

MICKLEFIELD ANNUAL PARISH MEETING

MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 23RD MAY 2016

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr J A Crossley, Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, Ms J L Hebden, Clerk to Micklefield Parish Council
PRESENT: Public (10)

The meeting opened at 7.32pm and was chaired by the Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, Cllr J A Crossley.

16/01 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 28 MAY 2015

Proposed by Mrs E Todd

Seconded by Mrs C Garforth

RESOLVED by unanimous vote that the minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting held on Thursday 28 May 2015 are an accurate record. The Chairman signed the minutes for verification.

16/02 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 28 MAY 2015

Proposed by Mrs E Todd

Seconded by Mr I Garforth

RESOLVED by unanimous vote to bring forward item 8 (Peckfield Landfill Site and Caird Peckfield Fund) to between item 3 (Electors' Question Time) and item 4 (Development of existing housing allocations...).

15/06 – Cllr J A Crossley reported that there was no further update on the proposed East Leeds Parkway, although Leeds City Council and Metro seemed to prefer Thorpe Park as a location.

16/03 – ELECTORS' QUESTION TIME

The following questions were asked:

Resident - What was happening with the tree planting to the rear of Hall Farm Park? The land had been compulsory purchased and the trees bought, but the trees had not been planted and the landowner was seeking compensation.

Cllr J A Crossley was not aware that the land had been compulsorily purchased.

Resident - the landowner was seeking compensation for his entire plot of land, not just the strip required for tree planting. Leeds City Council expected the issue to be resolved by Christmas, but the trees would need to be planted in autumn, or another year would be missed.

Cllr J A Crossley posited that the landowner was contesting the purchase price.

Resident – the landowner can contest the amount and it could take up to 6 years to resolve. It would be good for the community and had not been addressed by the Parish Council.

Cllr J A Crossley informed the resident that another resident had pursued the issue very competently and the result was a compulsory purchase. The MP had also played a role, so it had not been necessary for the Parish Council to become involved. He would keep an eye on the situation.

Resident – why does it need to go through this process, when the tree belt formed part of the planning approval?

Cllr J A Crossley – The development had planning permission and a Section 106 agreement for the tree planting, which was agreed to and signed by the landowner. The landowner subsequently sold the land to a third party, who hadn't signed the Section 106 agreement and refused to plant the trees. Leeds City Council's planning process changed as a result of the problems encountered.

Resident – Is funding still available from Banks (Renewables)?

Cllr J A Crossley – Hook Moor Wind Farm was on the agenda.

Resident – The precept for Micklefield seems to be higher than for other Parish Councils, why?

Cllr J A Crossley explained that the precept was not higher than all Parish Councils, not even all those in West Yorkshire, but it was the highest of Parish Councils in Leeds. This hadn't always been the case, but when the Parish Council realised that the only way to keep the Recreation Ground would be for the Parish Council to take it on as Trustee, it was also realised that money would be needed. In 2003, the precept was raised in order to raise the money. In addition, [when funding regulations were changed and] the LCTS grant came in, many Parish Councils set budgets that would cover costs in the event that no grant would be available and the precept increased. A good comparison [to Micklefield] is Pool-in-Wharfedale, which has a similar population and number of houses, but can charge a precept half that of Micklefield, because of the number of D band properties in Pool-in-Wharfedale. Micklefield has a significant proportion of A band houses. The Parish Council has the responsibility to set its precept and neither Leeds City Council nor the local MP has the power to change it.

16/04 – DEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING HOUSING ALLOCATIONS, ALTERATIONS TO THE JUNCTION OF CHURCH LANE AND THE A656 RIDGE ROAD AND CHURCH LANE REALIGNMENT OPTIONS

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that the subject had been raised at the previous year's Annual Parish Meeting. The allocation to the rear of Great North Road had been approved as a housing allocation. The Parish Council had informed Leeds City Council about the flooding problems, in particular run-off from existing housing areas. The decision letter had yet to be published, as the details had not been finalised regarding a possible realignment of the Church Lane. Other developments had been applied for and approved in principle. The Parish Council had influenced the materials to be used and raised the issue of the school's ability to take more pupils. The school could be expanded within its existing brownfield site and the greenbelt could be used for a playing field. The Parish Council had also raised the issue of the size of the Doctors' Surgery, which would be addressed after approvals and a decision.

