

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

Minutes of Meeting held on Thursday 29th November, 7.00pm at Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, David Berryman, Neil Bettinson, John Dickens, Gary Grayston, Jenny Kirkwood, Julie Love, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey (arrived late), Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr Pete Warren
Apologies: Gemma Rhodes, Cllr John Thurman, Chris Saffell

1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves as there were new members.

2. Terms of reference

- (a) A change in the number of "ordinary" project team members from 5 to 6 was agreed. A change to the role of the NCC representative was agreed, deleting "Accesses NCC planning information etc as required."
- (b) There is still a need for somebody to assume the role of Secretary, but none present volunteered.
- (c) A discussion was held about how members declared an interest, and the code of conduct for councillors was discussed as an example framework. It was agreed that there would be an agenda item at the start of every meeting for members to declare an interest, and they could also do this during the meeting if a situation arose where it became relevant.
- (d) As a general rule meetings of Parish Council working parties are not open to the public, and it was agreed that this should be the case with the Project Team, the point at which the public can formally get involved being the ELPC Management Committee to which the Project Team reports. However any request for attendance would be dealt with as an individual case, and where appropriate invitations issued, and relevant agenda items included.
- (e) It was agreed to **recommend** to the Parish Council that minutes of the project team would be circulated by email to the project team for correction after each meeting, then passed to the next available ELPC Management Committee for acceptance/comment before publication on the Web site. **Action CO** to raise with ELPC Management Committee.

3. Minutes of the meeting of 11 October

These were accepted as a true record.

4. Matters arising/actions not otherwise on the Agenda

- (a) A follow-up meeting with Keyworth's Neighbourhood Plan Group had been arranged – Wed 12 December at 10:00am in the Feignies Room at Keyworth Village Hall. Any members of the team wishing to attend should inform CT. PM reported that a volunteer/part-time member of staff was assisting the Keyworth group with data analysis.
- (b) A brief article had been written for the ELPC newsletter and circulated to the team. Publication of the newsletter was imminent.
- (c) With assistance from Paul Cooper and Sue Lewis, a Web page had been set up to gather relevant information for the project. A few minor modifications were outstanding. See <http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/east-leake-neighbourhood-plan>. All were invited to comment on further information required etc - **Action All**. DB had some ideas from the Keyworth page that could usefully be added and would let CT have the details – **Action DB**.

5. Consultation with Neighbouring Parish Councils

(a) Gotham

CO and CT had visited Gotham Parish council on 30 October 2012 to explain the Neighbourhood Plan project. They were content with East Leake's Neighbourhood Area, and suggested that if they were to produce a NP of their own in the future it would also probably just cover their own Parish area, possibly taking in Thrumpton and Barton. They offered to include an article in their newsletter soliciting views of Gotham residents on the facilities in East Leake that they use. The copy has been supplied and the newsletter recently published.

(b) Costock

CT had visited Costock Parish Council on 21 November 2012 for a similar purpose. They see themselves very much as users of the East Leake facilities with a stake in plans for future development. CT described the survey being done by the Community Plan Group and handed round a copy of the form. They asked

if the survey could be extended to neighbouring parishes, and CT agreed to raise this with the Community Plan Group. **Action CT/GG**

Specific issues mentioned:

- Concerns about capacity of Health Centre and schools.
- Concern about state of the Health Centre building, and wanting information about future plans.
- Removal of banks has reduced viability of East Leake as a “hub” and impacted other businesses. As people no longer go to EL for banking, they don’t use the other shops.
- The need for parking provision to keep pace with housing developments. As more housing is built further from the centre, more residents will drive in rather than carry heavy shopping bags home, and need to park.
- Request for a proper path between the co-op and Health Centre car parks. They suggested that lighting would reduce potential crime problems (e.g. escaping shoplifters).

Following the meeting CT had supplied copy for their website/any future newsletter requesting views of Costock residents on facilities in East Leake.

(c) Other

CO was visiting Bunny that evening and would report back in due course. Visits were scheduled to Sutton Bonnington (CO, 7 Jan), Rempstone (CO, 21 Jan).

6. Progress Reports from RBC

- (a) Adoption of the Neighbourhood area – PM reported that there had been no responses to the consultation, and that a decision would be made at the Cabinet Meeting on 4 December.
- (b) Funding – PM reported that an additional tranche of money was being made available by government, with the next closing date for applications being 8 January. The Borough Council could apply for £30,000, and they would administer the fund. Payments are made in two stages - the first, of £5,000, once a neighbourhood area has been designated. The second payment of £25,000 is made on the successful completion of the independent examination, to help cover the costs of referendum etc. PM also reported that a single national body (or possibly two) to assist NP groups from April 2013 was being selected. **Action PM** to prepare funding application and submit by the 8 Jan deadline.

