

# RUDDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting

Held at St Peter's Rooms on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2015 at 7.30 p.m.

Action

### Membership

Councillors	W A Wood	Chairman
	K S Piggott	Vice-Chairman
A	Mrs A Auckland	
	G Ellison	
	D J Hall	
	Mrs J Hallam	
	Mrs H G Hurman	
	Mrs S Kaur Samra	
A	S Kirby	
	J Noble	
	Mrs M Pell	
	Mrs M Robinson	
A	A J Scott	
	N J Tegerdine	
	M Walsh	

PCO =  
Parish  
Council  
Office

PCG =  
Parish  
Council  
Ground  
staff

Persons absent are marked 'A'

Persons representing the Parish Council on other business are marked 'O'

### Also in Attendance

G D Long Clerk to the Council  
110 members of the public

### C. 15/09/01 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs A Auckland (holiday), S Kirby (work commitment) and A J Scott (holiday).

### C. 15/09/02 Declaration of Members' Interests

Councillor D J Hall declared an interest in all items in the agenda as his property backs onto the proposed Bloors development.

### C. 15/09/03 Results of Consultation & Recommendations

The results of the consultation and the recommendations of the Estates Working Group were handed out – see Appendix 1.

### **Councillor Mrs H Hurman arrived during the following item.**

### C. 15/09/04 Motion for Adjournment

**Resolved that:** The Council adjourns to allow the members of the public present to make statements on agenda items.

The following comments were made:

- The consultation was welcomed, however not everyone received the document.
- The consultation document did not include all possible alternatives e.g. repairing the existing Village Hall.
- The consultation result may have been influenced by where in the Village People live.
- Option 1 had fared best.
- Overall the total responses of 'Non Acceptable' exceeded those of 'Acceptable' by 2 to 1.
- A petition with 277 signatures had been submitted against selling Sellors Playing Field. There was an overlap with the consultation responses.
- Were the results scrutinised by an independent authority?
- Ruddington Parish Council (RPC) should get a flooding report before they sell.
- Bloor's motive is to make a profit.
- If Option 1 goes ahead the Parish Council will be responsible for the upkeep of a larger area of land and will have to pay for this. There should be a smaller area.
- The boundaries are inaccurate.
- If this land is built on the developers will want to build on more land.
- A resident of Trent Avenue said her grandson will no longer be able to walk out of the front door and play football on the Playing Field.
- Local residents, Helen and Andy Powell, had given the football nets used on Sellors Playing Field.
- Removing Sellors removes the 'safety net' forcing children to play on the edge of the Village.
- The response to Option 1 was very close – 3 votes – is there a chance of an error?
- There was no opportunity on the consultation document to comment.
- It is a long way to move a playing field.
- There is a moral obligation not to sell Sellors Playing Field.
- There should be sustainable brownfield growth for new houses.
- The sale of Sellors will generate a new community and sporting facility, together with an outdoor all weather surface.
- The flooding issue can be overcome.
- Building here is less intrusive than other possible sites.
- Some new homes can be built on the old Village Hall site – contributing to the total needed.
- It looks like having a new Village Hall is more important than a proper consideration of housing development.
- The proposal supports the building of 180 houses on Green Belt.
- This is premature: A. Wait for the Local Plan Phase 2, B. There is only a need for 250 houses on Green Belt, 180 shouldn't be in one place, and C. If they are completed early Ruddington may get more than 250 – it is a minimum not a maximum number. Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) is not thinking of building on Green Belt around Ruddington for another 3 years.
- Pleased that the RPC decided to consult.

- Dismayed at the heavily loaded consultation document – there is no option to repair the current Village Hall. This would only cost £80,000.
- The results of the consultation were inconclusive.
- The Parish Council cannot reach a decision tonight.
- There is a covenant on Sellors Playing Field and there is a moral, and probably legal, obligation not to sell.
- Compliments to RPC on the consultation document – a reasonable attempt to find residents views.
- RPC has democratic legitimacy and the duty to make a decision.
- RPC has a financial duty to make the best use of resources.
- A better hall and facilities is an improvement for the Village.
- RPC has a fiduciary duty to carry this forward – find out what money is on the table and then make a decision. It is subject to an RBC planning decision.
- Flooding is an engineering issue and can be dealt with.
- The distance (240 metres) that the playing field may be moved is not a big problem.
- Option 1 is not ideal but it is an improvement.
- Strongly support the recommendations.
- What alternatives for funding are there? Have RPC looked into them? There are many grants available.
- There should be a tendering process for selling Sellors.
- Building on and around Sellors is merging towards Wilford. This is not in line with the RBC Strategic Core Plan.
- The current Village Hall needs substantial work.
- It is a low capacity venue.
- It loses £6,500 a year and cannot pay for its own maintenance.
- It is used by more people from outside the Village than in.
- Sellors Playing Field is a dog toilet. There is no sporting activity based there.
- New houses will bring more business into Ruddington.
- A new community centre with better facilities will benefit the whole Village.
- This is a 'one off' opportunity.
- If the land is sold it should go to open tender.
- RPC could have a 'buy a brick' scheme.
- Bloors publicity is full of 'could' and 'possibly'.
- There is no need for a decision now.
- RPC should identify funding sources for what they want.
- Hoping that councillors are listening and taking note.
- There is no rush.
- There is a better way to do this.
- The Village already has many facilities and venues, including an award winning Country Park.
- There is need for a playing field near houses, not along walk away.
- There are Section 106 monies from Pasture Lane which will go to a new pool in West Bridgford unless action is taken to get them used in Ruddington.
- Once the Village Hall is gone, it is gone. It is a historic building. Please look at the character and heritage of the Village.

