

AYLESTONE COMMUNITY MEETING

WEDNESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 2020

Gilmorton Community Rooms, Hopyard Close, Leicester, LE2 9GY

Present: Councillor Porter (Chair)
Councillor Clarke

NO	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION REQUESTED AT MEETING</u>
10.	INTRODUCTIONS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	<p>Councillor Porter as Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>Councillor Clarke declared an interest for the avoidance of doubt in the items of business on the agenda as a campaigner to protect the green spaces of Aylestone.</p> <p>Councillor Porter declared an interest for the avoidance of doubt in the items of business on the agenda as a campaigner to protect the green spaces of Aylestone. Councillor Porter also declared an interest for the avoidance of doubt that he was opposed to the Council's draft proposal in the draft Local Plan to demolish the community centre and shop.</p>
11.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	<p>Apologies for absence were received from Noel Cazley (City Warden).</p>
12.	ACTION LOG OF LAST MEETING	<p>The notes of the previous meeting held on 28th August 2019 were noted.</p>
13.	LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION	<p>Grant Butterworth, Planning, Development and Transportation, was present to provide information on forthcoming consultation on the Local Plan. During discussions the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The new plan would cover the period 2019 – 2036.• Consultation would commence in late March 2020 for a period of 12 weeks and would seek the views on revised policies and objectives. Comments would not be taken until the consultation went 'live'.• Residents would have three opportunities to have their say on the Plan. For the first time suggestions could be made by the public on where they believed development was needed.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All responses would be considered, and another consultation exercise would be undertaken later in the year following which the plan would be submitted to Government and a public enquiry held.• Currently the revised policies and suggested sites were draft. Officers had started off looking at over 400 sites, which had since been reduced to 85 sites.• Housing delivery across the country was not meeting targets, and it was difficult for people to access affordable housing.• The Government target for Leicester was the provision of an additional 1,712 homes a year until 2036 (nearly 30,000 over the plan period). It had been a difficult job to find sites for 30,000 homes, and it was felt that the target could not be met across the city. The Council were in talks with Oadby and Charnwood councils and an agreement reached in principal for the County to meet some of the target as long as it could be shown the City had looked at every possible site within the city boundary.• Sites that had already received planning permission, for example Franklyn Fields, did not count towards the target number of new homes.• Delivery of accommodation in Leicester had been good, particularly in the city centre, but it was difficult for people to access affordable housing.• When looking at potential sites, several factors were looked at, for example, flood risk, heritage, nature conservation.• There was a summary page for each site identified available on the website. It was not suggested that all sites should be developed.• Only two sites were proposed for Aylestone Ward in the Plan but to date there were no detailed designs or proposals: a strip of land next to Great Central Way for a small number of houses; replacement shops and centre to include accommodation. During consultation people could choose for sites not to be developed and to remain the same.• Draft Plan documents could be found online at https://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/sec/local-plan-2019-2036/• Residents noted the one shop was used by the mass number of people living in the area, and its removal would be problematic. It was stated that |
|--|--|---|

not everyone drove, some people were disabled, and there was a minimal bus service, and that people would find it difficult accessing shopping facilities elsewhere.

- Residents were concerned that there were plans to take away the ball court which they stated was the only place that children on the estate could go to and stay out of trouble.
- It was noted that Gilmorton Estate bordered with Blaby Council, who would have their own local plan.
- Residents were informed that the Council wanted to hear from people, and if the swell of public opinion was for or against proposals residents should go online, write to the authority or visit a library to pass on their views.

It was noted the Council owned the land identified in the draft plan and could decide to build housing as one opportunity or sell to a private developer to produce affordable housing. Residents asked if development took place, how many would be council houses. They were informed that it was not possible to state at this stage.

The Chair asked for a show of hands from residents who supported the proposals in the draft plan for Aylestone. The overwhelming view of everyone who attended the meeting was they were not in favour of the proposals in the draft Local Plan.

Residents noted that there was concern development would impact on the community and amenities. It was also suggested that further consideration be given to additional community-run buildings and land for residents to use as they wanted.

Councillors and officers noted the concerns raised by residents and asked them to forward additional ideas they may have for development in the area or other potential sites that could be used. They added that if the community wanted a new centre and shop they would run with the idea, but had not heard that residents were in favour of the idea. Residents asked if the Council had any plans to compulsory purchase land to develop but were informed there was little resource to do so, and there had only been two purchases made over many years, both in the city centre.

		<p>Residents queried by the park area had not improved in over ten years. The meeting was informed that developers had to provide a contribution of money to the local area, otherwise known as Section 106 money, which could be used to improve children's play facilities in the area.</p> <p>ACTION: Councillors asked that information on funding allocated to Gilmorton for additional play facilities be provided to them.</p> <p>Residents stated the Council should look at Brownfield sites. It was noted there was a large development of such sites at Waterside and in the city centre but still would not equate to the 30,000 homes required. It was further noted that there were planning permissions on some of the sites, or sites were on the flood plain and difficult to build upon.</p> <p>Some residents agreed that overall the plan was good, in that it would help to alleviate overcrowding, and that people with children wanted a house in the area. However, Other residents were concerned that the heart of the community that existed on the estate would be damaged if development took place. Residents were informed that if the authority did not have an up-to-date plan, the local Planning Committee would lose control and the Government Inspector would decide on developments, and that adjacent districts have been losing appeals against sizable developments.</p> <p>Residents asked why they had not been able to lease one of the shops next to the community centre. They were informed the centre and shops fell under the property department, and the shop would not be let until a decision had been made on whether the buildings would remain or be developed.</p> <p>Residents said that a lot of people had been unable to attend the meeting, and that meeting information was inaccessible to all. Officers informed residents that a letter would be written to those near affected sites, and a summary leaflet would be delivered to every house in the city.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Grant for attending the meeting and taking questions from residents.</p>
14.	LOCAL POLICING -	The Police representative did not present to the

	UPDATE AND FEEDBACK	meeting.
15.	CITY WARDEN - UPDATE AND FEEDBACK	Apologies were received from the City Warden.
16.	WARD COMMUNITY BUDGET	<p>The meeting was informed that Ward Councillors had approved budget applications.</p> <p>No questions were raised by attendants at the meeting.</p>
17.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	<p>A resident asked that future meetings be better promoted.</p> <p>With there being no other items of business, the meeting closed at 8.02pm.</p> <p>Request for future agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on rat running • Marsden Lane ramp • Workplace car park levy – Council plans for public transport

