

## Thurmaston Liaison Group

10<sup>th</sup> April 2014 - 6pm at Roundhill Academy

### Seventh Meeting

#### Attendees

- Cllr Ralph Raven – Thurmaston Parish Council
- Cllr Kate Knaggs – County Councillor and Thurmaston Parish Councillor
- Cllr Seaton – Charnwood Borough Council
- Mr Owen Bentley - BABTAG
- Richard Wain – Project Manager, Hawksmoor
- Nick Baker – Planning Consultant, nlp
- Victoria Walker – Community Engagement, Beattie Communications

#### Apologies

- Rt Hon Stephen Dorrell MP
- Queninborough Parish Council
- Councillor Grimley
- Councillor King
- Lynne Stewart
- Rob Gill

#### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

RW explained that Rob Gill was unable to attend and he would chair the evening's meeting.

#### 2. MATTERS ARISING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Q) OB asked if there was any further update regarding when TA will go through the LLITM model?

A) RW explained that the model runs are going through the system and initial output is expected at the end of April. RW shared some dates for further outputs and indicated the final results are likely by the end of May. (WYG has subsequently confirmed that the finalised TA will then be submitted with the final data once this has been considered).

We will organise another transport focussed meeting to discuss the revised TA once it has been submitted.

Q) OB queried if there was any further information regarding the green space management from the Land Trust?

A) RW said that he had met with Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Parish Council and Thurmaston Parish Council to discuss and CEG is arranging to meet with the Land Trust. Hopefully by the next liaison group meeting we should have a proposal back and will report back at the next meeting. **ACTION POINT – Next meeting**

Q) OB asked if the next newsletter could have an update regarding the Core Strategy delay so people are aware.

A) RW explained that as we are all awaiting a response from Charnwood, until that time we are not sure what can be said. All attendees agreed that another newsletter would only be issued when there is news regarding this and LLITM outcome.

Q) OB queried if the Bidwells and this application would still press on if the Core Strategy is delayed?

A) NB responded that the plan making process is separate to the planning application process, although there is a relationship between the two. Our view is that there is an existing housing need which will not reduce, despite a delay in the Core Strategy. Early indications have shown that in terms of numbers these may increase. Our ideal would still be to see the application go to a planning committee in the next few months.

A discussion took place regarding the HA holding directive. RW explained that following the transport meeting next week, there will be an opportunity to open up discussions with the HA regarding their concerns which are specific to the hobby horse junction.

Q) OB asked what happens if Bidwells pushes ahead with the smaller application?

A) NB explained that it would be a decision for the local authority, but the coordinated approach of an SUE is in our view better than smaller piecemeal developments.

Q) OB highlighted that there was a S106 discussion at the last meeting. He queried if this would be appropriate for inclusion regarding delivery of better broadband and getting gas in the area for existing residents.

A) NB explained that there is a utilities and waste water strategy within the application documentation and WYG may have given an indication as to how this will work.

RW added that certainly in terms of broadband it is in our interest to ensure that there is a high quality provision and I'm sure that is something we can look at. **ACTION POINT - RW**

Q) Cllr Seaton queried that if the Core Strategy is delayed and if application continues through its process what happens in terms of the governance of the green space?

A) RW explained that this is still up for discussion and we are meeting with the Parish Councils to discuss. From the meetings we've held so far we think that a central governance of the site is looking like the most preferable option. For example if it was the Lands Trust, they can look at the amount of open space and they cost the management of this in perpetuity and there is a capital sum (sinking fund) to start that off and then a management contribution is allocated to each of the houses (in lieu of a precept payable to a Parish Council).

Q) Cllr Knaggs asked if this Trust's responsibilities would just include managing green space.

A) RW said it could also include the assets on site, such as a library, sports pavilions, and community buildings for example.

Q) Cllr Knaggs queried that if residents just paid this precept to the Trust would they have Councillors?

A) RW explained that this depends upon whether the assets and open space are managed as a charity, a village council, a parish council or such other management structure. If the proposal includes for a Development or Community Trust, parish councillors from neighbouring parishes could be elected as representatives as well as resident and ward members etc... The management board of the new structure would then act as the representatives of the community, much like Parish councillors.

Q) Cllr Knaggs asked how this will evolve and how it would be managed from the outset.

A) RW - In the early days it is for the developer to set it up, fund and manage. It is also in their interest to ensure this works effectively. It is difficult to retrofit a structure after the development has started. Very much like the travel plan coordinator, it is better to be in operation from day one so there is someone managing the assets and green space.

Q) Cllr Seaton queried that there needs to be more clarification regarding how the resident's charge (precept) is paid in terms of the residents in housing association properties who are on benefits?

