

From: Helen France

Sent: 06 June 2018 10:53

To: Yvonne Parker

Subject: RE: Participants at Matter 4 - opportunity to respond to Document EX75 - supplementary note EX69

UDVET RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT EX75 – SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE TO EX69

We wish to make brief observation and comment as follows:

1. There appears to be some discrepancy on the number of Council sites to be disposed of throughout documents:

EX69 talks about 38 Council sites but the breakdown within Paragraph 8 in this document lists 40

EX75 appears to list 36 sites

41 sites were listed on the document handed out on the day of the Stage 4 Hearing.

There may, of course, be a reason for this, such as site withdrawal, of which we are not at present aware. The ability for any party to cross check is hindered by the fact the Council list sites in a different order in different documents. Consistent presentation of information would assist everyone.

2. At the Stage 4 Hearing we asked the question about the expected yield from these sites of affordable and social housing given the Borough has 10,400 people of the Council House waiting list. EX75 does not appear to address this issue in a transparent way. Looking more closely at EX75, of the 36 council owned sites listed:

24 sites are going to be disposed of via 'negotiated tender' to housing developers. If the Council are going to tender, presumably they should be listing their housing delivery, type and tenure expectations in a tender document for each site. Basic expectations should be transparent now within EX75, given the public pronouncements by Kirklees Cabinet members that selling Council owned land will give the Council a greater say in what gets built is what is really needed. Simply, working on the basic 20% affordable housing guideline we believe is not good enough. The sale of public land should be delivering clear and obvious public benefit and delivering the type of housing and community facilities really needed for all sections of society (and outlined in the Local Plan).

8 sites are going to 'Registered Providers' who presumably might build a greater percentage of affordable/social housing if the Council sell them the land at a low price.

4 are going to DPP3 providers – perhaps the only ones likely to build socially needed housing, if our understanding is correct.

At present what we have seen in this document and EX69 gives us little confidence that the quantity, and type of affordable and social housing plus community facilities will be delivered from the sale of a large quantity of public assets.

Helen E. France

On Behalf of the Upper Dearne Valley Environmental Trust (UDVET)