Resident – If the greenbelt is taken for a playing field, will it stay greenbelt, or will it become brownfield?

Cllr J A Crossley said that it would remain greenbelt and its classification would have to change before it could be built on.

Resident – Would a Section 106 schools be negotiated by officers?

Cllr J A Crossley If the development site has a school within it, this will be Section 106. Improvements to an off-site school would use CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) money.

Resident – Does the same apply to the Doctor's Surgery?

Cllr J A Crossley – No. Further, CIL is capped and Leeds City Council would have to find the rest of the money.

16/05 – PECKFIELD LANDFILL SITE AND CAIRD BARDON COMMUNITY FUND

Cllr J A Crossley referred to minute 15/03 of the minutes from the Annual Parish Meeting held on 28 May 2015 and resolution that the Parish Council made a request to Grantscape for information on grant funding given to projects in Micklefield. The data had been available on Grantscape's website as part of its annual accounts. He distributed hard copies of the information to the meeting, which covered the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2015, when Grantscape had managed the Caird Bardon fund. Green Leeds had administered grant funding from landfill tax credits from 1997 to 2005. Just over £3,000,000 had been distributed to projects, of which £266,344 had been given to projects in Micklefield. Only one project in Micklefield had been declined funding and this was due to the application not conforming to the funding rules.

Resident – thanked Cllr J A Crossley for providing the information. Agreed that the projects were useful, but that it was still Micklefield that experienced the problems. Acknowledged that perceived lack of funding to Micklefield was due to scheme rules and the low number of local groups available to apply for funding and undertake projects. Nonetheless, it seemed fundamentally wrong.

Cllr J A Crossley believed it also illustrated the lack of community buildings, facilities and groups in Micklefield. Between 2001 and 2005, the Parish Council was in the process of becoming the Trustee of Micklefield Recreation Ground Charity and could not apply for funding for projects in the recreation Ground until 2005.

Resident – A Scout hut would be great, but there is no land available to build one. Could the Scouts get a grant to extend a Leeds City Council building in partnership with Leeds city council?

Cllr J A Crossley said in theory this was possible, but it would depend on Leeds City Council's agreement. There was no land available in Micklefield for community use.

Resident – With new housing, the village would need a Community Centre. There is no [publically available] building big enough [to function as a Community Centre].

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that the Parish Council had identified a possible site for a Community Centre. At the present time, there were problems with the neighbouring land owner regarding landownership. None of the approved housing allocations had provision for a Community Centre or shops.

Resident – who owns the Old School Site?

Cllr J A Crossley explained that a tiny part at the front belonged to Leeds City Council, but that the rest, up to the boundary of Micklefield Recreation Ground, belonged to Ashdale Land and Property Co. Ltd. A planning application had been submitted for houses on the Old School Site, but had included a strip of land that belonged to Micklefield Parish Council as Sole trustee of Micklefield Recreation Ground Charity.

Resident – observed that there was lots of building, but no room for other types of expansion. Children would still have to leave the village for other things [entertainment, school etc.]

Cllr J A Crossley agreed that this was the problem.

Resident – a dwelling can be converted in the future if a person would like to and the Local Planning Authority approves.

Resident – If funding is available, why not extend the Youth and Adult Centre?

Cllr J A Crossley – would need to approach Leeds City Council and seek additional funding.

Resident – could it [Micklefield Youth and Adult Centre] be made two storey?

Resident – the foundations may not be good enough. It isn't even single storey building; it's an old fire station.

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that the Old Co-op Site was now being developed into four very, small houses.

Resident – Isn't there a lower limit for the size of a house, because too many are small ones?

Cllr J A Crossley advised that Leeds City Council was in the process of formulating a policy to prevent houses being too small.

Resident- Leeds City Council is planning to knock down the garages on Church Lane. The land can't be used for housing because of the bus-stop. Instead, it will be made into parking.

Cllr J A Crossley asked the meeting it's overview of the operation of the landfill site over the previous year.

Resident – It has improved over the year and the Environment Agency has given regular updates. The litter is as bad – the netting has holes in it.

Resident – When will the site be finished?

Cllr J A Crossley believed the final date for filling was 2018 and 2020 for the completion of remediation.

Resident – Is part of the tip used for waste heavy metals?

Resident (member of Peckfield Landfill Site Liaison Committee) – Toxic waste was initially accepted, but was soon stopped and now only general household waste was accepted.

