



Leeds City Council

Decision Statement – Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Development Plan Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Regulation 18 Decision Statement

1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent examination, Leeds City Council now confirms that it is making modifications to the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Table 1 below. The Plan will then proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum.
- 1.2 In accordance with the independent examiner's recommendations, the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to referendum based on the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area as designated by Leeds City Council in late 2026
- 1.3 This Decision Statement, the examiner's report and the draft Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documentation are available on the Council's website: <https://www.leeds.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/little-woodhouse-neighbourhood-plan>
- 1.4 They are also on the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan website <https://littlewoodhouseplan.org/>

2. Decisions and Reasons

- 2.1 The examiner has concluded that subject to the specified modifications being made to the Plan, the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions stated and other relevant legal requirements.
- 2.2 The Council accepts all of the modifications and the reasons put forward by the examiner for them. The examiner's reasons and Recommendations are set out in Table 1, followed by the Council's decisions.
- 2.3 The Council is satisfied that subject to the modifications specified in Table 1 below the Plan meets the relevant Basic Conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, is compatible with the Convention Rights and complies with the provision made by or under s38A and s.38B of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2.4 To meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum which poses the question "Do you want Leeds City Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Little Woodhouse to help

it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?" will be held in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area. It is anticipated that the referendum will take place in late 2026

This Decision Statement is dated 26 August 2026

TABLE 1 Schedule of Modifications Recommended in the Examiner's Report

Modification Number	Page/Part of the Plan	Examiner's recommended changes	Examiner's reason	Leeds City Council's decision
Introduction				
OM1	7	[Provide a link to the online map depicting the detailed boundary of the neighbourhood area]	<i>The boundary of the neighbourhood area is shown in Map 2. It is also available online along with other designated neighbourhood areas on a map maintained by Leeds City Council.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
General				
OM2	General	[Provide direct links to the Parts and Appendices from Part One]	<i>The Plan includes significant design guidance and codes, including for specified areas, in Parts Two, Three and Four. This has been produced by AECOM as part of the Government's former Neighbourhood Planning Support Programme and is of an appropriate quality. It will help if all the Parts and Appendices can be linked from Part One of the Plan.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
General				
OM3	General	[Provide links to larger scale/online versions of the Plan's maps where possible and provide consistent numbering]	<i>There are multiple instances of different map numbers being used on the same maps and all numbering, including in the supporting text and policies, needs to be updated. Ideally the contents of the maps would be presented alongside other development plan policies by Leeds City Council where appropriate.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
General				

OM4	General	[Make identified corrections in the final Plan]	<i>There are some presentational issues and corrections which should be addressed when finalising the Plan, including:</i> <i>• Inconsistency between Policy HC2 title in Contents and Section 10</i> <i>• Inconsistency between Policy E2 title in Contents and Section 19</i> <i>• Inconsistency between Section name “Community and Employment” in Contents and “Community, Employment and Education” on page 49</i> <i>• Incorrect page number for Policy M1 in Contents</i> <i>• Page 4 – bookmark not defined</i> <i>• Incorrect numbering of Maps 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
Housing				
M1	13	Amend Policy H1 to replace “must” with “should” “a rebalance” with “more balance”	<i>The Policy drafting is positively worded. It is unduly restrictive in stating what “must” happen and it is more correct to state that the intended outcome is “more balance” than a “rebalance”. There is no state of balance to which the area is being returned.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M2	16	Amend Policy H2 to: Replace “must” with “should” in all instances Replace b) with “where between two and ten units are proposed the provision of at least one new dwelling suitable for family accommodation will be supported” Delete the lettering “c)” and make the text which follows a separate paragraph Replace “would require justification” with “should be justified” in the final paragraph	<i>The Policy drafting is unduly restrictive in stating what “must” happen and there is no evidence supporting development proposals as small as two units providing family accommodation. Part c) stands more clearly as a separate paragraph stating what “will” be required.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

