

## East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

### Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 3 December 2013, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Neil Bettison, Fred Briggs, Gary Grayston, Greg Hewitt (arrived late), Julie Love, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Chris Saffell, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Lesley Bancroft, Andrew Brown, 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. Project Plan (V6)

- a. Revised timescales were noted, to complete work by May 2014 for pre submission check, giving a referendum date of May 2015. CT stressed that although completion is a long way off, the current work on policy drafting needs to be completed by end of January to keep on schedule, and everyone's concentrated effort was needed over the next 2 months.
- b. It was noted that the Parish Council Management committee had received and endorsed plans for spending the £7000 Locality grant.
- c. CT and CO reported on a meeting with our consultant, Andy Beard, that afternoon. He had checked the proposed revised project plan, and believed this was achievable. AB had researched the latest NPs to be examined, and would forward relevant information. The following activities had been agreed as the next steps:
  - AB to meet groups working on "green", "transport", "business", and "infrastructure" to focus on generating the content for these sections, along with starting to sketch any maps needed. Action **CT/ABe** to agree the date and make arrangements.
  - AB to contact traffic consultant with the village centre brief, with a view to him coming up one evening, staying overnight so that he can witness the early morning "rush hour" in the village, then meet the teams working on "village centre" and "transport" sections to take these forward. Action **ABe/CT** to agree date and make arrangements
  - The rerun of the Building for Life workshop would take place on a Saturday in February. As the scheme had been revised, the training would be aimed at all Parish Councillors and members of the NP Project team. Development Control officers from RBC would be invited, from both planning policy and development control sections, as the team was keen that RBC's existing policy that new housing developments must comply with this scheme be more rigorously enforced. Members of the Community Plan Group and the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan group would be invited also. **ABe** to confirm the date.
  - **ABe/CO/CT** to research Neighbourhood Plans elsewhere that are NOT allocating housing sites.
- d. Details of a Policy Writing Workshop to be run by Planning Aid under the "Direct Support" element of our grant had been circulated to the project team in advance of the meeting. It was agreed that we would see if this could take place at 16:30 on 7<sup>th</sup> January, in place of the NP meeting that night. Food would be provided, as councillors would be going straight to a planning meeting afterwards.

3. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

- a. Consultation and Communication.
  - **CT** would bring the statement of consultation up to date – action c/f
  - **GH** to comment in Statement of Consultation – action c/f
  - **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. Action c/f. Copy date is end of December
  - **CT** would write a "latest news" item for the PC website. Action c/f
- b. Business/Employment.

JL had circulated before the meeting an initial introduction to the Business section, about which there were no comments at this stage. She raised concerns about a possible conflict of interest, as

she was a potential provider of services to businesses. The Project Team thanked her for alerting them to this, but did not feel that it was problematic in terms of her processing the results of her survey of business needs, as long as the results can be linked back to individual responses if needed and a rigorous process demonstrated. Going forward with policy drafting, the team again thought this would be fine, as there are unlikely to be proposals such as earmarked sites that would directly benefit her business. The situation would be monitored. **JL** agreed to write up the survey results. (Action c/f)

c. Green areas and rural “feel”, maps.

**CO** would draft this section for the next meeting – action c/f.

**CO** would contact a local resident who may be willing to help with producing and/or printing maps.

Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. (**CO**)

**CO** would ask RBC for maps.

**NB** would ask NCC for assistance with maps.

d. Village Centre.

- **CT** had produced a consultant’s brief to draw up proposals for improvements to the central area. It was agreed that a “by-pass” scheme remained a long term aspiration, and that this should be reflected in the NP, along with a shorter term vision.
- **FB** had produced rough draft of a smaller scheme (mini roundabout, removal of dual carriageway, redevelopment of pavement areas etc) and it was agreed that **CT** would add this to the brief, along with the diagram of the current layout.
- **CT** to contact ProHelp for possible assistance if we were unable to identify a suitable consultant with the fee available.
- The draft policy on play equipment would be passed to the PC Amenities Committee in January. 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** c/f

e. Transport.

