

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team
Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 6 May 2014, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Matthew Kemp, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies or not present: Andrew Brown, Gary Grayston, Julie Love, Clive Keble, Jenny Kirkwood, Phil Marshall, Cllr John Thurman

1. Membership

Neil Bettison continues to receive copies of correspondence. He dropped in some maps for the project team to use.

Matthew Kemp had volunteered to join the group and attended the meeting from about 7:30 onwards. **CT** would edit the terms of reference/membership document.

CO has indicated what assistance is required from the Planning Aid England urban design colleague, Darren Carroll. He has yet to get a response.

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. Project Plan and Assistance

- a. CT had updated the project plan and briefed the team on the current pressures. The remaining policy sections need to be drafted urgently – i.e. within the next 2-3 weeks. The contingency month has now been used up and the schedule cannot slip if we are to make the May 2015 referendum.
- b. Assistance – CT has asked CK to move forward the documents that need to be submitted alongside the plan. The plan itself, Consultation Statement, and Evidence Base are in hand but we will need assistance with the other required elements. CK wished to know what else PAE could help with.
- c. CT had submitted a monitoring report for the smaller grant, which has not yet been spent (it is for printing etc). Some consultancy money remains in the larger grant, but it's not clear at present how to use this to move forward.

4. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- CT would write a "latest news" item for the PC website. Action complete
- It was noted that three sections had been approved by the Parish Council with minor amendments.
- The Community Plan launch event on 26 April had featured a stall about the Neighbourhood plan, featuring the three draft sections. 40 copies of the sections plus consultation forms had been distributed, generating some interest in the plan. Several residents on Meeting House Close raised the current issues they were experiencing with building work.
- The Annual Parish Meeting on 21 May will include a major item about the NP. **CO** would organise and give the presentation. Key messages would be "no, it's not too late" and "these are the first three sections". The display boards had been left set up and would provide the focus for a display. **CT** would organise further copies of the documents. **CT** cannot be present. **All** were asked to help staff the stall if available.
- **CT** would start to maintain an assembled document, and release revised drafts as necessary, so all changes should now be channelled through her to ensure version control. **Action All**

b. Business/Employment.

- The business consultation report had been added to the Statement of Consultation.
- The changes suggested by CK were discussed and it was agreed that **JL** would be asked to review these and produce a list of changes. **MK** would check through the three draft sections and

provide a list of use classes to apply to different policies. It was noted that these need to be incorporated in such a way that keeps the policies tight but also intelligible to the public.

- **LB** to set up a meeting with Lorna of British Gypsum, Julie and herself. Action c/f
- **CT** would also try to progress consultation with British Gypsum via the contacts made on the geological issues.
- At the CP launch LB had had a discussion with a prospective new retailer wishing to lease a shop in the village who had been unable to do so, we are told, because the property owner did not consider the nature of the business to be what was needed. It was agreed that as major stakeholders the owners of the shops in the village centre should be contacted with a copy of the draft of the first 3 sections, along with an offer to meet to discuss. **Action LB** to write to them.

c. Green Environment/Constraints Map

- **CO** now had a collection of photos and would focus on the constraints map and finalising the draft of the section in the current template (vision/objectives/key points/policy/justification)
- It was noted that the Woodgate case officer report refers to the ridge line as a boundary for building (see para below) but does not consider it necessary for houses to be below the ridgeline. Suitable wording will be needed in the NP if the remaining ridgeline is to continue to provide a visual "green ring" around the village as viewed from inside, and to prevent the village being visible from outside.

The applicant has shown that no built development would occur over the southwestern side of the ridgeline, although building relatively close to the ridgeline in places would mean some buildings would project above it. I don't consider that this relationship would be unduly harmful visually and the key is that development does not spill down the slope away from the main village. In respect of refuse collection the applicant has revised the size of the turning head at 'Damson Road' and has shown tracking information for a large refuse vehicle

- 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.

- The revised section on the village centre, with no indicative scheme, had been approved by the Parish Council with some amendments.
- Action c/f - **CO** would approach the new 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.
- **CS** agreed to review the changes suggested by CK/DC and provide the necessary amendments to this section.

e. Transport.

- **CS/CT** had found an improved map of rights of way. It was agreed that this map would be included in the plan, and other important footpath links would be included as a list. **CT** would send **PW** a copy of the list to check.
- A written report of the helpful meeting with the airport had been agreed by all parties present, circulated to the project team, and included in the statement of consultation. **CS** would amend the transport section accordingly and **CT** would amend the housing section. **LB** would include items in the newsletter as agreed (next edition if possible).
- The amendments suggested by CK were discussed and it was agreed that **CS** would make the relevant amendments.

f. Infrastructure.

- **LB** had obtained information about sewage capacity and future projections but at this stage it was not for public release. She would continue to explore the information and seek permission to publish the data in connection with the NP. It was also suggested that she make the Borough Councillors aware.

- **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.
- It was agreed that the NP would be unable to include any specifics about a new Health Centre but should indicate the necessity, a preference for a village centre location, and some possible sites (which may or may not ever become available). **CO/CT**
- The meeting about schools had been productive, and a written report had been produced and was being agreed by all parties. The Local Authority wished to obtain community views via the Parish Council as the preferred options for locating a third primary school. Action **CT/CO/LB** to take this to the council.

g. Housing.

- **CT** action c/f to redraft housing policies in light of the policy writing workshop and other input.
- **CO/CT** to draft a NP group response to the Heavens application.
- The Woodgate reserved matters had now been approved.
- Meetings with developers. Action **LB/CO** to continue to work on this
- Research NPs not allocating sites – action c/f **CT**
- Suggestions that something be added about green building elements such as solar power, and about self build developments. **CT**

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

- a. Stanford Hall. **JT** continues to work to influence the traffic situation.
- b. BfL workshop –Monday 12 May – Action **CO** to resend details to all confirmed and potential participants.
- c. Research into NPs not allocating housing sites action c/f (**ABe/CO/CT**)

6. Meeting Reports etc

- a. Community Plan launch on 26 April had gone well, although there were not a huge number of volunteers forthcoming. The brochure and action plan would be printed and distributed shortly.
- b. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – nothing further to report.
- c. **CT** reported on the RBC Town and Parish Forum which had been on planning. The importance of the BfL standards had been mentioned several times. Several villages/towns are starting to think about NPs. Ratcliffe on Trent PC had made contact – they are just starting their NP.
- d. Noted that the PC had submitted a response to the government consultation on the operation of the NPPF

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

CT, 7-May-14