PBSA drafting		
Feb	Open forum + Planning – Planning in LW		
Mar	Stakeholders – Unipol, LCC tenants, LUU Aron Clark	Green infrastructure issues	
Mar	Public Forum – Woodsley – health and wellbeing	Draft PBSA design code v1	
Mar	LBU – Quintin Bradley – planning exchange		
June	COVID - all meetings suspended incl planned AGM		
July			
August	Emails work on drafts	<b>PBSA design code v4</b>	
August	Emails work on drafts	Park Lane design code v5	
August	Completion of Street Art on the Bridge		
	LWCA committee – first meeting on Zoom		
	Outdoor meeting LWNP Exec (3 members) Ian Mackay - Assistance EBR & suggested Locality application	Application to Locality for Technical Support	
Oct			
Oct Nov	LW Community Forum – Zoom meeting		
Oct	LBU student projects outlines agreed + questionnaires	LBU projects	
Nov	Locality & Aecom discussions & Diagnostic		
Dec	Feedback from AM(LCC) on PBSA draft code		
Dec	Feedback from Ryan Platten on PID policies discussed	Evidence base report (EBR) v2	
	Evidence report revision – Emma Lewis (LCC)		
<b>2021</b>			
Jan-Feb	Aecom stakeholder meetings and LW virtual site visit	Aecom consultancy start	
Jan	Public forum – LGI site proposals		
Jan	Draft NDHA appendix	<b>Draft Non designated heritage assets (NDHA)</b>	
Jan	<b>Rosebank School survey and meeting</b>		
16 Feb	LWNP AGM -approval of redesignation application		
Mar - Apr	Membership renewal, Website structure agreed		
Mar	LWNP Forum – review of Housing policies	Housing policies	
		Student accommodation	



April 2021	LWNP Forum – review of student accommodation pols	Heritage policies	
May	Application for Redesignation of Forum - Consultation	Green spaces policies	
May			
June	LWNP Forum – review Heritage policies, NDHA		
July	LWNP Forum – survey and review Green policies	Aecom Drawing and Design documents	
	LWNP Forum – Aecom documents General design and Character analysis design guidelines drafts		
Aug Sep	Discussion of Local Plan Update		
Aug	Feedback from Conservation Team – NDHA	<b>Forum Redesignation</b>	
31 Aug	Redesignation of LW Neighbourhood Forum		
Sep	Stakeholder – Oak House opening – Unipol		
Nov	LBU Student engagement projects – presentation	<b>Final drafts – Aecom GDG &amp; CDG</b>	
Nov	Final drafts – Aecom General Design Guidance and Character Analysis Design Guidance GDG CDG		
Dec			
6 Dec	LWNP Forum & AGM – Kirkstall Road plans consultation		
<b>2022</b>			
Jan	LWCF LWNPF – Waste management		
Feb Mar	LBU presentation and walk		
Mar	LWNP Forum – Movement & transport	Draft Movement policies	
May	LBU student projects (Masters Urban Planning)	LBU Projects - evidence	
May	LWNP Forum Revised Housing policies	Housing revised policies	
June	Walkabout Completion of Green spaces survey		
July	LWNP Forum – draft heritage, green policies	Heritage Area policies & Green spaces policies	
July – Sep	Community events – Kirkstall, Rosebank, Woodhouse M		
Oct	LWCF – Council Housing and affordable housing	<b>Park Lane design v10</b>	
Oct	Agreement with LCC of v10 Park Lane design code	<b>Neighbourhood Plan v1</b>	
22 Nov	LWNP Forum & AGM – v1 of Neighbourhood Plan		
Dec	Informal LCC feedback on draft policies NPv1	Response to Innovation Arc	
	Consultation on the Innovation Arc SPD		

<b>2023</b>			
Jan	LCC Feedback and LW responses		
Feb	Support - restart of Hyde Park NP Forum	Comparison of NP policies	
Mar	LWNP Forum – review Vision and Objectives and N Plan	<b>Revised Vision and Objectives N Plan v2</b>	
Apr	LWNP Cttee Changes to H2 H4 HC1 G1 for v3		
Apr – May	LBU students – intro, walk and projects	N Plan v3	
May	LWNP Forum – Neighbourhood Plan v3 agreed	<a href="http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org">www.littlewoodhouseplan.org</a>	
	Website launched		
June	Door to door leaflet of new areas in Heritage Area	Projects list	
July	LWNP Forum – discussion of updated Projects list		
July	Feedback with Innovation Arc team	Little Woodhouse Ways	
Sep	Heritage Walks – Little Woodhouse Ways published		
Sep	Community engagement – Unipol, Oak house, Rosebank, Grand Mosque	N Plan v4	
21 Nov	LWNP Forum AGM – assessment of progress - from Ian MacKay		
Dec	Consultation – on Josephs Well proposed PBSA		
	Revised Evidence Review – updated with 2021 census Kwame Steadman	<b>Evidence review 2023</b>	
	Uploaded evidence links to website		
<b>2024</b>			
Jan	LUU Students fair – LW and HP questionnaire	Student questionnaire	
Feb	List of Businesses & organisations – renew survey		
Mar	LWNP Forum – review of Employment policies	<b>N Plan v5 Pre Submission v1</b>	
April	LBU Masters - walk and projects	<a href="http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org">www.littlewoodhouseplan.org</a>	
	Website updated		
	Reg 14 Pre Submission Engagement Strategy		
May - July	Pre-Submission Engagement		
	To be added		

May - July 2024	PSC Engagement	<p>Business survey updated</p> <p>4000 leafleted door to door households 100 posters, 20 exhibition panels</p> <p>200 businesses post &amp; hand delivery, mosque, school and health centre</p> <p>4 Forum meetings</p> <p>4 Community forums</p> <p>U of Leeds Fresh Start student event</p> <p>UofL Sustainability activities</p> <p>West End Riverside consultation</p> <p>Pre Submission Consultation</p> <p>Leafletting households and PBSAs</p> <p>Drop in events &amp; outdoor stalls</p> <p>Emails/mail/network vol orgs (2ce), Statutory orgs and local authorities, development companies &amp; landlords</p> <p>Press: WLD, YP, Civic Trust</p> <p>Mail out/visits to businesses</p> <p>Visit to Mosque</p> <p>Rosebank Parents meeting &amp; playground stall</p> <p>Woodhouse Moor WOW UofL event</p>	<p>UofL Student questionnaires</p> <p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan v4 (Final draft Neighbourhood Plan v1)</p> <p>Responses to PSC Consultation – community and statutory Table XX</p> <p>140 attendance at drop ins</p> <p>74 comments on area map</p> <p>34 questionnaires, 74 commented with 159 comments</p> <p>Website viewers &amp; visits</p> <p>May – July - 560 visits</p> <p>1585 views</p>
Jan – Sept 2025		<p>Consideration of Statutory &amp; other detailed responses from:</p> <p>National Gas, Coal Authority, Natural England, YPP, Uni of Leeds, Historic England, Park Lane Campus, Leeds City Council detailed responses</p> <p>Community responses</p> <p>West End Riverside consultation</p>	<p>Discussion of responses:</p> <p>Leeds City Council coordinated comments, LCC Conservation team</p> <p>Detailed responses to Uni of Leeds</p> <p>YPP, Luminate (Park Lane Campus)</p> <p>Updated consultation with West End Riverside</p>

## Appendix A.2 – List of consultation bodies engaged with

- **Pre Submission Consultation Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan -**
- [planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk](mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk); [enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk);
- [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk);
- [sp-yorkshire@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:sp-yorkshire@environment-agency.gov.uk);
- Yorkshire ePlanning;
- [Tony.RIVERO3@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:Tony.RIVERO3@networkrail.co.uk);
- [simon.jones@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:simon.jones@highwaysengland.co.uk);
- [consultations.mmo@marinemangement.org.uk](mailto:consultations.mmo@marinemangement.org.uk);
- [consultations@marinemangement.org.uk](mailto:consultations@marinemangement.org.uk);
- [nnhc@openreach.co.uk](mailto:nnhc@openreach.co.uk);
- [localgovtconsult@ctil.co.uk](mailto:localgovtconsult@ctil.co.uk);
- [contactus@kcom.com](mailto:contactus@kcom.com);
- [support@tescomobile.com](mailto:support@tescomobile.com);
- [customerrelations@ee.co.uk](mailto:customerrelations@ee.co.uk);
- [techsupport@three.co.uk](mailto:techsupport@three.co.uk);
- [emf.advisoryunit@vodafone.co.uk](mailto:emf.advisoryunit@vodafone.co.uk);
- [Will.Osborne@mbnl.co.uk](mailto:Will.Osborne@mbnl.co.uk);
- [eamon.hansberry@cornerstone.network](mailto:eamon.hansberry@cornerstone.network);
- [emma.peace@openreach.co.uk](mailto:emma.peace@openreach.co.uk);
- [Thomas.Poad@virginmedia.co.uk](mailto:Thomas.Poad@virginmedia.co.uk);
- [kim.johnston@cityfibre.com](mailto:kim.johnston@cityfibre.com);
- [communications.lth@nhs.net](mailto:communications.lth@nhs.net);
- [nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com](mailto:nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com);
- [stakeholder@northerngas.co.uk](mailto:stakeholder@northerngas.co.uk);
- [technical.sewerage@yorkshirewater.co.uk](mailto:technical.sewerage@yorkshirewater.co.uk);
- [wbu.service.centre@yorkshirewater.co.uk](mailto:wbu.service.centre@yorkshirewater.co.uk);
- [office@leedsadvocacy.org.uk](mailto:office@leedsadvocacy.org.uk);
- [info@leedsinvolvement.org.uk](mailto:info@leedsinvolvement.org.uk);
- [info@val.org.uk](mailto:info@val.org.uk);
- [info@leedsgate.co.uk](mailto:info@leedsgate.co.uk);
- [enquiries@leeds.anglican.org](mailto:enquiries@leeds.anglican.org);
- [kelly.bouckley@dioceseofleeds.org.uk](mailto:kelly.bouckley@dioceseofleeds.org.uk);
- [info@wnychamber.co.uk](mailto:info@wnychamber.co.uk);
- [policy@ageuk.org.uk](mailto:policy@ageuk.org.uk);
- [lslis@leedssocietyfordeafandblind.org.uk](mailto:lslis@leedssocietyfordeafandblind.org.uk);
- [info@opforum.org.uk](mailto:info@opforum.org.uk);
- [jackie.snape@da-y.org.uk](mailto:jackie.snape@da-y.org.uk);
- [Planning.north@sportengland.org](mailto:Planning.north@sportengland.org);
- [planning@theatretrust.org.uk](mailto:planning@theatretrust.org.uk);
- [info@ywt.org.uk](mailto:info@ywt.org.uk);
- [yorkshirenortheast@forestry.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:yorkshirenortheast@forestry.gsi.gov.uk);
- [secretary@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk](mailto:secretary@yorkshiregardenstrust.org.uk);
- [north@cla.org.uk](mailto:north@cla.org.uk);
- [smarterchoices@sustrans.org.uk](mailto:smarterchoices@sustrans.org.uk);
- [Robert.Mashed@wyjs.org.uk](mailto:Robert.Mashed@wyjs.org.uk);
- [mjwleeds@outlook.com](mailto:mjwleeds@outlook.com);
- [office@leedscivictrust.org.uk](mailto:office@leedscivictrust.org.uk);
- [office@ancientmonumentsociety.org.uk](mailto:office@ancientmonumentsociety.org.uk);



- [eplanning@c20society.org.uk](mailto:eplanning@c20society.org.uk);
- [PaulJarczewski@woodlandtrust.org.uk](mailto:PaulJarczewski@woodlandtrust.org.uk);
- [Chris.king@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.king@leeds.gov.uk);
- Elizabeth.Greenwood@leeds.gov.uk

115	Artlink	community	art	closing 2024
173	Ripon House	community	hostel	approved premises
211	Samaritans	community	mh charity	
113	St Anne's Community Services	community	family	
112	Hyde Park Source	community	green	
206	Student Minds	community	student MH charity	
216	Gryphon Sports Hall	community	UofL sports	
94	Woodsley Community Centre	community centre		
174	Fairbairn House	Education		
180	Charles Thackray Building	Education		
179	Leeds Innovation Centre	Education		
181	Univ of Leeds Estates & Facilities	Education		
176	School of Law	Education		
178	Maurice Keyworth Building	Education		
10	Park Lane Campus Leeds City College	Education		
17	Leeds Sixth Form College	Education		
208	Business Change	Education		
157	Yorkshire College	Education		
158	Inlingua Leeds	Education		
161	MDA College	Education		
175	Leeds University Business School	Education		
177	Marks & Spencer Archive	Education		
28	Rosebank Primary School	Education		
168	Swarthmore Education centre	Education		
77	Leeds Language Academy	Education		
199	30-32 Hyde Terrace	Education		
170	Greater World Centre & Christian Spiritualist Sanctuary	faith		
172	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	faith		
19	Ahlul Bayt	faith		
137	North Church	faith		
204	Howard price Hillel House	faith		
89	Leeds Grand Mosque	faith		
91	Hyde Park Methodist Mission	faith		
184	Little Woodhouse Hall NHS - CAMHS	health	MH training	
84	Andrew Tylee Pharmacy	health	pharmacy	
185	The Mount NHS Mental Health	health	MH	
130	Unity Plus Healthcare	health	recruitment	
156	Leeds Laser Clinic	health		
27	5 Ways recovery academy	health	addiction recovery	
167	Candlelighters	health	children's	
166	Clarendon Spa Dental	health	dental	

90	Woodsley Health Centre	health	community nursing
109	Hyde Park Pharmacy	health	pharmacy
103	Hyde Park Surgery	health	GP

### Appendix A.3 - Minutes of meetings in which comments, responses and amendments were discussed

- See **Meetings Archive** page of website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX **B**

Reg 14 Consultation: appraisal of organisations' comments

## Appendix B: APPRAISAL OF ORGANISATIONS' COMMENTS FROM PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

KEY:	Leeds City Council	LCC
	YPP (Developer)	YPP
	Luminate (City College)	Luminate
	University of Leeds	UoL
	Historic England	HE

