

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

Minutes of Meeting held on Thursday 8th January, 10:30 am at Parish Council Offices

Present: John Dickens, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren, Chris Saffell

Apologies: Lesley Bancroft, David Berryman, Neil Bettinson, Gary Grayston, Jenny Kirkwood, Julie Love, Gemma Rhodes

1. Minutes of the meeting of 29 November

These were accepted as a true record.

2. To consider next steps as a set of 8 sub projects

CT and CO had prepared a document which laid out the work as a series of sub-projects, linking to the various sections of the draft vision statement. It was noted that the sub-projects would need to run in parallel but to different timescales, as some had longer lead times. Some of the areas were more important to cover in the Neighbourhood Plan than others, and the team could decide to proceed with some and omit others. Resource to undertake the work could be an issue and there is balance to be determined between having a large comprehensive plan, taking several years to produce, and a more targeted one which could get to examination quicker, and have impact sooner.

The team agreed to assign a leader to each sub project, who would then review the relevant information sources and plan and start the work needed in that sub project, to report back at the next meeting. This would then feed into the overall project plan. Sub-project teams could be set up to assist the leaders. Leaders were assigned as follows, and team members not present were asked to consider volunteering to lead the others. **Action - All working members of the team**

Consultation and communication	CT
Business/Employment	
History	
Green areas and rural "feel"	CO
Village Centre	
Transport	CS
Infrastructure	JD
Housing	CT

PW offered to help in the Transport sub project, and it was noted that DB also had interest/knowledge in this area.

It was agreed that any emails to organisations should be sent from individual email addresses, and that the signature at the bottom should be

"A N Other

On behalf of the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan Project Team"

The postal address and telephone number of the team (if needed) should be given as that of the Parish Council. A template for (paper) letters to be sent from the team would be needed. **Action CT**

PM noted that RBC has a database of contacts, and he agreed to look up relevant details for the organisations listed as initial contacts. **Action PM**

3. Matters arising/actions from meeting of 29 November, not otherwise on the agenda:

a. Procedure for publication of minutes

It was confirmed that minutes would be published on the web page after they had been approved by the project team and submitted to the Management Committee of the Parish Council. Any confidential information would be minuted on a separate sheet and not published on the web page.

b. CT and Sue Lewis were thanked for their work on the [NP web page](#). It was noted that further documents should be added as they become available, as this will form part of the submission of the plan in due course.

- c. It was noted that the response to Meeting House Close plans had been submitted, including wording to distinguish the NP Project Team response from that of the Parish Council, to also be used in any further responses.
 - d. LB had discussed with the Monitoring Officer whether there was any issue with parish councillors contributing to NP Project Team responses to consultations. This was not considered problematic.
4. Consultation with neighbouring Parish Councils
- a. CT and CO met with members of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Group on 12 December. Their plan is concentrating on prioritising sites for new housing. As there is a complication with green belt, this may be taken forward via Borough Council planning processes rather than the Neighbourhood Plan process. They have already published their [village design statement](#), which takes forward aspects of the work we are doing in East Leake. They described their consultation process, which has included a questionnaire to business, drop-in session at with BGS (their large employer), a kiosk in the Health Centre for giving views online, a presentation to the U3A, a presentation at the parish meeting, visits to schools, consultation with the police. Data analysis is taking place using a funded employment.
 - b. Meeting with Bunny Parish Council (CO to report)
CO had met with Bunny Parish Council on 29 November. They were interested, but East Leake is not particularly regarded as a service hub – their residents tend to use Keyworth and Ruddington too, the latter having the advantage of a bus service
 - c. Meeting with Sutton Bonnington PC (CO to report)
CO had met with Sutton Bonnington Parish Council on 7 January. They do regard East Leake as a service hub - for health centre, library, shopping and school. Issues raised included:
 - Need for improved bus service between the two villages
 - A question as to whether the East Leake would be including anything in the plan about gypsy/traveller sites.They would run an article in their next Parish Newsletter asking for views, as Gotham had. The Gotham article would be adapted and sent to them. **Action CO**
 - d. It was noted that the meeting with Rempstone PC is due to take place on 21 January.
 - e. There are no further meetings in the pipeline. West Leake and Stanford have not replied.
5. Progress with bids for funding (GR/PM to report)
PM reported that this was being progressed via Richard Mapletoft – now that the NP area has been designated, there should be £5000 available, with further funding for examination/referendum etc.
Action PM/GR
PM also reported on the current state of the Core Strategy. The government inspector had raised questions, and RBC had responded and were waiting to hear further. [A date of 31 January for the exploratory meeting has since been announced.]
6. Report from Community Plan Group survey and impact on the draft vision
The Community Plan Questionnaire results were not yet published, and so not available for the group to review in relation to the NP vision. However CO/CT/GG/JK were members of both groups and had seen the draft report and received a presentation from the analyst preparing the report. The results were broadly in line with the vision, certainly there are no results to contradict it, so it was felt that the consultation on the vision should go ahead without any further changes to it.
7. Draft vision – public consultation
It was agreed that an article would be written for the next Parish Newsletter, and the vision produced as a flyer and circulated with the newsletter. Views would be sought:
- What is missing?
 - Any observations?

- What should be prioritised?
- Any offers of help?

CO would ask the Management Committee for funding to print the leaflet. It was thought that this could be repaid from the £5000 grant once available. **Action CO**

Professional layout would be undertaken and 4000 or more copies printed – in addition to circulating with the newsletter, this would give enough copies for businesses, employers, and users of East Leake as a “hub”. Possibly distribution points were the Health Centre, Co-op, and Post Office, via the larger employers, ELA, and neighbouring Parish Councils. **Action CT**

8. Evidence review:

- PM tabled a summary of S106 funding raised for the latest 154 dwellings on Gotham Road - £4458 per dwelling, assigned as follows:

- Education £360,832
- Health £141,680
- Walking, Cycling and Public Transport £153,900
- Open Space Maintenance £15,066
- Village Hall £15,000

PM undertook to follow up with the Highways department and the RBC case officer to see what money had been handed over to the various agencies and how it had been spent. **Action PM**

Figures for developments in Bingham (£4519.78 per dwelling) and RAF Newton (£6236.67) were provided for comparison. Bingham’s allocation included a significant sum for a “community chest” to be managed by the town council, but no provision for education, presumably as the schools had capacity. Newton, a new settlement, included a sum for a community building, which is atypical.

It was noted that the way the funding gains are handled will change as S106 is replaced by the Community Infrastructure Fund.

- CO reported that he had not received a response to date from our County Councillor and he would renew efforts. **Action CO**
- Stanford Hall. It was noted that plans have now been submitted to RBC and can be viewed on their website. LB was asked to set up a meeting between the developers and members of the NP project team, to explain the Neighbourhood Plan vision and work to date and explore together the impact of the development and opportunities of mutual interest. **Action LB**
- Transport review – DB had responded by email that he had nothing further to report at this stage.

9. Consultation with business

- CO, CT and GG attended the local business forum breakfast on 13 December and distributed copies of the vision. The group has a good network of contacts and email distribution list, and it was felt that it would be a useful way to engage local businesses, though other methods would also be needed.
- Engaging with British Gypsum. **Action LB carried forward**

10. Date of Next meeting: **Tuesday 5th February, 7pm at the Parish Office**

Regular evening meetings have been arranged for the first Tuesday of the month, 7pm at the Parish Office. These will be supplemented by daytime meetings if necessary to ensure that all members of the team are involved.