

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team
Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 4 March 2014, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Gary Grayston, Julie Love, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman

Apologies: Neil Bettison, Fred Briggs, Andrew Brown, Clive Keble, Jenny Kirkwood, Cllr Pete Warren

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.

- **CT** would write a "latest news" item for the PC website. Action c/f
- **GG** would consult the Community Plan Group to see if the NP may have a table at the CP launch event on 26 April. NP Project Team Members were invited to staff the table. *[Post Meeting Note – We have had confirmation that CP group would be pleased for us to do this. Lesley has confirmed she be one of the people staffing the table. Others would be appreciated.]*
- **LB** would add an agenda item to the March Full Council meeting for the Project Team to brief them on the current Village Centre draft and plans.

b. Business/Employment.

- **JL** is still receiving returned forms and adding them to the summary, prior to producing the report of the business consultation.
- **CT** would check her notes of the meeting with ABe to see what policies were emerging, and check back with ABe for his notes and/or assistance.
- **CT and JL** would get together to draft the section.
- **LB** now met with Lorna ?? of British Gypsum and would set up a meeting with Julie, Lorna and herself for about a month's time.
- **PM** explained that the Core Strategy included British Gypsum as one of several centres of employment in the Borough, and would forward the reference. He thought there might be scope for more detail in the NP.

c. Green Environment/Constraints Map

- Following input from CK about the experience of [Rolleston on Dove](#) NP it was agreed that we would produce a "constraints map" rather than talk about a "village envelope".
- **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. Action c/f
- **CO** had obtained some assistance with obtaining base maps, but further assistance will be needed going forward to get modifiable maps.
- LB reported that the necessary OS licence had now been obtained.
- Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**
- The draft policy on play equipment had now been approved by the PC, and would be included in the NP.

d. Village Centre.

- The draft Village Centre section of the plan was discussed in detail and it was agreed that **CT** would contact **ABe** with the required changes to the T-junction improvement plan, and redraft the section of the NP to take into account comments received. It was agreed that the amended section would go first to the March meeting of the PC for consultation, then the Community Plan Group, and then the public at the CP launch.

e. Transport.

- **CS** asked for clarification on the footpaths/cyclepaths priority list, and would draft this section, including a map, for the next meeting.
- **CT** reported on her visit to the airport outreach event. She had obtained a copy of the Sustainable Development Plan, currently out to consultation. (This can also be viewed on the EMA website.) She had spoken with the Principal Planner, who would be pleased to meet with members of the project team. Data on journeys to work for employees on the airport site could be provided. **CT** raised the possibility of a bus service, and was informed that a “new service to South Nottinghamshire (via East Leake and Gotham)”, had been added to the list of possible future developments on P16 of the “Economy and Surface Access” section of the plan, following a request by **ABr**. It was agreed that **CT** would set up a meeting with representatives of EMA and as many as possible of **CT**, **CS**, **LB**, **JT**, **ABr**.
- **ABr** would continue to lobby for bus services. Action ongoing
- The **PC** would be encouraged to respond to the consultation, to support the request for bus service. **CT/LB/CO/JT**

f. Infrastructure.

- **LB** had written 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. She had explained the situation to **DB** at **RBC**, and he would discuss with **AP**.
- **LB** to set up a meeting with the **ST** management - action c/f.
- **LB** had asked **Severn Trent** for further data on releases into the brook and other monitoring statistics but nothing was forthcoming as yet. **DB** had suggested feeding them data about housing applications and asking for their plans for dealing with the increased capacity and their overall infrastructure plan for the Nottingham area.
- **CO** had had a discussion with the Chair of the patient partnership who would attempt to find out who we need to lobby for a new Health Centre. A petition will not be effective unless we know who to address it to.
- **CO** reported that the idea was gaining ground to use the **Bowls Club** site for the new Health Centre. An option for relocating the **Bowls Club** would be to move it further along the plateau area of the field. **MM** had been tasked with asking **RBC** for their views on this and she had reported that they had said no. **CO** to seek further information on the reasons etc. Identifying a suitable village centre site could be included in the **NP** as an aspiration.
- **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. The latest temporary extension had eased the problems with waiting space etc, but not provided any additional doctors or services. A patient survey was being undertaken and the results would be available in due course.
- Project team to meet with relevant parties to discuss the school places strategy going forward. **Action CT** to set up meeting c/f. **CT** noted that the **Costock Road** planning application says that **Brookside** could be expanded to cater for this development, but then had no further space to expand. Concern was expressed that houses were already being built and **Brookside** is full – no expansion has started there yet. **PM** briefed the team about the secondary school strategy – current plans were for the secondary places for the **Clifton** development to be provided at **East Leake Academy**, and some others schools. There would be a new school at **Gamston**. Catchment areas may be redrawn.

g. Housing.

- **CT** action to redraft housing policies in light of the policy writing workshop and other input. Action c/f
- The current situation re housing developments was noted. 621 homes have now had planning permission, the latest site being **Costock Road**.
- The **Johnsons** garage site has put in an outline planning request for redevelopment as residential. It was not thought necessary for the **NP** team to send in a response on this.
- **CT/CO/LB** reported on the meeting with the **Woodgate** developers, and the issues raised with them, including footpath links and housing mix.

- It was thought that the Lantern Lane site had now been sold. **CO** would investigate and if so **LB** would set up a meeting for the PC to influence reserved matters.

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

- a. PM had revised the RBC evidence document and **CT** would circulate this and replace the version on the NP website.
- b. Stanford Hall. **JT** continues to work to influence the traffic situation. It was noted that the “national” part of the development is further into the future.
- c. History – review of conservation area referred to PC, and the new portfolio holder is CO, who would instigate a review with RBC.
- d. BfL workshop – a new date of Monday 12 May is proposed, with a format that allows attendance just for the morning for people who can’t spare a whole day. Action **CO** to issue invitations and assess numbers to: our Parish, Borough and County councillors; Neighbourhood Plan Project Team; Community Plan Group members; Keyworth Community plan group; RBC planning officers (via AP and DB). Other suggestions welcome.
- e. Research into NPs not allocating housing sites action c/f (**ABe/CO/CT**)

4. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan launch is set for 26 April. The draft document has been sent to stakeholders. The group has processed the response from the PC – there have been no other responses to date. The launch will be publicised via flyers delivered to homes, and banners.
- b. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – modifications are currently out for representations to be made.
- c. It was noted that CK has found a volunteer (Andrew Ruck) to assist with policy research for us.
- d. Keyworth NP has recently held an event for developers to present the benefits of their respective sites.

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

CT, 10-Mar-14