

**East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on Wednesday 4 Jun 2014, 7pm Parish Council Offices**

Present: Gary Grayston, Julie Love, Clive Keble, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman

Apologies or not present: Lesley Bancroft, Andrew Brown, Matthew Kemp, Phil Marshall, Chris Saffell, Cllr Pete Warren

1. Membership

JK has indicated that due to Rushcliffe work demands she is not able to attend meetings, but is happy to advise on community consultation as needed.

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)**

There had been some confusion about contact between CO and DC and it was agreed that **CO** would resend the request.

3. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- The Annual Parish Meeting on 21 May included a presentation and display about the NP. Drafts of three sections of the NP and consultation forms had been handed out. The meeting had been widely advertised. There were 17 members of the public present.
- The latest draft of the NP at the time will go to the PC meeting on 24 June for their approval. Hopefully the draft will be almost complete by then and already circulated to the NP Project team. (Note pressure on time – **All**)
- Next would be consultation on the draft with key stakeholders. **CT/CK/PM/JK** to assemble the list of consultees. CK advised that RBC and NCC in particular should have early sight of the plan.
- Public consultation would follow. Some discussion about the form this would take. Envisaging a folded colour leaflet (A4 or A5 size) with summary of the policies in understandable form plus an insert or tear off sheet of consultation questions. (NB problem of inserts falling out needs to be considered). **CK** to send **CT** an example to aid with the drafting. Leaflet drop to every house. Community organisations and businesses to be consulted using the same leaflet/form. **CT** to draw up a list from organisations contacted for the vision consultation. An event of some sort should also be considered. The full plan will be on the website for those who wish to study it in more detail. (**GG** to check that this displays correctly on different devices.)

b. Business/Employment (Now Section 3).

- **Action LB** c/f - to write to owners of shops (i.e. landlords).
- JL/CT had met to agree edits to the section and had met with HB of BG who had subsequently sent written suggestions for changes. These and CK comments had been done – all agreed with the changes.
- **CT** to send HB a copy of the edited section in due course
- Agreed that policy E1 would include use class A4 (**CT** to action)
- A survey of business units in the designated village centre area, categorised by use class, would be undertaken, to document the overall provision at this point in time and demonstrate that the vacancy rate is zero or low. **Action ??**
- **JL** pursuing case studies from businesses that have had difficulty finding premises.
- Neighbourhood statistics could provide a picture of the home employment sector (and possibly data relevant to other sections). **CK** to seek a volunteer to research this source and produce a profile.
- Agreed to edit policy E3 – development could be other than to increase employment (**CT**)

c. Green Environment/Constraints Map (Now Section 6)

- **CO** would focus on the landscape character analysis, view, constraints map etc, possibly with assistance from DC (see above). Discussed option of using remaining consultancy money to take this forward. **CT** to check budget. **CO/CK** to produce brief for consultant.
  - **CT** would pull the draft text into the document and work on the justification. Include cross reference to the footpaths section.
  - Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. (**CO** – once the draft is available)
- d. Village Centre. (Now section 9)
- Changes made by CS/CT following various input were agreed.
  - **CT** to reword Policy V1 “presumption in favour”
  - 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.
- e. Transport. (Now Section 4)
- Changes made by CS/CT following various inputs were agreed.
  - **CK** to research precedents for the policy to avoid future lack of connectivity of housing sites (or ransom strips) - 4.1.12 and last sentence of policy T2
- f. Infrastructure. (Now Section 5)
- Still need evidence we can quote re sewage capacity. Progress this via **JT/RH/LB**.
  - **CO/RH** have produced some evidence re Heath Centre Capacity – more needed.
  - Agreed to invite the CCG to a meeting to discuss NP/Health Centre. Action **CO**
  - Follow up meeting between ABr and EL Health Centre – Action **CO**
  - Data from LA about schools still awaited. **CT** to follow up.
- g. Housing. (Now Section 2)
- Changes made by CT following various inputs were agreed.
  - Research NPs that include phasing of housing and other justification for this **CK**
  - Agreed to move 2.5 (market housing) before affordable **CT**
  - Split H5 into 2 policies and enlarge comments about design. Link importance of BfL to other sections of plan (vision, objectives etc) **CT**
  - Agreed after discussion to use walking distance of 1.25km in 2.7.2 and policy H6. This takes in most of the sites currently going through planning, although not all the sites shown in the SHLAA. It provides more than enough sites for the Core Strategy target number of houses. It corresponds approximately with the furthest existing housing (Top of Woodgate and Rushcliffe Grove). Agreed to include this as text only rather than include a map showing walking distances.
  - Paragraph is needed to ensure that it is understood that this is only one constraint – i.e. it doesn't imply the plan favours building all the way to Costock.
  - **CK** to research other NPs that use walking distance/compactness as a selection criterion for sites.
  - Rewording of H6 (c) and 2.7.3 agreed to remove an actual distance. **CT** to action
  - **CK** to research justification /precedents for including policies about coalescence
  - H6(e) – CK advised getting specific advice on wording about 100 year flood line from Borough, County, Severn Trent and Env Agency. **CT**
  - Meetings with developers. Lantern Lane had taken place. Costock Road scheduled for 17 June.
  - Response to Heavens had been sent in from the Project. Decided against sending another response re Lantern Lane due to pressure of time as the PC response had covered it.
- h. Other sections
- Include statement about regular/periodic review of plan. **CT**

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

- a. **CK** to move forward the documents that need to be submitted alongside the plan - Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Basic Conditions Statement (BCS), and any others. (The Consultation statement and the Plan itself are in progress by the project team.)

5. Meeting Reports etc

- a. Community Plan brochure and action plan have now been distributed – copies given to CK.
- b. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – examination scheduled for July. Consultation under way. Parish Council representation had been submitted.
- c. Letter from a resident had been passed on by LB – **CT** to consider response.

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

CT, 6-Jun-14