

EXTRACT OF THE MNUTES

SOUTH (OUTER) AREA COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 2013

PRESENT: Councillor K Bruce in the Chair

Councillors N Dawson, J Dunn, J Elliott,
D Nagle, K Renshaw and S Varley

Apologies Councillor R Finnigan, B Gettings,
S Golton, T Leadley and
L Mulherin

18 **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

19 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors L Mulherin, S Golton, R Finnigan, B Gettings and T Leadley.

As there was not a Member from the Morley North Ward present, it was advised that the meeting was not quorate and any decisions made would have to be ratified at the next meeting of the Area Committee. Should any decision need implementation before then, it would have to be progressed through the officer delegation process.

20 **Minutes - 15 July 2013**

RECOMMENDED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2013 be confirmed as a correct record.

21 **Open Forum**

In accordance with Paragraphs 6.24 and 6.25 of the Area Committee Procedure Rules, the Chair allowed a period of up to 10 minutes for members of the public to make representations or to ask questions on matters within the terms of reference of the Area Committee. On this occasion there were no members of the public in attendance.

22 **Deputation to South (Outer) Area Committee: Site Allocation Plan - Sites 3081A/3081B (Ardsley & Robin Hood)**

The Area Committee received a deputation from residents of Middleton Lane and Middleton Avenue, Rothwell regarding concerns over Site Allocation Plan Sites 3081/A and 3081B.

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting to present the deputation:

- Leon Inglis (spokesperson)
- Steve Lunn
- Steve Pritchard

- Steve Plumpton
- Diane Freeman

The deputation had been brought due to strong objections to development proposals at the allocated sites and it was felt that any proposals for housing should be rejected. Issues highlighted included the following:

- Infrastructure issues – Mr Inglis had been a Middleton Lane resident for over ten years and had not been able to register with a local dentist; has to wait 2 weeks for doctors' appointments and had not been able to find a place in a local school for his son.
- To increase the local population by another 1,000 residents would place more pressure on an already stressed infrastructure.
- There were already traffic problems in the area and proposed developments would bring in approximately 600 additional vehicles. This would cause added danger to pedestrians and the turning into Middleton Lane was already hazardous and deaths had occurred.
- When the land was advertised for sale, the agent's brochure marketed it as 'highly productive grade II agricultural land which was easily cultivated for cropping'. It was felt ludicrous in the current monetary situation to lose highly productive land for housing. The land had been bought solely for profit with no regard for agricultural use nor the history of the land.
- Concern regarding the loss of habitat for wildlife and damage to the ecosystem.
- It was believed there was a covenant on the land restricting it to farming use.
- It was felt that there were more suitable sites for development across the city including unused industrial and commercial areas.
- Concern that any development could cause problems with flooding to existing housing.

It was reported that those bringing the deputation had only been informed of the consultation period regarding the site allocations two days prior to the closing date and that the information was difficult to understand and respond to. It was felt that there was no transparency with this planning application and there needed to be a review on how residents are informed about planning. This particular area is semi-rural, does not have internet access, has residents who are physically unable to leave their homes and documents were not understandable without officers available to explain. The timing of the consultation also fell over a holiday period.

Members supported the deputation and raised concerns regarding the consultation and felt more should have been done across the City and particularly at a local community level.

RECOMMENDED – That the deputation be referred to the Executive Board for further consideration.