

**Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting for Whatton-in-the-Vale held on Tuesday  
30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 7:30 pm – Page - I**

The chairman of the parish council, Councillor Chris Grocock chaired the meeting.

There were 103 residents present and the Borough Councillor, Cllr Maureen Stockwood and the County Council Councillor, Cllr. Francis Purdue-Horan were in attendance.

## **MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous Annual Parish Meeting of the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2016 were approved by the meeting.

## **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The Chairman provided a brief resume of the Parish Council's activities for the past year. He went on to say that he was conscious of the meetings resolve to discuss the Planning Application and would therefore curtail his report.

## **FINANCIAL REPORT**

The acting clerk provided the Parish Councils Financial Report for the past year. The Report is annexed to these Minutes.

## **MATTERS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC**

### **Bus Service**

The issue of the cessation of the Bus Service was raised, it was confirmed that Trent-Barton was to cease the Villager V2 service on the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2017 as it was not commercially viable. The meeting was informed that Nottinghamshire County Council were attempting to find an alternative operator.

## **Planning Application**

### **Background**

The meeting was informed that the Planning Application for 90 dwellings was an outline application with all matters except the principle of the site being suitable for up to 90 houses and the means of access reserved. Meaning that, if approved it would be followed by a 'Reserved Matters' application which would deal with the number, style, position and tenure of the proposed development.

It was explained that the Local Plan Part I (Core Strategy) was adopted by the Borough Council in 2014 and Policy 3.1 of that document states '*.... In other settlements (not shown in the Key Diagram), with the exception of Newton and the redevelopment of the former RAF Newton development will be for local needs only.*'

Whatton falls into the category of 'other settlements', so the plan envisages any development in Whatton to be for local needs only. It was further explained that in a strict interpretation of Policy 3.1 the proposed application would fail. However, Rushcliffe is not currently meeting its 5-year supply of housing and the Applicant is arguing that as 3.1 is a 'Delivery Policy' given the current shortfall that Policy is out of date and no weight should be given to it.

Councillor Stockwood informed the meeting that Rushcliffe were now vigorously defending and using the Local Plan in deciding Applications. In addition, Cllr. Francis Purdue-Horan also informed the meeting that there were some positive moves in improving the 'Housing Supply' situation in the Borough which would be helpful in the Borough refusing inappropriate and unsustainable applications such as the one currently on the table for Whatton.

### **Increase in Population**

The matter of the size of the proposed development was raised, in that it would amount to an increase in housing of approximately 23% which was felt by the meeting to be wholly disproportionate to the size of the village.

A resident asked if it was possible to negotiate with the Applicant for a smaller number, say 20 or 30. The Chairman explained that we could only respond to the application as presented.

## **Healthcare**

A number of residents raised the issue of the impact on Healthcare facilities. It was felt that the Health Centre at Bingham was over-stretched and the increase in population due to this application would have adverse impact on the Healthcare provision, especially as both Bingham and Newton (both in the Health Centre catchment area) are earmarked for significant population growth. Additionally, in the absence of a viable public transport system visits to the Health Centre in Bingham are typically by car and parking in Bingham at times (in particular Surgery hours) is virtually impossible.

## **Traffic**

Various residents spoke to the what they perceived as the dangers posed by the Grantham Road/A52 junction which it was felt would be worsened by the increased traffic movements if the proposed development was to go ahead. It was also stressed that the view of the state of the junction was based on actual experience, not a one-day traffic survey.

The view was also expressed widely, that the lack of any viable sustainable (public) transport options would lead to journeys from the proposed development by motor car. Such use of the motor car would amount to between 180 and 360 traffic movements per day. This would clearly greatly impact on the safety of Grantham Road and the A52 junction. Additionally, the traffic movements would result in increased CO2 emissions.

The meeting discussed the situation with the A52, there were already 'tailbacks' at the Saxondale Island at peak hours and high traffic flows through Radcliffe-on-Trent the proposed development would exasperate that situation.

## **Grantham Road Plane Trees**

The Meeting was concerned with the impact of the proposed junction on both the Plane trees and the visual aspect of the 'Avenue of Trees'. The 'Avenue' is iconic and the view is from both within and without of the Conservation Area. Cllr. Stockwood expressed surprise that the trees were not subject to 'Tree Preservation Orders' and informed the meeting that she had requested that all the Plane Trees be made subject of TPOs.

## **Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting for Whatton-in-the-Vale held on Tuesday**

**30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 7:30 pm – Page - 4**

### **Planning Statement**

The Meeting was told that certain statements made in the Planning Statement were at best misleading. In particular, it attempted to assert that Aslockton and Whatton-in-the-Vale 'function as one settlement' and justify that assertion by reference to the 'Sustainable Locations for Growth Study' what the Statement failed to mention was the comment '*The constraints to growth, including the need to avoid coalescence of Aslockton and Whatton...*'. Also quoted is the 'Rushcliffe Additional Background Paper', again they fail to mention the note attached to Aslockton and Whatton '*Given their proximity to each other, whilst distinctive settlements in their own right, Aslockton and Whatton share some infrastructure and services*'.

The meeting was adamant that Whatton-in-the-Vale and Aslockton were separate and distinct Civil Parishes with their own Parish Councils and the sources cited by the Applicant demonstrate that fact.

It was also pointed out by residents that the 'Local Facilities' cited in the Statement were in fact located in Aslockton, not Whatton.

The meeting also felt that the 'sustainable' transport options were grossly overstated, in that

Whilst there is a Cycle Route there is no dedicated cycle path or lane (save for a small area on Whatton Bridge and between New Lane and the entrance to Bingham on the A52). Cyclists have to share what is a poorly maintained road network with other road users. The increase in traffic movements caused by the proposed development is unlikely to make cycling safer or desirable.

The bus link does not provide a viable commuter option for modern working times and in any event, will cease operation in July 2017.

The train does provide a better commuter option, but very few options during the day.

The meeting felt that they were no viable sustainable transport options.

### **Show of Hands**

The Chairman asked for a 'Show of Hands' of those opposed to the Application, the meeting was unanimous in its objection.

**Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting for Whatton-in-the-Vale held on Tuesday  
30<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at 7:30 pm – Page - 5**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9:15 pm.