KEY:	Minor or no change involved or agreed	
	Justified disagreement	

SECTION/POLICY	FROM	COMMENT	APPRAISAL	
<b>Introduction</b> <b>(and General Comments)</b>	LCC	<i>A discussion would be welcomed on the best way to make use of the AECOM studies</i>	AECOM documents to be included as:  NP Part: General Design Code  NP Appendix: Character Appraisal and maps	
	LCC	<i>Note that the Appendices are supplementary and do not form part of the Plan.</i>	Re-arrange documents as Parts and Appendices.	
	LCC	<i>It is considered that the draft Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions subject to taking account of the comments set out in the Council's response.</i>		
	YPP	<i>It is important to note that the Little Woodhouse area is immediately adjacent to the University of Leeds main city centre campus. It is important that good quality accommodation for students is provided in close proximity to the campus and that the planning system does not unreasonably inhibit the delivery of new accommodation. In</i>	These comments preface specific comments below re Policies H3 and H4	

		<i>recent years, there has been considerable investment in new large scale PBSA schemes particularly in the city centre. It is important that there continues to be a mix of accommodation available including provision of smaller scale, conversion schemes for more mature students and postgraduates which may be outside the city centre. It is also important to note that students generally do not want to rent a 37sqm studio as the rent will too high and they do not require this amount of space for their day to day living. Therefore, student housing providers generally provide studios ranging from 20sqm to 30sqm which is in line with the Council's design standards.</i>		
	YPP	<i>We object to the Preferred Student Housing Area designation with regards to draft Policy H3 as well as parts C and D of draft Policy H4. The representations set out below demonstrate that these proposed designations do not meet the Basic Conditions required as per PPG guidance and should therefore be removed or changed to meet these requirements.</i>	See LCC comments re Basic Conditions compliance above.	
<b>Vision</b>				
	LCC	<i>Suggest 'existing and future residents' to include for example parents at Rosebank who haven't been able to find housing</i>	Agreed. Phrase added	
<b>Objectives</b>				
housing and community	Luminate	<i>It is requested that the wording is amended to include 'student' at bullet point 1 to ensure in line with the spirit of the draft LWNP, that all resident types are considered within the policy, as follows:  'housing and community - to meet the housing aspirations of all our residents, offering a balanced mix of housing stock, catering for all types of households, including younger and older people, families with children and cooperative housing ventures, <u>and students;</u>'</i>	Agreed. Student added	
heritage and character	LCC	<i>Heritage and character objective –consider including a reference to the historic green spaces of the area as well as buildings and streets as this is significance aspect of the historic environment of the area e.g. Hanover Square and Woodhouse Square. Also consider a recognition of the surviving historic planting / trees of the area – this is a cross-over with the green infrastructure objective but recommend explicitly recognising the heritage significance of surviving historic trees and greenscape of the formal squares. Also the need to protect and care for the veteran trees and plan for their managed succession.</i>	Add wording.  "heritage and character - to value, protect and restore our heritage architecture, streets <b>and historic landscape of trees and green spaces</b> , and build appreciation of this local community area"	



			Veteran trees now referred to in 14.3.6. Also covered by Project P-G3.	
	LCC H'ways	<i>'Restore our heritage architecture and streets' – please note that any restoration of paved footways, cobbled streets or a mixture will need to be funded, this cannot be funded from the Highway maintenance budgets</i>	This is an objective. It is conservation policy to replace materials like for like where possible in conservation areas. This is also included in Projects (P-M6), which require funding.	
green infrastructure				
community facilities and employment				
movement				
health and well-being				
sustainability				
climate change	LCC	<i>Recommend considering emphasising the embodied carbon benefits of the surviving historic buildings and their adaptability to new uses and potential for sympathetic retrofit to enhance their energy efficiency and also their heritage significance with the use of appropriate materials and detailing - breathability, character and appearance of the hist env. There is substantial Historic England guidance on achieving sympathetic energy efficiency measures in traditional buildings that could be signposted in the relevant chapter.</i>	New paras. 9.3.4 and 10.3.2 Reference added.	
<b>HOUSING</b>				
Policy H1: Aiming for a balanced community	LCC Regen	<i>Housing and community – there is an opportunity for further discussion between the Regeneration Service and the Neighbourhood Forum around aligning our approach to the emergence of new development schemes within the WER</i>	Discussions held. Placemaking policy added including links across	

			Kirkstall Road to align with WER proposals.	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 3.3.2 - Family households are generally underrepresented within the city centre and fringe areas where there is a much younger population and greater concentration of high rise accommodation than Leeds as a whole. Due to the size and diverse nature of Leeds there will be areas in Leeds where family households dominate. A better comparison would be with other city centre fringe areas such as Holbeck, Burmantofts, Mabgate etc</i>	Agreed we are justified in comparison. Added a para to CS evidence re city centre family housing being promoted, and additional phrase to 3.3.2 providing further justification.	
	LCC	<i>Part a seeks to increase the amount of accommodation for families – it is not clear what criteria should be used. What would be (un)acceptable? Part b seeks to avoid high concentrations of students. How is this defined? Would PBSA (sui generis) be caught by this policy? What concentration would be too great? This policy needs further thought. Perhaps the best approach would be to support H6B but with some additional criteria. H6 is much more detailed than LWNP H1 which only talks about 'encouraging' certain housing types. It may be that H6 provides more protection. H1 may be better as an objective as more detailed policies follow</i>	Conceived as an overarching/strategic policy, with later housing policies providing detail.  Also added phrase to 3.3.7, defining a sustainable community to include being well served by social and green infrastructure.  Agreed to keep after discussion.	
	Luminate	<i>Remove bracket in final bullet as follows: '...existing communities).'</i>	Typo. Agreed. Changed	
Policy H2: Housing Mix	LCC	<i>Paragraph 4.2.4 - Reference to CS policy H3 should be H4</i>	Agreed. Changed	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 4.3.1 - This may not be accurate for example, there are residential areas around Lovell Park and Saxton Gardens, The Calls</i>	These are not “historic” – agreed change to “only area continuously occupied by residential development since the Victorian era”	
	LCC	<i>B) Two units is a very low trigger for the policy and this appears to be unreasonable, 4-5 units may be better.</i>	Rawdon NP has a similar policy. Phrase added to 4.3.6 “and echo the requirement in CS for any	

			conversions to include at least one family sized unit.”	
	LCC	<i>C) Any acceptable extension is ambiguous. The conversion of buildings without extensions is supported by national and local policies. Utilising extensions for COU apps may not be something that can be insisted on. Does this relate to both houses and apartment buildings?</i>	Following discussion – change to “plus any proposed extension.”	
	UoL	<i>The University supports the intention of Policy H2 to create a broader housing mix as this could also benefit mature students with families looking to settle in the area along with graduates. However, achieving the standards set, particularly in some types of conversions maybe challenging and unviable. We therefore welcome the flexibility built in through proposed Policy H2(c).</i>	Agreed. See change above	
Policy H3: Purpose-Built Student Accommodation	LCC	<i>Presumably, the reason the PBSA Area is designated is that it is considered suitable for PBSA and a further test to demonstrate that a proposal does not undermine balance of communities is unnecessary? Is there is opportunity for the Policy H3 to use the fine grain understanding of the area to provide more detailed criteria of where PBSA may or may not be acceptable outside of the Preferred PBSA Area? See Core Strategy H6B to avoid duplication. Design guidance is useful. The Council’s draft SPD on HMOs and PBSA may be helpful in quantifying some of the policy expectations, for example room sizes. Suggest a higher trigger point for community facilities e.g. over 250 rooms.</i>	Section 5.3 rewritten to further justify the PBSA area. PBSA area to include Park Lane Campus, Josephs Well and Western Campus  Communal spaces are important for student health and well-being, whatever the size of the PBSA. Add para 4.2.4 to PBSA Design Code to ensure extent of communal space conforms to LSS draft SPD.	
	LCC	<i>H3 8: Planning gain can only be sought to make the development acceptable in planning terms by mitigating the adverse impact of a development. There would need to be justification for community benefits in this respect.</i>	Changed to “PBSA Development should demonstrate that there will be a positive benefit to the local community, including provision of shared facilities where possible” (italics indicate additions).	

	LCC	<i>Consider impact of identifying preferred area for PBSA - may lead to imbalance, severance and high concentration within one area.</i>	Impact considered acceptable in view of benefit elsewhere. Argument amplified in the text.	
	LCC	<i>Enhancing health and wellbeing needs to be defined.</i>	Added e.g. to text: space, light, amenity, social interaction. Added footnote reference to BPF report.	
	LCC	<i>Some of the provisions of H4 could apply to H3 and vice versa - could the policies be combined?</i>	They deal with two different types of development, therefore some aspects differ in inclusion/emphasis. However, some wording from H3 has been added to H4.	
	Luminate	<i>Policy H3 and the Appendix 4 PBSA document direct PBSA primarily to the area at Burley Road, but not exclusively. Likewise, this is demonstrated in the Park Lane Design Code document which also recognises PBSA as a potential use within the Park Lane site. For consistency throughout the various NP documents it is therefore required that the policies align. Limited revisions are therefore required to Policy H3 as follows:  ‘2 Location: PBSA will normally but not exclusively only be permitted if it is located within the “Preferred PBSA Area” shown on Map 4. Any PBSA development must avoid undermining the balance and well-being of existing residential character and amenity and the loss of existing dwellings suitable for family accommodation.</i>	H3.2 amended to:  “Location: PBSA will normally only be permitted if it is located  a) within the “Preferred PBSA Area” shown on Map 4;  b) within the Park Lane Campus in accordance with the Park Lane Campus Design Code; or  c) within the University of Leeds Western Campus as a minority element in the mix of uses there and provided there is no loss of existing green space.”	
	Luminate	<i>A revision is required to bullet point 5. This is because there is an onerous expectation that all new PBSA schemes can be designed for conversion to residential use C3. Many schemes do achieve this but it is not always possible due to varying reasons eg shape and efficiencies of a site. Furthermore it is not a requirement within the NPPF.</i>	If it is not possible this needs to be demonstrated as part of the planning application – thus “should” instead of “must”.	

		<i>Omit “PBSA should be designed so that future conversion to residential use (Use Class C3) can be achieved if and when required with the minimum of demolition.”</i>	<p>Adaptability as an aim is included in the Local Plan Update P10-6. and will be carried forward in the Leeds Local Plan 2025.</p> <p>In view of that and our aims to make buildings last, it is important that they can be relatively easily reconfigured to other uses, if the current use becomes unviable.</p> <p>Retain sentence.</p>	
	Luminate	<i>‘8 Community benefit: PBSA Development should demonstrate that there will be a positive benefit to the local community through provision of shared facilities <u>where possible</u>.’</i>	Agreed. Amended.	
	UoL	<p><i>The University’s Western Campus is located within the LWNP area. At the time of writing, the University is commissioning new Masterplanning work for the whole of its campus. This will include a review of how the Western Campus functions and how it could become a more integral part of the main campus. Western Campus could act as a gateway to the campus, through better placemaking and new developments or refurbishments, which could include new student accommodation. Any new PBSA in this location would be within the existing campus, and therefore within the control and management of the University, unlike the majority of new PBSA development off campus. Issues such as noise would therefore be managed by the University directly. The Western Campus is not part of the existing residential area of Little Woodhouse. Therefore, should proposals for the development of new PBSA on Western Campus come forward, it would not undermine the purpose of Policy H3, but could positively contribute to the aspirations of Policy H1. We therefore propose the following amendments:</i></p> <p><i>1. Add Western Campus as a Preferred PBSA area.</i></p>	<p>H3.2 amended to:</p> <p>“Location: PBSA will normally only be permitted if it is located</p> <p>a) within the “Preferred PBSA Area” shown on Map 4;</p> <p>b) within the Park Lane Campus in accordance with the Park Lane Campus Design Code; or</p> <p>c) within the University of Leeds Western Campus as a minority element in the mix of uses there and provided there is no loss of existing green space.”</p>	
	UoL	<i>Amend Policy first para: “The development of purpose-built student accommodation <u>must will normally</u> be located, designed and managed in accordance with the principles set out in the “PBSA Design Code””</i>	Disagree. “Normally” is included under 2. Location	

		<p><i>Amend item 2 in the policy:</i></p> <p><i>“2. Location: PBSA will normally only be permitted if it is located within, <u>or immediately adjacent to</u>, the “Preferred PBSA Area” shown on Map 4. <u>Any New PBSA development outside these areas</u> must avoid undermining the balance and well-being of existing residential character and amenity and the loss of existing dwellings suitable for family accommodation.”</i></p>	<p>Alter to:</p> <p>“Any PBSA development should ensure that the character and amenity of any existing nearby residential uses are not adversely affected by it.”</p>	
	UoL	<p><i>As drafted, Policy H3 of the LWNP does not meet the requirements of Basic Condition E, due to its nonconformity with Policy H6(b)(iii) of the Leeds Core Strategy.</i></p>	<p>The CS wording (as amplified in the text) is to prevent high concentrations adversely affecting residential areas. Any concentration in the Preferred Area is justified as it removes the adverse effects of proximity.</p>	
	YPP	<p><i>In its current form, draft Policies H3, which designates a Preferred Area for student housing, and parts C and D of Policy H4 have the potential to significantly limit the appropriate conversions of buildings to student accommodation.</i></p>	<p>H3 designates a preferred area for <u>Purpose Built</u> Student Housing only. One of the objectives of the NP is to bolster C3 housing in the area and restore the balance of a mixed community which is being overwhelmed by student accommodation. Accommodation to C3 standards does not preclude student occupation and can also provide for mature students with families (para 6.3.5 added to text). Most of these buildings were originally built as residential accommodation. Increasingly conversions of such buildings are meeting the H9 Minimum space standards criteria to meet C3</p>	

			standards even where it is clear that the applicant is looking to appeal to the Student Market.	
	YPP	<i>the designation of a Preferred Student Area under draft Policy H3 would mean that any listed buildings located within the neighbourhood plan boundary but outside of this designation would potentially not be considered appropriate for conversion. This means there is a risk that vacant listed buildings which could otherwise be reused and enhanced could remain vacant. This poses a significant risk to the conservation of the listed buildings within the area of the neighbourhood plan, as without active use and maintenance these buildings would become neglected and deteriorate.</i>	H3 designates a preferred area for <u>Purpose Built</u> Student Housing only.  Listed buildings – any building – could be converted to C3 housing.	
	YPP	<i>Locating PBSA developments outside the conservation areas also limits the opportunities for revitalisation and adaptive reuse. Conservation areas benefit from an appropriate mix of uses, including residential, educational, and commercial activities, which contribute to their preservation and enhancement.</i>	H3 designates a preferred area for <u>Purpose Built</u> Student Housing only.  It does not affect uses in the rest of the area	
	YPP	<i>As such draft Policy H3 and Policy H4 do not comply with Basic Condition C as the character or appearance of the conservation areas are neither preserved or enhanced.</i>	H3 helps to ensure the enhancement of the conservation areas by preventing an inappropriate scale of new development in them.  See LCC view on Basic Conditions above.	
Policy H4: Conversions to student accommodation	LCC	<i>Paragraph 6.3.6 - Care needed using the term ‘original’ – elements of historic buildings may be of value even if not from the ‘original’ phase of development. Consider rephrasing – such as ‘...any work carried out respects the heritage significance of the buildings and their setting’.</i>	Agreed Re-phrased (now) para. 6.3.9.	
	LCC	<i>Criterion e) – external amenity space - May be impossible to achieve for some properties. Exception should be written in to the criterion. Whilst it may be desirable for residents to have access to private outdoor amenity space, it is not an essential amenity. Many conversions will have no opportunity to provide private amenity space and may already have good access to local green spaces. A lot of residential accommodation in cities does not have such access, and it would be difficult to resist</i>	Amenity space is important for health and well-being. Also, if such conversions need to show they can become C3, private amenity space would be needed.	