7. Evidence Review

- (a) PM/GR had prepared a very helpful summary of relevant RBC and other material, circulated electronically earlier that day, and paper copies were tabled at the meeting. This included:
- Summaries and links to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which includes 11 sites around East Leake that could be suitable for development, with two further sites submitted to RBC since the last assessment.
 - Affordable Housing Viability Assessment, giving further explanation of targets for delivery of affordable housing. (Targets are 30% for Ruschcliffe overall, and 25% for Leake.)
 - Sustainable Locations for Growth Study, examining the level of accessibility of existing settlements and potential for further growth.
 - Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham – this concludes that when compared to other settlements across Greater Nottingham, East Leake is ranked 13th out of 98 in terms of accessibility to education, retail, health, employment and community facilities.
 - Interim Infrastructure Delivery Plan, providing detail on the likely infrastructure requirements for areas identified for growth, including East Leake.
 - Housing Strategy
 - Open Space Audit
 - East Leake Parish Profile
 - Ward Profiles
 - Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, which provides a greater understanding of what makes the landscape within Greater Nottingham special. Relevant extracts included for Nottinghamshire Wolds regional character areas: NW01 Gotham and West Leake Hills and Scarps, and NW02 East Leake Rolling Farmland.
 - Conservation Area Management Plan and townscape appraisal

PM and GR were warmly thanked for this contribution, which has honed in on information relevant to East Leake from a huge body of paperwork. All were asked to study the extracts and links in the documents, for further questions, discussion etc at the next meeting. **Action All**

PM noted that Section 106 contributions from developers were at the level of £7000 per dwelling. There has to be evidence that the money is needed for purposes arising directly from the development in question. Following a discussion about infrastructure requirements, PM undertook to provide further information about contributions for new housing in East Leake received by RBC in recent years, and how funds received had been allocated. **Action PM**

PM noted that Section 106 funding was being scaled back to be replaced by Community Infrastructure Levy, which goes into an accumulated fund to finance infrastructure projects across the Borough. CIL charges are expressed in terms of £ per m², and may be set at differential rates. A new homes bonus is also being introduced.

- (b) CO had reviewed the 2004 Parish Plan. Most items contained within it are being progressed, have timed out, or are already on the NP agenda, but he noted that the plan had included a proposal to pull together Health Centre, Library, Parish Office etc into a community centre making it a real hub for the community. This would be revisited.
- (c) NB had nothing specific to report from current NCC plans etc, but would keep as watching brief as these were reviewed. He had circulated the new NCC strategy to the group previously. He noted that it was important to get roads in new developments adopted as soon as possible, and that this could be problematic. Crime assessments were carried out when new developments were at the planning stage. He recommended that the team use their County Councillor as a resource, as she can assist where he cannot. It was agreed that the group would write to Lynn Sykes, enclosing the draft vision, and informing her of the project. **Action CO**
- (d) CO reported that he had been unable as yet to find any relevant written plans etc from the Health Authority, but would continue his research. **Action CO**
- (e) LB reported that she had written to the Airport, Stanford Hall contacts, and the drainage board for the area (now Severn Trent, was Kingston Brook). There had been no response. Little activity is evident from the Stanford Hall Project after the consultation last summer. Their website is at <http://www.stanfordhallredevelopment.org.uk/>.
- (f) DB had no specific evidence sources to refer to re transport. PM noted that highway modelling work by RBC is under way. Buses, tram extension, and widening of the A453 were all items that needed to be tracked. **Action DB** to continue research.
- (g) There was a discussion about further work to be undertaken, and a suggestion made that the National Planning Framework be reviewed. **Action not assigned**, but it was noted that the ELNP has to conform to the RBC core strategy which in turn has to conform to the National planning framework.

8. Consultation with Business

- (a) A business forum has been set up in East Leake, and the second meeting is to take place on 13 December. The group discussed how consultation about the NP should be approached with this forum and it was agreed that the approach should be largely introductory and informal, to get a feel for the group. The draft vision would be made available and informal discussions initiated if appropriate about the needs of business. **Action CT** to contact Matt Youdale.
- (b) Various options for initiating consultation with British Gypsum were discussed, and it was agreed that contact would be made initially via Derek Haydon of RBC who would know who to speak to at BG. **Action LB**

9. Brainstorm – moving from vision to policies.

This item was a discussion about how to move from aspirations in the draft vision to specific planning policies in the NP, analogous to those derived in the Upper Eden Neighbourhood Plan. Some ideas were forthcoming, but on the whole the group did not feel that the research and consultation had progressed to the stage where work could be undertaken on this. It was agreed that CT/CO would meet to flesh out the project plan, involving JK/NB if available. **Action CT** to arrange meeting.

DB volunteered to contribute some draft ideas in writing. **Action DB**

It was suggested that each of the areas of the vision be considered in turn at successive meetings, but that the next meeting should focus on reviewing the results of the Community Plan Group's survey. **Action CT** to consult re dates for next meeting.

10. Consultation responses

Responses to consultations on Lantern Lane and Kirk Ley outline planning permission proposals had been submitted on behalf of the group, after discussion by email. The responses describe the current NP progress, and assess each proposal against the "Building for Life" criteria. A response would be prepared for the Meeting House Close proposals (deadline 11 December), using the same format. **Action All to consider and contribute views, CO/CT to draft and circulate.**

It was noted that wording would be included on future responses to clarify the relationship between the NP Project Team's response and the Parish Council's response. **Action CO/CT**

A question was raised whether Parish Councillors participating in the NP Project team response carried dangers of predisposition, if finalised before the Parish Council's response. **Action LB** to check with the Monitoring Officer at RBC.

11. Date of Next meeting – to be arranged.

CT, 30-Nov-12