

## East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

### Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 5 November 2013, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Fred Briggs, Andrew Brown, Greg Hewitt, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Chris Saffell, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Gary Grayston, Julie Love, Phil Marshall

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. Membership

Mark Wall had left the group due to work commitments, and the revised Terms of Reference was noted. Andrew Brown (County Councillor) was welcomed. He would receive papers and attend meetings when his diary permitted.

3. Grants

- a. It was noted that the remainder of the Locality grant had now been awarded, bringing the total to £7000. The team thanked CT for her work in obtaining the grants.
- b. GH had suggested applying for lottery funding, "Awards for All" and it was agreed that this would be done later if needed.

4. Project Planning

The following actions were agreed to move forward with the items that have been funded:

- The proposed expenditure would be passed through Management Committee for approval that this satisfies financial regulations etc. **LB/CO**
- The proposed consultants would be contacted to get dates in their diaries. **CT**
- The "Direct Support" contact would be informed about the grant and asked about progress with the elements they are providing. **CT**

5. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- **CT** would bring the statement of consultation up to date and forward a copy to **GH** for comment
- Further public consultation on the NP was due to take place when a draft is available
- **CT** would write a newsletter article for the next PC newsletter etc to inform residents of the progress the group is making – i.e. that a grant has been obtained to draft the plan. The article would summarise the situation with the current planning applications.
- **CT** would write a "latest news" item for the PC website.

b. Business/Employment. **JL** now has the feedback from businesses and will shortly write up the results. (Action c/f)

c. History. This would be passed to the PC Amenities Committee, as it was thought that the conservation area and management plan was due to be reviewed – it should provide adequate mechanism for safeguarding historical issues, without the need for specific policies in the NP. **LB**

d. Green areas and rural "feel". **CO** undertook to draft this section for the next meeting – action c/f. Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. (**CO**) **CT** and **CO** had met to discuss the mapping elements that would be required in the plan. (These were not just about green issues.) There was a discussion about separation of settlements, and how this could be achieved within the EL NP – as this can only go as far as the parish boundary.

e. Village Centre.

LB had received a reply from PH saying that he could not prepare plans as offered until the village centre vision had been articulated by the NP Project/Parish Council and been through the

referendum. There was some further discussion about the feasibility of the “community centre/bypass” scheme, perhaps with lottery funding. The following actions were agreed:

- **FB** to produce rough draft of a smaller scheme (mini roundabout, removal of dual carriageway, redevelopment of pavement areas etc)
- **CT** to investigate use of consultants to move things forward, either using part of the grant money, or the PC sum earmarked for the NP.
- **CT** to contact ProHelp for possible assistance

The draft policy on play equipment was approved by the Project team, and it was agreed that this would be passed to the PC Amenities Committee. They would be asked to approve its inclusion in the NP, and also to consider adopting the vision/policy in the meantime as a Parish Council policy.  
Action **LB**

f. Transport.

**CS** would redraft the transport policies for the next meeting, following the discussion at the previous meeting. He had requested travel plans from schools and other organisations, but these had not yet been received.

It was suggested that **CS** contact the airport about their travel plan –regarding both East Leake residents who work at the airport and those who use the airport as passengers. **AB** is a member of the airport consultative committee and would raise the matter of bus services from the airport to East Leake with them at the next meeting in January.

It was suggested that **CS** contact Paul Winson about their plans for services in the area.

g. Infrastructure.

The proposal for registering the Bulls Head as an asset of community value remains in consultation – no objections have been received to date.

Meeting with Severn Trent and Environment Agency re drainage/sewage requirement. Action c/f **CO/LB**

Health Centre – **AB** suggests a petition to all relevant agencies. Action **CO** to report after next meeting of the practice.

h. Housing.

The revised draft housing policies were agreed by the project team.

Actions c/f **PM** to look at the document again, come up with suggestions for Policy H2 (phasing), and formalising wording in other areas.

The current situation re housing developments was noted. Kirk ley, Lantern Lane and Woodgate all have outline planning permission, Meeting House Close has full planning permission. Field End Close pending. Next field along from Meeting House Close – planning application being put together. It was noted that the Lantern Lane and Kirk Ley sites are now up for sale. **AB** and **CO** reported on the proposed development between Stanford and Cotes (900+ homes).

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

- a. Education S106 money – following report back from **NB** it was agreed that **CO/CT** would meet with Jonathan Smith as offered. Action **CT** to arrange meeting.
- b. The Chair of Planning and Clerk had drafted a letter to developers offering liaison between outline and full planning permission. This would go to the Planning Committee for approval, and the Woodgate developers contacted thereafter (the other two sites being up for sale). Action **JT/LB**

- c. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. **(PM)**
- d. Stanford Hall. JT continues to work on this. AB reported that he had been informed by NCC Highways that RBC had undertaken a stage 1 safety audit. A Pegasus crossing (for horses) would not be provided, but signs would be put in place to warn drivers about horses and the verge would be widened to help the horses cross. A 40mph speed limit had been rejected as the existing 50mph limit cannot be enforced. It might be possible to raise concerns at the stage 2 or 3 audit stages.
- e. James Lough had now agreed the NP/PC/Stanford Hall meeting report for inclusion in the statement of consultation. Action **CT**

#### 7. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan Group continues to draft and proofread the brochure and action plan. They are receiving NP minutes.
- b. Meeting with British Gypsum - **LB** has contacted KG replacement, but no response as yet. **CT** will arrange a meeting with the minerals contact with regard to the mapping exercise.
- c. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – the meeting for RBC to approve the revised version will be on 12th December.
- d. CT reported that a group of residents from Bingham had been in touch. They were seeking to persuade the Town Council to take forward a NP.
- e. A catch up meeting with Keyworth had been arranged for Monday 11 Nov. **CO/CT/LB**

8. AOB – Sutton Bonington has decided not to do a NP.

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

CT, 6-Nov-13