

Appendix 1

Chapel Allerton Neighbourhood Plan and Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document

CONSULTATION REPORT

Preparation and Informal Consultation

For the last few years CANPlan has been an active focus for community interest in local planning and environmental matters in Chapel Allerton. CANPlan is led by a Steering Group of 16 residents and has developed a contact list of over 500 people. Active support has been provided by Councillors and the Inner North East Area Committee.

In May 2008 the Steering Group organised the 'CANPlan Slam' held at the Seven Arts Centre where residents were invited to speak about what they liked, disliked, valued or treasured about the area. Informal consultation and awareness raising was also undertaken at the Chapel Allerton Festival, September 2008.

The Steering group provided assistance to Leeds City Council in the preparation of the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area Appraisal in 2008, and in turn used the final Appraisal as a basis for the historical and design context of the NDS.

The Chapel Allerton Community Survey was undertaken in Autumn 2008, with 3000 questionnaires circulated and 730 responses collected (a good return rate of 24%). The results of the questionnaire survey and ideas for the first draft of the NDS were displayed in a public 'open day' in July 2009, attracting 120 visitors and further comments.

The overwhelming result of the survey was the importance of the character of the local area, the sense of community, and the local amenities. The concerns of the community was the volume of traffic, the limited range of shopping, and antisocial behaviour. In particular, it was felt that the NDS should promote improvements to roads and pavements, improved recycling, more food shops, and more youth clubs. There were also many comments relating to specific sites within the area.

Informal consultation with key stakeholders was then undertaken through comments on a series of drafts of the NDS through later 2009 and Spring 2010, in particular Officers within Forward Planning and the Sustainable Design Unit. A number of other departments within Leeds City Council were also consulted, alongside Local Ward Councillors, the Leeds Access Advisory Group, Leeds Youth Council, Leeds Older Persons' Forum, Leeds Voice, transport companies, the NHS, and the emergency services.

This informal consultation included being reviewed by Planning Officers and being submitted to Leeds City Council's Planning Board in March 2010.

Formal Consultation

The final draft NDS was submitted to Planning Board on 14th March 2011 and approved for formal public consultation subject to minor amendments which were incorporated prior to circulation.

The approved Consultation Draft was subject to a six weeks consultation from 14th April to 26th May 2011.

A formal Planning Notice was published in the Yorkshire Evening Post. Formal notices were issued to statutory consultees and the document was posted on the Council's and the steering group's website together with response forms. Hard copies were available on request and were also available at the Development Enquiry Centre and at Chapel Allerton Library.

During this formal consultation 3000 leaflets were sent to every household, and local businesses were also contacted. CANPlan also organised a public 'open day' in May 2011.

Ward Councillors and the local MP were contacted, along with the Civic Trust, and the owner/developer of one of the most contentious sites in Chapel Allerton, the former Yorkshire Bank site on Harrogate Road.

For details of the consultees, final representations received and any consequent changes see the attached Representations Statement in Appendix 2.



Appendix 2

Chapel Allerton Community Plan and Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document

REPRESENTATIONS STATEMENT

Relating to the main issues raised during the formal consultation period in accordance with Regulation 18(4)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 as amended.

Summary of representations received during consultation period 14th April – 24th May 2011

QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 53 questionnaires were completed

	question	yes	no	not sure
1	Do you agree with the transport proposals set out in the Plan to improve pedestrian safety?	46	6	1
2	Do you support the proposals to part pedestrianise the areas outside the Yorkshire Bank and create a village/town square?	45	5	3
3	Do you agree with the proposals to limit the number and concentration of bars and other licensed premises in Chapel Allerton?	42	10	1
4	Do you agree with the proposals to improve the appearance of shop frontages and the village centre through new shop signs and paving material?	46	5	2
5	Do you agree with the Future Vision for the development of the former Yorkshire Bank site off Harrogate Road as set out in the Plan?	42	3	8
6	Do you support the proposal to seek the listing of the existing Yorkshire "Penny" Bank on Harrogate Road?	43	10	
7	Do you agree with the need to improve and encourage the use of existing green spaces by the public?	49	4	
8	Do you support the proposals to further improve and encourage the use of the Cemetery by the War Memorial.	45	4	4
9	Do you agree with the need to provide improved recycling facilities?	45	4	4
10	Do you agree with the need to tackle litter in the streets?	49	1	3

