

**East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 7 May, 7pm Parish Council Offices**

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Neil Bettison, Fred Briggs, John Dickens, Greg Hewitt, Julie Love, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Mark Wall, Cllr Pete Warren  
Apologies: Jenny Kirkwood

1. Minutes of the previous meeting  
These were accepted as a true record and would be passed to the Parish Council Management Committee before publication on the NP website. **(LB)**
2. It was noted that David Berryman had left the group for the time being due to other commitments and Fred Briggs, a local resident, had joined.
3. Progress reports from Sub Projects.
  - a. Consultation and Communication. CT reported that actions to further circulate the draft vision had been completed. 5 responses from residents had been received, plus one from Natural England. CO had not yet followed up with one of the residents. **(CO)** LB had responded to other residents as appropriate as comments overlapped with normal Parish Council business. It was agreed that it was not necessary/appropriate to specifically consult political parties.

**CT** had started to assemble the Statement of Consultation and this had been circulated prior to the meeting. Work is ongoing. List of churches receiving draft vision to be added **(CO)**.

- b. Business/Employment. **JL** was continuing to contact various businesses and employers. There was a general feeling that the village is getting busier, and that businesses are working together more. Saturday afternoons are perceived as being very slow for trade - "it goes dead". There is some indication that businesses would be willing to contribute to improving the village centre.

Parking keeps being raised as an issue. This needs to be convenient so that people are encouraged to use the shops etc, however for on-street parking there is a tension between convenience and safety. The group discussed how to take forward parking improvements and agreed that there were two aspects – short term improvements which were being dealt with by the Parish Council, and longer term plans, which could be included in the NP, under the village centre topic. JT suggested using the rest garden for additional parking.

- c. History. **MW** had been undertaking initial reading and has a contact in University of Nottingham. He intends to work on this further after half term. Actions to set up meetings with local history society and farmers/landowners were c/f **(CO/JL)**. **CO** would forward MW the contact details for the local history society and **CT** would send him information about the village conservation area.
  - d. Green areas and rural "feel". Little progress this month. Next steps are to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**
  - e. Village Centre. FB presented proposals to facilitate the long term improvement of the village centre by removing the current Gotham Road/Main Street junction, and by so doing unlock the potential of the village centre which is currently highly constrained by the road layout. This would allow most of the space currently occupied by road surface to be pedestrianised, forming a village square, and also make land available for further development in the form of additional shops and restaurants. This would greatly improve the safety and amenity value of the shopping area and allow a multi-purpose central space for such things as farmer's markets, expansion of outdoor tables for cafe's, etc.

Village centre proposals from the CABE facilitated workshops were also tabled and considered.

There was a wide ranging discussion, with some support for working towards an aspirational design, but concerns for practicality and affordability. It was agreed that **LB** would set up a meeting

between herself, FB and the Highways department to discuss both the short term options and the more ambitious longer term objective. Ideas would be presented to the public at the NP stand in the Annual Parish Meeting on 22 May. **(LB/FB)**

- f. Transport. CS hopes to progress this over the next month. The team discussed the scope of what could be included in the NP. It was thought that specific policies for cycle paths, footpaths etc could be included, and that impact on matters not directly related to planning, e.g. public transport, could be influenced by means of a prioritised list for use of developers' contributions. Items such as community transport schemes might otherwise be outside the scope of the NP, sitting more comfortably within the Community plan or other agencies. The impact of the tram service should be considered, but extension of rail passenger services other than for heritage/leisure use was unlikely to be achievable. **(CS/PW)**
- g. Infrastructure. **JD** had not developed his draft any further. CT's draft bid for the Bulls Head site to be placed on the register of assets of community value was considered. PM advised that she should consult with Derek Haydon about process for submission etc **(CT)**. It was agreed that the Bowls Club and Fire Station sites were also relevant, but that these could follow onto the register once the procedure is understood. JT asked who would pay for the Bowls Club to be relocated should this site be used, and it was suggested that this would be part of the cost of the Health Centre project.
- h. Housing. CT's initial draft of policy areas was considered. There was some debate as to whether several options for policies (in this section and others) should be worked up for consultation, or just one. The consensus was that this would depend on the policy area. **CT/PM** to meet to review evidence and discuss housing policies further.

4. Matters arising/actions from the previous meeting, not otherwise on the agenda:

- a. Newsletter article for Sutton Bonington – action carried forward **(CO)**
- b. Arrangements for use of £30,000 DCLG grant to be clarified – action c/f. **(PM)**
- c. S106 money in respect of the most recent housing development down Gotham Road:
  - CO had reminded Nicky Tyler at the East Leake Health Centre about the £141k. There would be a meeting shortly to discuss getting a new Health Centre. **(CO)**
  - Contact the education authority to investigate plans to spend £300k. (Action **NB**)
  - Parish Council Amenities committee had considered the matter of £154k available for improvements to footpaths, cycle-paths and public transport and would create a prioritised list in their June meeting. **(LB and councillors)**
  - LB had had a response from RBC to her letter about funding for play equipment. There is £19k remaining from the latest Gotham road development, and they have received a bid from the Costock Road playing fields association. **LB** would forward a copy of the letter to **PM** who would investigate further.
- d. Possible meetings between the group and developers between outline and full planning permission stages would be referred in June to the Parish Council Planning Committee to discuss amending the Planning Policy. **(LB/JT to add to agenda for Planning Committee)**
- e. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. **(PM)**
- f. Business cards had been ordered and delivery was awaited. **(LB)**
- g. Meeting with Keyworth DCLG contact - action c/f. **(PM)**

5. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan Group was in the process of drafting an implementation plan.
- b. The meeting re Stanford Hall had been arranged for 17 May at 9am. All members of the project team able to attend are welcome. The agenda drafted by CT was agreed.
- c. Meeting with British Gypsum – action c/f **(LB)**
- d. The CABE Case Study had been finalized but not yet appeared on their website.
- e. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy was reported. A technical meeting with the examiner was held on 9 April. RBC has a suspension of 7 months to revise and resubmit the strategy. The overall number of houses that Rushcliffe has to provide for the Nottingham area by 2028 has been increased by 3550 and there is to be a review of the Green Belt which is likely to remove about 2% of land from the green belt but not replace it with land in other areas. There will be consultation on modifications but unlikely to be further consultation on unchanged elements of the plan. The 3550 houses have to be adjacent to Nottingham, so are not likely to affect the current situation for East Leake.

6. Bidding for grant funding (up to £7000) or direct support from Locality etc. No action as yet. **(CT)**.

7. The advisability of including photos of the NP Project Team on the website had been discussed by the Parish Council, and it was happy with group photos to illustrate the work but not individually identified photos.

8. The Westminster briefing circulated by JD looked quite interesting but was agreed to be too expensive for anyone from the team to attend.

9. AOB

- a. PM reported that he and GR would be attending a Planning Aid training event.
- b. Lady Bay was setting up a Neighbourhood Forum.
- c. Bingham had expressed an interest in the NP work going on in East Leake.
- d. **LB** had received a supportive letter from the regional planning manager of the Co-operative estates in response to the draft vision consultation, and she would forward this to **CT** for inclusion in the Statement of Consultation.

10. Date of Next meeting: **First Tuesday of the month, 7pm at the Parish Office**

CT, 12-May-13