M3	19	Amend Policy H3 to read: “Policy H3: Purpose-built student accommodation The development of purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) should be located, designed and managed in accordance with the Principles set out in the “PBSA Design Code”: 1 Health and Wellbeing 2 Location: PBSA will normally only be permitted if it is located within the “PBSA Area” shown on Map 4. The only exceptions are: a) within the Park Lane Campus in accordance with the Park Lane Campus Design Code; b) within the University of Leeds Western Campus provided there is no net loss of existing green space and any development reflects the existing scale of buildings there; and c) at Josephs Well where it respects the architectural and historic quality of the existing heritage asset. Any PBSA development should ensure that the character and amenity of any existing nearby residential uses are not adversely affected by it. 3 Connections and Movement 4 Communal Amenities and Facilities 5 Building Design 6 Room design	<i>The Policy also includes a principle on “community benefit” that is not a design consideration and does not appear in the PBSA Design Code. Notwithstanding its importance this should be deleted from the proposed set of design considerations.</i> <i>To avoid confusion over different drafting I recommend that Policy H3 makes reference only to the main headings in the PBSA Design Code other than in respect of “Location” ...</i> <i>The Policy drafting is unduly restrictive in stating what “must” happen</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
----	----	--	---	--

		7 Management”		
M4	PBSA Design Code	Add references to Map 4 in PBSA Design Code principles 2 and 5	<i>There is a missing reference to Map 4 in Principle 5 of the PBSA Design Code on page 15 and Map 4 should also be referenced in Principle 2 on page 7.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M5	18	Amend Map 4 to show an expanded area for the Western Campus consistent with that on page 22 Appendix C Design Code Document	<i>Map 4 shows an area of the Western Campus where PBSA may also be acceptable. This differs from the boundary for the Western Campus shown in the Appendix C Design Code Document (page 22). This has been explained by the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum in terms of excluding the Maurice Keyworth Building as it is listed and excluding the recently constructed Liberty Building. This rationale is unclear given that not all of the Maurice Keyworth Building is listed and the additional area includes the Michael Marks Building which is proposed to be recognised as a non-designated heritage asset. I share representations made by WSP on behalf of Leeds University that the wider area of the Western Campus should be identified. The PBSA Design Code and General 20</i> <i>Design Guidance and Code in Policy HC3 and heritage protections will have a strong influence over the nature and quality of development.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M6	18	Use the updated Map 4 provided to show the boundary of the PBSA area	Consequential change	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the

				examiner's recommendations
M7	22	Amend Policy H4 to: Delete “, via a design statement,” in the first paragraph Replace “only be permitted” with “be supported” at the beginning of the second paragraph Insert “significantly” after “amenity” in b) Insert a comma after “others” in f) Delete “, meeting current standards as a minimum,” in f) Delete “Priority should be given to designing” in g) and insert “is provided wherever possible” at the end Delete “, prepared in consultation with the local community,” in h)	<i>It is unduly onerous to state that conversions will “only be permitted” which address all the considerations. It is also unduly onerous both to expect a design statement to be produced for all relevant planning applications, as this is not a national or local validation requirement, and to specify that a management plan prepared in consultation with the local community is required in all instances. It would be appropriate to reference these preferred approaches in the supporting text.</i> <i>...The reference to meeting “current standards” for bin storage duplicates existing planning policy and there are other drafting improvements to improve clarity of the Policy or make it less onerous.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M8	24	Amend Policy H5 to: Replace “There will be a presumption against” with “Proposals for” Replace “unless it can be shown that the development” with “should demonstrate they”	<i>It is inappropriate for the drafting to include a policy “presumption” which is inconsistent with the general presumption in favour of sustainable development in national planning policy.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations

M9	25	Delete Policy H6	<i>While there is evidence of housing need within the neighbourhood area the provision of affordable homes is already addressed in Core Strategy Policy H5 and, given high levels of housing need also exist elsewhere, the evidence does not support a distinct approach to the neighbourhood area. The Core Strategy establishes an expectation of provision on site or otherwise in the locality (e.g. paragraph 5.2.17.4 for provision via commuted sums). Consequently the Policy also duplicates existing development plan policy and serves no clear purpose (paragraph 16, NPPF).</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
OM5	25	[Insert supporting text on affordable housing as agreed between Leeds City Council and Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum]	<i>Given that affordable housing was a significant issue raised throughout public engagement on the Plan it would be appropriate for the matter to be addressed in the supporting text and I am content with the wording agreed between Leeds City Council and Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum as follows: "The lack of affordable housing was raised many times throughout consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan. As it is a policy already covered in the Leeds Local Plan, it is not possible to duplicate the policy in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan. Local Plan Policy H5 states that any affordable housing provision should be on site unless there is robust justification. As a general principle, the text to that policy states that where a commuted sum is justified, "it should be calculated to ensure that the required quantity and type of affordable dwellings can be delivered in the locality of the development". Provision of affordable housing within the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Area would help to deliver the more balanced community envisaged by the Vision."</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
Heritage and Character				