Quality of Plan and Consultation

1 bad – 5 good

	1	2	3	4	5
What is your overall opinion of the proposals set out in the Plan?	2		4	23	24
How do you feel CANPlan is conducting this consultation?	2	1	4	14	32

Comments

Comments were received from 34 people

Notes: In the following table:

Ref	Refers to the respondents, listed at end of document.
LCC	Endorsed by relevant Leeds City Council Officers.
How issues addressed	Proposed modifications to Consultation Draft.

Ref	Comment	LCC	How issues addressed in the Document
CONSULTATION PROCESS			
33	We took the time and trouble to visit the library having seen a notice of CANPlan in the YEP. We found at the library that this questionnaire had been left in most streets but not ours. If my husband had not spotted the notice in the press, we should have known nothing of these well thought out ideas and planning.	Endorsement noted	Inclusion of additional streets to be considered in future consultations
26	An executive summary in future consults would be good - there is a lot of information to take in	Noted	No amendment to document
47	When leafletting about open consultation days, it would be good to specify the time deadline for replies to be in (bearing in mind that not everyone can attend the consultation event)	Noted	
43	Excellent	Endorsement welcomed	No action
49	Perhaps have a mini exhibition at Chapel Allerton Primary school to seek views of parents with young children.	All households in CA were given the opportunity to comment.	No action
GENERAL			
28	The consultation draft has no section 8.11, it jumps from 8.10 to 8.12	Noted	Paragraph numbering amended
31	Chapel Allerton is very nice as it is. Please don't spoil it by over-enthusiastic updating. (The woodland path through the churchyard could do with attention but please don't pave it)	Further consultation will be undertaken if this project is developed	No current action
29	Having moved to Chapel Allerton from Headingley I feel that the local community should be consulted and protected every step of the way. The local community in Headingley was decimated by lax planning and encouragement of HMOs and shops which were dedicated to students. Anyone over 25 or families find Headingley a no-go area at weekends after 5 pm. This must not be allowed to happen in CA.	LCC welcomes CANPlan's input to community planning and consultation and understands that CANPlan would hope to be involved in decisions affecting the character of the Conservation Area.	No action .
43	CANPlan document is absolutely excellent! Thank you again to all involved.	Endorsement welcomed	No action
48	Excellent plan which I fully support.	Endorsement welcomed	No action