		<i>proposals to re-use redundant buildings where provision of such access is not physically possible.</i>	Added 6.3.7 re importance for students. Added to policy “(e) where the property includes external areas.....”	
	LCC	<i>c) The outcome of this appears to exceed the emerging space standards for student accommodation in the draft SPD – suggest removing the words ‘without alteration’</i>	<p>Removing the words “without alteration” does have significant consequences, in that it will permit conversions to student housing provided it can be shown that it could later be altered to C3 This is relatively easy to comply with, and as a result would undermine the objectives of the NP to rebalance the housing mix.</p> <p>Retain wording but add further justification in paras. 6.3.2-4</p> <p>Also, add explanatory paragraph at the front of the policy H4 itself.</p>	
	Luminate	<i>Policy H4 is supported in principle. However, part c) may not be achievable for all sites as it will depend on the structure and floorplates of the existing building that is to be converted. There may be conversions that cannot therefore be designed to allow for a future change to use as a dwelling (use class C3). It is therefore required that part c of Policy H4 is deleted.</i>	<p>Removing the words “without alteration” does have significant consequences, in that it will permit conversions to student housing provided it can be shown that it could later be altered to C3 This is relatively easy for a developer to comply with, but could undermine the objectives of the NP to rebalance the housing mix,</p> <p>Retain wording but add further justification: see above</p>	

	Luminate	<p><i>Policy Intentions: This should be amended in line with JLL (Luminate?) comments regarding Policy H4 of the draft LWNP- it should be made clear that the policy encourages capability for other household types where feasible as this may not be the case on all occasions. The policy objective should therefore be amended as follows:</i></p> <p><i>‘Ensure that conversions for student use are also capable of use by a variety of other households where possible, to assist in achieving a more balanced community living in good quality, well-designed accommodation.’</i></p>	<p>This is an important point of principle, both in terms of sustainability and achieving a rebalance. Adaptation should always be possible, and always designed in.</p>	
	UoL	<p><i>While Policy H4 acknowledges there are no space standards for student accommodation, it seeks to apply space standards for C3 housing to student accommodation through Policy H4(c). Should proposals for the conversion of student accommodation to Use Class C3 dwellings come forward, this would require planning permission and demonstration of compliance with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The proposed amendment to Policy H4 shown below, would allow for internal alterations to be proposed during a planning application to demonstrate they were capable of conversion to C3 dwellings in compliance with the NDSS.</i></p> <p><i>We therefore request an amendment to the policy as follows;</i></p> <p><i>“c) individual units of accommodation are designed to be capable of use as dwellings (Use Class C3) which meet the appropriate space standards for dwellings <del>without alteration;</del>”</i></p>	<p>Removing the words “without alteration” does have significant consequences, in that it will permit conversions to student housing provided it can be shown that it could later be altered to C3 This is relatively easy for a developer to comply with, but could undermine the objectives of the NP to rebalance the housing mix,</p> <p>Retain wording but add further justification: see above.</p> <p>Agreed following meeting with UoL.</p>	
	UoL	<p><i>The demands for student accommodation in Leeds is complex, and the need for various types of accommodation for students such as postgraduates, mature students, and students with families need to be considered in addition to the more frequent demand for undergraduate accommodation.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Expand text to justify need for varied types of accommodation</p> <p>Add:</p> <p>“6.3.5 Moreover, postgraduates, mature students, and students with families need to be considered in addition to the more frequent demand for undergraduate accommodation.”</p>	

	UoL	<i>As drafted Policy H4, does not comply with Basic Condition E, as it is not in general conformity with the Core Strategy.</i>	LCC has given it the OK.	
	YPP	<i>In its current form .... parts C and D of Policy H4 have the potential to significantly limit the appropriate conversions of buildings to student accommodation.</i>	The requirements in H4 c) and d) do not prevent conversions to student use, but they do ensure c) easy conversion to C3 use later + quality space. Additional justification provided in 6.3	
	YPP	<i>Draft Policy H4 also reduces the flexibility for developers to convert listed buildings to student accommodation. Delivering student housing at Nationally Described Space Standards where the minimum studio size is 37sqm would not cater towards student lifestyles as the studios would be too expensive and a space of this size is not required as students typically prefer to engage in communal areas for socialising. Smaller units would therefore better align with student needs whilst preserving the integrity of listed buildings.</i>	Listed buildings – any building – could be converted to C3 housing.  If conversions are designed suitable for C3 use, they can still be used by students sharing.	
	YPP	<i>The restrictions to PBSA development imposed by the Preferred Area as stated within draft Policy H3 would mean that all PBSA is located in an area outside of the conservation areas. As such properties located within the conservation area may become underutilised and remain vacant due to low demand, thereby harming the preservation of the conservation areas</i>	Buildings could be converted to C3 housing without harming the preservation of the conservation area. The NP has demonstrated the demand for C3 housing in the area which is not being met.	
	YPP	<i>As such draft Policy H3 and Policy H4 do not comply with Basic Condition C as the character or appearance of the conservation areas are neither preserved or enhanced.</i>	Controlling the location of PBSA (usually large scale) will reduce their effect on the character and appearance of the conservation areas. See also LCC view on Basic Conditions above.	
	YPP	<i>Part C of draft Policy H4 would essentially require the conversions of buildings for student accommodation to meet Nationally Described Space Standards. As such all studios would have to be a minimum of 37sqm which contradicts the minimum studio size as stated within the draft PBSA SPD and, most importantly, the adopted Policy H9 in the Leeds Core Strategy (2019)</i>	C3 space standards would still allow students to share a dwelling,	

	YPP	<p><i>Part D of Draft Policy H4 is also not consistent with the Core Strategy and the draft PBSA SPD. Part D policy requires that conversions to student accommodation should include a communal room(s) which can accommodate all occupants and is available to them within the building, unless all the units of accommodation include a separate living room. This is not consistent with the requirements set out within the draft PBSA SPD which states that:</i></p> <p><i>“General communal space (e.g. common rooms) should be provided at 1sqm per bedspace (excluding corridors / entrances / foyers / bike stores) as a minimum for all bedspaces including studios”.</i></p> <p><i>The SPD’s provision for 1 square metre of communal space per bedspace is designed to ensure that communal areas are proportional to the number of residents and therefore allows the efficient and proportional use of space. This also allows greater flexibility when converting listed buildings for student accommodation without compromising the building’s historical integrity. Also, the provision of a communal room should not be a mandatory requirement as quite often students, in particular mature students, do not need a communal room.</i></p>	<p>Communal space is important for student interaction. The SPD refers to PBSA which usually accommodate large numbers of students, so that 1 sq.m per bedspace provides a large enough single space whereas smaller conversions covered by H4 would not.</p> <p>But change to “...a communal room <b>accessible</b> to all occupants”.</p>	
	YPP	<p><i>Draft Policy H4 is therefore not in accordance with the development plan and as such does not comply with Basic Condition E</i></p>	<p>See LCC comments re Basic Conditions above.</p>	
Policy H5: Houses in Multiple Occupation	LCC	<p><i>A local understanding of what “High concentration” means would be needed for implementation purposes. Develop criteria for when HMO may or may not be acceptable.</i></p>	<p>Para 7.3.5 re how use of LCC Design Management (DM) note on HMOs should recognise LWNP rebalancing objectives.</p>	
	LCC	<p><i>This policy appears weaker than Policy H6 of the Core Strategy - LWNP policy 'encouraged', CS H6 'should'</i></p>	<p>Alter policy to: CofU to C3 will be snormally be required on site</p>	
Policy H6: Affordable Housing	LCC	<p><i>There may be a general conformity issue with Core Strategy policy H5 for Build to Rent. This policy allows an off-site contribution without justification.</i></p>	<p>We do include the proviso “where possible”. It is an encouraging rather than a demanding policy.</p>	
<b>HERITAGE &amp; CHARACTER</b>				

Policy HC1: Little Woodhouse Heritage Area	HE	<i>We consider the documents are of a comprehensive standard and welcome the consideration of a specific Heritage Area, within the Draft Plan Area, as outlined in Policy HC1 – Little Woodhouse Heritage Area.</i>	Agreed	
	LCC	<i>Would it be useful to include something specifically on the potential to restore heritage significance through sympathetic retrofit of historic buildings and improve energy efficiency at the same time?</i>	Agreed. Applies to HA and NDHA. Also link to climate change aspect of HC3.  Para 9.3.4 added “Development within the Heritage Area has the potential to enhance the heritage significance of the area through sympathetic retrofit of historic buildings while improving their energy efficiency. (see also paragraph 10.3.2 and policy HC3).”	
	LCC	<i>Policy Intention: As well as controlling new development I think the policy intention is also about recognising and valuing the heritage and character of the area as an end in itself and the opportunities to enhance the area’s heritage significance including through the restoration mentioned in the objective and actions identified in the Heritage Area Appraisal. Consider rewording to widen the policy intention and reflect the full aim of the heritage and character objective.</i>	Agreed.  Change policy intention to: “To ensure that new development within the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area recognises, respects and values the heritage and character of the area’s architecture, streets and landscape, and that applicants understand its heritage significance and the opportunities to protect, restore and enhance it”	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 9.2 - A brief intro to the concept of ‘heritage areas’ would be useful.</i>	Amend 2nd sentence of para 9.3.3 to “Together with the conservation areas these further areas are, for convenience, identified as the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area, and the	

			following policy applies to that whole area.”	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 9.3 - NDHAs are part of the justification and evidence base for identifying the heritage area – recommend mentioning here and signposting to next section for full details. Consider showing the boundaries of the 3 designated conservation areas (CAs) on the heritage map</i>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Add phrase to 9.3.3: “...identifying further areas containing non-designated heritage assets the setting of which is worthy of area protection (see paragraphs 10.1.1 et seq”</p>	
	LCC	<i>Policy HC1: Suggest ‘preserve and enhance’ rather than ‘respect’ to reflect national policy. Suggest referring specifically to historic green spaces e.g. the squares/mature trees. Note that harm to heritage assets can be balanced by public benefit as stated in NPPF.</i>	<p>Extract from Holbeck Examiner’s report re similar policy:</p> <p><i>“The effect of Policy H1 is to require development in the defined area to “preserve or enhance” its character as if it were all designated as a Conservation Area. As a result the Policy does not meet the Basic Conditions and a more nuanced approach is required which recognises some of the proposed area lies within a Conservation Area and some without.”</i></p> <p>Agreed to retain wording. No change</p> <p>Added bullet point to HC1 re green spaces etc</p>	
	LCC	<i>Policy HC1: “Development within and within the setting of the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area (as defined on the Policies Map)...” suggest change to “Development within the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area (as defined on the Policies Map) and it’s setting...”</i>	Agreed. Changed	

	LCC	<i>As written, the policy does not appear to add any further detail or understanding to assessing applications for heritage related proposals than the existing adopted policy and legislation</i>	Disagree. The Heritage Area (apart from the parts in the CAs), does not fall under any existing policies or legislation. The policy also highlights specific characteristics of LW (though not exclusively). It also emphasises the importance of Heritage in this specific area.  Agreed with LCC. No change	
	UoL	<p>Precis of initial argument: Defining a “Heritage Area” which is not a Conservation Area could devalue the concept of a Conservation Area.</p> <p><i>Areas of the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area outside of the Conservation Areas could, subject to meeting the criteria for a NDHA, be designated as such and LWNP Policies HC1 and HC2 amended to reflect this, rather than seeking to align the requirements with that of a designated Conservation Area</i></p>	A NP does not have the authority to designate conservation areas. However, the HA Appraisal has shown that the extensions to the existing conservation areas are worthy of special consideration equivalent to that of conservation areas. For clarity, amend 2nd sentence of para 9.3.3 to “Together with the conservation areas these further areas are, for convenience, identified as the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area, and the following policy applies to that whole area.”	
	UoL	<p><i>Map 5 highlights the Michael Marks Building and Clarendon Building on the University of Leeds’s Western Campus as Positive Buildings in the Conservation Area (CA).</i></p> <p><i>Neither the Michael Marks Building nor the Clarendon Building exhibit any of the characteristics set out [as positive characteristics in HC1]. The Michael Marks Building opened its doors to the public in March 2012, and exhibits modern architectural features such as distinctive cladding and clean lines. The Clarendon Building is also a modern style building, featuring grey cladding and extensive horizontal glazing. It is not clear from the evidence available the criteria used to categorise The Michael Marks Building and the Clarendon Building as Positive Buildings in the Conservation Area. Neither building exhibits any of the positive characteristics identified in Policy HC1. We</i></p>	Para 10.3.1 now includes the full criteria for inclusion as advised by Historic England. Amongst those are architectural interest and group value, both of which these buildings exhibit.	