M10	29	Amend Policy HC1 to: Replace “respect” with “preserve and enhance” in the second line Insert “respect” before “the historic” in the second line	<i>The Policy drafting addresses elements distinct to the Heritage Area and is sufficiently consistent with national planning policy except in relation to the requirement for development to “preserve and enhance” Conservation Areas.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
OM6	29	[Amend the Policy drafting to replace: “it’s” with “its” in the first line “The” with “the” in the second bullet “How” with “how” in section a)]	<i>There are minor improvements to the drafting recommended.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
OM7	27	[Use the updated Map 5 concerning the heritage of the neighbourhood area]	<i>Map 5 includes reference to “positive boundaries” although these are only visible in more detailed maps provided in Appendix B. I was provided with an updated Map 5 and recommend that this is used.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M11	31	Replace Policy HC2 with: a) “The non-designated heritage assets and positive buildings in the neighbourhood area include those identified in Map 5 and Appendix B.”	<i>The drafting of Policy HC2 largely repeats that of Policy HC1 and so serves no clear purpose (paragraph 16, NPPF). The policy considerations relevant to non-designated heritage assets lying outside the Heritage Area and so not covered by Policy HC1 are already addressed in national planning policy, as noted in paragraph 10.21. Consequently my assessment is that Policy HC2 should serve only to identify the non-designated heritage assets and positive buildings in the neighbourhood area allowing for the possibility that others may be identified. The planning considerations for development management purposes are already provided in national planning policy, the Local Plan and Policy HC1 and should not be included.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

M12	34	Amend Policy HC3 to: Replace “must” with “shall” in the first line Replace “General Design Code” with “General Design Guidance and Codes” in the third line Delete from after “Part 2” to end of section k)	<i>The Policy drafting differs from that in Part Two and paraphrases its content in an abbreviated form. The Policy references only the “General Design Code” whereas Part 2 includes fuller “General Design Guidance and Codes”. To avoid confusion over different drafting I recommend that Policy HC3 makes reference only to the General Design Guidance and Codes. The drafting is unduly restrictive in stating what “must” happen.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M13	32-33	Include reference to Core Strategy’s and Leeds Site Allocations Plan’s designation of the Burley Lodge (Woodsley Road) Local Centre in the supporting text	<i>The last part of the Policy references Burley Lodge (Woodsley Road) Local Centre. This is identified in Leeds Core Strategy Policy P10 and the Leeds Site Allocations Plan and I recommend that direct reference is made to this in the supporting text. Inclusion of a Map showing the boundary of the Local Centre would be helpful.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
OM8	32-33	[Reference the map showing the boundary of the Burley Lodge (Woodsley Road) Local Centre provide in the new map showing local shopping facilities]	<i>Inclusion of a Map showing the boundary of the Local Centre would be helpful.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
OM9	34	[Change Policy title and supporting text to “Design and Quality of Development”]	Drafting improvement	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M14	36	Recognise that two of the identified placemaking opportunities extend beyond the neighbourhood area in the supporting text, for example by including “It is recognised that where these locations	<i>Two of the locations extend beyond the neighbourhood area and the fact that these parts are outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan should be recognised in the supporting text.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the

		extend beyond the neighbourhood area they are outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan” in paragraph 12.3.3		examiner’s recommendations
M15	35	Amend the Key to Map 6 so the colour and shading of the placemaking opportunities depicted is clear and consistent	<i>There is a mismatch between the colours used to depict the five placemaking opportunities in Map 6 and those used in the Legend.</i>	Agree to modify the text and maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
OM10	38	[Replace “should be taken in these areas” with “locations shown in Map 6 should be taken” in Policy HC4]	<i>I suggest Map 6 should be referenced directly in the Policy.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M16	40	Replace Policy HC5 with: “Development proposals within the Leeds City College Park Lane Campus (shown on Map 7) should be carried out in accordance with the Principles set out in the “Park Lane Campus Design Code”: 1. Context and Local Impact 2. Uses, activity and adaptability 3. Movement and Connectivity 4. Identity 5. Built Form 6. Public Space	<i>Policy HC5 sets out design principles which come from the Park Lane Campus Design Code. There are inconsistencies in the drafting of the principles and their headings between Policy HC5 and the Park Lane Campus Design Code. As with Policy H3 to avoid confusion over different drafting I recommend that Policy HC5 makes reference only to the main headings of the principles in the Park Lane Campus Design Code.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

