

## Gotham Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee

### Notes of Meeting held 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018

#### At 34 Leake Road Gotham

Present;	Members	John Anderson (Chairman)	Ken Mafham
		David Power	Alan James
		Simon Horner	Martin Raven
	In attendance	Rex Walker (Cllr. RBC)	Louis McCauley

1. **Apologies:** Andrew Howard, Paula Barnes, Hazel Trobridge, Jane Youatt. Absent: David Neal. Acceptance of apologies proposed by Martin Raven, seconded Alan James, all agreed.
2. **Declaration of interest:** As previous.
3. **Minutes of the last meeting:** The minutes of the meeting held 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 were approved (proposed Simon Horner, seconded Alan James). There were no matters arising.
4. **Financial Report:** From the funded budget of £5,500, there is a balance remaining of £1530.33 which comprises £500 for professional advice, an overspend of £96.68 on the biodiversity report, £800 for village hall consultation, £127.01 for leaflets and posters, £200 for publicity. In addition, there is approximately £1,300 grant from GPC available to the committee.
5. **SEA Determination Statement.** The Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to Rushcliffe BC 27<sup>th</sup> June. RBC are in no rush to progress the Plan as it is not in their interest to do so. John Anderson and Ken Mafham attended at RBC on 8<sup>th</sup> October to discuss feedback on the process and were advised all criteria had been met except for the sustainability analysis. An assessment had to be made as to whether this was required. Historic England had indicated a SEA was necessary, The Environment Agency and Natural England who had to be consulted on this had responded that they considered it was not required. Ken Mafham had prepared a statement which would hopefully satisfy the outstanding requirement and this had been submitted to RBC this week. The document to be added to the background papers for GNP.  
RBC expect to start the 6-week consultation period 26<sup>th</sup> October ending 7<sup>th</sup> December after which the Examiner will be appointed and papers sent to him/her before Christmas. RBC would be limited in their time as their own Local Plan Public Inquiry would be held then. There was concern at the time delay. Any comments received during the consultation period will be copied to us; we cannot respond to them but submit comments ourselves which may answer any adverse comments. After the Examiners report is received, RBC have 5 weeks to assess the report, then the referendum must take place. The RBC meetings to approve this are only held in March, June, September and December but this could be affected by the Borough elections held in May.  
GPC should be asked to write to RBC stating they are fully in agreement with the GNP.  
There is the possibility an outline application on GOT5A could preempt the position and there was concern that, if approved there is the potential that we could find the RBC Local Plan and the GNP could result in all developments being approved. We need to decide with GPC as to whether our position is that there should be no other development to ensure the examiner is aware of this being our preferred stance to show that it has been considered. Local opinion ought to have some influence. John to draft a letter for GPC and Rex will arrange a meeting with the planning officer Mr. Mapletoft to try to ascertain why he prefers GOT5A against all apparent logic.

## 6. Progress on Potential Housing Sites.

GOT01. It is understood the owner will now support development on this site and will consult with adjacent owners whose land may be added. The Environmental Survey cannot be published in the present form as it contains sensitive material relating to protected species which cannot go into the public domain. Agreed John to resolve this with the authors in the most appropriate manner. This site will now be for market housing, not social housing, which had not been appreciated by the owner's advisors who had been hoping for a trade-off for employment land which is not unlikely.

GOT03. As for GOT01

RBL Site. RBC have advised the applicant to withdraw the present application which is likely to be refused and submit a new, revised plan to address concerns. There has been no response to date. Ken Mafham to approach RBC to discuss him preparing a design brief for consultation in the village before any new application is submitted.

GOT09. Awaiting response on design brief.

GOT12. Planning application ongoing.

## 7. Policies – recommendation to GPC for implementation. It was agreed that a 'wish list' needed to progress policies identified to enhance the village, its environment and facilities. The following subjects were suggested;

Footpaths. A new footpath from Glebe Farm access road along the Eastern side of the village to link up with the existing path from Moor Lane to Fairham Brook. Kevin Thorpe has agreed to establish the Notts CC procedure, so this can be progressed.

Biodiversity. Green Spaces. Most of these are the responsibility of Notts CC.

Generic Design Brief for new developments. Ken Mafham advised these could only be site specific.

Traffic. The traffic survey should be updated to reflect any changes following further developments in East Leake. Rex Walker had opened a petition for a further speed indicator sign on Leake Road near Hill Road. If petition successful NCC could monitor traffic speed to determine need.

Cycle track from Clifton. The petition set up by John Anderson had attracted 360 responses and had been sent on to both the County Council and the former Borough Council, but nothing had been heard since. It therefore needs promoting.

Village Centre and Community Facilities. Need to determine what the village wanted. This could include possible new uses for the Church Hall, the future of which was under consideration by the church.

GPC to be recommended that we should organize an open meeting for the village for ideas from anyone interested.

**Next Meeting:** The date for the next meeting was agreed for 7pm Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018, venue to be advised.

DBP/22Oct18