

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team

Minutes of Meeting held on Thursday 5th February, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Neil Bettinson, John Dickens, Jenny Kirkwood, Julie Love, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren, Mark Wall (part)

Apologies: David Berryman, Gary Grayston, Phil Marshall, Gemma Rhodes, Chris Saffell

1. Minutes of the meeting of 8 January
These were accepted as a true record.
2. Matters arising/actions from meeting of 8 January, not otherwise on the agenda:
 - a. A letter template for project team members to use had been circulated. A second template had been produced, bearing the Parish Council crest, and was awaiting approval by the Management Committee. **(CO/LB)**
 - b. List of contacts from database – action carried forward **(PM)**
 - c. Newsletter article for Sutton Bonnington – action carried forward **(CO)**
 - d. A funding application had been made to the Department of Communities and Government and news is awaited. This should make £5000 available to RBC to assist with the East Leake NP initially, with further payments for later stages. See <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-cash-backing-more-communities-to-put-neighbourhood-plans-together> **(PM)**
 - e. The County Councillor had been asked for a grant and this seemed likely to happen. **(LB)**
 - f. Follow up how S106 money has been spent. Action carried forward. **(PM)**
3. Meeting Reports etc
 - a. CO reported on a meeting with Rempstone PC on 21 January. They do regard East Leake as one of their service centres, also Loughborough. They do not have a newsletter as such but PC agendas are delivered to every household. CO gave them the web address of the NP web page.
 - b. It was agreed that the Clerk would follow up the request to meet with West Leake and Stanford Parish Councils in about a month's time. **(LB)**
 - c. CT reported on the exploratory meeting prior to examination of the RBC Core Strategy on 31 January, which she had attended. The inspector has concerns on several counts and does not feel it can go forward to examination until these have been addressed, so there now will be a delay while she and RBC considers the options. The biggest problem is the overall number of houses Rushcliffe is proposing, and the disagreement with the other Nottingham councils on this. Other issues are the green belt, the timescale of the plan, and the extent to which RBC's proposals to disperse housing into larger villages addresses the actual need for housing adjacent to the urban area of Nottingham. It was noted that Gotham, Barton and Thrumpton PCs have got together to employ a consultant to help them oppose the development south of Clifton.

Discussion centred on the effect the delay to the Core Strategy would have on the East Leake NP. This cannot be submitted for examination until the Core Strategy is in place, but this is no reason to delay drafting of the NP as planned during the period while the Core Strategy is still under consideration, so long as any changes to the Core Strategy are tracked and reflected in the NP. In the absence of the Core Strategy, if East Leake housing developments are rejected by RBC they are more likely to be allowed at appeal. It was noted that this scenario can minimise the S106 funding gain available for village improvements.
 - d. The Community Plan Group is holding an action planning day on 23 March. This will include action planning on the "housing and planning" topic, which will need to tie in with the NP. **(GG, CT, CO)**
 - e. LB has written to the Stanford Hall developers to request a meeting, stressing that the discussion would be broader than just a response to the plans, and that the NP project was supportive of the development, wishing to share the vision and ensure that the NP reflects the opportunities presented. **(LB)**

- f. British Gypsum has confirmed that Kirsty Greggs is the main contact for this. LB will contact her to set up an exploratory meeting. Items to cover will include future plans of British Gypsum, areas where mineral deposits mean that housing development should not take place, views of employees as “users” of East Leake facilities, potential for other employment developments on or adjacent to the BG site. **(LB)**

4. Draft vision public consultation

CT reported that design/print of the vision statement had been to quotes and the cheapest chosen. LB was progressing this with the printers. When available it will be distributed with the PC newsletter to all residents, also to businesses, employers, Health Centre, shops, schools, churches, other Parish Councils, public spaces in neighbouring parishes etc. **(CT)**

5. Progress reports from Sub Projects.

- a. Consultation and Communication. **CT** reported that the main activity at present was the consultation on the draft vision. Meetings with groups such as schools, sure start centre, history groups, churches, and young people were suggested, and JK and NB offered to help facilitate these.
- b. Business/Employment. **JL** offered to work on this, though preferably not alone. It was suggested that she approach **GG** who may wish to be involved also.
- c. History. The Local History Group had been consulted earlier on the vision, but there had been no response. **CO** agreed to contact them again, perhaps to set up a meeting, or to enlist assistance from one of their members. It was noted that “farmers” (perhaps more accurately “farmers/landowners” had been included as consultees under this topic (re agricultural heritage) but their interests also crossed into employment/business and probably other areas. **JL/CO** offered to set up a focus group meeting to get their views, possibly enlisting the help of Cllr Richard Jenks.
- d. Green areas and rural “feel”. **CO** reported that he had not yet started work on this.
- e. Village Centre. **LB** agreed to work on this sub-project as it is closely connected with her Parish Clerk role.
- f. Transport. **CS and PW** had met twice and notes had been circulated to the group. Review of other NPs suggests that generally they are confined to a few broad policy statements about transport. They had agreed to draft few (3 /4?) policy statements for the Project Team to consider at March meeting, noting that these could be around:
 - requirements relating to pedestrian links within developments and village
 - desired cycle routes
 - aspirations relating to public transport
 - parking in village
- g. Infrastructure. **JD** reported that he had not yet started work on this.
- h. Housing. **CT** had visited both village estate agents and arranged a meeting with one to discuss their perspective of housing need. Meetings with private letting agencies (e.g. Belvoir Homes) and housing associations were suggested. There was some discussion about the meaning of the term “affordable” and **CT** agreed to circulate RBC’s definition that she had received from the Keyworth group.

6. Meetings with Developers.

A member of the Project Team had suggested that meetings with developers may be the best way to ensure that developments really do meet the “Building For Life” criteria, and it would be better to offer suggestions at the start rather than react to proposals submitted. It was noted that the PC’s planning policy does not permit interaction before plans are submitted. It was suggested that discussions with developers in between the outline and full planning application stages might be a way forward, and that the planning policy should perhaps differentiate between the two situations.

The importance of consistency was noted. It was agreed that this would be referred to the Planning Committee. **(CO/LB)**

7. Woodgate Development response.

The draft was discussed and some minor changes agreed. **CT** would edit and submit.

8. AOB

- a. Mark Wall, a local resident, was introduced and agreed that he would join the Project Team. He would look at the remits of the sub projects and decide where he could make a contribution to the work. **(MW)**
- b. LB gave out details of a free one day workshop on Neighbourhood Planning on 26 February at Rutland CC Offices. Travel expenses would be available. Anyone interested was advised to contact LB. **(All)**
- c. LB had a copy of a guide to NP by CPRE, if anyone would like to borrow it. [NB also available on line - see <http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/planning/item/2689-how-to-shape-where-you-live-a-guide-to-neighbourhood-planning>]

9. Date of Next meeting: **Tuesday 5th March, 7pm at the Parish Office**

CT, 12-Feb-13