		<i>therefore object to their categorisation as Positive Buildings in the Conservation Area at this time.</i>	Agreed with UoL and LCC to omit Clarence building but include Marks building.  Include this quote in the text:  “Heritage is not about the past. It’s about what we value enough to preserve for the future” (Owen Hopkins)	
	UoL	<i>Basic Condition A requires regard to be had for national policy and advice. Map 5 of the LWNP cannot meet basic Condition A, as the aforementioned buildings do not exhibit any of the special characteristics set out within Policy HC1. We would therefore suggest that the above buildings are removed from Map 5, to ensure that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the broad categorisation of contemporary buildings as positive buildings in the Conservation Area.</i>  <i>Basic Condition E: We suggest that the Heritage Area (Map 5) should be redrawn to replicate the boundaries of the relevant Conservation Areas that overlap with the Neighbourhood Plan Area, in order to create conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for Leeds City Council. Policy HC1 does not have regard to the adopted Conservation Areas and seeks to expand the policy control of the Conservation Areas beyond the existing boundaries. The policy cannot therefore meet basic Condition E.</i>	See comments above.  All agreed by UoL	
Policy HC2: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LCC	<i>Paragraph 10.2.1 - Fair to include the rest of NPPF para 209 about balancing harm in decisions</i>	Agreed. Added to 10.2.1 and 10.3.7	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 10.3.1 - NDHAs should now be identified within CAs not just outside them. Historic England criteria is wider than the three examples provided – recommend referring to the wider criteria. Again harm to NDHAs can be justified – NPPF para 209 ‘balanced judgement’ – the policy should be reflective of this</i>	Wider criteria are included in the Appendix B2. 10.3.1 amended to include full list.	

			10.3.7 changed to: “Applicants for development affecting a non-designated heritage asset will need to demonstrate their understanding of its local value and significance in order to ensure that any harm caused by the development is carefully weighed in the balance against any positive benefits.”	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 10.3.2 - Ref to map 6 should be map 5</i>	Agreed. Done	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 10.3.4 - Heritage statements are required for applications affecting NDHAs – see NPPF para 200 it refers to ‘any heritage assets affected’ which includes NDHAs as well as designated HAs</i>	Agreed . Omitted	
	LCC	<i>Policy designates the NDHA - but in terms of the criteria may not add to existing national and local policy</i>	Differentiated between NDHAs and Positive Buildings, thus more applicable to the quality range in Little Woodhouse.	
	UoL	<i>The LWNP Pre-Submission Draft Submission Version DPNP does not refer to the criteria used to select the buildings/structures identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets’ and ‘Positive Buildings with the CA’. Nor is it clear from the evidence base documents the criteria used.</i>	Add to Policy Intention: “(see Appendix B listing them and their assessment for inclusion)” Also footnote to para 10.3.1	
	UoL	<i>Basic Condition A requires regard to be had for national policy and advice. Map 5 of the LWNP and Policy HC2 cannot meet basic Condition A, without the defined criteria used in the categorisation of the NDHA being made clear.</i>	Defined criteria included in App B but now added to 10.3.1	
Map 5 - Heritage	LCC	<i>Consider showing the boundaries of the 3 designated conservation areas (CAs) on the heritage map</i>	Agreed. Map 5 amended	
	LCC	<i>Suggest improvements to the plan resolution and identifying street names</i>	Map 5 enlarged, street names added  Resolution increased	

Policy HC3: Design of Development	LCC Design	<i>There may still be opportunities to say more about design aspects and we feel that the best way to consider this would be to meet with the design team before revising the Plan further</i>	Agreed	
	LCC	<i>Policy HC3: Should include the word "normally" here for flexibility where other considerations justify. Several criteria are not design based</i>	When would good design not be a requirement? Includes “where appropriate”  All criteria are constituent parts of urban design.	
	Luminate	<i>The LWNP encourages the reuse of buildings wherever possible. Many buildings will be able to convert whilst others are unlikely to due to age, structure and quality of building all of which are often linked. Policy HC3 part Ki, seeks to retain embodied carbon wherever possible. This is encouraged. However, it is not clear what is meant by ‘survey, safety and viability.’ Indeed, whilst survey, safety and viability will be tested by a developer, it should be clear that the policy does not require this information to be presented as part of a planning application requirement.  Omit “subject to survey, safety, and viability” and add “where achievable”;</i>	“where possible” is already included, so a “where achievable” would be superfluous.  Omit “subject to survey, safety, and viability”	
Policy HC4: Placemaking Opportunities	LCC	<i>Paragraph 12.3.3 - Data obtained from LATP consultation available to use (albeit limited in this location).</i>	Data too limited.	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 12.3.5 [now 12.3.6] - Need to understand the aspect/sunlight/shade in this location when considering tree streets. Other pocket park/rain garden type interventions may be more applicable.</i>	Added “...trees and other greening measures – pocket parks, rain gardens, as appropriate for the location....”	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 12.3.6 [now 12.3.7] - Carefully consider current bus routes, highway and parking arrangements to improve and green public realm</i>	Added in that wording to the paragraph	
	LCC	<i>Opportunity to explore greening and public space opportunities beyond trees. Also enhancing connectivity to nearby destinations within and outside the NA</i>	Agreed. Expanded policy to include other greening	
	LCC	<i>Under section 12 concerning Placemaking Opportunities the draft LWNP sets out the importance of Park Lane/Burley Street and of Burley Road/Kirkstall Road corridors. The emerging WER Vision sets out proposed improvement to these corridors and identifies as a key move the creation of safe, legible and attractive points of connectivity to better</i>	Para 12.3.4 added with reference footnote to Gov/LCC Vision.	

		<i>serve movement to and from the city centre and unlock north-south connectivity across the area.</i>		
Policy HC5: Leeds City College – Park Lane Campus	LCC	<i>Paragraph 13.3.3 - Typo: "This engagement has taken the form of design presentations, discussions, workshops, and walkabouts. aimed at..." suggest change to "This engagement has taken the form of design presentations, discussions, workshops, and walkabouts aimed at..."</i>	Agreed. Done	
	LCC	<i>Suggest the principles within the design code are moved into this policy with the design code giving more detail.</i>	Agreed – as PBSA Design Code/Policy	
	Luminate	<i>Typo. Paragraph 13.3.3 Remove comma as follows: ‘...discussions, workshops, and walkabouts.’</i>	Agreed. Done	
<b>Projects:</b>				
P-HC3 Placemaking: Park Lane/Burley St	LCC Regen	<i>strong synergies with the emerging WER Vision and we would welcome further conversations as we progress our shared aspirations</i>	Amended following discussions	
P-HC4 Placemaking: Burley Road/Kirkstall Road corridors	LCC Regen	<i>strong synergies with the emerging WER Vision and we would welcome further conversations as we progress our shared aspirations</i>	Amended following discussions	
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>				
Policy G1: Green Infrastructure Opportunities	LCC	<i>The draft LWNP identifies a series of Local Green Corridors, including three which sit within the WER boundary: Burley Road South Side, Kirkstall Road North Side and North-South pedestrian routes. The Regeneration service is in agreement with these identified corridors and the emerging WER Vision document sets out proposals for improved blue green infrastructure including planting along these Corridors.</i>	Added reference to 14.3.4	
	LCC	<i>Policy G1 Green Infrastructure is welcomed but consideration of the updated Leeds Habitat Network and Green Infrastructure mapping as per the emerging Local Plan Update could be referred to: <a href="https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/7ffe8b7331754fe89f8f0aaa2b90b167">https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/7ffe8b7331754fe89f8f0aaa2b90b167</a> and in particular the Neighbourhood Plan could look to connect and strengthen the fragmented Leeds Habitat Network across the NP area by identifying “Leeds Habitat Network local extensions” such as the red arrows – by improving those areas for nature (meadows/fruit trees, substantial street trees possibly).</i>	Add para 14.3.2	

Policy G2: Local Green Spaces	LCC	<i>The policy should lay out what type of development is appropriate on the green spaces (advise following the approach in the NPPF, NPG)</i>	Added 15.2.2 and phrase to Policy G2	
	LCC	<i>Could be worth adding support for developments which improve the green space functionally of the sites (e.g. pavilions, paths, benches, statues, level access)</i>	Added 15.3.4	
Policy G3: Improving Existing Green Spaces	LCC Regen	<i>There are opportunities around Burley Willows for uplift to greenspace. The draft WER Vision also sets out an ambition for greening streets throughout the WER through planting and SUDs.</i>	Included in 16.3.2  Street trees included in Policy G1	
	LCC	<i>When it comes to Green Space and Play provision, it would be worth considering The Council's Planning Guidance. Green Space Guidance can be found under the link: <a href="https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/conservation-protection-and-heritage/landscape-planning-and-development">https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/conservation-protection-and-heritage/landscape-planning-and-development</a></i>	Added as Para 16.2.6	
	LCC	<i>Perhaps an aspiration for links across the Kirkstall Road dual carriageway. The other side (adjacent to the River Aire) is subject to development proposals particularly opposite to Willow Field and Yorkshire Television. Recreational opportunities could transpire including possible access alongside the river.</i>	Referred to in 12.3.5 Placemaking.  Add sentence at end of 14.3.4	
	LCC	<i>Thought could be given to how existing green spaces and parks could be upgraded. A sort of wish list (if finance was available). This could then be ready if such opportunities arise. Also these areas provide opportunities for successional planting and bio- diversity features.</i>	16.3.5. Added reference to projects delivery plan	
	LCC	<i>There is a lot of new tree planting in some of the existing green spaces, a lot of which are evidently dead. Such areas could be identified for replanting</i>	Included within project P-G3	
	LCC	<i>The aim is commendable but it appears overly onerous and complicated and would not be an easy policy for planners or developers to use. Conflicts with G4 of the CS.</i>	Add 16.2.7. Amend policy G3 to add "off-site" and change "just" to "should".	
<b>COMMUNITY and EMPLOYMENT</b>				
	UoL	<i>We suggest that the COMMUNITY and EMPLOYMENT section is retitled, to become the COMMUNITY, EMPLOYMENT and EDUCATION section (see additional policy ED1 suggestion below).</i>	Agreed heading change.  Add para 2 to Policy C1.	

Policy C1: Community Facilities	LCC	<i>Section 17 of the draft LWNP concerns community facilities. The draft WER Vision recognises the importance of these facilities and proposes a series of community hubs to be developed alongside the development of housing across the WER area.</i>	Add 17.2.2	
	LCC	<i>Last paragraph - This policy appears to apply regardless of whether the proposal is resulting in the loss of an existing facility or not. It appears to go beyond the requirements of CS policy P9 with no evidence to justify the position in relation to other city centre/inner city locations.</i>	Justified by lack of facilities now – see 17.3.3  Includes provisos: “..subject to location and scale, aim to...”	
	LCC	<i>Appears onerous for site owners and goes against the NPPF flexible approach to uses. Includes closed wording. Pubs can be protected under separate community asset legislation. Unclear how the need for pub etc would be demonstrated.</i>	Similar wording to Holbeck NP and CS Policy P9.  Remove pubs from list.	
	LCC	<i>Suggest looking and aligning with Policy P9 of the Core Strategy. There are also questions about what a ‘sufficient level of need’ means locally.</i>	Similar wording to CS P9.  Agreed 1st para is not that out of the ordinary for CF policy	
Policy E1: Employment opportunities	LCC	<i>Section 18 covering Employment Opportunities highlights the importance of the creative media sector to the local economy, which is also recognised in the emerging WER Vision as well as the Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy</i>	Made reference to WER and Inclusive Growth Strategy in 18.2.6	
	LCC	<i>Map 10 and the text of this policy need to be consistent with each other</i>	Agreed. Done	
	Luminate	<i>Map 10 and Policy E1 do not align at E1 part 1 and 2. The policy references Commercial and Light Industrial Areas and Commercial Fringe character areas. However there is no map which shows these areas within the draft NP, nor is there reference or explanation to them within other parts of the draft LWNP. It is therefore not possible to reference the policy to these areas without a map or definition. Either Map 10 should be updated accordingly or a new map created. Furthermore details Commercial and Light Industrial Areas and Commercial Fringe character areas should be set out. If they exist elsewhere</i>	Map amended.	

		<i>in the suite of NP documents, they should be referenced accordingly to connect the information. Until this point, the Policy cannot be accepted.</i>		
	Luminate	<i>Policy E1 part 2 d aims to deliver photo-voltaics on large roof spaces. Indeed this can only occur where feasible, therefore should be worded as such and as follows: d) contribute to renewable energy production by the use of large area roofs for photo-voltaic panels <u>where feasible</u>;</i>	First sentence of Part 2 includes “should aim to”, which allows flexibility.	
Policy E2: Employment/Residential mixed use	LCC	<i>Recommend that further thought is given to the title of the policy given the Use Class Order separates employment, residential and mixed use.</i>	In UCO and PDRs regulations, “mixed” is used in relation to a single building.  “Mixed Use” for a site or area is used extensively in the CS However, change to “Mix of Uses”	
Policy E3: Local shopping facilities	HE	<i>The Design Guide as part of the Draft Plan is welcomed, in particular with regard to Policy E3.  The reference to removing external roller shutters is positive, given the adverse impact external shutters have, in particular shutter boxes as stated in para 20.3.4 Woodsley Road, although para 10.6.6 as referred to, could not be found in the document?  In this regard, whilst the reference to Leeds Civic Trust Shopfront Design is very much welcomed, perhaps this could be supported with ‘good practice’ factual photos of facias/internal roller shutters, particularly perforated with the suggestion of backlighting too, which adds to the translucency) and included specifically as a Design Guide Document, along with the others in section C, which could benefit the Draft Area as a whole.</i>	“10.6.6” is now 11.3.6  The Design Guides are by AECOM and not possible to alter but the point is covered by 20.3.3	
	LCC	<i>Class A1 is replaced by Class E which includes a much wider range of uses. Perhaps refer to Class E(a)?</i>	Agreed. Change to Class E(a)	



	LCC	<i>Retention of shopping parade should have a criteria based policy.</i>	Intention is that these local facilities be retained in their status as local centre and shopping parades, subject to CS P3 and P4, as outlined in 20.2.2. Add sentence to 20.3.1 pointing out their value + change Policy E3 wording.	
Map 10 Employment	LCC	<i>Map 10 and the text of this policy need to be consistent with each other</i>	Added “Commercial and Light Industrial, PBSA and Commercial Fringe character areas” to the Map	
Additional Policy ED1	UoL	<p><i>The University would like to propose the addition of a specific policy which recognises the University’s role in the local community and objectives for its estate in the future.</i></p> <p><i>“Policy ED 1 - University of Leeds Estate</i></p> <p><i>University of Leeds is a major landholder within the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan area.</i></p> <p><i>Support will be given to proposals that improve and enhance the University of Leeds Estate within the Little Woodhouse area, for the benefit of the Local and University Communities, University Staff, and University Students.</i></p> <p><i>Support will be given to proposals that improve the link between the Western Campus and the main campus, in line with the University’s contiguous strategy for the wider campus.”</i></p> <p>UoL have prepared text justifying such a policy, included in their submission.</p>	<p>Complete new policy could require additional public consultation.</p> <p>Following meeting with UoL, agreed change of section title to include Education, additional para 2 in policy E2, and 19.3.8</p>	
<b>MOVEMENT</b>				
Policy M1: Safe Movement	LCC Regen	<i>The draft WER vision sets out options for improving connectivity into the city centre along Burley Road and Kirkstall Road as well as north-south connections into Little Woodhouse.</i>	Add sentence to 21.3.7	
	LCC Highways	<i>Opportunity to reference Healthy Streets approach to local centres like Woodsley Road (footpath widening, public realm, strategic signage, LCWIP etc), mobility hub and better connectivity to key local destinations and well as the City Centre</i>	Added bullet point on Woodsley Road to 21.3.3 + footnote references to LCC transport policy	