		7. Homes and buildings 8. Resources and climate change 9. Nature 10. Lifespan”		
M17	39	Amend the first part of paragraph 13.3.1 to read "The Park Lane Campus, including Park Lane College and the University Centre, are both run by..."	<i>The Policy references the “University Centre” site and it is not immediately clear how this relates to the Park Lane Campus. I was informed that Park Lane Campus comprises both Park Lane College (which is not mentioned in the Policy or supporting text) and the University Centre. I recommend drafting improvements to address this and also to improve clarity and relate the Policy to all development proposals in the identified area.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE				
M18	44	Amend Policy G1 to: Delete “proposed” in line three	<i>A drafting change is recommended as the Local Green Corridors are not “proposed” in the final Plan. Map 8 is at a small scale and a larger scale and/or online map should be provided enabling the detailed boundaries to be determined consistent with OM3.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M18	44	Amend Policy G1 to: Delete the second paragraph	<i>There is limited analysis and justification supporting the approach to retaining and replacing trees or justifying an approach distinct to the neighbourhood area. Policy LAND 2 of the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan (2013) already establishes a policy expectation to conserve trees and support new planting along with tree replacement on a minimum three for one basis and planting design and specification according to best practice. I conclude the second part of the Policy does not “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

			<i>particular area” as required by national planning policy (paragraph 16, NPPF).</i>	
M19	44	Include new Map 8a in the final Plan	<i>The north-south pedestrian routes (LGWC10) are not provided on Map 8 and they are only described in Appendix D. On request I was provided with a separate Map 8a showing their location and I am content with this.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M20	46	Amend Policy G2 to delete “where development which would be considered inappropriate in the Leeds Green Belt will not be approved except in very special circumstances”	<i>To be afforded protection Local Green Spaces need only be designated by the Plan. This follows a Court of Appeal case relating to a Local Green Space policy in a neighbourhood plan (Lochailort Investments Limited v. Mendip District Council and Norton St Philip Parish Council, [2020] EWCA Civ 1259) which means it is inappropriate without clear justification to include any wording that sets out how development proposals should be managed. No such justification has been provided in the submitted Plan and its supporting documents.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations
M21	46/General	Use the following names for each Local Green Space consistently in Policy G2, Appendix E and throughout the Plan and its appendices: LGS1 Hanover Square LGS2 Woodhouse Square LGS3 The Rosebank Millennium Green LGS4 Hyde Park Road (Benson Court) LGS5 The Willows LGS6 Duncombe Street LGS7 Marlborough Street LGS8 Marlborough Towers LGS9 Chorley Lane	<i>Maps showing the boundaries of each Local Green Space are provided in Map 8, Figure 1 (Appendix E) and in the individual assessments of each Local Green Space in Appendix E. There are some differences in the boundaries shown in Figure 1, especially for LGS3 (which does not extend to the south east in Figure 1) and LGS6 (which includes additional land adjacent to the building to the west in Figure 1). There are other minor anomalies between Figure 1 and the other maps which suggests it was separately prepared. This was confirmed by the neighbourhood forum and I recommend removing Figure 1 from Appendix E to avoid any confusion. It would be appropriate to include Map 8 in Appendix E if desired.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner’s recommendations

