

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

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

Present: Matthew Kemp, Phil Marshall, Julie Love, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies or not present: Lesley Bancroft, Cllr Andy Brown, Gary Grayston, Clive Keble, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell

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. Consultation and Communication.

- Amendments had been made in light of responses received to the pre consultation version. AB/NB had followed up with NCC to ensure they respond to the consultation version.
- CT had circulated the list of consultees to the project team. This would be tidied up for inclusion in the Statement of Consultation. **CT** would ensure that PM receives the final details so that the list can be used for the RBC consultation to follow. **MK** offered to undertake a land registry search for the landowner that had not yet been contacted.
- The summary leaflet/questionnaire had been distributed to residents over the weekend of 13/14 September, and those who had helped with this were thanked.
- There was enough money in the grant budget for a final leaflet which would summarise consultation responses and resultant changes made to the NP before submission.
- CT had circulated an initial analysis of 42 forms received to date, which was showing that a strong majority would vote for the Plan at the referendum. It was agreed that **CT** would complete the analysis in the same way, unless the final numbers made it difficult.
- CT raised the fact that some residents had left their contact details with questions or offers to give further views, and there was discussion about how to take this forward. It was agreed that this would be revisited when all the forms were in. Options were to invite them to a meeting, reply individually, or cover their questions in the follow up leaflet.
- Drop in sessions on 26/27 Sept had been attended by a total of 32 people. The co operative had provided the refreshments. Project team members who helped staff the sessions were thanked.

3. Project Timetable

- PM had consulted with his opposite number in Bassetlaw to get an idea about timescales. Two weeks to produce the submission version after close of the consultation period was very ambitious. The time would depend on the level and content of responses.
- PM reported that RBC were not able to run the referendum on 7 May with the other elections, due to the additional work involved, and it would need to be a separate exercise, probably to take place sometime after 7 May rather than before.
- The greatest pressure on the timetable was likely to be the availability of an examiner, as these are in short supply. PM would make it a priority to get one booked in.

4. Work needed to finish the plan

Item	Importance/urgency	Who
2.1.17/policy H1 – Health Centre. CO had met with CCG, but the report of the meeting had not yet been agreed for release into the public domain. Follow up work was needed - a meeting with Dr Shortt was suggested. Data is needed to demonstrate that the current building is inadequate. If not forthcoming, this could be progressed by means of a FOI request to the CCG and/or the NHS.	Critical	CO
2.1.23/policy H1 – sewerage. CT had not received a reply from STW, who were not subject to FOI. Other relevant bodies are subject to FOI (Ofwat, EA, Drinking Water Inspectorate and the Consumer Council for Water) and CT would see what data was available from these sources, and would also	Critical	CT

follow up with STW. CT had contacted our MP to ask why the water boards are not covered by FOI, and he had offered to assist in obtaining the data. CT would ask ELPC to clear this course of action.		
2.3/policy H3 – mix of market homes. JL pointed out that the housing mix used in H3 corresponded to Rushcliffe, not East Leake, data and expressed the view from representations made to her that the proportion of 1 and 2 bedroom homes should be higher than 19% currently in policy H3. The view is supported by the results of the Community Plan survey, where 41% of respondents assessed as a high priority “homes and apartments suitable for single people and smaller families”. PM and CT would look at running the housing needs model on East Leake data, using consultancy remaining in the grant allocation.	Critical	CT/PM
2.4/policy H4 – CT had discussed several options with RBC Head of Strategic Housing who had agreed to discuss this further with colleagues and get back to us. The challenge is to find a way to take this forward that is not in conflict with the housing allocations policy, and/or to persuade RBC to modify the housing allocations policy to include a local connection priority for housing applicants in the same housing need band. Intermediate housing does not come under the housing allocations policy but any “in perpetuity” restrictions could make it difficult for buyers to get mortgages. The section/policy will need to be reviewed in light of the reply from RBC and other relevant consultees.	Critical	CT/PM
T1 – RBC comments about list of footpath etc works – ensure that RBC and NCC have the list of priorities that the PC prepared earlier, and arrange to meet with both councils to discuss.	Progress this outside the NP	PW
5.1.1 – Views Analysis – Fred has supplied further photos - Conrad to update views analysis	Desirable	CO
Basic Conditions Statement, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability appraisal, EU obligations – CS had produced a first draft – all to check and comment back, particularly MK and CK	Critical	CS, MK, CK, All
Statement of consultation – to be updated for submission	Critical	CT
Newsletter to residents to report on the results of the consultation		
Health check by PAE before submission		
PC to sign off submission version – aiming for 25 Nov meeting		LB
Publicity before referendum to get people to vote		

5. PM reported that Rushcliffe had sent consultation responses on the Core Strategy to the inspector and were awaiting developments. The hearing might be reopened. The responses can be viewed on RBC website.
6. CT reported that both grants had been extended to 31 Dec 2011, but must be spent by that date. A successful bid had been made for PAE support for the final stage and we had been allocated CK.
7. The NP response to the Kirk Ley “variation” (an extra 100 homes) was agreed and CT would submit it. It was noted that Field End Close application had gone to appeal and that a resident had responded including references to the emerging NP. PM would brief the case officer about the relevant parts of the NP.
8. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday of the month, 7pm at the Parish Office.

CT, 11-Oct-14