	LCC	<i>Review existing and future ped crossing provision in areas of high footfall, near the college, university residential, hospitals but also key local centres like Woodsley Road.</i>	Added to Project P-M5 – Traffic problems.	
	LCC	<i>Paragraph 21.3.4 concerns movement into the city centre via Woodhouse Square and the emerging plans for a new city centre park adjoining Great George Street bridge through the Innovation Arc. A separate piece of work has been commissioned by the Regeneration service and is being developed by Mott MacDonald, looking at Infrastructure across the Innovation Arc. This will develop plans for improvements to active travel routes leading from Woodhouse Square to Great George Street.</i>	Too soon to make a specific reference to the LCC work.	
	LCC	<i>Review potential to promote north south bus routes to connect Burley Road and Moorland Road and Royal Park Road.</i>	Included in Projects (P-M1)	
<b>PROJECTS and DELIVERY PLAN</b>				
	LCC	<i>strong synergies with the emerging WER Vision and we would welcome further conversations as we progress our shared aspirations</i>	Discuss further as things progress. No change to NP	
	LCC	<i>We welcome the inclusion of projects in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Delivery Plan. We would recommend that the availability of funding and it recommended that the forum uses the Neighbourhood Plan to bid for funding in the future</i>	22.1.3 and 22.2.1 discuss funding	
<b>APPENDIX C4: PBSA</b>				
Page 3, paragraph c:	Luminate	<i>Typo: "that" should be "than six".</i>	Agreed	
Design Principle PBSA2: Location	Luminate	<p><i>There is a fundamental misalignment between Policy PBSA2 and the draft LWNP and Park Lane Design Code. The policy sets out that PBSA can only be supported within the PBSA area. However, this is not the case. The PBSA area is a preferred area, not the only area. The wording should therefore be amended to align with the wider policy documents as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Delete as follows 'PBSA should only be located within the area shown on the map in fig 2 accompanying this Design Code'</i></p> <p><i>And replace with</i></p> <p><i>'PBSA will normally be located within the "Preferred PBSA Area" and in other locations such as the Park Lane Campus where it satisfies the relevant policies set out in the LWNP and Park Lane Design Code.'</i></p>	H3 and PBSA Design Code now in sync. PBSA Area map amended.	

	UoL	<p>To create consistency with Policy H3, we proposed a slight amendment to the wording of Design Principle PBSA2: Location, as set out below.</p> <p><del>“The preferred location of new PBSA should only be located within the area is shown on the map in Fig 2 accompanying this Design Code.</del></p> <p>To create consistency with the proposed amendments to Map 4 of the draft plan (PBSA Preferred Area), we would recommend that Figure 2 of Appendix C4 is amended in the same way.</p>	H3 and PBSA Design Code now in sync. PBSA Area map amended.	
Design Principle PBSA5: Design	Luminate	<p>Bullet point 5 encourages green roofs to be provided. This is possible on some schemes and not others due to need for alternative use of the space, structural weight bearing risk and maintenance. Developers seek to include green roofs where possible but flexibility is required. Amended wording is set out as follows:</p> <p>‘Roofs may be visible from above and should be positively designed accordingly. Green roofs should be the norm for all flat roofs <u>where feasible</u>.’</p>	Agreed Add “where feasible”	
	Luminate	<p>Similar to policy H4 of the draft LWNP, LEG supports the ambition to design buildings where possible to allow for adaption to other uses in the future. However, this is not always achievable for varying reasons including size and shape of floorplate, costs etc. It is therefore recommended that the policy allows for flexibility such that developers allow for adaptation only if possible, as follows:</p> <p>Bullet point 15: ‘Buildings should be demonstrably designed at the outset to allow for future adaptation to other uses, if and when required, with minimum structural alteration <u>where feasible</u>.’</p>	Disagree. This is an important point of principle, both in terms of sustainability and achieving a rebalance. Adaptation should always be possible, and always designed in.	
Design Principle PBSA6: Room Design	Luminate	<p>‘At least 20% of rooms should be designed to meet the requirements of M1 volume 2 of Part M of the Building Regulations for ‘wheelchair accessible bedrooms’</p> <p>However this does not align with current Building Regulations (see Appendix 1- page 43, paragraph 4.2.4, part g) which requires that ‘at least one wheelchair-accessible bedroom is provided for every 20 bedrooms, or part thereof’. Furthermore, Building Regulations Part M Volume 2 states that PBSA falls under the same category as hotel accommodation. Building Regulations therefore require 5% of bedrooms to comply rather than 20% as proposed in draft Policy PBSA5. The difference is significant and unrealistic. It is therefore proposed that the policy is amended to align with current Building Regulations as follows:</p>	Agreed. This was a typo and was intended to align with Building Regs. Change to 5%.	

		<i>'At least one in 20 bedrooms should be designed to meet the requirements of M1 volume 2 of Part M of the Building Regulations for 'wheelchair accessible bedrooms'.</i>		
<b>APPENDIX C5: PARK LANE CAMPUS</b>				
0. Introduction	Luminate	<i>Within the opening sentence at paragraph 0.1.1, an amendment is required to clarify the full range of education providers across the site for completeness. This includes both Leeds City College and the University Centre. The sentence should therefore be amended as follows:  'The Leeds City College Park Lane <u>and University Centre</u> Campus is located in the south-east of the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area, at the junction of Park Lane and Hanover Way.</i>	Amended.	
	Luminate	<i>Paragraph 0.2.1 The following wording at the end of the paragraph should be removed as not considered relevant as follows: <del>[Note: this paragraph to be firmed up when policy numbers/titles are fixed]</del></i>	Deleted.	
2. Uses	Luminate	<i>Uses 2.1.1: Consideration of student accommodation within the Park Lane Campus should be clearer in that it is acceptable where part of a wider mix of uses across the whole site. The wording should therefore be amended accordingly as current wording says 'may be considered', which is not considered decisive enough for developers. The following revision is therefore required as follows:  'Student accommodation (sui generis). The site is outside the preferred area for purpose-built student accommodation, but the use <del>may</del> <u>can</u> be considered only as part of a wider mix of uses over the whole site.'  This aligns with Principle PL2: Uses, activity and adaptability.</i>	Amended.	
Design Principle PL2: Uses, activity and adaptability	Luminate	<i>A small typo is identified as follows: 'Part b iv. Sui Generis: Student accommodation (where is <u>it</u> forms part of a wider mix of uses on the site as a whole.'</i>	Amended.	
Design Principle PL8: Resources and climate change	Luminate	<i>As per draft LWNP Policy HC3 – Design of Development, it is not clear if evidence at PL8 part d) is required  to demonstrate that consideration has been given to reuse, adaptation or refurbishment of existing buildings. It is therefore requested that the final wording is removed as there</i>	As per Policy HC3, "where possible" is included at the top of the Principle, so can omit phrase as suggested	

		<p><i>is no need to provide supporting evidence of surveys, safety and viability to support a proposal.</i></p> <p><i>'d) Consideration of reuse, adaptation and refurbishment of existing buildings, in part or in full <del>subject to survey, safety and viability.</del></i></p>		
Design Principle PL10: Lifespan	Luminate	<p><i>It is suggested the word 'upkept' is replaced with 'maintained' in the final bullet of the policy to provide a better flow within the sentence as follows:</i></p> <p><i>d) In view of the prime location, it is expected that design will be simple and interesting to enable it to function, be cherished and <del>be upkeep</del> maintained in the long term.</i></p>	Better wording. Amended	

Aug 2025

LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX **C**

Reg 14 Consultation: appraisal of individuals' comments

## Appendix C: APPRAISAL OF INDIVIDUALS' COMMENTS FROM PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

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

KEY:	Minor or no change involved or agreed	
	Justified disagreement	

SECTION/POLICY	FROM	COMMENT	APPRAISAL	
<b>Introduction</b> <b>(and General Comments)</b>	Garance	<i>Excellent website</i>	Changed.	
	Rawinsky	<i>Minor text change to Georgian Mansions and Victorian Villas</i> <i>More stress on 20 minute neighbourhood (Forum 9 July)</i>	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.</i> <i>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	
<b>Vision</b>				
	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>	
<b>Objectives</b>				
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	
<b>HOUSING</b>				
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 “where possible”. Can we get agreement to designate the area as now being saturated with respect to PBSAs? Don’t understand</i>	H6 Affordable Housing: “..will normally be required on site.....” and change “encouraged” 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).	
<b>HERITAGE &amp; CHARACTER</b>				
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 &amp; 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) I - 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	
<b>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</b>				
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 fpr 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 are 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</i> <i>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	<i>[Willows] 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	<i>[Willows] Trees along the far fence are a good idea</i>	G3 is general, with specific improvements subject to consultation.	
	10/6 – 7	<i>Planters, terrace gardens, trees planted, more greenery and parks for children</i>	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,	
<b>Green Infrastructure Projects</b>				
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	<i>[Willows] 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	<i>[Willows] 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	<i>[Willows] 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</i> <i>More child friendly parks</i> <i>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 off 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 Map 10 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	
<b>Community Projects</b>				
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&amp;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&amp;S as well</i>	Outside the area. No change	
<b>MOVEMENT</b>				
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? Parking in the turning bays makes it very difficult Stranger parking -People from flats opposite (on Burley Rd) have permit parking so excess cars park in the Willows. Parking on corners- blocking road for Access Bus. Could street wardens visit?</i>	General project on traffic improvements at P-M5	

	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 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.....”	
<b>Movement Projects</b>				
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 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>	Non planning issue	

		Stop students littering around hyde park	Drugs -Asbo	Outside NP Area	
--	--	--	-------------	-----------------	--

Aug 2025

LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

## APPENDIX **D**

Examples of materials

## Appendix D: Examples of materials

### LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



***Do you live, run a business, work/volunteer or study in any of these localities covered by the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area?***

Burley Road, Hyde Park Road, The Willows, The Marlboroughs, Moorlands, St John's and Hyde Park Closes, Rosebanks, Ribbanks, Belle Vue Road, Kelsos, Consorts, Kendals, Victoria and Consort Terraces, Claremonts, Clarendon Road, Mount Preston Street, Hyde Terrace, Hanover and Woodhouse Squares, Woodsley Road, Westfield Road, Kirkstall Road (north side), Willow Road.

The Little Woodhouse\* Neighbourhood Area is now officially recognised for drawing up a neighbourhood plan – and this is your chance to have a say. You can join the Neighbourhood Forum of local people now setting up – no special knowledge required, just an interest in helping to improve the places we live and work in.

#### ***The next step***

The next step is to establish the Neighbourhood Forum by a Public Meeting – come along and bring friends and neighbours – tell us what you think should be done.

**Tuesday 15 March 2016, meeting 7.00 to 8.30 pm at**  
Woodsley Community Centre, 64 Woodsley Road, LS3 1DU  
Light refreshments available from 6.30pm

LiWNPf Barbara Mitchell 13 Claremont Grove LS3 1AX Tel 0113 245 2269

### LITTLE WOODHOUSE \* NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



OPEN PUBLIC MEETING and AGM

**An invitation to the new  
Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum**

***If you would like to find out more,  
come along to the next meeting on***

**Tuesday 15 March 2016**

- **free refreshments from 6.30pm,**
- **the meeting starts at 7pm – 8.30pm**

**at the Woodsley Multicultural Community Centre,  
64 Woodsley Road LS3 1DU**

***Everyone welcome - a chance to learn more and to  
join in discussing what we think will improve the  
local area***

- Little Woodhouse takes its name from the ancient hamlet described in 1715 by the Leeds historian Ralph Thoresby as "one of the pleasantest Hamlets in the Parish" (please see back page for areas included in the Little Woodhouse Area)

### ***What is the Vision for the Little Woodhouse Area?***



Based on what local people have been telling us so far, here's how we think it might be – have we got it right?

#### ***A Vision for Little Woodhouse***

*Little Woodhouse will be a strong and resilient mixed community of long-term residents, families, students and young professionals, with good connections to the city centre, the universities, the LGL hospital and major transport links. There will be strong community links across different groups and organisations involved in the area.*

*The Little Woodhouse area will retain and respect its rich heritage of buildings, streets and green spaces, and will provide an attractive environment to residents and visitors. There will be clean and tidy streets with improvements in the environment, including litter collection, parking arrangements and safe bus, cycling and pedestrian routes.*

*The area will offer sustainable places to live to different sized households and different age groups with opportunities to work, study, shop, and to enjoy leisure and healthy exercise close by. There will be good access to health and education services for all age groups. It will be a tranquil area with a low crime rate for an inner city area.*

***Do you agree? Come and tell us what you think – at the  
next public meeting on Tuesday 15 March 2016***

Woodsley Community Centre, 64 Woodsley Road, LS3 1DU  
refreshments from 6.30pm, Meeting starts 7.00pm – 8.30pm  
**Welcome to all who live, work, run business or study**

LiWNPf Barbara Mitchell 13 Claremont Grove LS3 1AX Tel 0113 245 2269

### **What is a Neighbourhood Plan?**

It is a plan prepared by a Forum of local people for local people,

- Housing – what sort of housing is needed and where new homes, shops and employment should go
- What buildings should look like, heritage and conservation areas
- Green spaces e.g. play areas, parks and other small green spaces
- Other issues important to you, such as litter, transport and other local services, shopping, education, health.

### **You can be involved in a Neighbourhood Planning Forum**

- All people who live in the local area, both long and short term residents, tenants and owners
- people who work (or volunteer) or study in the area
- private and public businesses and voluntary organizations,
- everyone with a common interest in developing and improving the local area.