53	A great initiative. We fully support all the proposals which we feel would benefit Chapel Allerton hugely.	Endorsement welcomed	No action
23	The gentleman we spoke to was clearly not interested in any constructive criticism or genuine concerns about the proposed village square outside the Yorkshire bank. He was rude and ignorant and refused to consider anybody else's point of view. Why consult with the community if you don't want to listen to what they've got to say?!	The questionnaire responses acknowledge that not everyone shares the same view regarding the proposal to create a village/town square, however, there is clearly a majority view in favour of this.	No amendment to document. CANPlan hopes to work with the City Council to advance this proposal.
21	Thank you for the work you are doing on this project, I do appreciate it.	Support welcomed	No amendment to document
56	Thank you for all the work you've done on this	Support welcomed	No amendment to document
59	Why on earth is this being proposed anyway and why are people such as your committee so intent on changing the face of Chapel Allerton? It seems to me that Chapel Allerton has changed beyond recognition over the years by all the developments that have occurred. Why can't it just be left alone?!!!	CANPlan has worked hard to engage residents in issues and decisions which affect their community and the city council welcomes their input.	No amendment to document
TRANSPORT			
25	I'm glad cyclists are mentioned. Perhaps consideration should be given to cycle routes to the schools.	This is an initiative which would be supported by the city council.	Comment to be added in para 6.16
24	Chapel Allerton has become Patchallerton due to the state of the pavements, side roads and speed bumps which in some cases are too high and I do feel that these should take priority rather than using resources to pave the centre unnecessarily.	Noted Repairs will be carried out as funds become available.	'Repair' to be added to note 2, p10
44	Parking outside the parade at post office adjacent to Montreal Avenue – new yellow bus stop lines are too restrictive past crossing so all trying to park on corner of Church Lane/Montreal Ave to go to PO, Natwest Bank, hairdressers etc. Plus creation of new bus stop at Esso garage op Tech North only a few yards for main existing one is ridiculous. Clogged with buses now and traffic chaos.	Noted	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
22	Nobody seems to have taken into account the transport of disabled people to existing premises (bank, dentist etc) and this proposal removes parking spaces which are not to be replaced. Also nowhere for collection/delivery of goods to launderette, WJB, dentists, angel share etc.	Parking for disabled people would need to be taken into consideration in any remodelling of the area.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
37	The parking of vehicles on Montreal Avenue is creating a situation of confrontation and danger to pedestrians.	Noted	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
34	Car parking has to be addressed in some way. The Mustard Pot and Co-op car parks are insufficient for car travellers who come into Chapel Allerton.	Given the built up nature of the area car parking can only be brought forward through the redevelopment of existing sites. The Council's emphasis is on encouraging visitors to the centre to walk cycle or use public transport.	No amendment to document
49	Very important to have an additional pedestrian crossing on Harrogate Road near Yorkshire Bank site.	Noted, however this could only be achieved through developer contributions or through an injection of additional capital funding.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document

51	Very much want to see improvements to pedestrian safety and reduction in traffic volume and speed.	Noted	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
21	<p>One cannot argue with the safety argument and I do support the idea of a 2nd pedestrian crossing for Harrogate Road, however, I am less keen on the suggestion to narrow the road, I think the width of Harrogate Road helps contribute to the sense of openness and welcome to Chapel A. If the road was to be narrowed to provide a cycle track that would be a very sound reason, but not just to close off access. I am also very concerned that narrowing the road will just force commuters to find more rat runs as for instance Henconner Lane which is already used as such. The area could do with a 'park and ride' facility, as many commuters do park in the area for this purpose. Similarly, I am not keen on the pedestrianisation of one side of the road by the willow tree - I feel this would just be taken over by encroachment of tables and chairs from the eateries on that side. I have a personal interest in this in that I frequently turn right into Stainbeck Lane from Harrogate Road at the Willow Tree to access Henconner Lane from Stainbeck Lane. The change in the configuration of the roads would make this very difficult, which I guess is the intention!</p>	<p>The city council has no current plans to narrow Harrogate Road and this would only be considered in the context of improving pedestrian and cycle facilities. The highway implications of any proposals to create a village/town square would need to be carefully considered. There are no plans for park and ride in this area in the short or medium term, however, if an opportunity arises which is viable it would be looked at seriously, however, it would be more likely to be closer to the Ring Road to improve the potential catchment.</p>	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
54	<p>My main concern with any future proposals for Chapel Allerton and its immediate vicinity, is the speed at which traffic is allowed to travel. I live on Potternewton Lane (no.74) between Scott Hall Road, and Harrogate Road, and have to witness daily attempts by drivers to achieve 'red line' revs between the two speed humps on Potternewton Lane, which to be honest, are the most useless speedhumps I have ever come across. They are at two fairly major crossroads, that at Henconner Lane, and at Blake Grove. Cars regularly come along Potternewton Lane at over 50 mph, which is frightening given the number of people that have to cross the road at this point, both to access Chapel Allerton school, and the village area of CA itself. The idea that future proposals may seek to redirect traffic away from Harrogate Road is all well and good, but I fear it will make Potternewton Lane even more dangerous, as it will be used as a cut through, just as Blake Grove is now to gain access to the St Martins. The truth is, that most of the time, Harrogate Road is too busy for cars to achieve any great speed, as there are a number of pedestrian crossings and of course, the lights at the end of Potternewton Lane. Directing traffic away from Harrogate Road would also require changes to be made to surrounding roads such as ours, as the speeds witnessed on this road far exceed those seen on Harrogate Road. For a start, the speed humps at both Blake Grove and Henconner Lane should be replaced with traffic islands which form a chicaned area between the two, so that drivers cannot achieve the speeds they do now. It would also afford safer crossing facilities without the need for noisy pelican crossings which of course, nobody would want to see (or hear) in such a closed residential area. At the moment, there is no real deterrent or incentive to stop drivers doing 50+ mph down what is a 30mph road. I do fear that during the time I live here, I will witness a serious road traffic accident. Neighbours have already told me of several prior to me moving here in 2007.</p>	The city council has no plans to redirect traffic off Harrogate Road which will continue to remain the main access through the area.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document

