

Chair: Christine Thornton, 40 Cross Flatts Avenue, Beeston, Leeds, LS11 7BG. Tel 0113 270 0875

Secretary: Mr Robert Winfield, 7 Allenby Gardens, Beeston, Leeds, LS11 5RW. Tel 0113 271 6985

E mail [robert.winfield1@ntlworld.com](mailto:robert.winfield1@ntlworld.com) Forum Website- [www.beestonforum.btck.co.uk](http://www.beestonforum.btck.co.uk)

find us on Facebook at 'Beeston Community Forum'



## BEESTON COMMUNITY FORUM

Matt Magee Esq  
Corporate Affairs Manager  
Tesco Stores Limited  
by e mail

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2011

Dear Matt

I confirm that the Beeston Community Forum Committee met on 28<sup>th</sup> April, (the meeting was postponed from 21<sup>st</sup> April) . I have been requested to write to you in connection with a number of matters connected with the traffic and noise surveys, our objection to the planning application for a store on Old Lane Beeston, and the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

Firstly, the committee has had a detailed discussion about the traffic and noise surveys. The documents which we have considered relate to a noise survey which was carried out on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2008 and Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> November 2008. We are not aware of any subsequent noise survey. I am sure you will understand our concern that the only noise survey which appears to have been taken was taken around 2 ½ years ago. I am sure that you will not hesitate to correct this impression if we are mistaken. Moreover, you will be aware that our letter of objection states that

*'We also contest the statement contained in the supporting documentation in clause 5.41. The supporting documentation in our view needed to justify such a statement would have to include a detailed base line study of the current noise levels that exist in the vicinity of Old Lane **specifically on working days at peak commuter times and at less busy times , but also at weekends**' (emphasis added).*

We are also concerned that no noise survey appears to have been taken at a time when Leeds United FC are playing a home game. You will, of course be aware of the potential impact on traffic of a match or similar event at Elland Road football ground.

We therefore feel that there should be an updated noise survey, taken at

- I) peak commuter times during the week
- II) at weekends and
- III) on a day on which Leeds United FC are playing a home game.

We recognise the practical difficulties of complying with iii) above fairly quickly, in view of the imminent end to the football season. We feel that a noise survey could instead be taken at a time when a pop concert or similar event is taking place at Elland Road; for example there is due to be a concert

involving Rod Stewart on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> June.

A less important issue arises from the fact that a number of changes have been made to the design of the proposed store after the planning application was first submitted. Can you confirm that these will have no material impact on the noise situation?

We have concluded that if the additional noise surveys which we hope will be carried out confirm the conclusion of the survey carried out in November 2008, the predicted noise levels will be within acceptable limits, and it would be impossible to sustain an objection to the store on the grounds of noise.

The committee discussed the timing of deliveries to the store. We believe that any deliveries during the hours of 11 p.m to 7 a.m are unnecessary and would cause a nuisance to local residents. We therefore feel that if the planning application is granted, it should be subject to the condition that no deliveries take place between the hours of 11 p.m and 7 a.m. We also believe that if the noise generated by the store proves to be greater than the levels which have been predicted, Tesco should be required to finance mitigation measures for local residents, for example double glazing and air conditioning.

We also discussed Tesco's commitment to create 140 additional jobs if the new store is built. We note that Tesco has given a commitment that most of these positions will be filled by local people, although we fully appreciate that certain specialised positions (e.g managers) would need to be filled by experienced staff who would probably come from outside the area. We are concerned that we have heard that people coming from places as far away from the store as Bradford and Wakefield would be considered to be local people for the purpose of this undertaking. We understand that when Tesco built its store in Seacroft, Leeds, a commitment was given that as many jobs as possible should be filled from the Seacroft and Whinmoor areas, with recruitment from outside this area taking place only if no applicant from these areas was considered suitable. We feel that Tesco should look to fill as many vacancies as possible from an area close to the new store; perhaps the LS10 and LS11 postal districts.

We note that Tesco are committed to financing any measures which may be deemed to be necessary if the building of the new store leads to an increase in 'rat running'. Several members of the committee feared a repetition of the situation which occurred when the then Leeds Co-op organisation (which is now part of the Co-operative Group following two mergers), was required to pay a quantity of section 106 money to finance improvements to road crossings in the vicinity of their store on Beeston Town Street. Leeds City Council delayed the building of these improvements for several years after taking the section 106 money from the Co-op.