***Join in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum to  
help us get a wide range of people's views to develop the  
Neighbourhood Plan to improve our local area.***

If you are interested, please provide your contact details to  
Barbara Mitchell, LiWNPf, c/o 13 Claremont Grove LS3 1AX  
Email to [bamitchell92@gmail.com](mailto:bamitchell92@gmail.com) Telephone 0113 245 2269 or  
text 07813 025611

Name:

Postcode:

Your contact details:  
(your email or telephone or address)





**Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning**

Making a difference to developments in our area  
[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

1




**Housing**

The Neighbourhood Plan aims for new developments to provide ...

- A balanced community
- Housing mix for all sizes and types of household
- Affordable housing
- Standards for design & build



4




**What is neighbourhood planning?**

Power for local people\*\* to prepare a plan for their area:


- To influence planning decisions
- To shape future planning developments
- To ensure developments are appropriate for the area and

A Neighbourhood Plan has to take into account national and local council plans



\*\* all residents - long and short term


2




**Student accommodation**

Our Plan's aims for new student developments ...

- Set standards for room space and amenities
- Provide shared social spaces
- Access to views and green space around blocks
- Good management of blocks
- Locate high blocks on lower ground




5




**Little Woodhouse neighbourhood area**

- Next to city centre, University and LGI hospital
- Population is 76% students
- Housing mix of heritage, social housing and student blocks
- Shortage of family housing
- Green and quiet (mostly)



3




**Private rented- HMOs**

Aim to reduce harmful effects of HMOs - can be noise, untended gardens, untidy bins and litter and poor maintenance

Limit conversions to small single studios to enable the use by family or other households

Our Plan aims to keep housing that can be used by anyone, eg "families", student households, older people



6

D2 Powerpoint display – continued over ....

**Heritage area**

Lots of heritage - old mansions, terraces, old pathways and steps tell the story of the area

New developments should respect the heritage, views and landscape, listed buildings, conservation areas and other features

Our Plan has Design guidelines to preserve the character and improve the area



7

**Community assets**

What facilities are important for the area to keep?

Health centre, primary school, meeting spaces, local shops, cafes and pubs ...

Opportunities for employment and working from home

Our Plan values these assets and aims for future developments to improve local community facilities



10

**Building design**

Design new developments to be attractive and high quality:

Design for ease of use and privacy, flexibility of layout and adaptability for different users

Use orientation, landscaping and layout for climate change, both to capture heat and to insulate

Design buildings for long life, energy efficiency and carbon capture and encourage more green spaces and biodiversity eg swift bricks




8

**Safe movement**

Our Plan aims to improve walking, wheeling and cycling into and around the area

New developments should give priority to and improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrian and cyclist routes and ...

Use opportunities to improve pavements and add greenery



11

**Green spaces**

Our Plan recognises the importance of green spaces for health and wellbeing

Make the most of ten local green spaces eg Woodhouse Square, Hanover Square, Rosebank Green

Improve green corridors using streets and paths, gardens, verges and trees

Find opportunities for more small green spaces for planting, seating and play areas



9

**Have your say - join us**

**Agree with our aims (or not)?**

You can ...

- ~ Fill in our (short) questionnaire
- ~ Join our mailing list / come to Neighbourhood Forum meetings

Email: [bamitchell192@gmail.com](mailto:bamitchell192@gmail.com)

**Thanks for watching!**

**You can find out more:**

[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)



12

D2 Powerpoint display – students event January 2024

## What is a Neighbourhood Plan and why do we need one?

This Neighbourhood Plan will be part of the statutory Development Plan for Leeds and the planning policies in it will influence the City Council's planning decisions in our Neighbourhood Plan Area through to 2033.

**How was it developed?** Since we began to develop the plan in February 2016, many residents, community groups, students, workers and businesses have taken part in our meetings, workshops and consultations.

### The Vision, Objectives and Policies

The plan sets out what our community values and wants to achieve. Thank you to everyone who has contributed so far.

### What do you think of these policies?

All comments will be considered before we go on to the next stage of submitting the Plan for Examination and a local Referendum, where all local voters will get to decide whether to adopt the Plan.



For details of events and lots more information, please see our website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

Consultation 20 May to 19 July 2024

### Your chance to help the Area Plan – We need your views

We want our Plan to help shape the Little Woodhouse area into a good place for all sorts of people to live, work and visit – you can help by giving your views.



### How to tell us what you think ...

- Look for more information at our website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org) and leave your comments on the Contact Us page

- Or email your comments to [littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com](mailto:littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com)

Come along to one of our **Drop In** events – see details on the front cover

[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)



Or complete the survey at <https://surveys.leeds.gov.uk/s/LWNP-QR/>

## Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 20 May – 19 July 2024



Help shape the Little Woodhouse area into a good place for all sorts of people to live, work and visit – you can help by giving your views.

**Come along** to any of these Drop In events to see the policies, chat with our volunteers, and leave us your comments

**Monday 20 May** at the Swarthmore Centre, Woodhouse Square between 4pm-7pm

**Wednesday 5 June** at the M&S Archive, Western Campus, off Clarendon Road between 1pm-4pm

**Tuesday 11 June** at the Woodsley Centre, Woodsley Road between 5pm-8pm

**Tuesday 9 July** at the Civic Hall, Calverley St from 5.30pm to 7.30pm

[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

## Our Vision for Little Woodhouse

We want Little Woodhouse to be a good place for a wide range of people to live, work, study and visit, to respect our heritage and green spaces, employment opportunities and community facilities. We want new developments to be of high quality, improve health and wellbeing, be sustainable and resilient to climate change.



### housing and community

- To meet the housing aspirations of all our residents, offer a balanced mix of housing, catering for all types of households, including younger and older people, families with children and cooperative housing ventures
- in new developments for students, consider the health and wellbeing of both students and nearby residents – location, building and room design, landscaping and communal facilities
- aim for more affordable housing in new developments in the area

### heritage and local character

- To value, protect and restore our heritage architecture and streets and build appreciation of this local community area
- link and extend the existing Conservation Areas to form the Little Woodhouse Heritage Area, valuing the buildings, streets and settings that form the character of the area
- set out guidelines for good design and layout for new buildings and find opportunities to improve local places



### green environment

- improve the extent of planting and tree cover in green corridors and Local Green Spaces with benefits for biodiversity, health and well-being, and climate change
- ensure green spaces are well maintained; and seek opportunities to extend and develop for health and leisure, including play areas and sports



[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

### community facilities and employment

- support local facilities and retail, and increase local employment opportunities: cultural, education, health, hospitality, voluntary and private business.



### movement, getting about

- improve links to the city centre across the whole area, more local bus services, safe cycling and pedestrian routes; improve streets to make them cleaner and more attractive to use.

### health and well-being

- support ways to address air pollution, noise nuisance, waste and crime prevention, improve access to health and care facilities, promote a safer and healthier environment for the wellbeing

### climate change

- contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions by encouraging retrofit over new development, minimising carbon emissions from buildings and encouraging active travel.

### sustainability

- make Little Woodhouse a welcoming place where people feel comfortable living for the long and short term and contributing to a lasting sense of pride and community.

# Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan



The Plan is being prepared by your local community. It will help to decide the future development of Little Woodhouse - so it is

## **your plan**

**Your** comments are needed on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan future policies on: •Housing developments •Heritage •Green spaces •Community •Employment •Moving around.

This is **your** chance to comment on the policies before it is submitted to the Council. All comments will be considered in making the final draft.

**Come along to find out more**

## **DROP IN EVENTS**

**Monday 20 May** from 4pm – 7.30pm

at Swarthmore Centre Woodhouse Square LS3 1AD

**Wednesday 5 June** from 1pm to 4pm

at M&S Archive, Western campus, off Clarendon Rd, LS2 9LP

**Tuesday 11 June** from 5pm to 7.30pm

at Woodsley Community Centre, Woodsley Rd, LS3 1DU

**Tuesday 9 July** from 5.30pm to 7.30pm

at Leeds Civic Hall, Calverley St, Leeds LS1 1UR.

**Open for comments 20th May to 19th July 2024**



Keep an eye open for extra outdoor events

Read draft Plan **online:** [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

and leave your comments on ContactUs page, or

Email direct to [littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com](mailto:littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com)

The consultation closes on Friday 19th July.






## D5 Community consultation activities

Workshops, litterpicks, walkabouts,  
information stalls – Kirkstall, Woodhouse Moor, Rosebank



Student questionnaires – Marlboroughs forum – Rosebank stall





D6 Pre Submission Consultation – Swarthmore, Woodsley, Willows, M&S Archive – map comments and exhibition

**What do you not like about your area? Total responses: 121 from 25 respondents**

<b>Streets</b>	31	26%
Litter, bins on streets, poor waste collection 18, road surface and pavements 5, graffiti 4, flyers 1, rats 1, street lighting poor 1, dog fouling 1		
<b>Architecture, buildings</b>	18	15%
Upkeep houses and gardens 9, Overdevelopment 8, To Let signs 1		
<b>Community</b>	17	14%
Makeup of local population 7, lack of community 5, lack of local pride 4, transient population doesn't care 1		
<b>Transport</b>	17	14%
Traffic, pollution 6, poor public transport 4, lack of parking 3, crossing Burley Road at Park Lane 2, parking on pavement 1, unofficial taxi rank parking 1		
<b>Nuisance, crime</b>	15	12%
Noise 6, anti-social behaviour 3, drugs 2, drunk, vagrant 2, 'brothel' 1, television 1		
<b>Retail:</b>	9	7%
Poor range of shops & facilities 8, lack of shops east side 1		

**D7 Questionnaire 2014 -summary 1**



## Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum

### Questionnaire 2014 – summary of results

#### What do you like about your area? Total responses: 74 from 25 respondents

<b>Green spaces:</b> The Squares, Rosebank, Woodhouse Moor, gardens	24	32%
<b>Location:</b> Closeness to services, city centre, Swarthmore, mosque, church, university	14	19%
<b>Architecture:</b> Buildings, heritage, Street layout,	13	18%
<b>Community</b> Mix of residents, Quietness of area, LWCA	9	12%
<b>Retail:</b> Shops, pubs, bars	6	8%
<b>Transport</b> Lack of traffic, no parking problems	5	7%
<b>Safety</b> Policing, feeling safe, street lighting	3	4%

### D7 Questionnaire 2014 – summary 2

## Little Woodhouse NEIGHBOURHOODPLAN

**Summary of points recorded:  
15 March 2016**

### Comments from small groups

Group 3:

- Identity challenge
- Communication
- Clear physical boundaries
- Poor city connectivity
- University mental map
- Public transport
- Healthy Living
- Lack of diversity in housing

Group 2:

- Area is dominated by students in terms of housing
- Families have moved out
- Blocks are being constructed
- NDS should be the basis to bring forward and enhance character of the area
- Improve entrances to the area – bridge, old steps, Rosebank
- More green spaces for community involvement and consultation
- Encourage green spaces in new developments

Group 1:

- Dwindling residents who own property
- Strong concerns over developers owning much of the property resulting in transient population
- Having PBSA not built in the middle of the community
- Wonderful amount of diversity and the area does (feel) safe
- Close to city centre, excellent commuter routes
- Student involvement, outreach workers and community involvement
- University disciplinary process for student conduct

## Public Engagement REPORT

- Rosebank green space

### General discussion – ideas:

- Way marking
- Community map and guide
- Reflect diversity
- Radio stations and TV studios

### Points from maps:

- Quiet areas
- Variety of independent shops
- Rosebank excellent for activities
- Unofficial taxi rank (Belle Vue Rd)
- (east of area) transient population in HMOs/ flats – do they care less about neighbourliness
- could we have a Community map?
- No clear boundaries for Little Woodhouse
- Dog fouling (Rosebank)
- Better community bin facilities (needed)
- Park Lane roads – built for vehicles not pedestrians or cyclists
- The Bridge, the Gateway – threatening spaces, no eyeline, conflicting spaces – it could be a landmark site
- Clarendon way (and Little Woodhouse Street) unpleasant spaces – private land
- Few shopping facilities on the east side; should have more info about Woodsley Rd offer, (there are more shops on campus now)

D8 Groupwork 2016

## Little Woodhouse NEIGHBOURHOODPLAN

## Public Engagement REPORT

### Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats (SWOT) (from July 2015)

#### Strengths:

- The Draft Vision and Aims is based on the positive points made at previous meetings and in questionnaires
- Heritage, Location, variety of housing
- Close to City, LGI, Univs and Colleges, links and employment opportunities

#### Opportunities

- Localism agenda
- Integration of pockets of population
- Raise profile of Little Woodhouse
- Community festivals
- Student involvement
- University resources
- Students staying on
- List stakeholders and population
- Maximise local activity
- Increase contacts with landlords
- Influence developments at early (design) stage
- CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) resources for local improvements
- Neighbourhood Plan itself – use to influence developers

#### Weaknesses:

- Pockets of different people are separate from each other
- Roads are barriers – invisible as well as physical
- Lack of recognition of “Little Woodhouse” as a place
- Low recognition of value of community-run projects eg Rosebank and under use of asset
- Lack of contact with private landlords
- The Bridge as a main pedestrian connection to city, is in a poor state

#### Threats:

- Demographic imbalance worsens if transience increases
- Pockets turn into islands – lack of contact between groups
- Planning changes eg permitted development bypass local plans
- Impact of large developments

# **Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Public Engagement report Rosebank School**

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

## **Responses from questionnaires:**

<b>N. =10</b>	<b>Postcode</b>	<b>What do you like about your area? (up to 3)</b>	<b>What do you not like about your area? (up to 3)</b>	<b>What would you like to change to make your area better?</b>
1	Not given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The community</li> <li>• Easy access to city centre</li> <li>• School, GP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street, not house</li> <li>• Lot of student house</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More house for familie</li> <li>• Clean park</li> </ul>
2	LS6 1NT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School</li> <li>• park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cars – commuter parking</li> <li>• traffic too many cars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic wardens to control the parking</li> </ul>
3	LS4 2HG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community</li> <li>• school</li> <li>• people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• safety</li> <li>• park/play area</li> <li>• more houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more houses/garden – safe</li> <li>• library</li> </ul>
4	LS6 1SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community</li> <li>• school</li> <li>• doctors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• safety</li> <li>• park/play area</li> <li>• more houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more houses</li> <li>• greener gardens, safer</li> <li>• library</li> </ul>
5	LS11 5QB	Horsford <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• garden</li> <li>• school</li> <li>• university</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic jam</li> <li>• the bus is late</li> <li>• less street cleanliness</li> <li>• the case of car parking</li> </ul>	
6	LS6 1QL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• friendly and peaceful neighbourhood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people don't know how o meet each other</li> <li>• dogs foul footpath from Woodsley Rd leading to school</li> <li>• parking areas (pay and display)</li> <li>• tree leaves in winter time (how to clean)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• bus route through Woodsley Road</li> <li>• improve bus 19 and 19A to the train station</li> <li>• find places where people can meet</li> </ul>
7	LS12 2BN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community – mixed very friendly</li> <li>• good transport links</li> <li>• schools, shops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• too many student flats</li> <li>• becoming area for students and nor families</li> <li>• rubbish (especially when students leave)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more housing (affordable) not flats</li> <li>• make the landlords pay to clean up after students instead of residents</li> </ul>
8	LS6 2HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the community</li> <li>• green space for children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• student, new builds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stop new building for students, more for families</li> </ul>

