

Hyde Park Neighbourhood Forum Meeting 12th June 2014

Present: Sue Buckle, Amanda Jackson, Dawn Carey Jones, Bill McKinnon, Wendy Cook, Jenna Riley, Shafique Sheikh, Lydia Blundell, Mavis Whitbread.

Apologies: Janet Bailey, Amit Roy, Gwyn Harrup, Ali McNeill, Jill Setterington, Pravin Dayalji, Ghaffar Karim, Rev Joanna Seaborne, Nathan Clarke, Victoria Jaquiss, Kay Raveekarn, Cllr Neil Walshaw, Pervis Akhtar, Marian Charlton, Ian Mackay, Howard Eaglestone, Mick Jolley, Frankie O'Byrne, Jen Carlberg, Lois Mortimer, Mary Osborne.

[SB agreed to chair the meeting in the absence of Cllr Walshaw.]

Notes from last meeting: Everyone read through the notes from the last meeting and agreed that they were a good account of the last meeting.

Matters Arising: Response to the Headingley Forum's

Consultation: As agreed at the last meeting, this was sent by Cllr Walshaw. **Hyde Park Corner:** BM: Last week it was heritage being talked about at the trolleybus public inquiry and DCJ did a great defence of Hyde Park Corner. Metro were saying that if they knock the shops down it will open up a bit of green space and views to St. Augustine's Church. DCJ argued that if the shops were knocked down it wouldn't be a viable district centre. Metro were saying the trolleybus would mean the removal of the hoardings in front of the back of St. Augustine's but DCJ argued that Metro owned that land anyway so why couldn't they just remove the hoardings now. **Little Woodhouse Forum's Consultation:** The deadline for responses has been extended to 24th June. AJ: The notes from the last meeting don't say anything about the area below Moorland Road which was discussed at the first meeting. DCJ: We concentrated on Hyde Park Corner at the last meeting. BM: It's not part of Little Woodhouse but not historically part of Hyde Park but think people living there would consider themselves to be living in Hyde Park. Can we ask Little Woodhouse why they want this area in their plan? Can we ask the people who live and work there? AJ: It's hard to know where people there would see themselves. SB: People I know there see themselves as in Hyde Park – there's Hyde Park Close, Hyde Park Methodist Church, Hyde Park Source, Hyde Park Surgery.

Boundary: JR: There are only six people other than me here *[two more people subsequently arrived]* and ideally we wanted sixteen or seventeen members here. We've got an amended boundary here in line with what was discussed at the last meeting. It does include Hyde Park Corner but not the corner at Victoria Road / Cardigan Road. It's IM's job to designate the area, I'm here to help but not a decision maker. Rationale for including Hyde Park Corner and excluding the Victoria Road / Cardigan Road corner makes sense to me but I don't live here. I was hoping tonight that this proposed boundary would be finalised.

[The group looked at the new proposed plan boundary which now includes Hyde Park Corner as agreed at the previous meeting.]

SB: What if we came up with an alternative boundary south of Moorland Road and then I rang up people to ask what they think? JR: You could do, you're nearly there with application, you need the boundary in one section and everything else in another.

JR: IM and I happy about including all of Hyde Park Corner and all of Woodhouse Moor. Giving the Victoria Road / Cardigan Road corner to the Headingley Plan fits in with the character areas set out in the 2010 Neighbourhood Design Statement. We need to know that the majority of the Hyde Park Interim Forum are happy with the inclusion of Hyde Park Corner and the exclusion of the Victoria Road / Cardigan Road corner. The Hyde Park Interim Forum needs to endorse the boundary and then apply for designation and start a six week consultation period. *[Everyone was disappointed that more people weren't there because it didn't feel right to be taking decisions with so few people present.]*

DCJ: In our first meeting when representatives of the Little Woodhouse Interim Forum were here we looked at the Little

Woodhouse boundaries. SB: People that AM spoke to were happy to consider themselves in the Little Woodhouse Plan but AR and AB see themselves as living in Hyde Park. The church and the health centre seem like Hyde Park to me. AJ: It looks like Hyde Park to me. JR: Will look at the character of houses in the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Design Statement. SB: The housing estate has always been known as Hyde Park. Nick Davies' book about the Hyde Park riots featured conversations with people from that area. WC: Could we make a draft objection to the Little Woodhouse Plan now? If we meet again in two weeks it will be too late to object. Then we could consult with people by email to see what they think and it'd be ready to go if agreed.

JR: The Hyde Park Forum needs to include members from all over the area, not just one area of the community. At the end of the Little Woodhouse publicity period one of the questions will be how widely have they consulted. SB: Will knock on doors in Hyde Park Close to see what people there think.