- **CS** had redrafted the transport policies and they had been circulated before the meeting. It was suggested that linking to neighbouring streets/housing areas be added to policy T1. There were no further amendments, and **CS** was thanked for capturing the feedback from the November meeting.
- It was noted that the PC would need to maintain and publish their strategic plan for footpaths and cycle paths. Action **CT, CO, PW, JT, LB**
- **CS** had received travel plans from the two primary schools, and these had also been circulated to the team.
- There had been no response to the request to ELA, and **CT** would follow this up (as she is a governor).
- There had been no response to the request to British Gypsum, and **CT** would follow up with JE and AG who **CT** and **CO** had met recently.
- **CT** would follow up the request for Weatherford’s travel plan.
- **CS** had received a response from East Midlands Airport about their travel plan – their Surface Access Strategy (which contains Travel Planning policies for employment at the Airport) will be published in Spring 2014. The [current strategy](#) was written in 2006 and many of its aspirations were no longer feasible. They were not optimistic that any future bus services would be provided between the airport and East Leake. **CT** would add the response to the statement of consultation.
- **ABr** would raise the matter of bus services from the airport to East Leake with the County Highways Committee and the joint consultative committee at the airport. Action c/f
- **CS** had learnt that Loughborough bus service operators were waiting for news about the town centre routes before planning their services, so this could be followed up after there was news on this.

f. Infrastructure.

JT informed the group that The Bulls Head had been successfully registered as an asset of community value – the first in Rushcliffe. *[Post meeting note - See <http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/community/assetsofcommunityvalue/>]*  
Further applications could be considered by the team in future meetings. Action **All**

The meeting with Severn Trent and Environment Agency re drainage/sewage requirement had been set up. Action **CO/LB** to report back in due course. There was discussion about whether or not S106 funding could be used to support drainage/sewage, and the team noted that this was not the case, and expressed concern that there was no incentive for the water companies to highlight inadequate infrastructure, as they would have to fund any improvements from income. Evidence of problems should be gathered.

Health Centre – ABr suggests a petition to all relevant agencies. **CO** to report after next meeting of the practice – action c/f. **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.

g. Housing.

PM had given initial consideration to the draft housing policies and CT had incorporated changes as suggested. The policies as they stood were agreed by the project team, with a few issues to follow up. An additional policy, reinforcing the need for new developments to actively comply with the Building for Life criteria, would be added. Reinforcement of existing conservation area measures should also be a policy. Action **CT**

The current situation re housing developments was noted. 471 new homes have been approved. An application for a further development on Costock Road is currently out for consultation. It was agreed that **CO/CT** would produce a response, stressing that RBC has only tested the infrastructure for 400 extra homes, and this figure has already been exceeded.

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

- a. CT had spoken with JS of the Education Authority, who had clarified the situation with regard to planning of Primary School places, and use of S106 money for this:-

The former plan to use the money from the Gotham Road development to build two extra classrooms at Brookside was shelved when the Lantern Lane housing application came along, with agreement of all concerned, as the places were needed at Lantern Lane School rather than Brookside. The current plan is for the Lantern Lane housing developer to contribute the site plus funding for two classrooms. The existing £330k in hand (from the Gotham Road estate) will be used to bring up the number of classrooms to four, and provide additional rooms, play space, meeting rooms etc, for the annexe. The two portacabins can then go.

The S106 funding coming with the new developments has not been in any way allocated. This could be used to build two or three extra classrooms at Brookside, or to acquire a site and build a Brookside Annexe, or a new school. This remains to be determined in consultation with the developers, schools, residents etc and dependent on the numbers of new homes south of the main road.

- b. The letter to developers offering liaison between outline and full planning permission had been approved by the Parish Council. The Woodgate developers will now be sent the letter. (The other two sites are 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 to influence the traffic situation.

- e. James Lough had now agreed the NP/PC/Stanford Hall meeting report for inclusion in the statement of consultation. Action **CT** c/f

5. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan Group continues to draft and proofread the brochure and action plan.

Meeting with British Gypsum - **LB** has contacted KG replacement, but no response as yet. **CT/CO** had met with JE and AG with regard to the mapping exercise, and will follow this up to obtain policy statements about undermining, and maps of mined areas, deposits planned to be mined, and deposits which have planning permission but are less likely to be mined in the near future. They were keen to help with consultation with their employees and offered rooms etc. It was noted that NCC should be asked for a statement about undermining policy. (Action **NB/CT**)

- b. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – the meeting for RBC to approve the revised version will be on 12th December, and will be [webcast](#) on the day. Action **ALL** to study the [document describing the proposed modifications](#).

- c. CO/CT reported on the catch up meeting with Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Group on Monday 11 Nov. They now have public exhibitions and planning applications from developers in progress, and have the basic framework of their plan in place, with the assistance of a researcher. They are evaluating potential sites using the criteria in the SHLAA. We agreed to continue to share information between the two groups.

- 6. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday the month, 7pm at the Parish Office. NB there will be no meeting on 7 January, however there will be a training course at 16:30 that day instead.

CT, 5-Dec-13