

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 4 February 2014, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Neil Bettison, Fred Briggs, Julie Love, Clive Keble, Jenny Kirkwood, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Andrew Brown, Chris Saffell

Clive Keble of Planning Aid England, now the contact for our direct support package, was welcomed to the meeting.

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. Overall Structure of NP

- a. Contents – the content list provided by ABe, with some amendments suggested by CS, was agreed as a working document. The documents for submission would also include the Statement of Consultation, Basic Conditions, and the Evidence Base. CK advised that the policies be tested before inclusion to ensure that they are needed. As the Community Plan is proceeding in parallel, some non planning policies will be covered by this. Some policies may already be covered in the RBC Core Strategy. Consultation to date has provided considerable weight of opinion, which will need to be backed up by data.
- b. The report of the workshop and follow-up information circulated separately was noted, and those who had been able to attend confirmed that the workshop will assist in policy writing, with several tools provided, along with advice on testing the tightness of the policies.
- c. The structure for policies suggested by CS was adopted, i.e. vision statement at the start of each major section, with policy subsections structured as “Key Objectives, Key Issues, Policy, Justification”. There was some discussion about reversing the order of Issues and Objectives, and it was agreed that this could be considered later if necessary.

3. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- **CT** had updated the statement of consultation up to date and it was agreed that she would include amendments suggested and that this would then be published on the website as work in progress.
- **CT** had drafted an article for the next issue of the Parish Council newsletter.
- **CT** would write a “latest news” item for the PC website. Action c/f

b. Business/Employment.

- **JL** now had 30 responses to the survey and had started the work to produce a summary. She asked when she should stop receiving forms, and it was agreed that the report could be drafted and amended later if further forms came in.
- **LB** now has a contact name at British Gypsum and it was agreed that she would arrange a meeting with this person, **LB** and **JL** in about a month’s time. It was agreed that among other issues they would discuss the RBC policy that mentions British Gypsum specifically to see if any further planning policy for British Gypsum site was required in the NP. **CK** and/or **PM** would provide the reference to this.

c. Green Environment/Village “Envelope”

- **CO** had obtained some assistance with obtaining base maps, but further assistance will be needed going forward to get modifiable maps and the required licences
- Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**

- Paul Phillips of RBC is to meet LB and others and **LB** agreed to check whether this meeting could cover some of the NP discussions needed about Meadow Park.
 - CT reported on a meeting with a local farmer/landowner which had thrown up some useful viewpoints and ideas.
 - There was some discussion about the legality/advisability of trying to define an actual “village envelope” and it was noted that the objective was to define characteristics to be protected from development and draw up a constraints map, cross referenced by evidence. **CK** offered to forward relevant examples from Rolleston on Dove and other NPs in preparation.
 - The policy writing workshop and subsequent emails from RH had been helpful in determining the methodology used to map out the ridges, photograph the views to be protected etc. **CK** would seek volunteers to assist with this work. **CO** would set up dates for exploratory walks and **all** were encouraged to sign up to assist with these when they are able. It may be possible for **CO** to ask for assistance with this work from agencies such as the Wildlife Trust.
- d. Village Centre.
- Following a useful visit by consultant Bob White, a concept had been developed for the T-junction area, i.e. a non priority junction with road surface suggesting a roundabout and crossing locations, along with alterations to the central reservation and paved areas. **ABe** was working with **BW** to draw this up and write up the scheme and this would be brought to a future meeting.
 - The draft policy on play equipment had been approved by the PC Amenities Committee in February and would go forward to full council later in the month. Action **LB** ongoing.
 - There was some discussion on the rationale for including these items in the NP, and it was agreed that this was to provide a strong justification for using S106 or CIL funding to help bring forward these whole community improvements needed because the village is expanding rapidly.
- e. Transport.
- **CS** had redrafted the transport policies and they had been circulated before the meeting. There was a discussion about the difference between policies T1 and T2, and it was clarified that the first related specifically to a particular development, while the second was about larger developments contributing to the overall walking and cycling infrastructure of the village. It was suggested that the strategic plan for footpaths and cyclepaths should be included in the NP rather than referred to the PC to produce and maintain. The suggestion was passed to **CS/PW** for further discussion. There is an existing list of priority work, and **CT** would forward this to **CS/PW**.
 - All travel plans had now been received, and circulated to the project team, and **CS** has drawn out relevant supporting statements in the “justification” section.
 - **ABr** would raise the matter of bus services from the airport to East Leake with the County Highways Committee and the joint consultative committee at the airport. Action c/f
- f. Infrastructure.
- No further nominations of Assets of Community Value were considered relevant at this time, but it was agreed that this could be revisited at future meetings.
 - The report of the meeting with Severn Trent re drainage/sewage requirement had been included in the statement of consultation. The next step was for **LB** to set up a meeting with the management to challenge their assertion that there is not a problem with capacity in the pumping station. **LB** would also write to AP at RBC to ensure that he was aware of the conflicting views of Severn Trent management and their local operatives as to the capacity, so that this could be taken into account when considering further planning applications. **LB** would also ask Severn Trent for further data on releases into the brook and other monitoring statistics.
 - Health Centre - **CO** would ask the practice for strategy documents that the NP can use in its evidence base to support (or refute) the community perception, articulated through the community plan survey and elsewhere, that the Health Centre is unable to cope with current/projected demand – action c/f
 - **ABe** had suggested that sites for a new Health Centre and schools should be included in the NP. This was discussed, and it was thought that it may be possible in the case of the Health Centre –

CO to pursue. However it would be too difficult with schools. However the project team did need to meet with relevant parties to discuss the school places strategy going forward. **Action CT** to set up meeting.

g. Housing.

- **CT** action to redraft housing policies in light of the policy writing workshop and other input. There was some discussion on whether or not a maximum figure could be included. **CK** tabled relevant references to other NP examinations.
- The current situation re housing developments was noted. The NP team had responded to the consultation re Costock Road, majoring on infrastructure concerns. It was noted that the Field End Close application had been turned down by RBC.

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

- a. There had been no response from the Woodgate developers from the PC offering to meet and it was suggested that this be followed up. Action **JT/LB**
- b. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. (**PM**)
- c. Stanford Hall. **JT** continues to work to influence the traffic situation.
- d. History – review of conservation area referred to PC, but there is currently thought to be no portfolio member. (**LB**)
- e. BfL workshop – **CO** to look at a different format/day of the week that may be more favourable to parish councillors.
- f. Research into NPs not allocating housing sites action c/f (**ABe/CO/CT**)

5. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan Group stakeholder consultation version of the brochure and action plan had been distributed with the papers, and **All** were invited to comment back individually to them. PW queried the dates on the housing section, and **CT** undertook to check these.
- b. Meeting with British Gypsum – Actions are complete and outcomes are documented in section 5.4 of the draft statement of consultation.
- c. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – PM reported that the revised version will shortly go out to consultation. The NP and/or PC may wish to respond to the consultation.
- d. It was noted that Bingham has started a community-led plan.

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

CT, 11-Feb-13