55	One other pedestrian issue on Harrogate Road that is arguably far more important than the central CA issue is the lack of pedestrian crossing over Harrogate Road from the School gates, a lollipop service has not been in operation for many years. You should increase the remit of your CA map to cover the area down to Tesco Express - it should propose a pedestrian crossing outside the school also the junction at the end of Montreal avenue needs redesign as well as the entrance to the Methleys from Harrogate Road -these are all three dangerous locations especially since they are used by novices to walking who by the age of 9/10 may be walking alone.	Noted. The provision of additional crossings will be considered when resources permit and is a clear aspiration within this plan.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
56	Radish being situated close to the oblique junction of Regent Street and Allerton Hill has witnessed many accidents and near accidents. Consideration should be given to this being traffic lighted. Visibility is difficult on turning right out of Regent Street and turning both left and right from Allerton Hill (which is also used by taxi drivers as a turning circle!). The whole issue speaks to increased traffic congestion within Chapel Allerton. There is a great deal of worry amongst traders along Harrogate Road about on-street parking and that the hour allowed is taking trade away. This is because people like to come to CA to have something to eat and browse the shops which cannot be done within the time allocated. ...however, the green ethic running behind Radish is discouraging of over use of cars and many of our customers are local and walk or are bike-riders. I believe CA should do what it can to support the council's intentions to cut emissions and relook at its transport policy. One thing currently on the table is the idea of Leeds becoming a garden city and to connect CA up to the green space Urban Fix mechanism proposed by Tom Bliss and Schumacher North. This will entail encouraging people not to bring their cars but to walk and ride. Certainly the more congested it gets, the less people will want to visit. With petrol prices inevitably going up more, this may be a self-limiting factor but with good planning, expansion of WizGo, possibly less parking opportunities rather than more, I think a better balance can be struck.	The city council welcomes the endorsement of its general policy approach which prioritises walking and cycling.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
57	I have studied the Neighbourhood Plan and an important feature should be a reasonably priced Car Park, possibly a maximum stay of about three hours. May I suggest the unused Yorkshire Bank Training Building and the adjoining land, with access from Allerton Hill and a shopping parade (no restaurants or cafes) fronting onto Harrogate Road.	The land is not in council ownership and no funding is currently available to cover the cost of acquisition.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document
60	Hopefully the footpath into Potternewton Court will be included in the proposed footpath improvement works and with the provision of some form of obstruction to stop vehicles parking half way across the footpath, often with engines running and particularly in-front of my flat. My flat is the only ground floor flat with the door opening directly onto the footpath.	Noted Repairs will be carried out as funds become available.	No amendment to document
COMMUNITY SAFETY			
21	Bars and Restaurants: These in themselves are not a bad thing if properly managed. The emphasis should be on having variety and the take-always promoting anti-litter measures. (And Aagrah need to improve their extraction facilities - the smell of Indian food (normally very appetising) is overpowering in the area around Seven)	Noted	Generally covered in section 7 – no amendment to document

