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1. introduction
   1. A full planning application (ref:19/03718/FU) was submitted by GL Hearn on behalf of Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust for the demolition of Estates Post Room, Hawthorn House, Sycamore House, Memory Clinic, and Records Building and the erection of a new part single/ part two storey Children and Adolescent Mental Health Facility (C2 use) at St Mary’s Hospital, Green Hill Road, Leeds, LS12 3QE. The planning application is due for determination on 16th September 2019.
   2. The description of development reads:

*‘Demolition of the existing buildings; construction of a new part single/ part two storey Tier 4 Child and Adolescent Mental Health (CAMHS) facility including a new substation/ generator, a Section 136 facility, with associated access, parking, soft and hard landscaping’*

* 1. The Applicant carried out pre-application engagement with the determining Local Planning Authority, key stakeholders and the local community. This included a formal pre-application enquiry meeting with Leeds City Council and a pre-submission public engagement event.
  2. The pre-submission public engagement event focused on presenting the proposed construction of the West Yorkshire CAMHS unit to staff and the surrounding community and sought to ensure that all interested parties were provided with an opportunity to be involved in the pre-application planning process and provide feedback.
  3. Following submission of the full planning application, the Applicant held a post submission public engagement drop in event. This public engagement focused on: informing the local community that the planning application had been submitted; how the local community could be involved with the planning application process; and presenting the revised proposal to the local community and outlining the amendments that had been made to the scheme since the initial pre-submission public engagement event.

1. post submission public consultation
   1. The event took place at Holly House on the St Mary’s Hospital site on 16th July 2019 between the hours of 4pm and 7pm. The event was relatively well attended with approximately 26 attendees. The attendees were a mixture of staff from several local NHS Trusts as well as residents from the local surrounding area.
   2. A summary of the response is provided below:

* **The majority of attendees were in favour of the revised development proposals**
  1. *Comment:* Many comments welcomed the redevelopment of the hospital site, with the addition of a Section 136 unit. The spacious, modern and sensitive design with a wellbeing focus was viewed very positively by residents and staff alike. The soft landscaped area, with the retention of a number of trees was also viewed very positively by the surrounding community.
  2. *Response*: It was well known that a child and adolescent mental health facility is needed in the West Yorkshire district to meet the needs of children and adolescents within the area.
* **Changes made to the proposal since the last public engagement event**
  1. *Comment:* Questions were raised over what changes had been made to the proposal since the last pre-submission public engagement.
  2. Response: It was explained to residents and staff that an additional CAMHS Section 123 (S136) facility would be provided. A Section 136 facility allows for police and ambulance services to bring in a young person who is in need of a Place of Safety, where they will receive a mental health assessment. In addition to this, the proposed building is now part single/ part two storey as opposed to all single storey. This will allow for all staff officers and welfare facilities to be located on the first floor.
* **Suggestions over continued local engagement and good quality communications**
  1. Comment: Several suggestions were made regarding ensuring continued local engagement throughout the build process via comms updates.
  2. Response: The option was given to attendees to leave their contact details to be kept up to date with the development. In total 14 no. people left their details to be kept up to date with the construction of the facility and any other news with regards to the new facility.
* **Questions on how the application would be determined and the planning application process**
  1. *Comment:* A number of comments were made regarding how and when the planning application would be determined.
  2. *Response:* It was explained to residents and staff that the application is currently undergoing determination. It was explained that due to the development being a ‘major’ application it would have a 13 week determination period, which includes a 3 week public consultation where the local community can submit representations/ comments to the Council. The application will be determined at Planning Committee. A detailed agenda will be issued in advance of the meeting. This will be accompanied by a planning report outlining the application, relevant considerations, representations and consultation response and a conclusion with recommendations prepared by the Local Planning Authority Officer. The proposal will then be discussed by councillors who are independently elected and representations may be made to the committee by those in favour and against. It was explained that the usual format consists of one representative speaking for and one against. The application will then either by granted or rejected and the reason for refusal stated.
* **Many attendees had questions regarding what would happen to the remainder of the St Mary’s Hospital site.**
  1. *Comment:* A number of comments were made regarding what was happening to the wider St Mary’s Hospital site.
  2. *Response*: This public consultation relates only the redevelopment of the land outlined in red on the proposed site plan drawing and any redevelopment set to take place outside of this red line is outside of the scope of this planning application/public consultation and engagement.
  3. The wider St Mary’s Hospital site is owned by Leeds and York Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (LYPFT). As with all LYPFT estate, the main priority is to ensure that the Trust is providing the best environment to deliver great care to their service users. The ageing buildings at St Mary’s Hospital are not suitable for modern healthcare and LYPFT has acknowledged that the site does not meet its long-term needs.
  4. LYPFT has confirmed that it is therefore the intention to dispose of as much of the site as is practical in due course, however there are no definite plans or dates in place, and any further redevelopment will only occur once clear, well-informed clinical strategies are in place for all services currently based at St Mary’s Hospital.
* **Concerns over potential increase in traffic and parking, and the effect of this on neighbouring properties (including potential noise increase from drop off)**
  1. *Comment:* Concerns were raised about the levels of car parking proposed, and the effect this would have on the existing highway.
  2. *Response:* These concerns were noted and it was explained that the level of car parking being provided for staff and visitors was in line with the policy requirements of Leeds City Council. The nature of the proposed use of the site will mean that visitor times are not restricted to certain periods within the day so demand for parking will not be at specific times. In addition, staff will work on shifts, reducing the need for parking spaces during peak hours of the day.
  3. The Environmental Studies Transport Strategy Team at Leeds City Council has confirmed that noise from road traffic is unlikely to be of a level that would require specific measures over and above standard building elements. Therefore in this case an acoustic assessment is not required as part of the planning application.
  4. It was also explained that a Transport Assessment had been prepared in support of the planning application which concluded that the proposed development would not be expected to have a significant impact on the operation of the highways network.
* **Questions over when the construction will take plan**
  1. *Comment:*Questions were raised over when construction will take place and how long it would last.
  2. *Response:*It was explained that the current timescale for construction is spring 2020 to spring 2021. Attendees of the public engagement were given an option to leave their contact details to be provided with updates with regards to construction.
* **Suggestions the Trust speak to other facilities to find out what has worked for them in terms of staff safety and security and use an architect with children’s secure unit/ mental health experience** 
  1. *Comment:* Questions/ suggestions were raised over whether the proposed development had been designed in consultation with other trusts to find out what works best for a CAMHS facility.
  2. *Response:* It was explained that the proposed CAMHS facility has been developed in consultation with service users, staff and trust specialist advisors to help inform the design and context of the proposed development. This has ensured the CAMHS unit provides fit for purpose accommodation, which reflects a welcoming and homely environment for its users.
* **Questions on whether there can be a guest room or facilities for family members to stay in if they need**
  1. Comment: Questions were raised on whether a guest room could be provided to allow for family members to stay over if needed.
  2. Response: This facility is a local provision for families based within the West Yorkshire footprint. The provision of beds within the local community should ensure young people needing these services will be accommodated close to home and they will not be moved to units that are out of the West Yorkshire area. Due to space restrictions the unit does not allow for the provision of accommodation for families although we do recognise its therapeutic value. Families will be provided with local accommodation and travel information if required.
* **Questions on whether there could be a drop-in facility where children can hear from other children and how they have recovered** 
  1. Comment: Questions were raised on whether a drop-in facility could be provided where recovering children could hear from other children who have gone through similar experiences and how they have received care and support.
  2. Response: This would be more appropriately managed from a different venue, not from the inpatient provision itself. We couldn't easily manage 'drop ins' and have to consider safeguarding, confidentiality etc. but it is a nice idea to have some kind of a forum set up perhaps in a community CAMHS base. This suggestion will be forwarded to colleagues within the CAMHS community services
* **A question was raised on whether the derelict gas lamp post would be retained on site** 
  1. Comment: One resident question whether the derelict gas lamp was being retained on site.
  2. Response: It is proposed that the lamp will be re-sited on the St Mary’s site.

1. conclusion
   1. The post-submission public engagement process has provided key stakeholders, the local community and library users with an opportunity to view the plans for the proposed development in detail and ask direct questions of the professional staff in attendance.
   2. In general, the majority of attendees viewed the redevelopment proposals positively. It was recognised that a number of changes had been made to the scheme since the pre-application public engagement, which were also considered to be positive changes.
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