

**Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council
Neighbourhood Plan Working Group**

**Minutes of the meeting held in the Radcliffe Room, The Grange on Thursday 28 January 2016,
at 7.00pm**

Present:

Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council Representatives Jacki Grice – Parish Clerk, Cllr Martin Culshaw– Chairman Planning and Environment Committee, Cllr Keith Agar – Vice Chairman Planning and Environment Committee

Rushcliffe Borough Council: Cllr Roger Upton (N.P Chairman)

Residents: Rod Brears, Sue Clegg, Josephine Spencer, Paul Spencer, Martin Ryder

Business Representative: David Eggleston

Parish Council Attendees: Cllrs Georgia Moore (Chairman),

Nottingham Trent University: – Paul Collins

Apologies:

Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council: Sally Horn,

Residents: Mark Shardlow, Mike Tomlinson, Maggie Holmes

Nottinghamshire County Council: Cllr Kay Cutts

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Phillip Marshall – Senior Planning Officer (Technical Advisor)

RCAN: Alex Raynor

1. Welcome

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting and advised that Alex Raynor of RCAN, will no longer be attending meetings unless needed for something in particular due to other work commitments. Phillip Marshall from RBC is also extremely busy with the Greenbelt Review Consultation which is expected to be launched this week and Cllr Kay Cutts is attending a Neighbourhood Watch meeting this evening.

2. Declarations of Interest

None received.

3. Approval of Minutes of Meeting held on 07 December 2015

It was **Resolved:** “that the minutes are approved and signed by the NP Chairman, Cllr Roger Upton.”

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Dewberry Hill Boundary maps to be supplied to BPUD re Policy 4.

5. Neighbourhood Plan – revision dated January 2016

The attached suggestions were raised (see Appendix 1) Cllr Upton would feedback comments to Bob Phillips at BPUD.

6. Proposed Extra Work – Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)

BPUD Consultants has had further meetings with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in January 2016, to discuss the proposed changes to the draft NP as a result of the public consultation. The LPA has asked for further work to be done in respect of policy 10 – the residential development strategy and for a “Strategic Environmental Assessment” (SEA) to be carried out. Our planning consultant has agreed this extra work with the LPA and submitted a fee quotation of £1,600 for its completion, including all necessary expenses and disbursements.

The government grant for the NP has now been spent and the costs for the extra work as detailed above and for submitting the draft NP to the Borough Council can be financed from the Parish Council’s NP 2015/16 budget allocation/

The Parish Council has sent to “Locality” (an agency that manages NP grants) all the required “evidences” that were asked for by the end of December 2015 to validate the £7,900 of government grant.

The extra work to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment will have an estimated impact of one month on the critical path timeline for delivery of the final draft NP to the Rushcliffe Borough Council in the spring of 2016.

It is now proposed that the final draft of the NP is “signed off” by the Parish Council at its full council meeting on 18th April 2016, with a referendum in September and adoption of the Plan in October 2016.

Resolved: “To recommend to Planning and Environment Committee to approve the additional fees of £1,600 to complete the Strategic Environment Assessment.”

7. **Date of Next Meeting**

Thursday 25 February 2016

The meeting ended at 8.35pm

Approved by:.....Date.....

Appendix 1

Suggestions from Steering Committee Meeting 28/01/16:

Page 9 – 2.4 – the use of the word “negative” is felt to be too “hard” or even “offensive”! Suggestion is to change this paragraph to read: “Some of the village centre has arguably poor architectural and building quality, especially an area to the south of the Main Road, where a shopping parade, surface car parks and the health centre are located, and there may be an opportunity to rejuvenate this area during the neighbourhood plan period to help improve the vitality and viability of the village centre.”

Page 17 – comment in margin about need to change growth areas, etc., on Rushcliffe Parish Framework Map is noted.

