

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team
Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 2 July, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Greg Hewitt, Julie Love, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Lesley Bancroft, Fred Briggs, John Dickens, Gary Grayston, Jenny Kirkwood, Mark Wall

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. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

- a. Consultation and Communication. The English Heritage questionnaire had been returned. Work on the statement of consultation continued. The vision statement response from Ken Clarke was noted.
- b. Business/Employment. **JL** was continuing to make progress contacting various businesses and employers and would soon be in a position to collate the replies. She would also take the questionnaire to the next Business Forum.

Fly tipping in the service area for the shops had been raised as an issue. Suggestions for dealing with this from the team included: clubbing together to install CCTV; contacting Nottingham City Council who deal with trade waste as the untidiness associated with this could be encouraging people to add to the mess; contacting Streetwise to ask them to investigate the waste to identify the culprits. **(JL to feed back to retailers)** Event organisers, including people applying to the Parish Council to use the playing field, should be made aware of their responsibility for removal of litter. **(LB)**

The possibility of owners installing seating outside the greengrocer and flower shop had been raised. **JL** would feed back the advice to check whether planning permission was needed.

- c. History. **MW** was not present to report.
- d. Green areas and rural “feel”. No progress this month. Next steps are to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**
- e. Village Centre. A meeting of **LB and FB** with Paul Hillier of NCC has been arranged for 18 July to discuss the options going forward. It had previously been agreed that retailers would be consulted only after there was some indication of viability. It was noted that PH deals with local transport plans, and it was suggested that **LB** gives him the list of footpath, cyclepath etc works needed, as recently agreed by the Council.
- f. Transport.

There was further discussion as to whether developer contributions could be sought to establish, pump-prime, and subsidise new transport services. PM outlined the 3 conditions for seeking S106 contributions (relevance to the scheme, necessity, legal). There was some discussion as to whether this had to be something physical, or whether a service could be supported – capital contributions were easier to secure than revenue. **PM** would contact Paul Hillier to clarify further. (See also related action under (e) above.)

CS had drafted the letter to relevant agencies to consult on draft vision and strategic transport thinking for East Leake. It was agreed that he would send these out.

CS had studied NCC’s [new integrated passenger transport proposals](#), and reported that there were maps of the existing and proposed routes for Rushcliffe. The new principle was to run local services from villages to “hubs” connecting with other services, rather than to the final destination.

The biggest effect on East Leake will be the disappearance of the No 63 service, with trips to QMC via the No 1 and passengers changing at Clifton. Direct connection with other villages will be lost.

There was discussion whether in the light of this a village shuttle service could be provided by the community, including to Costock to connect to buses on the A60 routes. (No action assigned, but idea noted for future.)

g. Infrastructure.

The PC had agreed the list of footpath/cyclepath projects, which had been circulated to the NP Project Team before the meeting, and **LB** had been asked to forward the list to the relevant agencies to progress some of these using £154k funding from the Gotham Road S106.

CO reported that the Health Centre were keen to progress the new build, the prime difficulty being securing revenue streams to fund the lease. The Bowls Club was the current preferred site, due to proximity to car parking, bus stops, and minimising impact on neighbouring residential properties. Marie Males had been tasked with exploratory discussions with RBC who own the land. It was thought that some income could be generated by redevelopment of the existing site for commercial and/or retail use. It was likely that the recently renovated Library section would remain where it is. Professionals have not yet been engaged to move the project forward. GH suggested contacting [Nottinghamshire ProHelp](#) who may be able to provide assistance with these early stages. Companies specialising in Health Centres could be consulted to take things forward.

PM advised ringing the case officers for existing applications to ensure that Parish Council requirements are included in the S106 agreements. It was noted that there is urgency to get this done for the Woodgate and Kirk Ley developments. The Lantern Lane proposal would be determined shortly by delegated authority rather than being taken to Development Control, as the Ward Members had raised no objections, so this is also quite urgent. Meeting House Close proposals were being resubmitted, so this also needs to be considered soon. PM advised contacting Andrew Pegram to discuss this. **(LB,CO,CT)**. It was noted that RBC will be staying with S106 for the present, not moving to CIL until 2015.

It was noted that there is a difference of policy between RBC and ELPC about the siting of play equipment, i.e. within new developments v in the village centre. The PC was advised to contact Craig Taylor to discuss this further. **(LB,CO,CT)** A NP policy, in the "green" section, could be developed to cover the play equipment strategy in the future – the NP policy would need to complement the RBC policies and national standards. It was noted that this needed to be backed up by the evidence from the Community Plan, and that co-ordination was needed to ensure the NP policy and CP actions align. **(CO)**

The process for designating assets of community value had been clarified by email exchange with Derek Haydon, and it was agreed that the test proposal would be tidied up and taken to the Parish Council with a recommendation that it be submitted to RBC. **(CT/LB)**

- h. Housing. CT had not yet revised the draft policies further. She sought views on whether the NP should first produce options for consultation or go straight to a proposal. On balance the extra round of options was thought unlikely to be productive. The team discussed options for maximum number of new dwellings on green field sites outside the current village boundary, and for phasing. **(CT)**

3. 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 – PM clarified that this funding is for RBC's expenses including officer time, examination and referendum, and that bids to other funds needed to be made for the project's expenses.

- c. S106 money in respect of the most recent housing development down Gotham Road:
 - (Actions relating to Health Centre £141K and footpaths £154K covered in Infrastructure section above)
 - Contact the education authority to investigate plans to spend £300k. (Action **NB** c/f)
- d. (Play equipment action covered under infrastructure above).
- e. Possible meetings between the group and developers between outline and full planning permission stages continue to be deliberated by the PC. (**CO/LB/JT**)
- f. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. (**PM**)
- g. Meeting with Keyworth DCLG contact will be set up if/when opportunity arises (**PM**)

4. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The joint meeting between the NP Project Team and the Community Plan Group has been arranged for 6pm on 9 July.
 - b. Stanford Hall – actions c/f. **LB** would raise the transport concerns with the contact given at NCC, as they have agreed to highway and access measures that the Parish Council believe are not adequate in a number of respects. **LB** would also contact James Locke with a copy of the meeting report so that this can be agreed and included in our evidence.
 - c. Meeting with British Gypsum – action c/f. **LB** had discussed with KG, who was more focussed on community projects, but KG would try to put us in touch with others to cover other aspects of the business.
 - d. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy – revised housing proposals and green belt review are now out for consultation.
 - e. Planning Aid training event – PM advised that he is now one of the volunteers providing assistance to other NP groups, and had been trained for this.
 - f. Town and Parish Conference – JT, CT and GH reported briefly on this. CT had since met with the Chair of Kingston PC for an informal chat with a view to sharing experiences as suggested by JT. The [Plunkett Foundation](#) supports community ownership, and may be of use to the Community Plan implementation going forward. (Information passed on via these minutes.)
 - g. An invitation to speak about our NP work at a conference in Sheffield would be declined.
 - h. **JT** would attend the meeting with DCLG planners on 16 July – **CT** to pass on the details and let the organisers know.
5. Bidding for grant funding (up to £7000) and/or direct support from Locality etc. This work is ongoing. **CO/CT**
6. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday of September, 7pm at the Parish Office. There would be no meeting in August due to holiday absences.