## **D9 Parents questionnaire 2019**

**Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Public Engagement report Rosebank School**

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

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

**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,

D9 Parents questionnaire 2019

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

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

D9 Parents Groupwork 2019

**Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum – Wednesday 21 April 2021**  
**6.00pm – 7.30pm online Zoom hosted by Cllr Abigail Marshall Katung**

**Agenda**

1. **Welcome from Chair** introductions, apologies
2. **Minutes of last Forum** held on 23 March 2021

**Main topic: Student accommodation**

3. **What are the present policies for student accommodation in Leeds?**
  - Extract from presentation by Leeds City Council Planning Department
  - HMO, PBSA and Co-Living Amenity Standards Supplementary Planning Document – consultation completed March 2021 – link to full document
  - <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-and-guidance/adopted-supplementary-planning-documents/hmos-pbsa-and-co-living-amenity-standards-spd-consultation>
  -
4. **Views of students**
  - Results of survey of students in March 2019 and Feb 2021 - summary
  - Projects by planning students at Leeds Beckett University - ongoing
5. **Local impacts – when and where**

For instance, traffic, noise, shops, footfall etc
6. **Draft design code for student accommodation in Little Woodhouse**
  - Draft policies: health and wellbeing, location of PBSA, connections and movement, communal amenities, building design, room design, management

**7. Any Other Business**

Student Accommodation Halls – questionnaire results 98 students Leeds Univ Union March 2019 LWNPF

Importance of Design characteristic : No of responses (score on scale 1 (low) to 5 (high))	Average score	Rank
Location is convenient 79 responses	4.4	1
Cost n=98	4.2	2
Views, natural light n=97	4.1	3
Social – opportunity to meet people n=98	4.0	4=
Storage space in room n=97	4.0	4=
Security n=98	3.9	6=
Facilities provided in own room n=97	3.9	6=
Size of room n=97	3.7	6=
Communal facilities e.g. lounge, gym, laundry, games rooms, shared kitchen n=97	3.6	9=
Recreation space e.g. to sit outside, exercise etc N=97	3.6	9=
Like the character of the area n=98	3.5	11=
Close to shopping and/or entertainment n=98	3.5	11=
Eco friendly e.g. green roofs, water capture etc Use of sustainable building materials n=97	3.5	11=

(part of results summary)

**D10 Agenda, information for discussion April 2021**



<p><b>Little Woodhouse NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b></p> <p><b>Public Engagement 21 April 2021 REPORT</b></p> <p><b>Public Forum Meeting – Wednesday 21 April 2021 at 6pm online Zoom hosted by Councillor Abigail Marshall Katung</b></p> <p><b>How was the public engaged?</b> Forum meeting with reports on progress of evidence and discussion of draft student accommodation policies towards the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan (LWNP).</p> <p><b>Who engaged the public?</b> Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forum (LWNP)</p> <p><b>How were they engaged?</b> Over 80 Emails to members of LWNP Forum and to LWCA members and local organisations.</p> <p><b>Where and when did the engagement take place?</b> Online Zoom Meeting</p> <p><b>Who was engaged? How many people were involved?</b> 17 people attended the meeting with a further 10 apologies.</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Cllr Abigail Marshall (AMK), Cllr Kayleigh Brooks (KB), Deryck Piper (DP), Barbara Mitchell (BM), Garance Rawinsky (GR), Helen Graham (HG), John Coates (JC), Celia Hession (CH), Sue Thomas (ST), Ursula Klingel (UK), Alice Smith (AS) (Headteacher Rosebank Primary School), Jess Carrier (JC) (Unipol), Peter Baker (PB), Lotti Morton (Leeds University Union Community Officer), Mark Pullan (MP), Nicola Brown (NP) (Unipol)</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b> Abbie Miladinovic (AM) (Senior Planner, Leeds City Council Planning)</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> Cllr Javaid Akhtar, Freda Matthews, Mark Pullan, Sylvia Landells, Bill McKinnon, Philip Graham, Richard Scott, PCSO Thorpe, Sophie Moody, Emma Lewis (Planning Assistant Leeds City Council)</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Barbara Mitchell</p> <p><b>How did the public engage?</b> Online zoom discussion and chat thread: Introductions round the table, presentations and discussion of reports: Extract from LCC planning policies for students; Summary of scores from</p>	<p>student surveys; Draft v6 Little Woodhouse Student Accommodation Design Code.</p> <p><b>Circulated documents</b> – Agenda; Minutes of last Forum 23 March 2021; Extract LCC policies for students (Jan 2020); Draft v6 LW Student Accommodation Design Code (March 2020).</p> <p><b>1 Introductions and welcome</b> DP opened the public online meeting and thanked Cllr Marshall Katung for hosting on zoom. The purpose of the meeting was to review evidence for student accommodation in the area and to check that policy intentions were still valid and up to date.</p> <p>Those present introduced themselves. BM provided a list of apologies.</p> <p><b>2 Minutes of Forum and AGM held 23 March 2021 previously circulated</b> were noted as a correct record.</p> <p><b>3</b> DP outlined the purpose of the meeting – one of a series of meetings to gain feedback and check back that policy areas and drafts are still valid</p> <p><b>What are the present planning policies for student accommodation in Leeds?</b></p> <p>The Extract from presentation by LCC Planning Department (LWCF/LWNP meeting Jan 2020) summarised the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that Neighbourhood Plans have to work within to be recognised. Policies should be positively phrased to encourage, and not be discriminatory against a particular group.</p> <p>AM outlined the purpose of the LCC Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO), Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) and Co Living Amenity Standards' currently in consultation. It fits in the NPPF and aims to promote balance in the community. Student accommodation is not treated as residential in</p> <p>the framework and the national space standards do not therefore apply. Under LCC Core Strategy policies H6 and H9 this SPD is intended to fill the gap and establish space standards and other amenity standards, outlook, light, privacy and ventilation for student accommodation.</p> <p>The first consultation period has ended and some 500 comments from 65 representations have been received, mainly from HMO landlords, also LWCA, tenants and PBSA developers. Meetings taking place with stakeholders eg Unipol, Leeds Property Association. A response and re-draft should be out later in August/September. The full Document is available at <a href="http://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-and-guidance/">www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-and-guidance/</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DP explained that the LCC SPD and Little Woodhouse Draft Student Accommodation Design Code (LWDSADC) are complementary and there is a small overlap which will be adjusted so they will be fully compatible.</li> <li>KB said the council had recognised the imbalance and tried to limit further student development but Planning Inspectors had ruled this out as discriminating against a particular group</li> <li>UK challenged this use of the term discriminatory as it is outside the legal definition and is used as an excuse for not taking difficult decisions</li> <li>In Chat comments from CH and ST agreed with UK that a permissive planning approach was easy for developers to exploit and this in turn discriminated against less powerful groups, eg residents</li> <li>Co-Living is identified in the SPD as differing from collective Co-living such as Lilac etc. Instead it refers to a growing trend for purpose built blocks aimed at young professionals, with many single rooms but enhanced internal facilities eg gyms, laundry, café etc</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DP said that neighbourhood planning is an opportunity to try and create a more balanced community – for all residents. Students may form 76% of the local population, but they are also residents and need to be considered in the neighbourhood plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Views of students – survey feedback</b></p> <p>DP outlined the difficulties of capturing student participation because of short time in the area, however the Leeds University Union Community Officer, Aron Clarke, had facilitated a survey of 100 students in March 2019. A planned series of focus groups had to be cancelled in the same month. Results were discussed with Martin Blakey and Kelly Anne Watson at Unipol who found the results were in line with a larger national survey.</p> <p>More recently, Urban Planning students at Leeds Beckett University had completed the same questionnaire and compared their results as part of live case study in a Teaching module.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BM showed a table of results from the two rounds of questionnaires: though the groups very unequal in size (98 vs. 23) the results for the top most significant design features were similar</li> <li>The top four factors for students in the survey are <b>Location</b> (closeness to university and to city centre); <b>Cost; Light and views; and Social opportunities</b></li> <li><b>Character of the area and External appearance</b> were aspects less important to student respondents</li> <li>GR – pointed out that different factors were important to different groups and students are not one homogenous body. For instance Sycamore House residents, predominantly South Asian, valued the area as quiet and safe; other students make full use of Hanover Square sports pitch.</li> <li>DP added that some Leeds Beckett post graduate students were carrying out projects</li> </ul>
<p>linked to the LW Neighbourhood Plan and design codes – these are due to complete at the end of April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AM reported that LBU students were on a 7 week placement and could also give feedback on the design code.</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Local impacts</b></p> <p>3M reported she would provide a pro forma to collect evidence on the impact of student accommodation on other residents. Impacts could be either positive or negative, need to give details of when and where they have occurred.</p> <p><b>6. Draft design code for student accommodation in Little Woodhouse Area</b></p> <p>3B introduced the draft design code policies, previously circulated, and the draft policies were displayed on screen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Health and wellbeing</b> – the need to enjoy the environment is an overall design principle to achieve for both student and other residents. The two main types of student accommodation are cluster flats for up to 8 and single studio rooms. JC from Unipol said that cluster flats promote sociability and affordability and generally to be preferred, though students should have options. They had expected an increase in friction during lockdown but this was much less than expected, on the contrary many had made stronger social bonds. Unipol had arranged more social activities such as cookery and games nights to promote social interaction.</li> <li><b>Location</b> – The area south of Burley Road and north of Kirkstall Road has most of the tall SA blocks, where the topography reduces the impact of height and there are relatively few other residential areas. Exceptions are Marlboroughs and Willows estates. The dilemma of identifying a preferred location is the increase in concentration to spare other areas with a lower concentration. The</li> </ul>	<p>approach in other areas is to limit large scale development in line with the current low level and scale of buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Connections</b> – the effects of location mean that routes to universities and city centre need to be thought about by the developer and guidance provided to new occupants. Access for walkers and cyclists needs to be enabled and a plan for congested times such as term starts and ends.</li> <li><b>Communal amenities and facilities</b> The draft design code promotes internal communal space and external green space for relaxation and quiet conversation. AM reported that there is no requirement for developers to provide green space: Leeds policies G4 only applies to residential housing (student not classed as this) and G5 only to city centre. This is recognised as a gap. GR asked and AM gave confirmation that student developments were not subject to sec106 contribution, as well as no council tax.</li> <li>BM and GR drew attention to the extra pressure on parks and green spaces eg Woodhouse Moor at this moment. Inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan would require evidence of harms: examples could be found in the volume of community complaints and drawing comparisons with what was required for "residential" areas.</li> <li>DP said a student had pointed to instance of commutation sums for affordable housing required in Oxford – to be followed up. If so, could sums be set aside to reconvert HMO to family housing.</li> <li>AM suggested that this was a strategic level of policy, outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan, and would be better as feedback into the upcoming consultations to Refresh the Core Strategy.</li> <li><b>Building design</b> The draft policy Principle PBSA5 lists many aspects of external design including plant, use of energy and resources, pedestrian access,</li> </ul> <p>green infrastructure and planting. The aim is improving the look of developments for people outside as well as in. Often people are not aware of the effect of good design on them. Building design should also be adaptable to changes of layout and use (this is also in LCC SPD). HG enquired about zero carbon approaches. A policy for reuse and repurposing will form part of the overall Neighbourhood Plan covering all aspects, not only student developments. PB observed that older buildings have often been adapted to changes of use – modern buildings often less so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Room design</b> These will need to be revised to bring into line with LCC SPD which covers room sizes and light requirements in greater detail.</li> <li><b>Management</b> PB commented that a good management plan should be a requirement at the planning application stage to ensure adequate maintenance throughout the life of a development. Such a plan should also include measures to encourage students to take part in their local community, as well as arrangements for traffic and waste.</li> <li><b>General points</b> – there is more detail in the draft about different policies. The whole, along with other drafts, is currently being examined by Aecom and there may be further changes.</li> <li>AS – the children at Rosebank School are particularly interested in improving and enjoying local green spaces</li> <li>DP reported there was a meeting on 22 April to arrange a litter clear up around the Rosebank and School.</li> <li>NB reported from Unipol that a student survey has just been launched and is attracting good response – <b>affordability</b> is emerging as the key issue</li> <li>DP said different housing options appealed to students at different stages</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JC agreed students often moved on from PBSA into HMO, though international students often preferred PBSA. Many students grew to love Leeds as a city, value the community they are in and choose to remain.</li> <li>LM agreed students may try out different areas of the city – personal preference.</li> <li>DP cited the <b>benefits</b> students could bring, through volunteering, the survival of corner shops, lots of facilities, a vibrant neighbourhood safe to walk in at night, a sense of safety despite large groups of young people which might otherwise feel threatening</li> <li>GR identified <b>storage</b> as a major issue which needed more attention in room design section (6.3.4.)</li> <li>GR <b>thanked and commended PB</b> especially for the work in the production of the design code.</li> <li>NB reported that student numbers are set to increase – the number of 18 year olds is predicted to <b>increase 15% by 2025</b> and Leeds share of students by 8000. As the Article4 Direction limits the growth in HMOs, this means <b>more PBSAs</b> will be needed.</li> <li>DP asked about the effect of Covid and growth of online – Leeds City College are expecting an increase of students at home.</li> <li>NB replied that Unipol are seeing a growth in appreciation of the campus experience, though <b>affordability</b> is great issue: high rents mean many students (80%) have to work and now work is harder to get. The survey aiming for 1000 across all Leeds universities will close in May and early results may be available in late May – she will share these.</li> <li>LM echoed the view that there was a desire to get back on campus, though online may replace large lectures, the social and academic experience is valued. <b>Affordability</b> is the biggest struggle – the University has spent £70k in rent debt hardship funds.</li> </ul>

## D10 Notes of discussion in Forum 21 April 2021



- JC reported a presentation from UCAS that applications have risen and agreed the social and academic experience on campus is important. Unipol are exploring **what is affordable** given the level of loans and rents and lack of jobs. This should be available by the end of the year.
- KB reinforced the importance of jobs, she has asked the LCC economy team to report on the number of **business closures** and asked AM how best to include **affordability** in design work – AM through Local Plan update consultation, but agreed it could also be raised as **a Project in the Neighbourhood Plan**
- PB warned that making amenity requirements needed to be **balanced** against affordability, as more will increase rents.
- MP commented that LW will always be attractive to students because it is near the city and universities. The only way to reclaim a balance is to get **more non-student** accommodation in the area. But the only economically viable developments are large scale student accommodation or flats to sell. He feared **the challenge has not yet been covered**.