A) RW – from day one of the development, which will include affordable housing, RSL's will have the opportunity to pay this charge for their tenants or be factored into the registered social landlord's budget. As they have a long term view in terms of the payback of their investment, this maybe something which is funded and factored in, but it is something we need to look into. At Hamilton the recovery rate is approximately 95% of management charges. **ACTION POINT – RW agreed to look into how this is managed in Hamilton and will also speak to the Lands Trust.**

Q) Cllr Seaton queried that there are some areas in Hamilton, such as the parks where it has not been managed effectively. If there is no governing body such as a Parish Council to go to what will happen?

A) RW – I don't think that a faceless management company is the right way to go here. Instead there would be a development trust which is self-regulating as there are people on site actively ensuring it is well managed.

The minutes from the last meeting were approved. **ACTION POINT – VW to upload minutes to the website.**

### **3. FACILITIES WITHIN THE SUE**

RW – we would like to understand from members of the liaison group what is on offer in the area at the moment, where the gaps may lie and what the opportunities are in the area. We'd welcome ideas to feedback into the process.

Q) Cllr Knaggs said that Roundhill Academy is almost oversubscribed in year seven from the latest data which has just come in and there are some applications outstanding. In a year's time the school may be at full capacity. There needs to be room for expansion.

A) RW – we’ve had a response from the County today regarding education. They have assessed a number of options. In terms of primary education, they have looked at a couple of options, including provision of either 2 x 2 Form entry and 1x1 Form entry with a small off-site contribution or 2x 2 Form entry with a larger off-site contribution. These options maybe part of STEP.

In terms of secondary, County is looking at relocating Roundhill onto the site or expanding Roundhill on the existing site with funds from the development to accommodate the additional requirements. In terms of secondary if the capacity is reached at Roundhill prior to the delivery there would be contributions to allow for expansion at Wreake Valley or Roundhill as required to manage the new pupils during the interim.

Q) Cllr Knaggs said that there isn’t much space on site for Roundhill to expand.

A) RW said that there are plans which do show how it can happen which have been drafted by a school architect, it does include the school buildings to be increased by adding floor levels., It would be for the County and school to be involved in that decision. The County’s response, which we have seen today, should be put into the public domain imminently.

**ACTION POINT** – VW to circulate when this is made public

Q) Cllr Seaton asked about access into the proposed location of secondary school on site.

A) RW explained that if Roundhill relocated there would be potentially four access points from Thurmaston and a bus route into this school.

Q) Cllr Knaggs-asked if there is flexibility for the school to relocate to another area within the masterplan?

A) NB – explained that as the scheme has evolved, a number of locations for the school have been identified. For example, an early iteration showed the school to the north with the employment to the south .The indicative masterplan is just that and during the consultation and detailed design process there may be further changes.

Q) OB said that the cemetery is oversubscribed in both Thurmaston and Barkby/Barkby Thorpe and is provision still being considered?

Cllr Seaton added that Syston also has an issue as they are using land in Queninborough which has posed issues locally so it is something which should be considered.

A) RW said that it is something which is currently being assessed.

Q) Cllr Seaton said that a 3G pitch should be considered and this will help the community centre to be viable and profit making. Potentially this could be linked with the school.

A) RW explained that Rob Gill met with a Loughborough based company which works with Sports Solutions and they can provide these sorts of facilities. We have also spoken to Sport England regarding artificial pitches in lieu of grass pitches and the ratio of the provision of each of these. It is very much under consideration. There is a meeting at the end of the month with the leisure team at Charnwood to continue these discussions and the input from today will help inform those meetings.

Q) Cllr Seaton queried allotment provision. There are two sites within the masterplan and these are a must. We also don't have tennis courts in the locality and perhaps indoor crown green bowls could be included?

Q) Cllr Raven asked if a pub included.

A) RW said that the use class for a pub is accounted for within the District Centre and tennis courts are included in the indicative masterplan.

Q) Cllr Knaggs asked if a skate park included, particularly as it would be less challenging at the outset of a development.

A) NB – In the last few weeks we have started to get into this level of detail with Colin Bailey at Charnwood. The intention is a full range of activities and this youth provision is included.

If there is a need arising from the development there is space to accommodate it on this site.

The list of suggestions from Charnwood's leisure team at the moment includes:

- Skate park/BMX
- MUGA (multi use games area)
- Youth shelter
- Outdoor gym
- Fitness hub
- 3 x outdoor table tennis
- Play area

Cllr Seaton said the preference would be not to have a large play area within the residential area, such as provided at Watermead flats, as this is causing a lot of problems. The toddler areas are fine but areas big enough for football are problematic.

Examples suggested of good schemes for review include Pannett Park in Whitby and Victoria Park in Stafford.

NB explained that the Council standards do make distinctions between the types of facilities for specific ages.

Q) OB queried if we can look at provision of bridleways as Lynn Stewart has previously queried this.

