

Carlton Village Strawberry Fields Rule 6 - Planning Appeal Statement

This document is the summary of the key points that Carlton Community raise with regards to the proposed Strawberry Fields Application from Miller Homes.

The Key points objections are;

1. The Community does not require the level of housing proposed, which is shown in our consultants document on housing need in the area. See Appendix 1
2. The size of the development will almost double the village site in a 10-year period based on developments in the last 10 years. The scale is unsustainable on current infrastructure.
3. The development is not sustainable due to the scale of the development and this has not been considered by the Developer in their submission. Key points on this are shown in our comments in Appendix 4
4. The site has never properly been considered for housing and the presumption the site should be considered for housing is premature. This is shown in the Refusal of Outline Planning Permission notice from Leeds City Council
5. The Developer has failed to consult with the community properly and has not engaged with the Neighbourhood Forum. None of the key data and advice the forum has gathered have been considered. These are defined in Appendix 2,3 and 5
6. The Developer is trying to use a gap within the land allocation process to bring this site forward. This does not align with local and national planning policy.

“The community would specifically request the Planning Inspector to consider all of these items”

1) Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum (CVNF) is providing notification that it wishes on behalf of the community of Carlton to be involved within the planning appeal which relates to the application 18/00370/OT and the proposal to build 129 houses on land partially described as the Strawberry Fields.

2) A recent meeting with people from the village was convened and included 32 residents, local councillors and members of the CVNF.

3) The Chair of the CVNF, Mr Steve Carmody explained to the issues relevant to the appeal and the current planning position including the response of the Leeds City Council to the original planning application. The format of the meeting therefore firstly considered the initial rejected application, secondly the renewed and still current re-application and the basis of objections and finally included a broad discussion in respect of the appeal and why it was important to be involved in this process.

4) The aim of the meeting was to further familiarise attendees from the community of the issues, technical or otherwise, allied to the application and the appeal and to gauge opinion of those present.

5) There was widespread support that the CVNF should involve itself (on behalf of the Community) in this appeal and that view has caused this statement to be submitted. There was also unanimous agreement with the Leeds City Council stance (and decision) in respect of the original application and in particular the following objections.

(a)The proposal is contrary to policy SP1 of the adopted Core Strategy which sets out the spatial development strategy for Leeds, being based on the Leeds settlement hierarchy and which aims to concentrate the majority of development within and adjacent to the main urban area and major settlements where it can benefit from existing services, adequate levels of accessibility and priorities for urban regeneration. The appeal site is isolated from existing patterns of development and is neither located within, nor forms an extension to, the Main Urban Area, a Major Settlement or a Smaller Settlement. The proposed location for the residential development is not considered to be sustainable.

It is confirmed that the community do not believe the development is sustainable for a number of pivotal reasons, need, scale, infrastructure capacity, community impact and isolation of the community to quality public transport, it is clear that the application has not considered any of these in detail. It is also noted that the site in question has not been assessed in terms of sustainability in the context of the village as a whole particularly in respect of scale.

The community have a housing needs document (Appendix 1) and the requirement for the community is a housing need of 19 properties. This figure is considerably below the proposed site allocation of 51 dwellings and vastly less than proposed development of 129 properties. On this basis the community do not believe a need for this volume of properties can be justified or sustained within the village without significant investment on infrastructure and services. We believe that any presumption that the need for 129 properties does not align with any planning policy and will prejudice any decision on the use of the land described in SHLAA reference 129B.

(b)Development of the appeal site would predetermine decisions relating to the scale and phasing of new housing development and the designation of safeguarded land for homes and jobs beyond the plan period that is set out within the (highly advanced) Submission Draft/ Site Allocations Plan (SAP). The proposal would have a prejudicial, pre-determinative effect on decision-taking with regards to directing new development through the SAP and community involvement in the plan-making process. The development is considered to be unacceptably premature, contrary to the Planning Practice Guidance.

It is confirmed that the community agree that development of the site is premature, and that it has not been considered in the Site Allocation Process by the council or consulted upon with the community as being suitable for housing. It is noted that as part of the process of site allocation the landowner did not in a meaningful way make it known that the land might be available for housing in the manner described within the application.

