

East Leake Neighbourhood Project Team
Minutes of Meeting held on Tuesday 1 October 2013, 7pm Parish Council Offices

Present: Neil Bettison, Greg Hewitt, Julie Love, Phil Marshall, Cllr Conrad Oatey, Cllr Carys Thomas, Cllr John Thurman, Cllr Pete Warren

Apologies: Lesley Bancroft, Fred Briggs, Gary Grayston, Chris Saffell

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. **CO** reported that Andrew Brown (County Councillor) was planning to come to the November NP meeting.

b. Business/Employment. **JL** now has the feedback from businesses and will shortly write up the results.

c. History. **MW** was not present to report.

d. Green areas and rural "feel". **CO** undertook to draft this section for the next meeting. Actions c/f to get together the farmers/landowners group and consult Friends of Meadow Park. **(CO)**

e. Village Centre.
Action c/f **LB** would email PH to indicate that the project team would like him to prepare plans as offered.

f. Transport.

CS had forwarded to the project team the replies from Nottingham City Transport and Notts County Council. No projections/modelling have taken place of how the tram service would affect the No 1 service. There were no plans to change the No 1 at this time.

PM commented that some enhancement/alteration to the No 1 could emerge via developer contributions from the development between Clifton and Gotham.

The group then discussed the draft transport policies, and **CT/PW** undertook to feed back the discussion to **CS** for redrafting.

g. Infrastructure.

A group of Councillors and the clerk had met with AP of RBC to discuss influencing the content of the S106 agreements, and he had taken away some issues to explore further.

The proposal for registering the Bulls Head is in the consultation period.

The meeting about the new Health Centre is taking place next week, and **CO** will report at the next meeting.

CT had responded to the NCC Health and Wellbeing consultation on behalf of the project team, emphasizing the concern in the village about the state and capacity of the Health Centre.

It was agreed that a meeting should be set up to bottom the drainage/sewage requirement, as housing developments were not currently planning to contribute to increasing the capacity and the relevant authorities do not seem to be pressing for it. Action **CO**

h. Housing.

There was further discussion of the draft housing policies.

Actions: **CT** to redraft in the light of comments

PM to look at the document again, come up with suggestions for Policy H2 (phasing), and formalising wording in other areas.

The latest Costock Road consultation was noted, and it was agreed that CO/CT would draft a response to the planning application in due course. The consultation flyer does not state how many houses are proposed. We are now at the stage where outline planning permission has already been granted for more than the 400 additional homes that RBC believes the infrastructure can support – it has not been tested against a higher number.

Keyworth now has planning applications coming in, and it was agreed that a further meeting with them to compare notes would be useful. Action **CT**

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

- a. Newsletter article for Sutton Bonington – action deleted
- b. S106 money in respect of the most recent housing development down Gotham Road:
 - NB had not yet had a reply about the £300k for schools but would continue to ask. (Action **NB**)
- c. The PC has now amended its planning policy to allow discussions with developers between outline and full planning permission and the Planning Committee would shortly be agreeing how to take this forward.
- d. Actions outstanding to correct the links on the [RBC evidence review](#) and tidy it up ready for inclusion in NP submission documents. (**PM**)
- e. Stanford Hall. **JT** continues to work on this. There are signs of some progress being made with the horse crossing but no improvements for pedestrians or traffic. NB had suggested this as a topic for discussion at a meeting between the County and Borough Council Leaders, and suggested that **JT** follow up with Neil Clarke.
- f. **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)
- g. Those who had looked at the Tattenhall plan thought that it provided a useful steer in terms of content and format.

4. Meeting Reports etc

- a. The Community Plan Group is in the process of drafting the brochure and action plan. A photo competition is under way to provide photos for the brochure.
- b. Meeting with British Gypsum - KG has left British Gypsum and **LB** would make contact with the replacement. Action c/f
- c. Progress with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Revision – this has been deferred, but should be ready to take to the Council by mid December. Delay has been due to highway modelling of the effects of development in the A52 area, and the costing/funding of measures to mitigate the impact.

5. Bidding for grant funding (up to £7000) and/or direct support from Locality etc. CT reported that only £2050 had been awarded of the £7000 bid for, and that there was no money allocated for anyone to help write the plan. CO/CT had met with the person co-ordinating the direct support element, and this would be useful in terms of advice and pre submission check, but they could not help write the plan. It was agreed that **CT** would respond and ask for the rest of the money.

6. AOB – A large development is at the pre application stage in the Cotes area. 3000 houses are planned for Hathern.
7. Date of Next meeting: First Tuesday the month, 7pm at the Parish Office.

CT, 03-Oct-13