

## Part 1 - Your details

*\*This information must be completed*

	<b>Personal details / Client details</b>	<b>Agent details</b> <i>Only complete if you are an agent</i>
<b>Title</b>	<input type="text" value="Ms"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>First name*</b>	<input type="text" value="Joanne"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Last name*</b>	<input type="text" value="Hebden"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Job title</b> <i>(where relevant)</i>	<input type="text" value="Clerk &amp; RFO to the Council"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Organisation</b> <i>(where relevant)</i>	<input type="text" value="Micklefield Parish Council"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Address*</b>	<input type="text" value="6 Churchville Avenue"/>	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: auto;"> <p>RECEIVED - 6 NOV 2015 OVER COUNTER</p> </div>
	<input type="text" value="Micklefield"/>	
	<input type="text" value="Leeds"/>	
<b>Post code*</b>	<input type="text" value="LS25 4AS"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Phone/Mobile</b>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Email</b> <i>(We'd prefer to contact you by e-mail)</i>	<input type="text" value="clerk@micklefield-pc.gov.uk"/>	<input type="text"/>

## Part 2 - What comment do you wish to make?

*Please use a separate response form for each site/part of the Plan(s) you wish to comment on.*

**2.1. Which Plan do your comments relate to?**

- Leeds Site Allocations Plan   
  Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan

**2.2. Which section of the Plan do your comments relate to?**

**a. A specific site/designation in the Plan**

Site reference from the document or Map  
(e.g. HG2-1 (3026))

**Do you agree with the proposed use of this site?**

- Yes   
  No

**Please tick all the themes you wish to comment on;**

- |   |  |                                  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ecology/Landscape/Tree(s)                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local services/facilities                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Schools |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation/Heritage                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Loss of Greenbelt                            |                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highways/transport            | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Boundary <i>(please submit a revised boundary)</i> |                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <i>(please specify)</i> | <input type="text" value="Surface Water Flood Risk"/>                            |                                  |

*IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED 2.2 a - PLEASE GO STRAIGHT TO PART 3*

**b. Another part of the Plan**

Title of document (e.g. Publication Plan, background paper, sustainability appraisal)

Policy Ref. (e.g. – RTC1)

Paragraph Number

Diagram / Inset Map

Other

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED 2.2 b - PLEASE GO STRAIGHT TO PART 3

**c. A site previously considered and not allocated in the plan**

(See Housing & Employment Background Paper)

Reference No (e.g. SHLAA ref)

Address

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED 2.2 c - PLEASE GO STRAIGHT TO PART 3

**d. A new site which has not been considered. Please attach a site plan.**

Address

IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED 2.2 d - PLEASE GO STRAIGHT TO PART 3

## Part 3 - Is the Plan sound?

At this stage, before the Plan is sent to the Secretary of State for Public Examination, we are asking for your views about the 'soundness' of the plan. An independent Inspector will examine the plan against the 'tests of soundness' (Please read the guidance notes on how to complete this section)

**3.1. Do you consider the plan to be sound?**

Yes (go to Q3.3)

No (go to Q3.2)

**3.2. Which test of soundness are your comments about? (You must select at least one option)**

Positively Prepared

Effective

Justified

Consistency with National Policy

**3.3. Please set out why you think the Plan is sound / unsound? Your comments should briefly cover all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify your view. It helps us if you can use subheadings to deal with specific issues. Please continue on a separate sheet if you need to. There may not be another opportunity to make further comments before the plan is sent to examination.**

Site HG2-126 (Land to the north of Micklefield Railway Station Car Park, Micklefield) is currently part of the Adopted Green Belt. Please see separate sheet for a fuller explanation as to why Micklefield Parish Council agrees in principle with the allocation of site HG2-126 for housing, but why the 'effective' test is not satisfied and why the Plan is thus unsound in terms of this site.

**3.4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan sound.**

You will need to say why this change will make the Plan. It helps us if you can be precise as possible and providing any suggested revised wording. Please continue on a separate sheet if you need to.

For the allocation of site HG2-126 for housing to be sound, the Site Requirements should expressly include two important (if not vital) positive measures that would enable a housing development to be a credible proposition and which would thus make the Plan sound in terms of the 'effective' test. Please see separate sheet for a full description of the positive measures that should be added to the Site Requirements for HG2-126.

## Part 4 - Is the Plan legally compliant?

Please give evidence in support of the comment you gave in Part 2.

### 4.1. Do you consider the Plan to be legally compliant?

- Yes       No       Don't Know  
(Please read the guidance notes on how to complete this section)

### 4.2. Which part of legal compliance is your comment about?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local Development Scheme                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Statement of Community Involvement           | <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainability Appraisal Report                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consultation of appropriate Statutory Bodies | <input type="checkbox"/> Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Duty to Cooperate                            |   |

### 4.3. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is/ or is not legally compliant.

Please try to be as precise as possible, using headings to break up your comments and continue on a separate sheet if you need to.

In terms of this specific proposed housing site, HG2-126, the Plan is legally compliant.

## Part 5 - Take part in the public examination

### 5.1. Your comments will be taken into account by the Planning Inspector. Would you like to take part in the forthcoming Public Examination?

