

**Draft Minutes of  
BOTTESFORD PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
STEERING GROUP MEETING**

**7.30 p.m. Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017 – Old School**

Present:

**Steering Group Members**

Bob Bayman (BB) – Chair  
David Wright(DW)- Vice Chair  
Richard Simon (RS) - Clerk  
Colin Love (CL)  
Susan Love (SL)  
Cob George (CG)

**Helpers**

Bob Lockey (RL)  
Anne Ablewhite (AA)  
Kathy Sparham (KS)  
Peter Sheardown in attendance

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair welcomed the members, helpers and visitor Peter Sheardown to the meeting.

**2. Apologies for absence**

Alan Gough, Karen Gough, Val Lever, Peter Darlow, Pru Chandler, Bob Sparham

**3. To confirm and agree minutes of the Steering Group meeting 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017**

KS queried the report that was due to be circulated with the minutes This was the HEDNA report which will be attached or as a link to these minutes.

KS queried the comment in AOB that Bob Sparham had been financially supported by Bottesford Forum in his campaign to be a Parish Councillor and said that was not the case. CL said that he would produce evidence or apologise if he was incorrect. CL subsequently sent the clerk a copy of the declaration signed by BS when he became a Parish Councillor which showed CL was correct and the minute should remain as stated.

SL asked that 8. Review of Members and helpers be altered, that 'act' be replaced by 'campaign' and that people would be asked to become members if they had given appreciable help to the Steering Group in the past or could bring specific skills or knowledge to the group.

With the above changes the minutes were agreed and proposed as correct by DW and seconded by RL.

**4. Matters arising and actions from those minutes**

None

**5. Declarations of Interest**

None

**6. Behaviour at Meetings**

Some comments had been made by those attending the March meeting that there needed to be rules on behaviour at Steering Group meetings. CL proposed the following

***Behaviour in Bottesford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meetings.***

*All contributions to the discussions should be through, and at the invitation of, the Chair.*

*Each person called on to speak by the Chair must avoid raising their voice and be allowed to complete their contribution without interruption or interjection.*

*Any person not complying with these behavioural requirements will be given one reminder by the Chair.*

*If a person breaches these requirements for a second time then, at the discretion of the Chair, that person will be required to leave the meeting.*

This was seconded by RS and in voting all were for the proposal with one abstention.

## **7. Melton Local Plan – Update ( includes 8. SHLAA Sites)**

The implications for the Neighbourhood Plan by the latest proposals from Melton B.C. were set out and two options proposed

a) Should we campaign for a reduction in houses and sites

b) Should we embrace the numbers and sites and talk to developers.

CL said that this latest round of consultation was on the changes only and DW mentioned that the west site at Easthorpe had been included.

(In the Draft Melton Local Plan see - Addendum of Focused Changes July 2017)

RL felt that a response from MBC to Bottesford specifically would not have been amiss given the number of houses and sites here. He only saw the response today at the MBC presentation. The number of houses in Bottesford on which the last increase was based was incorrect as they had allocated all the housing in the Parish to Bottesford and then considered the hamlets in the Parish separately, a clear case of double accounting which MBC had never clarified.

CG said that the plan was not set in stone and sufficient objections would prompt a change.

BB said that the number of houses was not a bottom up approach as to what was needed in the Parish, the Midland Rural Homes and the NP questionnaire did provide this perspective. So how do we take this forward?

CL mentioned that Sajid Javid (Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) had said that affluent boroughs need to take more houses.

Waltham has proposals for 400 additional houses and it is difficult for Borough Councils to effectively fight inappropriate development. There are also proposals for 200 homes on the Cheese Factory site at Harby. Would these developments lead to a reduction required at Bottesford?

CG asked about the Normanton Lane site and where the Steering Group and Parish Council stood. BB responded that the site was not felt to be appropriate and was not one of the preferred sites. A positive plus might be the additional parking for the station but the site was the wrong side of the line in an Area of Separation and would generate more traffic pressure on the Market Street area.

CL said that Pat Reid was the case officer and a decision was likely in September and that Highways had made comments on the site and the car park.

SL reiterated that a mistake had been made on the house numbers in Bottesford village by including house numbers from Easthorpe, Muston and Normanton.

RL read out the PC response to the draft plan and asked when the comments were issued by MBC – about 2 weeks ago.

BB considered that a proper response to our submission was warranted again given the number of houses allocated and our stated reasons why the number should be reduced.

SL suggested that we revisit the numbers and the MRH survey.

RL asked if MBC responded to the MRH comments.

SL wanted the PC to debate the numbers at the Normanton Lane site as they had been reduced from about 83 to 55 by MBC but this was not necessarily what would be in the application. Pru Chandler had said that the time for Planning Consent had been reduced from 26 to 13 weeks.

Invite site owners / develops to next meeting.

KS wanted the village involved with scores on each site.

BB said that the consultation would be in the first draft of the NP.

CL was concerned over the different numbers proposed for the Normanton Lane site. On what do we respond and what is the likelihood of the increased numbers at appeal.

DW agreed with the scheme as did RL on the basis of 55 dwellings and not 88.

RS said that the car park would not be suitable for station car park use and the site was outside the natural boundary provided by the railway and additionally in an Area of separation.

CL said he had submitted his comments/caveats on the site which were the same as he had given to the Developers at their presentation. He also had concern that DW and the BC members had voted for 55 houses and not the 83 in the application by the developers.

SL asked if we could persuade James Goodson to come down to 55.

CL said that Bottesford itself is a flood risk, sites should be decided on flood impact to the Parish.

CG requested that house numbers for the Parish be reduced by omission of the Normanton Lane site.

KS asked for a presentation in layman's terms for the sites.