SS: We could propose including Hyde Park Close but not the surgery and church. SB: Would it make sense to have Hyde Park Close without the other areas? SS: The council treat this area as the backside of Woodsley Road. Hyde Park Road is a bottle neck at prayer times or if there's a funeral. This affects all of Hyde Park. The Moorland Road / Hyde Park Road junction should all be in the same plan so that traffic and parking problems can be tackled more easily. Parking problems here are massive. A lot of the Pakistani and Kashmiri community is focused around the Woodsley Road area. SB: Does this community see itself as part of Hyde Park or Little Woodhouse? SS: I think as their own community! LB: A key part of consultation should be talking to the mosque on Woodsley Road.

SS: What other Neighbourhood Forums are there? Burley? JR: Burley Top. WC: What about Woodhouse? DCJ: Woodhouse haven't got one at the moment.

SS: If we're proposing to include the Moorland Road / Hyde Park junction and the streets south and west of this then we may as well include the university's business school. AJ/LB: It would make sense to keep all of the university campus together so wouldn't make sense to include the business school in this boundary.

BM: Should we make a representation to the Little Woodhouse consultation about including the area we're talking about in our proposed boundary? SB: We should talk to FM and BM. DCJ: We should definitely speak to FM and BM as they came to our first meeting and were very open about the Little Woodhouse Forum consultation.

SS: The Hyde Park Road / Moorland Road junction is an accident blackspot and ought to be all in one plan. Also, there is a massive parking problem in this area. AJ: I agree. BM: Little Woodhouse proper is quite some way away. There are parking permits there. It's possible that parking permits might not be as high on the agenda of a Little Woodhouse Plan as they would be on a Hyde Park Plan.

JR: This issue can be included in the Hyde Park Plan but we need to move forward now and get the boundary designated. The deadline for applying for funding is 1st July. Tonight we've lost two weeks with thinking about amending the proposed boundary again, which is fine, but it would be good to get a move on. DCJ: It's really difficult because there are only eight of us here so it doesn't feel like as democratic a meeting as the last two so for us to be making decisions doesn't feel quite right. SS: DCJ should ask people what they think by email. BM: Could we have an email vote? SS: I don't mind proposing a vote now. SB: This feels a bit awkward. DCJ: We need to talk to FM and BM as well. AJ: Would support including that part in our plan if that was the consensus from the people who lived there. LB: At our first meeting we talked a lot about consensus and that felt right. WC: What about putting together a draft statement and having a half hour meeting just to vote? SS: We need people to come to a meeting next week and vote. JR: We also need to see how this will fit in with IM's workload. LB: If we could pull together a statement and have a meeting about it next week that might work.

JR: The boundary you're now talking about overlaps with Little Woodhouse's too. It would be good to get the Hyde Park, Headingley

SS: Sometimes you've just got to take a decision. DCJ: I think we need everyone here. JR: What you propose goes out for consultation so it's open for people to comment then. BM: Think what JR is saying is that she knows we're concerned about proposing that area to be in our plan without having consulted with people there but with our application we'd be putting it forward for consultation and therefore we would be consulting. If we propose including that area, then put it out for consultation, there won't be a delay, the three proposals will be roughly live at the same time and we're likely to be able to apply for funding in time. People who live in the whole area can say during consultation process whether they feel they ought to be in the Hyde Park NP.

JR: As long as you've got a good rationale for inclusion of areas in your plan and are not just poaching that's fine. There have been instances of poaching. BM: Hyde Park Methodist Church and Hyde Park Surgery. SS: AR would say he lived in Hyde Park. JR: IM makes the decision on designation but in conjunction with others such as Cllr Gruen.

AJ: Now the consultation process has been explained it feels better. BM: SB would probably take our consultation forms round people all over Hyde Park.

DCJ: Does it matter that the Little Woodhouse consultation is nearly over? BM: Would IM extend it? JR: Don't know. Your biggest voice is to get your application in with the amended boundary and supporting statement. Then things can be discussed further. It would be a shame to miss out on funding. JR: You need to submit the application and register your interest online.

DCJ: If we don't get moving is it possible we're more likely to lose Hyde Park Corner as well? Should I email Little Woodhouse to let them know what we're thinking and SB could ring FM and BM. I could send an email out to everyone on our list to explain the situation and say that we thought we needed to make a decision about including the extra bit in our boundary and then putting it out for consultation, but asking for comments from everyone by a certain time.

[SS proposed that we include the area between Moorland Road, Hyde Park Road, Woodsley Road and Belle Vue Road. AJ seconded the proposal. Seven out of the eight people currently present voted in favour. JR didn't vote because she has to be neutral.]