BUILT ENVIRONMENT			
43	Could do with a nice hotel – eco/green? Community owned? Could be part of Yorkshire Bank site.	Dependant on private sector for delivery.	Noted – no amendment to document
49	Very pleased that you've included the Montreal Parade shops within the plan. This area really needs improvement.	Endorsement welcomed	No amendment to document
52	Welcome your plans to improve the parade of shops in Scott Hall Road (very run down)	Endorsement welcomed	Noted – no amendment to document
46	Important to resolve the problems of the eye-sore of the Yorkshire Bank Site	The city council anticipates that the site will be redeveloped.	Noted – no amendment to document
51	Very concerned about the Yorkshire Bank development (submitted objection to previous development plan)	Any scheme would be considered in the context of the vision expressed for the site in the document.	Noted – no amendment to document
46	We sincerely hope that CANPlan will have a serious re-think about the proposed pedestrianisation of Stainbeck Lane/Harrogate Road junction. We cannot see nay benefits that this procedure will bring – only traffic chaos with the narrowing of the road on a busy 2-way bus route. It will be difficult to drop passengers off for the laundrette, dentist etc and prevent disabled access by car to the opposite side, (they too need the bank and the chemist). The additional crossing will surely divert motorists up and down King George Avenue and Woodland Lane (which they already do and many are breaking the 20 mph speed limit). This will add to the noise and air pollution for the surrounding houses. A definite no-no in our opinion! More important to resolve the problems of the eye-sore of the Yorkshire Bank site.	There are no firm plans for this area at present and further consultation would be carried, together with detailed consideration of any impact on the highway network. The city council anticipates redevelopment of the Yorkshire Bank site and will discuss the timing of this with the developer.	Noted – no amendment to document
45	I have concerns about the effect of pedestrianising outside the Yorkshire Bank on the traffic going down Potternewton Lane, It is already a fast busy road, I have 2 young children and more traffic directed down there in response is worrying.	As above	Noted – no amendment to document
21	The plans to improve broken paving etc. should not just stop in the centre, indeed the CANPlan in total should not just stop on the left hand-side of Harrogate Road. There is always a sense with these initiatives that it is that area that is the focus and that the Methleys and Henconners will not be the beneficiaries. I am aware that the plan makes reference to the 'Home Zone' initiative of the Methleys as a symbolic example but that was many years ago when it was still an area of owner occupiers. The Methleys is now predominantly a 'buy-to-let' zone and consequently the housing and front gardens are not as cared for and thus bring down the whole area. If the CANPlan could do something about instilling a sense of care for one's environment that would be very worthwhile.	Pavement repair has been identified by CANPlan as a priority within the whole plan area, but is a particular priority within the Conservation Area, of which the Methleys form a part.	Included comment about care of environment in section 10 Priorities
56	It has been rightly pointed out that bars and cafes, whilst bringing into CA, welcome trade, it has the counter effect of increasing traffic and parking congestion. This may be further exacerbated by the Yorkshire Bank development which is central to the future of CA both practically and aesthetically. A close scrutiny of plans here is essential and wonder if there is any room for CANPLAN to insist on an inclusion within the plans for an agreed facility - (green space, extra parking, whatever is the consensus). It is a key space and has been empty for too long and is in urgent need of development. I would worry about the frontage to the development (last plans had it as a huge roadside restaurant, I think) closing off sight of the space. It should in no way add to the current congestion.	The document is consistent with suggestions in the Conservation Area Appraisal. The city council cannot insist on the inclusion of greenspace, but can ensure that development is appropriate to the Conservation Area.	Generally covered in section 6 – no amendment to document