Cllr J A Crossley – Medical waste was originally accepted, but not aware heavy metals ever were.

Resident – Tipping of heavy metals would require a licence, which would be posted on the website.

Cllr J A Crossley announced that the current Caird Peckfield finding had been suspended by the company. The grant administrator (Mondegreen) had cancelled its funding meeting and not re-scheduled. No other information was available. He also explained the company structure and owners and that funding was given in lieu of paying tax to HMRC. If Caird Bardon did not give money towards its grant fund, it would have to pay tax to HMRC instead. It could not refuse to do either, or use the money in a different way.

Resident – informed the meeting that the Directors of the company were being investigated and wondered if HMRC could have put payments on hold.

16/06 – PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATION: LAND BETWEEN GARFORTH CLIFF, THE A656 RIDGE ROAD AND THE RAILWAY LINE

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that Micklefield Parish Council had objected in great detail to the proposals, as had Garforth Neighbourhood Plan Forum, CPRE and the local MP. The Parish Council had not objected to the proposed site allocations near Micklefield Station Car Park or New Town Farm, but had objected to the proposed Travelling Show People Site at the Old Pit Site, because it is allocated for business use and can be used for employment.

Resident felt that because Micklefield is so close to the border with North Yorkshire and on the fringes of Leeds City Council's administrative area, everything is dumped here.

Cllr J A Crossley explained that the allocations will double the size of the village, with no additional infrastructure and the loss of shops, Community Centre etc.

Resident – posited that piece-meal development had created problems.

Cllr J A Crossley - Explained that the one large site at Sturton Grange, with one landowner would allow a school, shops etc.

16/07 – MULTI USE GAMES AREA IN MICKLEFIELD RECREATION GROUND

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that consultations had been undertaken, a planning application had been submitted, a grant funding application had also been submitted, but unfortunately, the funding had been suspended.

Resident asked the value of the bid.

Cllr J A Crossley explained that the funding was for £49,000 but that the total value of the project was £80,000.

Resident - wondered why the Parish Council's MUGA would cost £80,000, when a bid for £7,000 was made to Grantscape for funding towards a MUGA [from previous the previous document circulated].

Cllr J A Crossley explained that the £7,000 represented a funding bid towards the cost of the project, not the entire cost of the MUGA. Micklefield Parish Council's funding bid did not represent the entire project.

Resident – residents have to leave the village facilities, so funding nearby ones benefits us, even if it isn't ideal.

Resident – a good example is the play fort as Fairburn Ings.

Cllr J A Crossley explained that Micklefield is an eligible area for Veolia funding and could apply for up to £40,000. The process is in two stages and the Parish Council would be bidding against the whole of the north of England. It would be a difficult bid due to the small number of users and residents [compared to competing bids for larger scale projects benefiting many more].

16/08 – HOOK MOOR WIND FARM AND THE RIDGE ROAD ANAEROBIC DIGESTER

Resident (Hook Moor Wind Farm Liaison Committee Member) – informed the meeting that there was no official opening yet.

Resident (Hook Moor Wind Farm Liaison Committee Member) – informed the meeting that groups could apply for funding online or in hard copy. Funding was only open to Micklefield and Aberford groups and the maximum amount available was £3,000.00. The annual fund available was £10,000, groups had to be constituted and contribute 10 percent. Did not know if any funding had been approved.

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that the Parish Council had agreed to apply to Hook Moor Wind Farm Grant Fund for some seats in the northern bowling green.

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that he had not received any complaints about the turbines. There was very little noise, no vibration or reverberation.

Resident – informed the meeting that eight properties had been used to monitor 'flicker' and there had been no problems.

Resident – complained that the noise from the motorway seemed to be worse.

Cllr J A Crossley posited that this could be due to the new development at Grange Court.

Resident – Confirmed that even close up the turbines could not be heard.

Cllr J A Crossley informed the meeting that the Parish Council had objected to the Anaerobic Digester due to it being inappropriate development in the greenbelt and that it had been approved. He informed the meeting that there should be no smell from the digester. No funding was available from the development.

16/09 – DATE OF NEXT PARISH MEETING

Proposed by Cllr J A Crossley

Seconded by Mr Cheeseman

RESOLVED by unanimous vote that the next Annual Parish Meeting is held on a Monday or Thursday in May 2017.

The meeting closed at 9.22pm.

Signed:

Chairman

Date: