

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

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

Apologies or not present: Andrew Brown, Gary Grayston, Clive Keble, Matthew Kemp, 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. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

a. Consultation and Communication.

- The draft NP had been approved by the parish council at their meeting of 24 June. Comments were received from one councillor and an amendment was agreed to cover this (section 2.1.10).
- A “pre consultation” version to be produced for checking by RBC, NCC, ELCPG, PAE, and HB at BG to identify any major issues.
- Next would be formal consultation of key stakeholders. **CT** is assembling the list of consultees.
- Initial public consultation would take place at same time. **CT** to draft leaflet/questionnaire.
- 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.
- It was agreed that a drop in sessions would be advertised, probably in Sept, after the leaflet drop. The format would be members of the plan group available in the Parish Office, along with documentation etc, to answer questions and take comments. Agreed that this would need to be a daytime, evening, and Saturday.
- **CT** would update the project plan/schedule, particularly with respect to the consultation.

b. Business/Employment (Now Section 3).

- Changes agreed at previous meeting had been made.
- **LB** had sent previous version (3 sections) to shop owners and agents with invitation to comment. No responses.
- **CO** would undertake the survey of business units in the designated village centre area, categorised by use class, to document the overall provision at this point in time and demonstrate that the vacancy rate is zero or low. **LB** would send him the PC business list as a starting point.
- Case studies from businesses that have had difficulty finding premises had been received and added to the Statement of Consultation.
- **CK** had found a volunteer to research Neighbourhood statistics and produce a profile.

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

- Revisions to Section 6 to date were generally agreed, more work being needed.
- It was agreed that the policy to protect “ridges/views” would use statements from the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment as its primary justification, rather than undertaking a complete landscape character analysis. We would attempt to complete this work ourselves, using a consultant to advise on the completed work and finish it if necessary. This approach was thought more efficient than producing a brief for consultants to do the work. **CT** advised there is about £1700 left in the budget for consultants.
- The draft “ridges” document was considered and **CO** thanked for the work. It was agreed to make the ridges more prominent, and to use an up to date OS map. **Action CO to redraw**
- **CO** would draft the views analysis as a separate document.
- The “areas of importance for separation” draft map was discussed and various changes agreed. **CT** to action. Work to find precedents for this continues. The draft text in the policy, not intended to be rigidly restrictive or formal, was discussed and agreed. It was noted that consultation with landowners would be needed.

- Provision in the NPPF for Neighbourhood Plans to designate “local green spaces” was considered. (NPPF paras 76-78). A [briefing document](#) had been circulated before the meeting. It was agreed that this was worth including, though thought unlikely that the designation could be used to protect the “areas of importance for separation” as they do not fully meet the criteria. It was agreed that **CT** would redraft section 6.3 and **CS** would produce a map. The following areas were agreed for designation.
    - Meadow Park
    - Village Green
    - Townlands trust land from railway to road (triangle near gypsum)
    - Costock Rd Playing field
    - Burial ground
    - Allotments
    - Costock rd playing fields
    - The ridge and furrow fields at the back of Potters lane
    - The Oldershaw trust playing field at bottom of Meeting House Close
    - The Rest Garden
    - The Glebe
  - 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)
- Various changes had been made as agreed.
  - 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)
- Various changes had been made as agreed.
  - It was agreed that CT would reword 4.1.12 and last sentence of policy T2 “ransom strips” to add extending the highway to the boundary.
- f. Infrastructure. (Now Section 5)
- Still need evidence we can quote re sewage capacity. Agreed that **CO/CT** would meet to discuss.
  - **CO** was making progress with the evidence of harm to a dog from sewage flood.
  - **CO** to seek further evidence re Heath Centre Capacity and follow up the suggestion to invite the CCG to a meeting to discuss NP/Health Centre. Action **CO**
  - Data from LA about schools - **CT** had followed up and would nudge again.
- g. Housing. (Now Section 2)
- Various changes had been made as agreed.
  - Research NPs that include phasing of housing - ongoing **CK**
  - **CK** to research other NPs that use walking distance/compactness as a selection criterion – ongoing
  - **CK** to research justification /precedents for including policies about coalescence - ongoing
  - CT had adapted text from another NP for the policy re flood plain.
  - PC Planning Committee had met with Costock Road developers.
- h. Other sections
- Statement about regular/periodic review of plan had been Included. (1.7)
  - CK had offered a briefing on the other documents required, (Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Basic Conditions Statement (BCS), and any others) and CT had sent round an availability request to project team members potentially interested in assisting with this task. LB was interested also – **CT** to send her a request.

3. Meeting Reports etc

- a. Community Plan had not met.
- b. Rushcliffe Core Strategy examination had commenced – CT would attend some sessions.

4. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday of the month, 7pm at the Parish Office. NB No meeting in August – matters to be progressed by email.

CT, 3-Jul-14