**Additional Points from chat:**

- AS said that **green space** has a high priority for children at her School.
- KB – developers seek **17% return** on investment – defined as “viable” by government
- DP – **70 Burley Road** – new application
- AMK – Leeds is a poor city compared to many in the South, but the number of universities has driven up **housing costs**. International students may have scholarships to meet rent costs, but home students cannot afford the level of rents, this is the reality and the challenge.
- AM – agreed to join briefing for councillors
- BM – will prepare and circulate a form to record **Impacts** of student accommodation

- CH – can the **Chat** be preserved? – AMK agreed to save in future – BM has tried to capture most of the comments this time.

**8 Date of next meetings of  
Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning  
Forum**

**Tuesday 18 May 2021 online zoom at 6pm –  
Heritage Area – covering 3 conservation  
areas and Non designated heritage  
assets**

**Tuesday 15 June 2021 – Green Spaces details to  
be confirmed**

**DP – many thanks to Cllr Abigail Marshall  
Katung for hosting and Cllr Kayleigh Brooks, to  
Peter Baker, Abbie Milandinovic from Leeds  
City Council, Jess Carrier and Nicola Brown from  
Unipol and Lotti Morton from Leeds University  
Union for their very informative contributions  
and to all who attended.**

**End  
Meeting closed at 20.01pm**

D10 Notes of discussion in Forum 21 April 2021

Hyde Park / Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Questionnaire  
2024

1. Please could you tell us your postcode  
(or the name of your street or building)?

2. What do you like about your area/street/building?  
(three things)

3. What do you not like about your area? (three things)

4. What would you like to change to improve your area?

Please return to Barbara Mitchell email: [bamitchell92@gmail.com](mailto:bamitchell92@gmail.com) or by post  
to 13 Claremont Grove LS3 1AX

***Thanks very much for your help***

***To find out more, see [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)***

D11 Questionnaire for students January 2024

HYDE PARK AND LITTLW WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING STUDENT SURVEY - JAN/FEB 2024

REF	A	POSTCODE	PLACE	Q3A	Q3B	Q3C	Q3D
1	LS10	1NA	Dock St	more green space, public seating	more public amenities, toilets, swimming	shops in the centre that service everyday needs	
2	LS2	9EL	St Marks	hold some activities to connect different communities			
3	LS6	3ES	Estcourts	residential parking	frequent road ? ???ping	navy information campaign	
4	LS6	3JS	Grimthorpe	more trees, flowers	encouragement to maintain tidy garden/street murals instaed of tags - local artists, interesting pieces		
5	LS6	1FN	Glassworks	better transport	more street light		
6	LS6			safety	night patrol police force		
7	LS4	2NQ	Beechwood Mt	better bus routes			
8	LS6	1EY	Royal Park Av	more trees			
9	LS3	1FJ	Oak House	lighting is mentioned above			
10	LS6	1QL	Cardigan Rd	lots of littering, would be good to improve cleanlir	include more street light so its safer to walk in winter time		
11	LS2	9AU	Archerly Rd	cleaner space	more street light		
12	LS6	1NW	Hill Top	cleaner area			
13	LS6	3EW	Headingley Mt	more public transport that's accessible	to parks further out of Leeds eg Roundhay	encourage more friendly respectable an	more parks, green spaces even if thy're small
14	LS6	3EW	Headingley Mt	more green areas	encourage more friendly and respectable neig	no littering less noise, can chat to neighl	I would love to see more independent shops & caf
15	LS6	1	Thornville Cres	more/better recreational services in the area, eg basketball, football etc			
16	LS6	3PB	Newport Mt	more green spaces			
17	LS6	3PB	Newport Mt	slight woldlife friendly lighting in W Moor	Cleaner streets	more info about bins and penalties	
18	LS17	6RB	Moortown	De-vamp the houses	rubbish	pedestrianisation - day stalls, farmers market	
19	LS6	1BE	Kensington Terr	safer	Cleaner streets	less crime	cleaner in summer
20	LS3			make it tidier	more street lamps (in Hyde Park)	safer	
21	LS2	9LG	Henry Price	have streets exclusively for electric cars(no noise, low emission)		inclusive traffic light	
22	LS6	3JU	Grimthorpe	cleaner	feel safer		
23	LS6	1NG	Walmsley Rd	make it feel safer	look nicer		
24	LS6		Moorlands	feel more safe walking round as a girl	less crime	less litter	
25	LS6		Moorland Av	safer for girls who are alone	less litter	less crime	
26	LS2	1JS	Hyde Terrace	more independent shops	cycle lanes	affordable rent	
27	LS6	2PG	Alma Rd	more nice food	safety on street		
28	LS6	9DJ	Cardigan Rd	make transport more reliable			
29	LS6			less cars more bikes	more green spaces	better bins and recycling	
30	LS6			toilets and more seating on W Moor	all bins on properties (by law?) fines for offend	all bins to have property numbers displa	remove bins without lids (rat cafes and litter blow
31	LS6	1BJ	Hyde Park Terr	bins	more trees	speed limit (for thos who don't follow it)	
32	LS6	3BG	St Michaels Rd	mainly less littering	overall I feel great about where I live		
33	LS2	9LY	Clarendon Rd	cleaner	safer!!		
34	LS6	1BJ	Hyde Park Terr	accessibility to walk on pavemnet	therefore bin placement	littering and rubbish on street because bins are not collected regularly enough	
35	LS6	1EZ	Royal Park Av	street lights	less rubbish!		
36	LS6	2AU	Regent Park Av	pedestrian walkways need to be safer	cycling lanes (I acknowledge they are getting better		
37	LS6	1SE	St Johns Close	please give more security patrol in the evening	more light please		
38	LS6	1NG	Walmsley Rd	more parks, flowers, trees			
39	LS6	1PB	Howden Pl	more light	more nature investments in parks around hou	more flowers n park	
40	LS6	1RW	Spring Grove Vw	more parks, flowers, trees	more trees	Hyde Park library - more workspaces outside of campus	
41	LS1			lights in park!	clean	more bins	
42	LS6	1EN	School View	more bins	streetlights in Woodhouse Moore		

## D11 Questionnaire for students – results

LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Reg 14 CONSULTATION May – July 2024

### Welcome to Little Woodhouse Drop In events– what to see and how to comment

[www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org) has lots of information and pictures to introduce the ideas and aims that inspired the Neighbourhood Plan as well as the Plan documents.

The Plan starts with an introduction setting out the background to the Plan. It then sets out the **Vision** and all the Objectives of the Plan.

The rest of the Plan has **8 main sections**, dealing with:

- ❖ Housing ❖ Heritage and Character ❖ Green Infrastructure
- ❖ Community and Employment ❖ Movement ❖ Projects and Delivery Plan

Each section includes

- ❖ A set of **Policy Intentions** which the Neighbourhood Plan aims to achieve
- ❖ A set of **Policies**, which the Council will have to take into account when deciding on planning applications.
- ❖ **Supporting text** which sets out evidence to support the policies

The Plan concludes with **Projects** which will need organising outside the planning system and a Delivery Plan for the Projects.

There are also **appendices and links to evidence** including the Housing Evidence Base Review, the Heritage Area Appraisal and Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA), Character Analysis and General Design Guidance, and Design Codes for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) and the Park Lane site. You can find all these on the website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)

From 2016 on, we have asked what people like or want in Little Woodhouse in questions, meetings and workshops to draw up this draft Plan. This consultation is about **what's in the Plan – making the policies to get things done that people have said are important**.

- ❖ Look at the Policies and Maps to find out what they aim to do – or ask us.
- ❖ Are you interested in any particular aspect of the Plan? You can choose.
- ❖ Do you agree with these policies? – You can leave your comments here **today**
- ❖ Or on the **ContactUs** page of the website [www.littlewoodhouseplan.org](http://www.littlewoodhouseplan.org)
- ❖ or send an **email** to [littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com](mailto:littlewoodhouseleeds@gmail.com)
- ❖ or complete a **survey** at <https://surveys.leeds.gov.uk/s/LWNP-QR/>

**Thank you for your help! All your comments will be considered.**

---

D12 Notes and questions for consultees PSC 2024 p1/4

#### **VISION FOR LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA – in brief**

- **We want Little Woodhouse to be a good place for a wide range of people**
- **to live, work, study and visit,**
- **to respect our heritage and green spaces, employment opportunities and community facilities**
- **we want new developments to be of high quality, to improve health and wellbeing, be sustainable and resilient to climate change.**

#### **HOUSING - Map 3 Student density population (p10) Map 4 PBSA preferred area (p16)**

- The policies aim to encourage a more balanced community and diverse housing mix.
- They also aim to improve accessibility and affordability of housing for families,
- and the quality of housing for students, in PBSAs, conversions and HMOs based on the health and wellbeing for students and other residents

#### **HERITAGE & CHARACTER – Map 5 Heritage (p24) map 6 Placemaking opportunities (p31)**

- The policies here aim to protect and enhance the historic character of Little Woodhouse, making a wider Heritage Area including conservation areas
- Set out guidelines for the design of new developments and Character Areas
- improve new placemaking, especially the Bridge, Little Woodhouse St, Woodsley Rd, Burley/Kirkstall Rd corridor and Park Lane/Burley St
- sustainability and accessibility throughout the Neighbourhood Area
- a design code for any future development of the Park Lane site (Map 7 p34)

#### **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE – Map 8 Green infrastructure (p37)**

- These policies aim to protect the green infrastructure – green corridors of trees and greenery, paths and streets
- listing ten Local Green Spaces which will gain the same protection as that of Green Belt
- They also aim to improve existing Green Spaces including improved play provision.

#### **COMMUNITY & EMPLOYMENT – Map 9 Community facilities p42 Map 10 Employment p45**

- These policies aim to support the local economy and community uses within Little Woodhouse. It lists community facilities for protection against their loss
- supports new employment opportunities and working at home at appropriate scales
- also supports the existing shopping facilities in the Local Centre (Woodsley Rd/Hyde Park Rd and on Burley Road and Burley Street.

#### **MOVEMENT- Map11 Movement (p51)**

- This policy aims to improve walking and cycling access within Little Woodhouse when new developments take place

**What do you think of these policies? – you can leave comments on the question sheet**

**Thank you for your help! All your comments will be considered.**

D12 Notes and questions for consultees PSC 2024 p2/4

## LITTLE WOODHOUSE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Reg 14 CONSULTATION May – July 2024

### Do you support these aims and policies?

#### HOUSING - Map 3 Student density population (N Plan p10) Map 4 PBSA preferred area (N Plan p16)

- The policies aim to encourage a more balanced community and diverse housing mix.
- They also aim to improve accessibility and affordability of housing for families,
- and the quality of housing for students, in PBSAs, conversions and HMOs based on the health and wellbeing for students and other residents
- **Do you support those aims and the policies?**      **Yes / No / Don't Know**  
     **Please add any comments overleaf ...**

#### HERITAGE & CHARACTER – Map 5 Heritage (p24) map 6 Placemaking opportunities (p31)

- The policies here aim to protect and enhance the historic character of Little Woodhouse, making a wider Heritage Area including conservation areas
- Set out guidelines for the design of new developments and Character Areas
- improve new placemaking, especially the Bridge, Little Woodhouse St, Woodsley Rd, Burley/Kirkstall Rd corridor and Park Lane/Burley St
- sustainability and accessibility throughout the Neighbourhood Area
- a design code for any future development of the Park Lane site (Map 7 p34)
- **Do you support those aims and the policies?**      **Yes / No / Don't Know**  
     **Please add any comments overleaf ...**

#### GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE – Map 8 Green infrastructure (p37)

- These policies aim to protect the green infrastructure – green corridors of trees and greenery, paths and streets
- listing ten Local Green Spaces which will gain the same protection as that of Green Belt
- They also aim to improve existing Green Spaces including improved play provision.
- **Do you support those aims and the policies?**      **Yes / No / Don't Know**  
     **Please add any comments overleaf ...**

#### COMMUNITY & EMPLOYMENT – Map 9 Community facilities p42 Map 10 Employment p45

- These policies aim to support the local economy and community uses within Little Woodhouse. It lists community facilities for protection against their loss
- supports new employment opportunities and working at home at appropriate scales
- also supports the existing shopping facilities in the Local Centre (Woodsley Rd/Hyde Park Rd and on Burley Road and Burley Street.
- **Do you support the policies, including the idea of employment and mixed use area (Map 10)**
  - **Yes / No / Don't Know**      **Please add any comments overleaf ...**

#### MOVEMENT- Map11 Movement (p51)

- This policy aims to improve walking and cycling access within Little Woodhouse when new developments take place
- **Do you support this aim and policy?** **Yes / No / Don't Know**      **comments overleaf ..**

**Thank you for your help! All your comments will be considered.**

D12 Notes and questions for consultees PSC 2024 p3/4

**Please use this side to give us your comments ....**

Comment on the Neighbourhood Plan overall ....

Comment for Policy ....

Comment for Policy ....

Comment for Policy ....

---

**Please tell us a bit about yourself -**

**Male / female / other ...**

**Age group: ... up to 19    19 – 29    30 – 39    40 – 49    50 – 69    70 and over**

**Connection to Little Woodhouse: please tick all that apply**

**Live    work/volunteer    study    in business    visiting**

---

**Thank you for your help! All your comments will be considered.**

D12 Notes and questions for consultees PSC 2024 (results see App C)  
p4/4