

**East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 1 April 2014, 7pm Parish Council Offices**

Present: Gary Grayston, Julie Love, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Lesley Bancroft, Andrew Brown, Clive Keble, Jenny Kirkwood, Phil Marshall

1. Membership

Neil Bettison had sent apologies and emailed to say that his role may be changing, and he was unclear of his future involvement in the project. He asked to be kept on the mailing list.

Fred Briggs no longer wished to attend general meetings, but was happy to be kept on the mailing list and be involved in any further planning specifically about the Village Centre.

The Planning Aid volunteer assigned at the last meeting was no longer available due to other demands, but CK had an urban design colleague available to help. It was agreed that **CT/CO** would explore this offer with CK.

2. 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)**

3. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- **CT** would write a "latest news" item for the PC website. Action c/f
- The Community Plan Group would be delighted for NP to have a table at the CP launch event on 26 April. Action **CT** to make arrangements, **all** to help if available

b. Business/Employment.

- **JL** had completed the business consultation report, and this had been circulated to the project team. All agreed it and thanked her for her work. It would be added to the Statement of Consultation **(CT)**.
- **LB** to set up a meeting with Lorna ?? of British Gypsum, Julie and herself. Action c/f, and noted that the meeting should include British Gypsum consideration of the Business and Employment section.

c. Green Environment/Constraints Map

- **CO** had had an initial walk to take photos of views etc, and would continue to work on this and the mapping as a priority for April.
- **CT** to ask **CK** about other sources of assistance.
- **CO** to ask for assistance with this work from agencies such as the Wildlife Trust. Action c/f
- Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. (**CO** – once a draft is available)

d. Village Centre.

- **CT** had reported by email that the Parish Council had approved section 3.8.1 with some comments querying whether the Health Centre needed to be in the Village Centre, but had not agreed with section 3.8.2.
- **CO** had discussed the location of the Health Centre with the Patient Partnership and they were adamant that it should be in the Village Centre because:
  - Proximity to Pharmacy
  - The elderly often combine Health Centre visit with shopping, using the Shopping Bus
  - Carers/drivers can leave patients in the Health Centre while popping out for shopping
  - Any new development out of the centre would need more land as parking would have to be provided

**CO** was asked to further enquire about the area needed, how many storeys a new building could be, and what other services would need to be co-located with it.

- There was a brief discussion on whether or not the Fire Station needed to be in the centre of the village. On balance it was thought not essential, but beneficial. There was some doubt as to whether the land could be used for anything else due to proximity to the brook.
- It was agreed that the wording about the Health Centre in section 3.8.1 did not need to be changed.
- Re section 3.8.2, policy V2, it was noted that the Parish Council had disputed the specifics of the drawn up scheme for the Village Centre, but not the overall objectives. It was agreed that **CT** would redraft the section, removing the specifics of the proposal, and that the revised section would go back to the Parish Council for agreement.
- There was some regret amongst the team that the policies would not be accompanied by an indicative scheme and it was agreed that **CO** would approach the Chair of Amenities Committee to see if the committee would work on developing an indicative scheme more acceptable to the Parish Council, in parallel with the NP, but not for inclusion in it.

e. Transport.

- **CS** had redrafted this section. There were no comments, and he was thanked for his work. It was agreed that both a map and a list of the rights of way and important footpaths were needed. **CT** would ask **CK** about assistance with mapping.
- **CT** had set up a meeting with representatives of EMA and as many as possible of **CT**, **CS**, **LB**, **JT**, **ABr**. **10am on April 10<sup>th</sup> in the Parish Office**. It was agreed that the following topics be explored:
  - Journey figures for people working on the site
  - Bus service
  - Sound insulation
- **ABr** would continue to lobby for bus services. Action ongoing
- The PC had responded to the airport consultation, to support the request for bus service.

f. Infrastructure.

- **LB** had written to **AP** at RBC to ensure that he was aware of the conflicting views of Severn Trent management and their local operatives as to the capacity. She had explained the situation to **DB** at RBC, and he would discuss with **AP**. **LB** to report back
- **LB** to set up a meeting with the ST management - action c/f.
- **LB** had asked Severn Trent for further data on releases into the brook and other monitoring statistics but nothing was forthcoming as yet. **DB** had suggested feeding them data about housing applications and asking for their plans for dealing with the increased capacity and their overall infrastructure plan for the Nottingham area. **LB** to report back
- **CO** discovered that a petition would need to go to NHS England. **AW**, Chair of Patient Partnership, now has a name, however he did not think that it was worth gathering names yet. The HC had responded to a national call for expressions of interest in funding, but there had been a huge response (total £9 billion), and it was not clear that East Leake would succeed in obtaining capital funding. There were other options, including building through a third party.
- **CO** to seek further information on the reasons why RBC had been unfavourable towards the idea of moving Bowls Club to provide a HC site. 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 that the Health Centre is unable to cope with current/projected demand – action c/f.
- **CO** reported that the patient survey had identified parking as a major concern. After the extension the HC was better able to cope but not to extend services as required or cover demand arising from the additional housing.
- There was some discussion as to whether Health Services could be provided in multiple locations, to avoid the need for a single large new build.
- **CT** had set up a meeting with relevant parties to discuss the school places strategy going forward. **24 April, 10am Parish Office**

- g. Housing.
- **CT** action to redraft housing policies in light of the policy writing workshop and other input. Action c/f
  - An application for the former Rabbit Farm site had been received – 28 homes. The NP Project had not been asked to comment, and it was agreed that no response would be made from the project. It was rumoured that the Heavens farm might be added to the area.
  - A further meeting had taken place with the Woodgate developers, who had responded helpfully to some of the issues raised by the PC
  - It was not known what the state of play was with the meeting between the PC and the Lantern Lane developers. Action **LB** c/f.

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

- a. PM had revised the RBC evidence document and **CT** had circulated this and would replace the version on the NP website.
- b. Stanford Hall. **JT** continues to work to influence the traffic situation.
- c. BfL workshop –Monday 12 May – all were encouraged to attend.
- d. Research into NPs not allocating housing sites action c/f (**ABe/CO/CT**)

5. Meeting Reports etc

- a. Details of the Community Plan launch on 26 April would be decided at the next CP meeting on 7 April.
- b. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – PM reported that the consultation period was still open. CT had circulated to the Project team the response of the PC and her personal response.

6. Love and Piste – (JL took no part in this discussion). The NP Project had been sent an invitation to comment on a planning application by Love and Piste. It was decided not to respond as a group.

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

CT, 9-Apr-14