

**East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 3 September, 7pm Parish Council Offices**

Present: Lesley Bancroft, Neil Bettison, Greg Hewitt, Phil Marshall, Chris Saffell, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman

Apologies: Gary Grayston, Jenny Kirkwood, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Pete Warren

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. CT reported that she had contacted Andrew Brown our new County Councillor giving information about the Neighbourhood Plan Project.
- b. Business/Employment. **JL** was not present to report. Actions to report back to retailers from July meeting c/f.
- c. History. **MW** was not present to report.
- d. Green areas and rural "feel". **CO** was not present to report. Actions c/f to to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**
- e. Village Centre. A report by FB of the meeting between LB, FB and Paul Hiller of NCC had been circulated in advance of the meeting. LB reported further that PH thought it highly unlikely that a by-pass scheme could be progressed in the near future, however he had offered to prepare some plans for a workable scheme for the village centre at no cost. CS asked if he would discuss this with highway engineers as any narrowing of the dual carriageway would need their input.

PH was not in favour of a shared space scheme for this area. CS commented that he had recently seen and been impressed with a shared space scheme at Southend on Sea.

PH is the contact at NCC responsible for S106 contributions for footpaths etc, and LB had furnished him with the Parish Council's latest list.

It was agreed that **LB** would email PH to indicate that the project team would very much like him to prepare plans as offered. It was noted that an alternative proposal might emerge through consultancy under the Locality grant/direct support (see below), and it was thought helpful to have more than one viewpoint.

LB reported Parish Council progress on other matters relevant to the Village Centre: rebuilding the toilets under way; extending the Gotham Road car park being discussed with RBC; liaison with Co-op over parking limit and connecting footpath.

f. Transport.

The process for seeking developer contributions to establish, pump-prime, and subsidise new transport services had been clarified – all potential transport related S106 contributions should be raised via Paul Hiller.

**CS** had received one acknowledgement but no replies to his letters to relevant agencies to consult on draft vision and strategic transport thinking for East Leake. It was agreed that he would follow up, copying in Andy Brown (our County Councillor) to the NCC correspondence.

g. Infrastructure.

The Parish Council's attempt to influence the S106 agreements for developments currently under way had received a somewhat unhelpful response from Andrew Pegram at RBC, probably due to crossed wires about procedures, and a meeting was being set up with AP to progress this further. Actions: **LB** to set up meeting and ask for copies of the relevant RBC procedures; **PM** to brief AP independently if the opportunity arises.

The proposal for registering the Bulls Head site as an asset of community value had been sent to RBC, but no response received. *[Post meeting note – the Parish Council has now received acknowledgement and a 28 day consultation period is in progress.]*

There was discussion about the inadequacies of the current Health Centre, but no news about the project to replace it. It was agreed that **CO** would be asked for a progress report for the next meeting and that **CT/CO** would draft a response to the NCC Health and Well Being consultation, stating the village's concern about the Health Centre.

- h. Housing. CT had revised the draft policies further and circulated them. **PM** offered to look at the document in detail before the next meeting, and all agreed this would be helpful. There was a further inconclusive discussion about a maximum number of new homes, and one promising avenue of thought was to state what infrastructure improvements were needed before further homes over a certain number were approved. **All** to check document further and circulate their comments.

It was noted that the Lantern Lane outline application had been approved by RBC. A response had been submitted on behalf of the team to the consultation on the Field End Close application. The Parish Council's planning policy had been changed so that dialogue with developers is now permitted between outline and full applications, and the Parish Council would be taking this forward with relevant developers at this time.

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

- a. Newsletter article for Sutton Bonington – action carried forward (**CO**)
- b. S106 money in respect of the most recent housing development down Gotham Road:
  - NB had inquired about the £300k for schools and would seek further information. (Action **NB**)
- c. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. (**PM**)
- d. Stanford Hall. LB had raised the transport related concerns with the contact given at NCC (Paul Ghattory) to no effect. **JT** continues to work on this, and will report back. The County Councillor is also engaged.
- e. **LB** would also contact James Locke with a copy of the Stanford Hall meeting report so that this can be agreed and included in our evidence. (action c/f)

4. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The joint meeting between the NP Project Team and the Community Plan Group had resolved issues about overlap between the two plans, and the minutes had been circulated to both groups.
- b. Meeting with British Gypsum - KG has left British Gypsum and **LB** would make contact with the replacement.
- c. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – The Parish Council responses to the consultation had been circulated to the Project Team. **PM** reported that there had been over 1200 responses, and that these were being summarized. The revised Core Strategy would go before RBC at a special meeting on 31 October, for a decision on whether or not to submit the revised document to the planning inspector. Technical work associated with the revision is ongoing, including an update of the SHLAA (which includes an additional development site in East Leake).

- d. **JT** had attended the meeting with DCLG planners on 16 July and his report had been circulated, along with a booklet from Locality. The examples of Neighbourhood Plans discussed at the meeting were not very relevant to East Leake. PM commented that the [Tattenhall Plan](#) was more similar to our situation, and **all** were asked to take a look.
5. Bidding for grant funding (up to £7000) and/or direct support from Locality etc. CT reported that the bid had been submitted and that she had been contacted to discuss the submission. A summary of the bid had been circulated to the Project Team.
6. AOB – GH reported that project funding was available to local villages from the A453 development. *[Post meeting note – GH reports that East Leake is not eligible after all.]*
7. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday the month, 7pm at the Parish Office.

CT, 13-Sep-13