RW asked in terms of local facilities in the area which are oversubscribed, what these are?

Cllr Knaggs responded childcare/nursery, libraries, doctors, dentists.

RW said that in terms of health there will be a contribution for existing facilities to expand and in the District Centre there will be provision for a new health facility. We are also liaising with the health authorities.

In terms of Blaby as an example (the New Lubbesthorpe scheme which has been granted planning permission) there is £0.5 million contribution towards health and by the 600<sup>th</sup> unit the developer has to offer a facility for six practitioners.

Q) OB said that in terms of phasing there will be pressure on existing facilities before new facilities are provided

A) RW explained that there will be financial contributions to expand specific facilities until the new provision comes forwards.

Q) Cllr Raven enquired about the provision of a library. Cllr Knaggs has asked about the impact of not having a library in the area. The proposal is for a community library strategy in the future, where 30 community libraries are proposed to be offered to the local community.

Q) NB explained that County has provided, as part of its response to Charnwood, a contribution request which provides a baseline figure. If the contribution for libraries is calculated based on the number of dwellings this would come to a figure of approximately £250,000. At the same time, County has recognised with a large scale development there may need to be a different approach to provision.

For example, a proportion of that fund could be used to sustain existing facilities and then there would be a 'hub' with an office and a management facility and workstation for the police as part of the provision.

RW asked whether the existing facility is well maintained, attractive and well used.

Cllr Knaggs said that each of the 36 libraries are in very different positions. The Parish does not want to take it on as it could be a liability.

Cllr Seaton agreed that it might be more successful if it was a more commercial facility, with a café for example.

RW suggested that Andrew Tyrer, who is responsible for facilities throughout the County and who attends the infrastructure meetings, could be contacted to explain further the intentions for the Library.

Q) Cllr Seaton asked if we wanted to run a library by extending Elizabeth Park could this be something the development could assist with.

A) RW said yes this is the sort of thing we can look at. It is these solutions which we think would be effective. A library doesn't necessarily need to be on this site but it needs to be within reach and a viable solution such as this could look at existing issues as well as accommodating and servicing the new population on the development.

Q) Cllr Raven asked could a swimming pool be provided?

Cllr Knaggs said there is a pool within Roundhill and this would need to be retained if located. Cllr Harley has asked about a leisure centre as well. Cllr Seaton explained that they were looking at extending Elizabeth Park to provide a gym.

A) RW – explained that on the masterplan shows that adjacent to the school there is a site for a potential leisure centre. Roundhill is an academy and has shown early interest in managing this sort of facility.

Q) Cllr Knaggs queried adult education provision. The house at the school was given to the Council when the school became an academy due to the cost of upkeep. However it might be something a new or expanded Roundhill wanted to consider.

A) RW said this is something we can ask the County about. There's no mention of this in the County's response. There is a multitude of uses which can be accommodated in the district centre and land for a school so there is an opportunity for this. **ACTION POINT**

Cllr Seaton said that the proposed community hub location would not be easy for residents of Thurmaston to access. NB said there is an access into the site from Thurmaston to reach the District Centre (it is not a through road).

**ACTION POINT** – VW to collate the list of requirements for the project team to report back to the District and County at the next meetings.

NB added that in terms of the mechanisms regarding how these facilities are provided the New Lubbethorpe agreement gives a recent example; the legal agreement there requires a community facility strategy to be submitted and approved early on within the development. It would be drafted by the developer and Blaby needs to approve it. Also, within the agreement, there are some detailed parameters. It sets minimum floor spaces and requirements. The strategy would have a detailed schedule of what would be required as part of the development.

Q) Cllr Knaggs - When would we know if a library is included or funds for a facility available?

A)RW - If an outline permission is granted there would be a S106 legal agreement which is formalised and signed. This would explain the funding mechanisms and trigger points. Detailed applications would need to be submitted and approved before development could begin.

#### **4. NEWSLETTER**

Q) Cllr Raven asked about the 15m landscape buffer as he had received a number of queries.

A) RW said that it is a landscaped area which also includes footpaths. This new landscaped area would be managed as part of the green space strategy. In addition to this green corridor, it would not sit adjacent to new built environment, there would be a set off which could be a private road and path accessing bungalows or it might be gardens for example.

Q) OB asked if the next newsletter could come out when there is news about the strategy.

**ACTION POINT – VW** - It was agreed that once Charnwood issues a response in terms of the Core Strategy we can review the outcome and provide an update.

The article has run in the Thurmaston Times and there is a magazine in Syston as well which VW could look at. The next Thurmaston Times is June/July – it was agreed if further information was available we would target this and include LLITM outcomes.

#### **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No items were raised

## **6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that as the LLITM information should be the topic of the next meeting. The date was provisionally agreed for 5<sup>th</sup> June subject to the information being available. **ACTION POINT – all.**