

**From:** Margaret Dale  
**Sent:** 06 June 2018 17:32  
**To:** Yvonne Parker  
**Subject:** RE: Participants at Matter 4 - opportunity to respond to Document EX75 - supplementary note EX69

Hello Yvonne

My comments on this matter are very succinct!

The one Council owned site in the Holme Valley (H728) has been removed from the list and appears to be the only one removed from the list given out at the last public examination hearing. What is the reason for this?

Regarding all the other sites a significant number are to be disposed of through a negotiated tender process. Does this comply with the good governance requirements of transparency and will it secure best value for the people of Kirklees? Why is an open tender process not being used?

What assurance will be given by the Council to ensure that adequate social housing provision will be secured as a result of the disposal of so much council owned land? The financial contribution to the Council's coffers will no doubt be appreciated but housing stock is another form of valuable asset, especially in an area where average wages are comparatively so low (second lowest in the country). House purchase for some is a step too far so the provision of affordable property for rental has to be an imperative.

How realistic are the time lines? In my experience of the legal processes, they always take longer than anticipated, are more complicated and more costly. Have adequate contingencies being built into the timeframes for the inevitably slippages? Some of the timeframes look optimistic to say the least – are they credible?

Will the Council undertake to strengthen the processes for ensuring that S106 payments are actually made?

Finally, will there be another hearing? If so I look forward to hearing from you regarding the details.

Kind regards  
Margaret