I note that your recent letter asked the Beeston Community Forum to put forward possible ideas for section 106 schemes. You may be aware that there has been a suggestion from within the Forum that there should be a 'Beeston Citizen of the Year' award. This was referred to in the Forum's Annual Report for the year 2009/2010 which has been posted on our website. Several members of the committee feel that Tesco might assist in the financing of this project (perhaps the purchase of a trophy), and could also display a roll of honour, consisting of previous winners of the award, in the store. There was also a suggestion that Tesco could provide additional litter bins in the area.

The committee then discussed the issue of traffic. In anticipation of the committee's discussion of these issues, I spent a significant amount of time studying the traffic surveys, noise survey and other relevant documents. I noted that table 13.2 of the traffic assessment stated that there would be 389 journeys to or from the development during the Friday peak hour and 436 trips during the Saturday peak hour. I sought clarification as to whether these figures represent additional trips which would be generated by the developments. Around two hours before the start of the Committee meeting, I received clarification from Mouchel that these figures represent a prediction of the total number of trips, rather than additional trips. Naturally, you will understand that a key issue is how many additional journeys would be generated by the development. At the committee meeting, a number of members studied the traffic survey which had been taken in February 2011 and reached the following conclusions:-

### **Fridays**

314 peak hour journeys before the building of the store (taken from the figure for traffic moving from location B to location A – spreadsheet 014 from the traffic survey)

389 peak hour journeys after building the store.

This would therefore represent an increase of 75

### **Saturdays**

283 journeys before the building of the store (taken from the figure for traffic moving from location B to location A – spreadsheet 015 from the traffic survey)

436 journeys after the building of the store.

This would therefore represent an increase of 153.

However, following the committee meeting, and a further study of the paperwork, I have spotted what could be a serious flaw in our analysis. The predicted figures are based on traffic flows adjacent to the location of the proposed store, but the actual figures are based on a different location; that is, the junction between Old Lane, Beeston Road and Beeston Town Street. Having studied the paperwork relating to the traffic survey further since the committee meeting, I am not sure that a survey was taken at the proposed location of the store in February 2011. If no such survey has been taken, we feel that it would be useful for such a survey to be taken and for a direct comparison of the actual traffic figures, and the predicted figures if the store is built, to be produced.

I would be very grateful for your clarification of these issues. Naturally, you may wish to refer this query to Mouchel.

In addition, I note from Mouchel's e mail which clarified that there would be 389 trips during the Friday Peak Hour and 436 during the Saturday peak hour that 'these numbers have decreased with the agreement of the Council'. I have been asked by the Committee to seek clarification as to

- I) by how much these figures have decreased and
- II) what is the basis for the decrease in the figures

There was a discussion about the road layout in the area close to the store. It was suggested that there would need to be changes to the existing road layout; however, it was noted that if the road network does not allow customers of the store to enter or leave it easily, shoppers would vote with their feet and decline to use the store. Could Tesco widen the road onto their land?

Dealing with the appearance of representatives of Tesco Stores Limited (and/or firms acting for them in relation to the planning application), I have been asked to clarify what we are expecting. The committee feels that the Forum does not want, or need a further presentation; simply an update about the current situation, and an answer to the questions which have been posed in this letter. Whether this requires the presence of traffic consultants at the meeting is a judgement which we are happy to leave to yourselves.

I confirm that the committee is minded to recommend to the Forum that the planning application is approved subject to certain conditions as stated below. I should stress, however that this recommendation is in no way binding on the Forum, which may choose to accept the recommendation, reject it, or accept a modified version of the recommendation at its absolute discretion. The conditions are:-

a) that there should be an updated noise survey, taken on a weekday, at a weekend, and when a major event is taking place at Elland Road Football Ground, which confirms that the noise generated by the new development would be within acceptable levels

b) that there should be (if such has not already been taken), an updated traffic survey taken on a weekday, and at a weekend, which confirms that any predicted increase in the level of traffic generated by the development would be within acceptable levels

c) that deliveries to the store should be prohibited between 11 p.m and 7 a.m

d) that the conditions set out in paragraphs 4.8 and 8.3 of the noise survey should be set out as formal planning conditions

e) that the jobs created by the new development should be filled by applicants from the LS10 or LS11 postal districts unless this is impossible or unreasonable.

f) that the assurances contained in your letter of March 2011 shall be accepted as planning conditions; in addition, Tesco shall be responsible for the maintenance of the benches which you have agreed to provide.

g) Tesco agrees to mitigation measures for local residents should the noise generated by the building of the store prove to be greater than predicted.

Concluding, I am very grateful for allowing your previous letters to us to be published on our website. I would be grateful for similar consent in relation to your reply to this letter, which I obviously look forward to receiving at your early convenience.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

ROBERT J.W. WINFIELD