

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE HEADINGLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT EXAMINER:
Christopher Collison BA(Hons) MBA MRTPI MIED IHBC

To Leeds City Council and Headingley Neighbourhood Forum

By email to Caroline Harris, Planning Assistant, Leeds City Council, and Helen Gee,
Secretary, Headingley Neighbourhood Forum

Dated 11 May 2022

Dear Caroline and Helen

Headingley Neighbourhood Development Plan Independent Examination – Examiner letter seeking clarification of matters

Further to my initial letter of 10 May 2022 I am writing to seek clarification of the following matters:

Policy HOU2

1. I understand strategic Policies EN1 and EN2 relate to developments of 10 or more dwellings. I propose a modification of the second paragraph after “Strategy” to insert “which relate to major developments”. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Policy HD4

2. The term “historic streetscapes within the neighbourhood area” is ambiguous and could be read as suggesting these are defined areas. I propose a modification to insert “elements of” after “account of”. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**
3. The term “coherent design” does not provide a basis for the determination of development proposals. I propose a modification to replace this term with “design appropriate to their setting”. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Policy HD5

4. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot adjust the boundaries of a Conservation Area. I propose a modification so that in the text presented immediately under the policy title “extend the Headingley conservation area to include part of the Cardigan Triangle and” is deleted. I invite comment on this proposed

modification. **Accepted – we might consider adding requesting this as a possible community action**

5. I propose the insertion in the Neighbourhood Plan of a Map to define the spatial extent of the Cardigan Triangle Character Area. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**
6. I propose in paragraph 8.12 “success” is replaced with “succession”. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Policy GE1

7. Do parts b c d of Policy relate to the 6 Local Green Space designations or relate to all green spaces, and in the case of part d) to parks and woodlands only? **b,c and d relate to all green spaces and now you mention it hypothetically d might too were we to develop eg pocket parks or institute other schemes to improve biodiversity**
8. Given the importance of Local Green Space designation I propose a map (or maps) of the Local Green Space designations is included in the plan document. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Policy GE2

1. The terms “bat tubes” and “hedgehog highways” are ambiguous. I propose a modification in part c) to insert “or boxes to provide artificial roosts” after “bat tubes”; and replace “hedgehog highways” with “accessways through boundary walls and fences for hedgehogs”. I invite comment on these proposed modifications. **Accepted**
9. The first sentence of part e) of the policy suggests development management has a wider remit than it has. I propose a modification in part e) to replace the first sentence with “Development proposals that minimise the paving of gardens for parking or ease of maintenance will be supported.” I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**
10. The third sentence of part e) of the policy appears to incorrectly assume all site boundaries and frontages are green barriers/hedges. I propose a modification in part e) to replace the final sentence with “Development proposals that avoid the loss of green barrier/hedges will be supported.” I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Policy GE4

11. Part a) of the policy relating to the introduction of a strategic planting scheme including arrangements for reduced mowing regimes on areas of public greenspace and roadside verges is a community aspiration not capable of implementation through the determination of development proposals. I propose a modification to delete part a) and transfer the text to the green space and environment community actions in part 12.7 of the Neighbourhood Plan
Accepted

2.

Policy TC1

12. The final paragraph requires correction with respect to the word “However” and the approach adopted is not evidenced. I propose a modification in the final paragraph to replace the text after “Centre” with “or elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Area, will only be supported in accordance with the extant cumulative impact licensing policy.” I invite comment on this proposed modification **Accepted**

13. I propose the Neighbourhood Plan should include a map of the spatial extent of Headingley Town Centre in the Neighbourhood Plan. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

3.

Policy GA3

14. I propose that in part a) of the policy the link to maps should be more precise so that a user is directed to the public rights of way map and the ginnels map. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

15. I propose in part d) of the policy the link is adjusted to take a plan user to the connectivity improvements map. This map should be adjusted to reflect the policy wording. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

4.

5. I propose that in part g) “Headingley” is inserted before “Stadium”. I invite comment on this proposed modification. **Accepted**

Paragraph 8.9

The representation of an individual states paragraph 8.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires correction with respect to references to properties. I invite comment on that point. **I suggest as added (with more detail) in the comments document: Rose Court will now be used as a school for children with special educational needs with The name**

Rose Court has been used for two adjacent buildings, one is now a school and the other is being redeveloped as apartments.

I request any response to these matters is agreed as a joint response of the Neighbourhood Forum and Leeds City Council wherever possible. This request for clarification and any response should be published on the Leeds City Council website.

In order to maintain the momentum of the Independent Examination I would be grateful if any reply could be sent to me by 12.00 Noon on Friday 20 May 2022.

For the avoidance of doubt recommendations of modification of the Neighbourhood Plan that may be contained in my report of Independent Examination will not necessarily be limited to those matters in respect of which I have requested clarification.

I should be grateful if Leeds City Council and the Neighbourhood Forum could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best regards

Chris Collison
Independent Examiner
Planning and Management Ltd