RL said that we need to convince people that we do need development.

CL we need detail for the sites before the consultation, BB suggested that we needed a meeting with the developers before the next closing date and in time for the PC to discuss the issue.

AA said that questioning people attending the MBC presentation today more people had attended having seen the Bottesford Forum Notices than those issued by the Parish Council.

BB said that the NPSG was a planning Group not a protest group and Bottesford Forum had no strategy for development in the Parish.

RL said that building next to the 'Daybells plot' could be interpreted as contrary to 'fingers of the countryside into the village' and that it was important to preserve the centre of the village and keep it clear of development.

BB felt that the number of houses now on the plot adjacent to the Daybells site was excessive and not in line the agreements we had reached with Messrs Daybells to produce a development that would enhance the village.

CG said that Bottesford Forum had objected to the Normanton Lane site.

Concern was raised over the recent changes in provision at the GP surgeries and SL said that we had when carrying out an early survey requested an input from both surgeries several times with no result.

DW said that the level of Affordable Housing in the Bottesford area was now set at 33 per cent.

BB in summary, said that we had 5 of the 6 weeks left and we needed to submit findings to the PC.

BB was also pleased to see the reduction in house numbers to 401 but **we wanted to be down to 300 plus the numbers of houses built since 2011 as a maximum**. Sites have gone up to six although the number of sites are four in number, two of the sites comprise two of the SHLAA plots. BB also said consultation was not sound and as the largest village we should have had a 'round the table' discussion with MBC. There would be more concern over the 88 homes on the Normanton Lane site than if it was restricted to 55.

The site adjacent to Messrs Daybells was considered to be too dense the numbers on this combined plot having gone from 18 to 41.

Grantham Road, the two sites that make up this plot have been substantially reduced in number by MBC but again this is not necessarily the number that will be built there.

There were also objections in the group to the west plot in Easthorpe as it is clearly eroding the Area of Separation between Easthorpe and Bottesford.

The developers for the site on Grantham Road and in the village centre to be identified so discussions can take place.

It was requested that we provide a view from the NPSG on the Normanton Lane site.

Mr Sheardown mentioned that although improved access to his land would be provided he was not in favour of the development, the Chair thanked him for his comments.

Votes in favour of the Normanton Lane development

NPSG Members

For - One

Against - Five

Abstained - One

Helpers

For -One

Against - Two

## **8. SHLAA Sites**

Included in 7 above.

## **9. Red Lion**

It is believed to be Grade 2 listed and as a substantial and attractive feature on the approach to Bottesford the interest of the NPSG was warranted.

DW said that a Community Asset Application had failed and that it was now sold.

The Planning application would go to Bottesford Parish Council for comment. The car park would be of use to the village as it is quite close to the shops and Library.

BB said that he would contact the purchasers.

## **10. Review of Members and Helpers**

The Chair proposed that additional members could be proposed and if seconded and received a majority of members votes the nomination would be accepted, SL seconded this and the following vote produced five votes for the proposal and none against.

The following Helpers were proposed and seconded and the vote was unanimous in each case.

Alan Gough

Bob Lockey

Leigh Donger

They were duly elected as Members with immediate effect subject to their confirmed agreement as they were absent at the meeting.

KS commented that it might be difficult for some people to get elected BB replied that in any case a nomination should be put to the SG.

## **11. Flood Investigation by the Environment Agency.**

RS briefly outlined the response he had received from the Environment Agency which indicated that a survey would start in the current fiscal year and that they were tendering for the work. A report is expected in late 2018. RS has asked for a copy of the Specification but had received no reply to date. BB suggested that we invite them back to a future meeting.

## **12. Parish Council Update**

Nothing to be reported, proposed response to the Draft Melton Local Plan to go to the next meeting, after we have seen the Developers. RS was asked to circulate the latest draft Neighbourhood Plan.

## **13. Agenda items and agree date of next Steering Group meeting - Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> September**

## **14. Any other business**

SL suggested that the Parish Council should look at Developer contributions in relation to the Normanton Lane site.

RL asked if there was anyone challenging the Historic England ruling concerning a section of Rectory Farm where it mentioned connections to a site at Easthorpe and limiting views of the church already hampered by the factory site. Who will make a submission to Historic England, Parish Council or Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group?

DW requested that the circulation list be updated and submitted a marked up list. After discussion it was agreed that any persons no longer living in the Parish would be removed. However people that had asked to be included would remain on the list so that they would be adequately informed.

Dates of future Steering Group Meetings, all at 7.30pm in the Old School

Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> August

Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> September

Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> October

Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> November

Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> December

**Circulation list:-**

Bob Bayman, David Wright, Richard Simon, Colin Love, Susan Love, Pru Chandler, Peter Darlow, Collette McCormack, Cob George, Anne Ablewhite, John Tobin (for Will Tobin), Alan and Karen Gough, Bob Lockey, Chris Greasley, Mark Taylor, Mark Longden, Alan Summers, Jean Reavley, Annie Newman, Dermot Daly, John Preston, Roger Pacey, Bud Hart, Connor Bufton, David and Joyce Slater, Heather Shephard, Ray Flanders, Sallyann Watson, Peter Sheardown, James Goodson, Mike Roberts, Andy Norris, Neville Spick, Barry Priestley, Neil Fortey, Don Pritchett, Leigh Donger, Alistair Raper, Dilys Shepherd, Miriam Forsey, Heather Stokes, Mr and Mrs K Palmer, Alison Reynolds, Susan Meech, Val Lever, Tom Parry, Allan Mulcahy, Bob Sparham, James Beverley, Simon Bladon, Kathy Sparham, Brian Attwood, Kathryn Price, Ruth Manchester, R Solomon, John Stapleton, Steve Ryan, Craig Eaton.