Page 18 – Several comments made about Radcliffe Village Framework diagram. Suggestion to simplify it by removing all housing shown outside of the boundary. Text that states “Route to South Nottinghamshire Academy, Radcliffe Junior School and Radcliffe Infant School” should be changed to “Route to South Nottinghamshire Academy and Radcliffe Junior School.” A new text of “Route to Radcliffe Infant School” should be shown against the right hand arrow pointing to the east. There was comment that this diagram does not show the exact boundaries on a plot by plot basis and therefore individual shops cannot be identified. I would argue that it is only an indicative diagram. An accurate plan of the village centre could be included as an appendix? I believe that a detailed plan of the Radcliffe Village Centre is to be included in the RBC impending public consultation on Local Plan Part 2 – Land & Planning Policies and perhaps Phil Marshall at the LPA can give you this?

Page 21 – Policy 1 – Village Centre First – line 4 – states “Outside of the Village Centre, applications which will result in over **500sq/m of retail space** will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that they meet the sequential and impact tests.” There was quite a lot of discussion on whether the 500sq/m was the right amount. It was compared to the size of the existing Co-oP and many of the committee felt that this was too large for a development outside of the village centre. There are major threats to Radcliffe Village Centre from supermarket developments at Bingham and West Bridgford and any development of the size of the current Co-oP outside of the village centre was considered to be a threat to the village centre. It would be appreciated if you would review this figure.

Page 24 – Policy 3: Main Road Regeneration Area. – The steering committee felt that this policy statement and the justification text both needed some text to emphasise the vision of creating a pedestrian friendly Main Road and that any regeneration of this area should try and route traffic away from the Main Road, i.e., to try and utilise the existing road to the Health Centre car park.

Page 25 – Policy 4: Local Green Space. –

Bullet point 3 – comment in margin about checking boundary with Cropwell Road. Confirmed that Dewberry Hill Nature Reserve does have a pedestrian access from Cropwell Road.

Comment made at steering committee meeting that Radcliffe Golf Club is not on the list. Suggested that as it is an “extensive tract of land” it is covered by another designation. Concern that public will not realise this and question why it is not listed. Could a note be included at the end of the list to comment about the Golf Club?

Page 28 – C – Transportation and Connectivity Policies –

5.13 –Introduction – the steering committee meeting had quite a long discussion about the first sentence “Radcliffe-on-Trent benefits from bus services, a railway station and a village which is readily walkable, however, there is still a heavy reliance

on the car.” The text “readily walkable” was considered to be potentially controversial to some of the community when they read the Neighbourhood Plan, especially if it is not “readily walkable” to them due a disability or whatever! The suggestion is to change “readily walkable” to “generally walkable to most residents”. The committee also suggested the following text be added to the end of 5.13 introduction. – “In this connection, it is important that traffic through the village is discouraged and that pedestrian safety is enhanced through the implementation of appropriate speed reduction measures.”

Page 30 – 5.16 – the committee agree with the inclusion of “a minimum of”.

Policy 10 – Residential Development Strategy - the committee understood that this policy will probably be changed as a result of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA). They understood and agreed with the change from “east” to “north-east”, but still feel that the public will be confused. Those on Shelford Road should understand that they are in the north-east sector, but those on the A52 Grantham Rd (in the vicinity of the Harlequin and Hudson Way/Dowson Close) may not! Can we put Shelford Rd and Grantham Road in brackets behind north-east to improve clarity?

Page 30 – 5.17 – the steering committee felt that the public need to have a map to show the areas at risk of flooding as mentioned in this paragraph, i.e., “and not locate development within any areas at risk of flooding.”

Page 31 – Policy 11 – Infill Development – there was quite a lot of discussion at the steering committee on the word “supports” in the first sentence. The majority view was that the word “supports” needs to be toned down to say “recognises the need for”

Page 31 – The committee supports the amalgamation of policies 12 & 13.

Policy 12 – It took some time for the committee to understand the different mix and densities for schemes of less than 10 dwellings and for those of more than 5 dwellings with the 30% affordable. The public may also have difficulty understanding this, but it may be difficult to put it more clearly!

Page 35 – 5.28 – line 1 - the committee felt that the words “are strongly advised to use” are too weak and need to be more robust and suggested changing to “are expected to use”.

Page 35 – 5.28 – line 2 – “Building for Life 12” – the committee suggests that some examples are given from this guidance, such as the design of buildings on corners of new developments, etc.