56	The pavements in CA are in urgent need of repair and revision. Wheelchair users are seriously disadvantaged with some very narrow pavements, (in particular corner of Casablanca) some kerbs are not low enough.	The document recommends that consideration is given to reducing the width of Harrogate Road to improve pedestrian accessibility. This is one of a number of transport priorities which requires further liaison with Highways.	Generally covered in section 6 – ‘repair’ to be added to note 2, p10
59	I went on your blogspot.com website to look at your proposed plans for a village green and can't find them. Wondered if you could help. I do intend looking at them in full...however my initial thoughts are that a village green in the proposed area is inappropriate. For a start the area is too small.. as it stands....but even if you are thinking of extending the area I for one don't think it is the right place to have it.	Any public space at the Stainbeck Lane /Harrogate Road would be small scale, however, it would contribute to the character of the Conservation Area.	Noted – no amendment to document
NEIGHBOURHOOD FACILITIES			
32	As we are living in times when the closure of libraries is becoming an acceptable option in cost cutting, twenty libraries are due to close in Leeds; some mention of the Chapel Allerton library should be made in the final document. Admittedly, the library is underused but it is still very important to many members of the local community. The library provides a range of services, hosts events and play a role in the Chapel Allerton Arts Festival. The fabric of the listed building is deteriorating and money should be found for repairs and refurbishing.	Noted	Item to be added to section 9
15	Since the only community centre - the Methodist Hall - is not obvious, a signpost from Harrogate Road would be helpful	Noted	No amendment to document
30	The library should be part of the redevelopment of the Yorkshire bank site - to include café and toilets. There is a waiting list of approx 2 years for allotments in Chapel Allerton; if any land is, or becomes, available this should be considered. Involve local takeaways in litter collection especially on weekends, (By the way Tommy is doing a great job)	It is acknowledged that there is a shortage of allotments in the locality. The creation of new allotments to reduce the waiting list and improvement in the quality of others is one of the priorities for greenspace provision.	Item to be added to section 9
27	I thought the 100 year old library should be mentioned, after all it is the centre of the community but it needs a lot of TLC and cash	Noted	Item to be added to section 9
41	I was so pleased to see full consideration to the lower shops in Chapel Allerton.	Noted	Noted – no amendment to document
21	I do strongly agree with the sentiment to encourage more and varied commercial outlets. I have lived in the area long enough to remember with affection: green grocers, a beautiful Italian shoe shop and the little black dress shop.	Agreed, maintaining a range of shops is key to maintaining vitality and viability of the centre.	Noted – no amendment to document
27	No more plastic bins, Town Street Walk has 19 bins cluttering pavements. Other areas in CA are worse.	Noted	Noted – no amendment to document
58	I note on your survey that you say there is only one bottle bank and that is at the Co-op. There is another one on Potternewton Lane. Bearing in mind the dreadful amount of litter that gathers around that one I hope very much that you do not encourage bottle banks to be sited in public spaces such as grass verges.	Noted	Item 10.5 to be corrected
56	There is a shortage of small independent food shops. CA needs a good green-grocer - it is not short of bakeries now. Radish often gets customers who have an allotment and want to get rid of gluts. I wonder if it would be possible to grant a street vending licence to the allotment holders? This could form part of the village square as an occasional stall perhaps?	This idea could be explored if the village square progresses.	Noted – no amendment to document

SUSTAINABILITY AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT			
26	Plastic and tetrapack recycling facilities would be great. The bottle banks are adequate.	Noted	Noted – no amendment to document
51	Very disappointed that glass recycling facility was removed by Lidl.	Noted	Noted – no amendment to document
42	Trees planted in as many places as possible eg in the space gained from closing road in centre. The lower part of Harrogate Road – near Lidl etc, would really benefit from trees, better pavements etc.	CANPlan has indicated that they will work with the community to develop a re-planting strategy and this would be supported by the council as funds allow.	Noted – no amendment to document
41	It would be good to see a survey of sites for public trees – a number have been lost in recent years so there are places to plant now.	Comments as above	Noted – no amendment to document
38	Re section 7, I would like to see a more ambitious approach to local eco-sustainability along the lines set out by Leeds Climate Action Coalition for the city, in the Vision for Leeds consultation.	Noted, however, this goes beyond the scope of this plan	Noted – no amendment to document
36	I feel the sustainability proposals need considerable strengthening toward transition town eco-economy energy plan. How can we create a place to help our children manage/cope? Am interested in linking TICA and permaculture etc	Noted, however, this goes beyond the scope of this plan	Noted – no amendment to document
37	The location of flower tubs outside the Old Police Station is fine, as long as someone remembers to water them.	Noted, volunteers are no doubt welcome.	Noted – no amendment to document
35	Major omissions are 1, minimum energy efficiency standards in all buildings, 2. Minimum renewable energy production local buildings, 3. Local food production. These are strategic issues and so essential. Other issues covered are good, but this is the key.	Noted, however, energy goes beyond the scope of this plan. The provision of the need for further allotments has been noted.	Noted – no amendment to document
21	Beautification and Litter. Yes, it is lovely to have beautification measures (street furniture and the like) if they are kept up. Instead, we now have tubs of dead plants on the railings by the crossing points. The single most important thing that would beautify the village centre (and the surrounding streets) is to have efficient and regular pick up of litter. Getting people to stop making litter seems to be a lost cause.....but litter can beget litter because people think might as well add a bit more, if it's not there in the first place it can discourage a few. On my way home from the centre I regularly pick up litter along School Lane.	Noted	Noted – no amendment to document

