

DRAFT

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

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Fred Briggs, John Dickens, Gary Grayston, Greg Hewitt, Julie Love, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren
Apologies: Phil Marshall, 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. Responses to the draft vision consultation from English Heritage and the Co-operative estates were noted. English Heritage had sent the group a questionnaire, which **CO** would complete by the deadline of 28 June. Work on the statement of consultation continued. The Project Team had set up a stand at the Annual Parish Meeting on 22 May and there had been some interest in the village centre proposals and RBC's potential housing sites SHLAA plan.



b. Business/Employment. **JL** was continuing to contact various businesses and employers, giving them a questionnaire and asking them to produce a statement that could be "on the record". Issues raised included postal/courier charges for small businesses, many of which do mail order. A collaborative arrangement to reduce costs could be useful, and this suggestion would be passed to the Community Plan Group. **(JL)**

c. History. **MW** was not present to report. Various contact details etc had been passed on.

d. Green areas and rural "feel". Little progress this month. Next steps are to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**

e. Village Centre. **FB** had circulated a revised paper and plan prior to the meeting. As noted above, there had been considerable interest in this topic at the Annual Parish meeting. **LB** had written to **KH** to set up a meeting between **LB**, **KH**, **FB** and was waiting to hear back about dates. A meeting with the Co-op would be arranged after this initial reaction from **NCC**. Consultation with retailers and residents would also await the results of this meeting.

Discussion took place about: the viability of the proposed eastern by-pass link, due to available road width; the possibility of bringing the eastern by-pass out further along Main Street in the Castle Hill area; the likely impact on retailers; the feasibility of staging the eastern and western by-pass links; one-way systems; the impact on overall traffic flow and volumes along Main Street.

CT had circulated a video on shared space (see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vzDDMzq7d0&feature=player_embedded) which could be implemented either alongside or instead of the by-pass idea. It was agreed that **LB** would forward the link to **KH**.

f. Transport. **CS** had drafted transport policies, which had been circulated prior to the meeting. The first 3 policies, dealing with footpaths and cyclepaths were generally agreed. It was harder to see how draft policies 4 and 5, dealing with public transport, could be implemented via the NP route. Perhaps developer contributions could be sought to establish, pump-prime, and subsidise new services? It was not known whether or not this is an allowable use of S106 funding, and **PM** was asked to clarify.

After some discussion it was agreed that **CS** would draft letters to the relevant agencies (NCC, Nottingham City Transport, and whoever runs the trams) to consult them on our draft vision and find out what their strategic thinking is on the impact on East Leake of housing developments, the tram extension, widening of the A453, Stanford Hall proposals etc. Has any modelling been undertaken on changing traffic flows through East Leake? What will be the impact on the No 1 service, and what are future plans for public transport services to East Leake.?

It was noted that NCC are undertaking a consultation on their new integrated passenger transport proposals <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/have-your-say/consultations/titan/>, but that the roadshow is not visiting East Leake. **CS/PW** to investigate.

- g. Infrastructure. **JD** had not developed his draft any further. CT had emailed Derek Haydon about process for submission of community assets but no reply received as yet (**CT**).
 - h. Housing. CT reported on meetings that she had with PM and Elira Mano of RBC. She had circulated a report to the group prior to the meeting and now had further information to add from PM, so this would be updated. **CT** would also circulate revised draft policies.
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 – action c/f. (**PM**)
 - c. S106 money in respect of the most recent housing development down Gotham Road:
 - Health Centre £141k would be raised at meeting on 12 June (**CO**)
 - Contact the education authority to investigate plans to spend £300k. (Action **NB** c/f)
 - Parish Council Amenities committee had considered the matter of £154k available for improvements to footpaths, cycle-paths and public transport and would create a prioritised list in their June meeting. (**LB and councillors**)
 - d. LB had had a response from RBC to her letter about funding for play equipment. **LB** would forward a copy of the letter to **PM** who would investigate further, and the submission of S106 bids via the required forms would be taken forward via the Parish Council Amenities Committee.
 - e. Possible meetings between the group and developers between outline and full planning permission stages would be referred in June to the Parish Council Planning Committee to discuss amending the Planning Policy. (**LB/JT to add to agenda for Planning Committee**)
 - 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. Business cards had been delivered and were distributed to those present. If others need a supply, please enquire at the Parish Office. Personal contact details can be written on the back if necessary. (**All**)
 - h. Meeting with Keyworth DCLG contact - action c/f. (**PM**)
4. Meeting Reports etc
- a. The Community Plan Group is continuing to draft its action plan. Concerns have been raised about overlap between the Community and Neighbourhood plans, and a joint meeting will be arranged to clarify. (**CT/CO**)
 - b. CT had circulated a report of the very productive meeting held with the Stanford Hall developers on 17 May. **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 – **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. *[Post meeting note: the CABA Case Study is now on their website. See <http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/CABA/Our-big-projects/Communities/Who-weve-helped-and-how/East-Leake/>]*
 - e. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy – revised housing proposals and green belt review to emerge shortly.
5. Bidding for grant funding (up to £7000) and/or direct support from Locality etc. **CO and CT** reported on a meeting with Andy Beard on 24 May about drafting the bid. This work is ongoing.
 6. Date of Next meeting: **First Tuesday of the month, 7pm at the Parish Office**

CT, 21-Jun-13