BM: Should we make a representation about this area as part of the Little Woodhouse consultation? JR: Yes because you did with the Headingley proposal. *[The group talked about what to put in a representation and created a draft - see draft at end of these notes.]*

[MW arrived and was given a brief update by SB.]

AJ: The boundary along Woodsley Road and Belle Vue Road is more natural on the ground. SS: It's important to think about Hyde Park Terrace and its history. People along Moorland Road look at themselves as living in Hyde Park. WC: It makes sense to include that part given the problems we want to look at over the next ten to fifteen years. AJ: Especially parking. SS: This area gets no TLC. SB: That's one of the reasons we wanted Hyde Park to have its separate plan. SS: There's a massive bin problem. AJ: We can't really say waste is unique to our area. We can justify inclusion of the bit we've voted on because of parking issues, religious centres, natural boundary, history associated with Hyde Park Close. JR: What about architectural characteristics? SS: Many houses were built in this area to enjoy Woodhouse Moor. JR: Are the houses in this area similar to others in Hyde Park? SB: There are Victorian terraces. AJ: Under normal circumstances we wouldn't be making the decisions with only eight of us here but we've done it because of the time constraint and because we realised that whatever decision we make goes out to consultation anyway.

JR: For your application you need to produce something like Annex 4 and Annex 2B of the Little Woodhouse application.

JR: It would make sense for each of the three groups to have a representative in the forum of the other groups. It wouldn't have to be the same person attending each meeting each time.

JR: Other ways of attracting new members, as well as at Unity Day, can be included in the application. SS: Hoping to have a Fun Day on the Royal Park site in the middle of Ramadan. We could use that as chance to consult and get more people involved. SB: Need to do some knocking on doors and talk to people in the mosques. SB: To get feedback from people we need something on a leaflet that can be filled in there and then. SS: Mosques important. SB: And schools. WC: Might be able to have a stand at the Hyde Park Picture House.

SS: Shall I put together a flyer? Anyone who lives or works in Hyde Park can join. JR: Need a statement of intent to demonstrate capacity for widening membership and that the application is well thought through. DCJ: Can we submit the notes from our meetings? JR: Submit everything. The membership should be open and inclusive. But need to get the boundary applied for and designated first. MW: When is the deadline? JR: Deadline for applying for funding is 1st July. MW: The urgency to get in touch widely with the community comes after the application is submitted? Older people are widely distributed throughout Hyde Park but it's hard to get hold of them. JR: Give some thought as to how to engage with older people and put it in the Statement of Intent.

DCJ: So what I need to do is email everyone who normally comes to our meetings to let them know what we talked about tonight in terms of including the additional area in our boundary proposal, sending a response to the Little Woodhouse consultation, and that we would have liked more people at this meeting to talk it over but since we didn't have, am sending out an email asking for comment.

DCJ: We've drafted a response to the Little Woodhouse consultation but we haven't drafted a supporting statement which we need for our application. This means we can't apply yet. Can we just use the notes from our previous meetings? JR: The supporting statement needs to talk about all of Hyde Park, not just Hyde Park Corner and the area we've discussed today. DCJ: Does that mean we need another meeting next week after all then? *[People at the meeting weren't available for a meeting the week after.]* WC: I can go through the notes and pull out bullets and then it can be sent round by email for people to add to and amend. *[Everyone at the meeting agreed that this would be OK.]*

DCJ: I've been sending out emails with addresses hidden but in this case it would be better for everyone to be able to see the email addresses so we could all reply to everyone. *[There was discussion about how to keep addresses hidden but still be able to reply to all. Some people thought you could do this and some not. Everyone at the meeting agreed that they didn't mind their email addresses being public and that it would be OK for DCJ to email everyone in the group with email addresses visible and if anyone didn't want this to happen in future they could let DCJ know.]*

Date of next meeting: Not set

Draft Response to Little Woodhouse Plan: Neighbourhood Plans are plans for neighbourhoods, hence the name. They're intended to cover distinctive areas that people identify with and which have an historical basis.

The proposed Hyde Park Neighbourhood Plan, stretching from Hyde Park Corner to Burley Road covers a well-defined area that people identify with and which has a strong historical basis.

In the the view of the Hyde Park Interim Forum the area between Moorland Road, Hyde Park Road, Woodsley Road and Belle Vue Road is part of Hyde Park. Our reason for saying this is that it includes Hyde Park Methodist Church, Hyde Park Surgery, Hyde Park Close and people who live in this area would identify themselves as Hyde Park residents.

The residential properties are of similar character, design and occupation as other areas of Hyde Park and some of them face the park. Woodsley Road acts as a natural neighbourhood boundary.

The Hyde Park Interim Forum asks that the area described above is not included within the Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan boundary.