		LGS10 Kendal Grove	<i>...There are minor inconsistencies between the naming of some of the Local Green Spaces between Policy G2 and Appendix E. On request the neighbourhood forum confirmed the names to be used are as in Policy G2 with the exception that "Marlborough Tower" should be named "Marlborough Towers". These names should be used consistently throughout the Plan and its appendices.</i>	
M22	43	Amend the boundary of Chorley Lane Local Green Space to exclude the tarmacked area of Clarendon Road and its junction with Woodhouse Square	<i>I visited each of the proposed Local Green Spaces and agree with the rationale and proposed boundaries with one exception. LGS9 Chorley Lane comprises separate parcels of green space divided by a significant road and it should exclude the tarmacked area of Clarendon Road and its junction with Woodhouse Square. A number of the proposed Local Green Spaces include a mix of hard and soft landscaped areas and I consider this entirely appropriate within a city environment.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M23	48	Amend Policy G3 to: Delete <i>" , in consultation with the local community through the local authority,"</i> Insert "and/" before <i>"or through"</i> in the penultimate line	<i>The Policy is informed by the many opportunities for improving the quality and functionality of green spaces throughout the neighbourhood area. It is positive in intent although it is not appropriate for the nature of consultation on proposals to be included in the policy drafting. This can be encouraged in the supporting text. The Policy drafting can be improved to recognise that both formal and informal provision can be made at the same time in some instances.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
COMMUNITY, EMPLOYMENT and EDUCATION				
M24	51	Amend Policy C1 to: Insert <i>"(as identified on Map 9)"</i> after <i>"services"</i> Insert <i>"satisfactory"</i> before <i>"alternative"</i>	<i>There is evidence supporting inclusion of the six community facilities provided in Appendix F and their location is provided on Map 9. I am content with the justification provided</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the

		Delete “in consultation with the local community, and” in Part 3 Insert a comma after “facilities” in the last line of Part 3	<i>...The intention of Policy C1 is to identify the community facilities where Core Strategy Policy P9 should apply. There are drafting differences between the two policies and I recommend modifications to Policy C1 so it mirrors Policy P9.</i> <i>... The evidence base also identifies a relative lack of community facilities in the neighbourhood area and it is appropriate to support their provision as a part of major development. It is not appropriate to specify the approach to consultation in planning policy although this can be encouraged in the supporting text.</i>	examiner's recommendations
M25	50	Amend Map 9 to include only the community facilities identified in Policy C1	<i>Appendix F refers to community “assets” rather than “facilities” and Map 9 additionally includes three public houses which falls into the category of community assets. This introduces a potential ambiguity and I recommend Map 9 shows only the facilities included in Map 9 and Appendix F references community facilities rather than assets. This also removes any potential confusion with identified assets of community value.</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M26	Appendix F	Amend Appendix F to refer to community facilities rather than community assets throughout	<i>Appendix F refers to community “assets” rather than “facilities” and Map 9 additionally includes three public houses which falls into the category of community assets. This introduces a potential ambiguity and I recommend Map 9 shows only the facilities included in Map 9 and Appendix F references community facilities rather than assets. This also removes any potential confusion with identified assets of community value.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M27	51/General	Use consistent names for the identified community facilities in Policy C1, Appendix F and throughout the Plan	<i>I also recommend the same names are used for the identified community facilities throughout the Plan and its appendices – Park Dale Hall is a community centre like Woodsley.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the

				examiner's recommendations
OM1 1	51	[Insert "particularly" after "supported" in Part 3]	<i>Policy E2 could be interpreted as limiting this support to identified areas. Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Forum has indicated this is not the intention and Policy E2 is intended to provide particular support for educational uses in these areas.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M28	57	Replace Policy E3 with "The retention of shopping facilities shown in Map ?? will be supported in accordance with Leeds Core Strategy policies P3 and P4."	<i>The intention of Policy E3 is to identify locations where the provisions of Core Strategy policies P3 and P4 will apply...The policy drafting should be simplified so it only identifies these as relevant locations for the Core Strategy policies to apply.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
M29	57	Provide addresses for the facilities identified in the Map showing local shopping facilities which are outside the Local Centre in the supporting text and/or as part of the Map	<i>On request I was provided with a new map detailing the location of Burley Lodge (Woodsley Road) Local Centre, three parades and six individual convenience stores. I recommend this is included in the final Plan along with addresses for the facilities outside the Local Centre to enable their precise location to be determined</i>	Agree to modify the text and include new maps as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations
MOVEMENT				
M30	61	Amend Policy M1 to: Replace "improve" with "improving" in the second line Insert "including within place-making opportunity areas defined by Policy HC4," before "applications" in line six Replace "as required by" with "identified in" in the final line	<i>The Policy is positively worded and enabling. It should relate to both the placemaking opportunities identified in Policy HC4 and the green infrastructure opportunities in Policy G1 and reflect the fact these are not "required". The policy drafting can also be improved.</i>	Agree to modify the text as indicated to comply with the examiner's recommendations