- Yes       No

N.B. The Planning Inspector will decide the best way to hear from those who wish to take part in the examination

## Part 6 - Future updates

### 6.1. Would you like to be notified of any of the following? (Please tick as appropriate)

- The Submission of the Plan(s) for Public Examination  
 The Adoption of the Plan(s)

Please sign and date this form

Signature:

Date:

05/11/15

dd/mm/yy

Thank you for taking the time to give your comments on the Leeds Site Allocations Plan and/or Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan.

If you would like to make another comment on another site or different part of the Plan (s), please use a separate response form.

**Submit your form**

# MICKLEFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Sole Trustee of Micklefield Recreation Ground Charity



## APPENDIX TO CONSULTATION RESPONSE

### Leeds Local Development Framework (LDF) Leeds Site Allocations Plan – Publication Draft (Public Consultation:- September - November 2015)

#### Site HG2-126

##### 3.3 Please set out why you think the Plan is sound / unsound?

The designation of this site as a housing allocation would require land to be deleted from the Green Belt and, therefore, Micklefield Parish Council needs to take great care in reaching a conclusion as to why this would be, in principle, acceptable.

Deletion of this land from the Green Belt would not take Micklefield (as defined by its Settlement Boundary) any closer to any other settlement (facing Micklefield along the same plane or planes of separation), these being specifically: Saxton, Barkston Ash, Newthorpe or Sherburn-in-Elmet.

Because of the topography, it is also the case that this site would not even appear to be encroaching towards the facing settlements described, from any publicly accessible vantage point.

Therefore, it is important to note that the deletion of this site from the Green Belt will not lead to any physical coalescence or even the perception of coalescence between the settlement of Micklefield and any other settlement. This cannot be said of certain other proposed housing allocations in the Outer South East HMCA.

Furthermore, given that this site has existing housing and housing allocation HG1-306 on three sides, its deletion from the Green Belt will not lead to encroachment into the countryside. The fact that the A1(M) forms the eastern boundary of this site also means that it is inconceivable for the deletion of this land from the Green Belt in this Plan to lead to future sprawl or encroachment into the countryside beyond in a subsequent Plan.

Micklefield does not have a central retail core or group of community facilities around which one can significantly increase the population of the village in a sustainable way and the village is therefore an inherently unsustainable location for further large scale housing allocations.

This fundamental fact was convincingly stated, and resoundingly so, by the Inspector for the Leeds UDP Review Inquiry, in his report published in November 2005. For clarity of thought and intellectual rigour, Micklefield Parish Council has long believed that paras.16.29 to 16.60 of that Inspector's report cannot be beaten.

However, the emphasis is on *large scale* housing allocations arising from significant deletions of the Green Belt around the existing settlement boundary. Site HG2-126 is not large scale, it is clearly *de minimis*, and it would be unreasonable to suggest that a development of 25 dwellings would be fundamentally at odds with the limited sustainability of Micklefield as a settlement.

It is for these reasons why Micklefield Parish Council agrees in principle with the allocation of site HG2-126 for housing.

However, the 'effective' test is not satisfied as there are particular problems with this site which if left unresolved will render the Plan 'unsound'.

- (i) There are significant issues in Micklefield regarding the foul sewer and surface water drains and the provision of an adequate and effective drainage system for any new dwellings.
- (ii) According to the Environment Agency's online mapping system, the junction of Garden Village with Great North Road already has a quantifiable risk of flooding from surface water. This is where, during sustained heavy or very heavy rainfall, rainwater does not drain away through the normal drainage systems or soak into the ground, but lies on or flows over the ground instead. The surface water flows can be either wholly within the site and/or outflow from adjacent land. The area around the junction of Garden Village with Great North Road is defined as part 'Medium Risk' and part 'High Risk'. This matches the Parish Council's own understanding of what happens at this junction during sustained heavy or very heavy rainfall.
- (iii) Site HG2-126 is at a higher level than the junction of Garden Village with Great North Road and if this site is developed for housing, the foul sewer and surface water drains will have to drain (either directly or indirectly) to that location. They will not be able to drain uphill to the even higher land which forms existing housing allocation HG1-306.
- (iii) Garden Village already has profound problems in terms of highway access, due to the narrow streets and the density of the existing housing in the estate. Under no circumstances must a development of site HG2-126 for housing involve vehicular access being provided from Garden Village or Station Approach.

### **3.4 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan sound.**

The following positive measures should be in the list of Site Requirements for HG2-126, for the allocation to be a credible proposition, satisfy the 'effective' test and for the Plan to be sound:

- (i) Development of HG2-126 for housing will require an assessment of the development's cumulative impact on the existing foul sewer and surface water drains in Micklefield. Where necessary, mitigation measures will need to be provided so that there will be no negative cumulative impact on the wider drainage system or the surface water flood risk elsewhere in Micklefield.
- (ii) Vehicular access to HG2-126 shall be from site HG1-306 to the north and must not be from Garden Village or Station Approach.

Joanne Hebden  
Clerk & RFO to Micklefield Parish Council  
5<sup>th</sup> November 2015