

# Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum

## Meeting (36) Minutes



*Present:* Jan Furlong (JF), Laurie Furlong (LF), Helen Nuttall (HN), Kathy Genn (KG), Chris Genn (CG), Ian Reynolds (IR), Jean Ward (JW)  
Cllr S Golton (SG), Cllr Hart-Brooke(CHB) Peter Ellis (PE)

*Apologies:* Cllr Diane Chapman (DC) Jacqueline Rooney (JR) Phil Gidney (PG)

**Meeting held on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023**

		Action (who)
<b>36.1</b>	Welcome & Introduction given. Apologies noted above	
<b>36.2</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes of the previous meeting (19<sup>th</sup> June 2023)</u></b> Attendees approved the minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>PE noted that 35.8 indicated that he had submitted a response to the planning application for two houses on Stainton Lane. He had not done this at the time of the last meeting, but had since made a submission</p>	
<b>36.3</b>	<p><b><u>Matters &amp; Actions from previous meetings</u></b> 35.3 Tomas Johnson of LCC had provided some feedback in respect of designation of agricultural land as greenspace. Essentially large tracts of land should not be included as identified within the national Planning Policy Framework and it would be difficult to argue that such land met the other criteria contained within the Framework. PE had circulated the comments in an email dated 12/7</p> <p>35.3 PE had still not had a Teams meeting with Jan Cleverly to try to resolve the Your Voice Leeds questionnaire, but hoped to do so before the next meeting</p> <p>35.4 PE had not further considered the idea of a workshop as suggested by Tomas Johnson</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>PE</b></p>

# Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum

## Meeting (36) Minutes



	35.4 PE had written to Tomas Johnson in respect of confirming that LCC would provide maps for inclusion in the Carlton Plan	
36.4	<p><b><u>Neighbourhood Plan</u></b></p> <p><b>a. Greenspace Chapter and Heritage Chapter (and actions going forward)</b></p> <p>PE circulated a draft copy of a Heritage chapter for the Plan and said that in trying to put this part of the document together, he felt having reviewed the relevant section in the Holbeck document, that the objectives related to this theme needed to be extended to provide greater detail and he had started to do that. At present there only existed a single objective and that was “Protect the historic core of Carlton”. SG and JF questioned whether more detail was necessary bearing in mind much more heritage and potential assets existed in Holbeck. PE said that while the heritage credentials of Carlton were clearly much less than Holbeck it was evident from the some additional information needed to be provided to create a more cohesive chapter.</p> <p>PE had also looked at identifying the potential heritage assets in a schedule which he circulated at the meeting. This effectively provided designations that are recommended within the “Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing” published by Historic England. The criteria were things such as Age, Rarity, Architectural and Artistic Interest, Historic Interest and Landmark Status</p> <p>PE had also put together a section entitled “A Brief History of Carlton”, to reflect the fact that other plans tend to have such a document in Plan appendices or in an associated section.</p> <p>Discussion also moved on to the question of the state of some of the buildings on the list. JW was concerned about the state of the Unicorn Pub which CG said dated from at least the C18th. It was said that the Plan could not really do much about the way buildings were being used at present, However if the building could effectively be given designation as a Heritage Asset then this might provide protection going forward.</p> <p>PE also mentioned the question of Heritage Trail. Holbeck for example had a Heritage Trail and had made it clear in the Plan that any development must respect the trail and particularly when that development was adjacent to the trail. Carlton does not have a trail, but could have prospective route. The plan put together by Jim Hardwick (local historian) was mentioned by JF and it was felt this would be a good starting point in identifying a route. PE had included reference to a trail in the draft chapter and had written a suitable objective and policy.</p> <p><b>b. Use of a Planning Consultant and associated actions</b></p> <p>PE had written to LCC to ask about Consultants and was a bit concerned to find that not many were still doing work on Neighbourhood Plans but Ian Mackay suggested contacting Mike Dando, someone who PE had met perhaps 4 years ago. Ian Mackay did not seem to think competition would be necessary, but this had certainly been the case when PE appointed Ecology consultants to do some work in respect of</p>	PE

# Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum

## Meeting (36) Minutes



	the Rothwell Plan. PE hoped to contact Mike Dando with the idea of setting up a meeting to discuss the Plan and information requirements	
36.5	<p><b><u>Public Engagement Initiatives</u></b></p> <p><b>a. Questions on Facebook and Website</b> This is ongoing and a response from Tomas Johnson is awaited. PE said that at Rothwell, the Facebook Group was proving to be quite effective and a succession of questions were being introduced on a weekly basis</p> <p><b>b. Further Displays and Venues</b>  PE said he had taken a display allied to Heritage to the July “Hug in a Mug” event at the Blackburn Hall” He hoped to start outing a display allied to Housing together in the coming weeks</p> <p><b>c. Smart Survey through yourvoice.leeds.gov.uk <a href="#">Your Voice Leeds</a></b> <b>See 36.3</b></p>	<p><b>HN</b></p> <p><b>PE</b></p> <p><b>PE</b></p>
36.6	<b>Finance</b> – no changes to report	
36.7	<p><b><u>Strawberry Fields Development</u></b></p> <p><b>a. Matters and actions allied to compliance with Construction Statement</b> There were no items of concern at present though KG/CG had met with the contractor and matters allied to the wall etc. relating to their property had been clarified. It seemed also that the farmhouse was now back with the “agent” and it was less than clear what that might suggest in terms of its retention</p> <p><b>b. 106 agreement update</b> SG outlined his ongoing negotiations with LCC, particularly with respect of the bus subsidy and the “set in stone” assertions allied to the 106 agreement. A draft version of an alternative scheme had been produced and SG had indicated that a proposal that improved pedestrian links should be considered. Notwithstanding this JF said that on Facebook there was increased discontent with bus provision, timetables etc. The merits of a shuttle bus were discussed as a mechanism that could better link local communities</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>SG</b></p>
36.8	<p><b><u>Other current planning applications or matters of interest</u></b></p> <p><b>a Battery Energy Storage Facility (latest version)</b>  The matter was discussed, and it was agreed that PE would send a very simplified response to the flyer produced and distributed by Firma Energy and which had to be submitted by the 23<sup>rd</sup> August. PE would do this and circulate before sending. It was noted that the planning application had not yet been lodged and this was perhaps associated with the response to the Firma Energy leaflet. PE said that having</p>	<b>PG/JF</b>

# Carlton Village Neighbourhood Forum

## Meeting (36) Minutes



	<p>looked at the proposal it was difficult not to make the exact same objections. SG said that the proposals were still viewed as not respecting the greenbelt concerns based on the information in the leaflet..</p> <p><b>b. Foxwood Guest House to Care Home</b>  <a href="#">23/03308/FU   Change of use of former guest house (C1) to care home (C2)   Foxwood Carr Lane Carlton Wakefield WF3 3RT (leeds.gov.uk)</a>  The Forum would not submit a response in respect of this Change of Use application. PE said he was concerned that if LCC in condoned a change of use, it was less than clear how for example how architectural changes to the property would be accounted for. Also the arrangement drawing was very simplistic and there were regulations and design standards that had to be adhered to and which no doubt (post meeting note : Possibly the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority??)</p> <p><b>c. Houses at Stainton Lane</b>  PE had submitted a neutral response and had highlighted that approval of this application should not set a precedent in terms of development that might erode the separation of settlements i.e. Carlton and Rothwell.</p> <p><b>d. Phone Box Library</b>  The phone box was now looking smart and some shelves had been installed. The outstanding requirement was for glazing which might cost between £650 and £850 depending on materials</p> <p><b>e. FORCE - Rothwell Council Offices</b>  Nothing more to report except that more interest in its use by various parties had been shown and that efforts were still being made to try and cajole LCC into releasing the building. Further efforts were being in made in terms of finance/ grants etc.</p> <p><b>f. Blue Plaque</b>  JF was considering renovating the plaque in situ</p> <p><b>g. Published comments on LCC Public Access Planning Site</b>  PE had drafted a letter to the Chief Planning officer and copied in Councillor Helen Haydn outlining the problems with the present policy that sees all public comments not published on the Public Access planning website and making arguments for it to be reversed. This issue will be particularly unfortunate when the BESS system application is put forward as the level of objection will not be transparent</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>JR</b></p> <p><b>DC/PE</b></p> <p><b>JF</b></p> <p><b>PE</b></p>
<b>36.9</b>	<p><b><u>A O B</u></b>  No other business was recorded</p>	
<b>36.10</b>	<p><b><u>Next Meeting : Monday 18th September 2023, 7pm at CCC</u></b></p>	