(c)The appeal site is allocated as a Protected Area of Search (PAS) (constituting safeguarded land for the purposes of the NPPF, paragraph 85, etc.) through (saved) Policy N34 of the UDP

Review. The release of this PAS site for housing would be contrary to Policy N34. Development of the PAS site would unacceptably undermine the plan-led system and be contrary to paragraph 85 (bullet 4) of the NPPF which states that "planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a local plan review, which proposes the development".

It is confirmed that the community agree that the site is a Protected Area of Search and is therefore subject to Local Policy N34. It is noted that no assessment of the use of the land has been considered and the community believe that a decision at this time to develop that site in the manner proposed may prejudice any future assessment or need for the land.

We believe the lack of consultation on the land clearly comes from the Developer, because the land was never considered by the Council as a site to develop at this time. We believe the Developer should have fully assessed the suitability of this site and presented it to the community and council

We would also like to clearly note the lack of consultation on this site from the developer. There has been one community event, which was sprung upon the community via a letter drop, giving a matter of days for any consideration of the proposal.

The Neighbourhood Forum have not been approached to discuss the scheme. The Forum did approach the Developer and requested a meeting. We held one, 1 hour meeting with the developer which was instigated by the forum and was to discuss the lack of engagement on the scheme and with an aim of trying to advise that we had not been consulted. No further consultation or engagement was received with either the forum or the community on the site.

This level of consultation is not in line with national planning policy.

6) As already indicated the community agreed that the CVNF was an appropriate group to lead the appeal process on its behalf and this was a unanimous decision which included acceptance that the officers present from the Forum should lead representations in respect of the appeal

7) On this basis and in summary the community have the following key comments in respect of the appeal, many of which have been which have been previously included in the planning objections by 186 public responders.

7.1) Sustainability of the site requires careful consideration as the community do not believe a development of this scale is acceptable. This view is further reinforced by reference to both community approved objectives (Appendix 2 and 3) and a recently conducted SWOT analysis (appendix 5) amended and ratified on the 29th July and is therefore contemporary. Three documents are therefore attached for reference:

i) Neighbourhood Forum SWOT analysis. This was not openly available to the developer at the time of the application as this has only recently been approved by

the community, we would request the inspector considers this as the community voted on this recently.

ii) The Carlton Neighbourhood Plan objectives, for which we have had two assessments. This was available to the Developer and has not been taken into account in the development proposal.

iii) The results from the initial online voting and the outcomes from a community meeting vote on the 4th March 2018.

It is our opinion that all of these items should be taken into account in judging the validity of the development proposals for the site in question but have not been considered by the Developer.

7.2) The community have a housing needs document (attached) and the requirement for the community is a housing need of 19 properties. This figure is considerably below the proposed site allocation of 51 dwellings and vastly less than proposed development of 129 properties. On this basis the community do not believe a need for this volume of properties can be justified or sustained within the village without significant investment on infrastructure and services. We believe that any presumption that the need for 129 properties does not align with any planning policy and will prejudice any decision on the use of the land described in SHLAA reference 129B.

7.3) The Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum strongly disagree with the council highway officers in respect of their views that the site can be accommodated, but who at the same time request a sum of £2,500 per property for a remote junction away from the community. The community are clear that increases in traffic in Carlton will be detrimental and that mitigation proposals are lacking in the proposal. The level of traffic increase will damage the village further than the existing traffic problems already do. This point is raised in all the documents provided, objectives, SWOT and Housing needs document.

7.4) Carlton has a deficiency of public transport and with 61 percent of people working within 10km of the village, the public transport facilities we have are wholly unsuitable. They are also under-utilised due to the poor quality and routing of the services.

7.5) Development of the site with an entrance in its current location will result in the curtailment of perhaps the key community event in the village, i.e. the annual Rhubarb Festival. The entrance junction is located exactly where the community congregate and close the road to make a strong central focus point of the event. This event generates significant funds for local businesses.