

# **MICKLEFIELD ANNUAL PARISH MEETING**

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**HELD ON THURSDAY 28 MAY 2015**

**CHURCHVILLE HOUSE, 7.30PM**

**PRESENT:** Public (19)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Cllr J A Crossley, Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, J L Hebden, Clerk to Micklefield Parish Council

The meeting opened at 7.30pm and was chaired by the Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, Cllr J A Crossley. Cllr Crossley explained that the Parish Meeting was for registered electors in Micklefield, who would be allowed to speak and vote.

### **15/01 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 15 MAY 2014**

Proposed by Cllr J A Crossley

Seconded by Mrs C Boothroyd

**RESOLVED by unanimous vote that the minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting held on Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> May 2014 are an accurate record, with an amendment to minute 14/12 to change 2014 to 2013.**

### **15/02 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 15 MAY 2014**

**14/02** – It was confirmed that the train times had changed and did not coincide with any bus times. In addition, some morning and evening services had been cut.

**14/06** – The Parish Council election had been uncontested. However, nine candidates stood for nine seats, so there were no vacancies at the beginning of the new four year term of office.

**14/07** – The Christmas Lights display had been extended. A resident commented positively about the Christmas lights.

### **15/03 – ELECTORS' QUESTION TIME**

**RESIDENT** – Requested information about funding grants (the amount spent in total and in Micklefield) and how Peckfield Landfill Site Liaison Committee works.

**RESIDENT (Member of Liaison Committee)** – Reported that the Scrutiny Board [that had undertaken an enquiry into Peckfield Landfill Site] had spoken to all interested parties i.e. residents, the Environment Agency, Parish Councillors and Health England and had visited the site as part of the enquiry. Health England would investigate health implications. Complaints had dropped considerably and the Environment Agency had been praised for its work. The landfill site was heavily monitored and was not the worst site.

**RESIDENT** – People don't make complaints. There are litter problems,

**RESIDENT (Member of Liaison Committee)** – Beyond the site boundary is not within the landfill site's control, although the manager has tried to enforce better litter control on lorries.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – [On the question of grant funding] Grant application to the grant administrator (currently Mondegreen, previously Grantscape and Green Leeds) for projects in the village have been successful, bar one. The exact amount of money given over the operational period is harder to calculate on the spot. Not aware if the information is even available.

**RESIDENT** – There should be a preference to Micklefield [for grant funding].

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Micklefield has received the money it has applied for.

**RESIDENT** – Figures should be available through a Freedom of Information Request.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** - Explained that the landfill site fund covers an area ten miles around the site and the grant manager can distribute funds as it sees fit. Was not sure how the information [where all the grant money has gone] would help. Nearly £1,000,000 of grant funding had been requested and received for projects in Micklefield.

**RESIDENT** – The village is on the periphery. It gets litter from the landfill site and the site owner should take responsibility.

**RESIDENT (Member of Liaison Committee)** –Reported that the landfill site manager had offered to clear litter from the Recreation Ground and that wasn't landfill site litter. She had asked Caird Peckfield if it would do a litter sweep, but had not yet received a response.

**RESIDENT** – There should be a presumption that Micklefield gets the money, which may give more groups the confidence to apply.

**RESIDENT (Members of Liaison Committee)** – Eligibility criteria prevents many groups from applying.

**RESIDENT** – Asked if only committees had applied for funding and if individuals know about it?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Only constituted groups can apply. Individuals can't.

**RESIDENT** – The school tried to get landfill tax funding but wasn't eligible. Lots of groups can't apply.

Proposed by Mr Garforth

Seconded by Mrs Boothroyd

**RESOLVED by majority vote that the meeting recommends to Micklefield Parish Council that it makes a request to Grantscape for information on the amount of funding given over the last five years and how much went to Micklefield, with a breakdown of the successful projects.**

**RESIDENT** – Reported that he and others were in the process of re-forming a Scout group. An executive council (management) had been set up as had training, but more adult volunteers with skills were needed.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Explained that set-up funding was not eligible for a grant from Mondegreen, but that the Outer East Community Committee or South East Housing Committee might give funding. When the wind farm was in operation, there would be funding available for village groups from Banks and the rules were not as strict as Mondegreen's

#### **15/04 – DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING ALLOCATIONS AND JUNCTION ALTERATIONS IN MICKLEFIELD**

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Last year the Parish Council had objected to the planning application (land off Great North Road). The development requires improvements to the junction of Church Lane and A656, but this had been complicated by landownership and availability issues. There was now a plan for improvements. A planning application from Barratt Homes and Persimmon Homes for development at land off Great North Road from Manor Farm to Garden Village had been submitted.

**RESIDENT** – [Referring to the junction alteration plans] Making an island from the south will make exiting the junction more dangerous for cars trying to turn north.

**RESIDENT** – The whole of Church Lane is dangerous, it's not wide enough.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** - The [development] application only needs junction improvements and it won't be refused because of any perceived problems with Church Lane.

**RESIDENT** – A traffic census was undertaken at the wrong time. Traffic going to Leeds would leave earlier than 8 to 9am.

**RESIDENT** – There was no traffic count on the A656, only at the junction. All the traffic needs to be taken into account.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – One of the expert objections raises road safety issues. The Parish Council has not made a decision yet [regarding the Barratt-Persimmon application]– just identified the issues most likely to be considered in a response. The issues identified were:

- Cannot object on the principle. The land has already been allocated for housing, but there should be a masterplan for new development.
- Barratt Homes doesn't have to ensure that improvements to the school are undertaken. The developer can give money to Leeds City Council to make improvements, but this is no good if the school can't be physically expanded.

- Access to the development is not likely to be a planning problem.
- The materials are mixed and should be mostly stone and render near Manor Farm and external boundary and red brick near Garden Village, with homes facing towards Manor Farm being in stone.
- The accommodation road around the perimeter of Garden Village should be widened. The Parish Council had asked the developer to do this to no avail.
- There was a possibility of flooding, not from the stream, but from rain run-off from the existing estate (the site has flooded in this way before). The planning application needs to address this. The problem had been raised with the developer and the plans had been altered to put all affordable housing in the flood areas.
- Should Sheep Dyke belong to the homeowners, who will then have the responsibility to clean the stream and make any repairs
- The Doctors' Surgery is only a satellite, can it really provide and maintain a service with extra houses

Not identified as issues:

- Air quality.
- The green wedge size
- The density of housing.
- 2 parking spaces per house.
- Public Right of Way retained.
- No vehicular access to Garden Village from site.

**RESIDENT** – Access to the A1(m) for emergency services and Yorkshire Water will be impeded.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The Highways Authority might not find this a problem, but it's worth trying.

**RESIDENT** – Is privacy a material consideration?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – It depends on the distance between the houses.

**RESIDENT** – Is there still a green strip proposed between the development and houses on Great North Road?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – No. There were concerns about who would maintain any landscaping, so it was removed.

**RESIDENT** - Is the sewer system a material consideration?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Yorkshire Water will know if the filter beds can take an increase in sewage. Surface water depends on soakaways.

**RESIDENT** – Settlement tanks are needed.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The developer has indicated that there will be two tanks in the green wedge to manage surface water.

**RESIDENT** – Will there still be an access road on the 'S' bend?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Yes. It will be an ordinary 'T' junction, but there will be landscaping and engineering works to the hill/banking to make the splays required by highways. Never seen an Inspector go against a highways technical officer in an appeal.

**RESIDENT** – Will this go to Panel?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The application says it is delegated to an officer for a decision, so the Parish Council will ask the Ward Councillors to request that it goes to the Plans Panel.

**RESIDENT** – Shouldn't brownfield sites be developed first? Isn't that Leeds City Council's policy?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** - There used to be a moratorium on using greenfield sites, but this was taken to court and lost.

**RESIDENT** – Isn't it the case that houses are needed, so they'll put them anywhere?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The land has already been approved for development. Arguing that it shouldn't have been won't get anywhere.

Proposed by Mrs C Boothroyd

**RESOLVED by majority vote to recommend that the Parish Council objects to the Barratt-Persimmon Homes development.**

### **15/05 – HOUSING ALLOCATION – BETWEEN GARFORTH AND MICKLEFIELD**

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Land between Garforth Cliff, A656 and the railway line has been offered as a housing site allocation, which is supported by Garforth residents.

**RESIDENT** – An outline proposal for the site from a developer has been circulated around Garforth.

### **15/06 – MICKLEFIELD RAILWAY STATION 9RELOCATION AND EAST LEEDS PARKWAY)**

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – There has been no update. The Selby/York junction still needs improvement. Even if the Parkway isn't built at Micklefield, the local station will still need to be moved.

**RESIDENT** – There are already train delays.

**RESIDENT** – There would be no vehicular access via Pit Lane.

**RESIDENT** – Access to the existing station car park is causing problems for people exiting Garden Village.

**RESIDENT** – Could the current station be closed?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – If another station is provided near the level crossing, then yes, because it would be considered a reasonable walking distance from the current location.

**RESIDENT** – Reported that she had asked for an update from Metro officers and had been told that there were no plans for the East Leeds Parkway.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Leeds City Council's recent preference has been for a site at Thorpe Park.

### **15/07 – MUGA IN RECREATION GROUND**

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Reported that a young person's representative had asked for a MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) in the old bowling greens area. The Parish Council has approved, in principle, a MUGA behind the football stand. For various reasons, the old bowling greens were now the preferred site. It would be an easy project and would fit into part of one bowling green at a distance of 25m from housing. Mondegreen might be approached for funding.

**RESIDENT** – It would be a bonus for the village.

**RESIDENT** – There might be problems with vandalism.

Proposed by Cllr J A Crossley

Seconded by Mrs A Webster

**RESOLVED** by unanimous vote to recommend to the Parish Council that it seeks to create a multi-use games area (MUGA) across the west flank of the defunct bowling green nearest to the car park in Micklefield Recreation Ground.

### **15/08 – HOOK MOOR WIND FARM AND RIDGE ROAD ANAEROBIC DIGESTER**

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Reported that the Wind Farm would be operational by the end of December 2015. The Parish Council had objected due to inappropriate development in the green belt, but it had been approved after going to appeal.

**RESIDENT** – It was held up by an objection from the MOD. The new owner of Church Fenton airfield is proposing to re-open Church Fenton to civil aviation, how can this be okay now?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The location of a turbine affected the radar. Don't know how this will now affect Church Fenton airspace.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – There will be a Hook Moor Wind Farm grant fund that will be managed by a committee.

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – The anaerobic digester on Ridge Road was approved and has been built. The Parish Council had objected due to inappropriate development in the green belt.

**RESIDENT** – Where is the waste coming from?

**CLLR J A CROSSLEY** – Don't know, but there are plenty of farms around.

**RESIDENT** – Only non-useful waste is sent to the digester, things that are already rotting. There were concerns about increased traffic on Ridge Road.

**15/09 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Proposed by Cllr J A Crossley  
Seconded by Mrs C Boothroyd

**RESOLVED by unanimous vote to hold the next Annual Parish Meeting on the third Thursday in May 2016.**

The meeting closed at 9.43pm.

**Signed:**

**(Chairman)**

**Date:**

Joanne Hebden  
Clerk and RFO  
Micklefield Parish Council

6 Churchville Avenue  
Micklefield  
LEEDS  
LS25 4AS