

	<p>c. Outstanding End of Grant Report (CACI et al) As reported in the previous meeting, in order to ensure a new application was approved it was necessary to close out a previous grant in the form of an End of Grant Report. To do this it was a requirement to show invoices in relation to the previous work progressed. Unfortunately this work had not been completed and so retrospectively the information had to be submitted. PE had obtained two of the invoices and this included the CACI invoice which was the most important one as it exceeded £1000 and would have to be uploaded into the EOG form as required for all work in excess of that sum. However there was one invoice outstanding and it had become apparent that the consultancy named in the 2016 application form (Traffic Counters) did not progress the work. JR had written to Louise Lord in an effort to obtain the required information from Darren Lord who was the former treasurer of CVNF. A response was awaited.</p> <p>d. Consultation Statement and other interim actions There was nothing much to add in relation to this over and above what had been noted in the previous meeting. PE intended to try to collate information resulting from surveys , engagement events to produce a draft statement document</p>	<p>PE & JR</p> <p>PE</p>
45.5	<p>Public Engagement Initiatives:</p> <p>a. Questions on Facebook and Website The information that had resulted from the Facebook exercise was said to be comprehensive and would be incorporated in the Consultation Statement draft</p> <p>b. Further Displays and Venues etc. PE indicated he had taken a simple display board to an event held at the Methodist Church that indicated that there would be an imminent distribution of a summary Policy Intentions Document.</p> <p>c. Smart Survey through yourvoice.leeds.gov.uk Your Voice Leeds PE had contacted Katie Bell at LCC and received a reply to say that a Akbar Khan would contact him in respect of the matter. Nothing had been heard as yet</p>	<p>HN</p> <p>PE</p> <p>PE</p>
45.6	<p><u>Finance</u> It was thought the issue allied to the costs allied to the web site mentioned in the previous meeting had been clarified.</p>	<p>KG/ HN</p>
45.7	<p><u>Strawberry Fields Development</u></p> <p>a.Further matters related to site management etc. It was indicated that work on weekends still seemed to occur and it was felt pertinent to check the responses to planning conditions to understand better the intentions allied to waste bin collection</p> <p>b.106 agreement PE had hoped to further clarify at the meeting some of the detailed comments made by SG in respect of this matter.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SG</p>

45.8	<p><u>Other current planning applications or matters of interest</u></p> <p>a.Call for sites published plan There was nothing further report on this except to say that Councillors continue to press for some sort of time-line in respect of the matter i.e. the programme for making information available allied to perhaps a short list or long list of potentially acceptable sites</p> <p>b.Foxwood Lodge SG pursuing a meeting with the management of the care home</p> <p>c.Castle Gate PE had checked the Wakefield Public Access site again and still could find no evidence of any outline application</p> <p>d.Phone Box Library It was hoped that some sort of grant application might be made in respect of the glazing for the phone box library</p> <p>e. BESS The application had been rejected, but a very succinct report that had recently been included on the LCC Planning web site from the West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue was almost conciliatory compared to the comments allied to the first application. This was considered both strange and extremely inconsistent. There was no indication as to whether there would be an appeal</p> <p>f. Trees at Carlton Hall PE noted that there was an application in relation to trees at Carlton Hall. However it is not possible to respond to this as comments are not now invited in relation to applications allied to trees. As far as could be determined the work to trees related mainly to those on the boundary and were as a result of complaints from residents at Naseby Rise</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>PE</p> <p>JR</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
45.9	<p><u>AOB</u> PE had neglected to include BESS on the agenda. It had been reported that the application on land adjacent Westfield Road had been refused mainly on grounds allied to greenbelt and noise considerations. It remains to be seen whether the applicant will appeal this decision.</p>	Noted
45.10	<u>MEETING: Monday 15th July at 7.15pm, at Carlton Cricket Club</u>	