RESPONSES RECEIVED

ref	Name	organization	format	note
1	A Murray	resident	questionnaire	no comment
2	P Crotty	CA ??? club	questionnaire	no comment
3	A Wilstead	resident	questionnaire	no comment
4	A Pearman	resident	questionnaire	no comment
5	Mrs Gilboure	resident	questionnaire	no comment
6	N Carr	resident	questionnaire	no comment
7	L Crowley	resident	questionnaire	no comment
8	T Nuttall	CA Tennis & Squash Club	questionnaire	no comment
9	K Gouley	resident	questionnaire	no comment
10	P Julings	resident	questionnaire	no comment
11	T Earnshaw	resident	questionnaire	no comment
12	D Earnshaw	resident	questionnaire	no comment
13	T Cook	resident	questionnaire	no comment
14	J Brown	resident	questionnaire	no comment
15	R Bateman	resident	questionnaire	support, comments and suggested improvements
16	N Hall	resident	questionnaire	no comment
17	D Hallas	resident	questionnaire	no comment
18	N Lewis	resident	questionnaire	no comment
19	A Talbot	resident	questionnaire	no comment
20	P Lally	resident	questionnaire	no comment
21	C Cobbett	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
22	Janet Daville	resident	questionnaire	support and comments
23	Jennifer Daville	resident	questionnaire	limited support, comments
24	J Smith	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
25	A Needham	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
26	I Lyons	resident	questionnaire	support, comments and suggested improvements
27	J Tillison	resident	questionnaire	support, comments and suggested improvements
28	C McDougall	resident	questionnaire	comment and correction
29	V Wright	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
30	M Copeland	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
31	M Rayner	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
32	J Watson	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
33	J Clarkson	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
34	D Wilson	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
35	G McNaughton	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
36	A Cassels - Brown	resident	questionnaire	comment
37	G Markinson	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
38	L Arblaster	Leeds Climate Action Coalition	questionnaire	support and comment
39	J Murray	resident	questionnaire	no comment
40	T Bliss	resident	questionnaire	no comment
41	P Doney	resident	questionnaire	support and comment

42	L Cooper	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
43	J Watson	CA Holistic Centre	questionnaire	support and comment
44	S Bolton	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
45	J Wilkinson	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
46	L & K	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
47	J Coxhead	resident	questionnaire	comment
48	Y Deane	resident	questionnaire	support
49	S Ross	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
50	J Gibson	resident	questionnaire	no comment
51	S Lewis	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
52	B Reed	resident	questionnaire	support and comment
53	J & P Smith	resident	questionnaire	support
54	K Frain	resident	e-mail	comments
55	R Strong	resident	e-mail	comments
56	Meg	Radish Bookshop	e-mail	support and comment
57	A Solomon	resident	e-mail	comments
58	D Ward	resident	e-mail	support and comment
59	Ann-Marie	resident	e-mail	comments
60	B & J Wozniak	resident	questionnaire	support and comment