- I have never known a consultation with no free test box for people's views. It calls the purpose of the consultation into question.
- What conversation has been had in terms of the Youth Club?
- Has a land swap been considered on land next to St. Peter's School?
- Were the numbers in the consultation independently scrutinised?
- Only the raw results have been given.
- Many people do not know the names in the document e.g. Sellors Playing Field, Packman Dyke.
- RPC has never spent money on the Village Hall. It needs doing. Grants are available.
- There will be no houses near the new play area.
- A vision is needed in terms of planning. The Village Plan, and potentially a Neighbourhood Plan would find what the Village wants.
- Don't want to build on the Green Belt unless have to. The Local plan says the secretary of State has to give approval before the Green Belt can be built on.
- Option 1 of the consultation might be unachievable. Look at other options.
- There are lots of people opposed to Option 1.

### **Committee in Session**

#### **C. 15/09/05 Parish Council Consultation**

The Chairman, Councillor W A Wood, introduced the item on the consultation regarding.

- A. The sale of Sellor's Playing Field and the acquisition of a new larger public open space and playing field nearby; and
- B. The sale of the current Village Hall and the financing and location of a replacement.

He reminded members of the work that had been necessary to reach this point and that if the Estates Working Group recommendations are agreed this will not be the final decision. There had been no contact with Bloor's for many months, pending this decision.

Members discussed:

- The reasons why the Village Hall needed action taking to address problems,
- The desire for improved facilities in Ruddington,
- The offer from Bloor's to purchase Sellors Playing Field and replace it with a larger area of public open space north of Packman Dyke,
- The views expressed by members of the public during the adjournment, and
- The results of the consultation.

The results of the consultation were not perfect but gave a clear and reasonable view on which option had most support. It helps the Parish Council make a decision based on the views of the residents of Ruddington.

The concerns regarding building on the land around Sellors Playing Field, the potential flooding risk, the loss of view from people's homes, the covenant on the original gift of Sellors Playing Field and of the loss of the existing playing field were acknowledged.

A number of questions were raised by Councillor Mrs M Pell on behalf of members of the public and answers given by the Chairman and the Clerk.

It was acknowledged that this was a difficult decision which had to be taken in the best interests of the whole of Ruddington.

Councillor K S Piggott moved the recommendations and Councillor N J Tegerdine seconded them. Council agreed to vote on the Estates Working Group recommendations, as set out in Appendix 1, en bloc.

For 10, Against 1, Abstentions 0 Note: Councillor D J Hall did not vote.

**Resolved that:**

1. The agreed objectives are to: 1. Provide a new, larger public open space on land north of Packman Dyke, and 2. Build a new Village Hall on land north of Packman Dyke. This would mean the sale of Sellors Playing Field and the Village Hall.
2. Estates Working Group will move the negotiations forward with Bloors to establish a price and conditions for the sale of Sellors Playing Field. The final sale to be approved by Parish Council. EWG
3. Estates Working Group shall investigate ways of acknowledging the Sellors legacy. EWG
4. Estates Working Group shall consider ways of providing play facilities for children under 10 years old near to the existing Sellors Play Area. EWG
5. Estates Working Group is given authority to progress this project and commit expenditure up to £10k per item from the Major Projects Earmarked Fund where it is considered necessary. Expenditure to be reported back to the next meeting of Parish Council. EWG

The meeting closed at 8.55 p.m.

Chairman

## Appendix 1 Report of Estates Working Group

### Purpose

To consider a report of Estates Working Group on the results of the Parish Council consultation.

### Background

The Parish Council paid Royal Mail to deliver the consultation document to every house in the 'NG11 6' postal area.

Over 1,000 individual responses were received. The responses are set out in the table below.

### **Final Responses**

(See Appendix 1 for a list of the options).

<b>Total responses</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>Option</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Acceptable</b>		474	315	160	109	129	362
<b>Not Acceptable</b>		471	551	658	721	686	483
<b>Don't Know</b>		22	17	40	23	40	32
		967	883	858	853	855	877

The responses have been checked that there is a name and address. There are a number of possible duplicates identified (there may be more) but as it is not 100% certain these have been left in.

### **Headlines:**

- Only Option 1 has more 'Acceptable' responses than 'Not Acceptable' – by 3! Option 1 also had the highest number of responses saying it was 'Acceptable' - by more than 100 responses. It had the lowest number of responses saying it was 'Not Acceptable' - by 12 responses.
- Clearly Options 3, 4 & 5 had a very low number of 'Acceptable' responses.
- The consultation document clearly stated that 'do nothing' was not an option and views were sought on 6 possible options.

For every option the 'Not Acceptable' response was under 15% of the number on the electoral role. For Option 1 (as well as for Options 2 & 6) it was under 10%. In other words over 90% of people on the electoral role either stated the option was 'Acceptable' or did not take the opportunity to state it was 'Not Acceptable'.

- There was an overall response rate of 17.43% on the assumption that all responses are from people on the electoral role. Note: Electorate (from electoral register 1/12/14): Camelot 1403, Easthorpe 1359, Flawford 1186, Manor 1628. **TOTAL 5576**

In addition, a petition has been handed in with 277 signatures against the sale of Sellors Playing Field. A brief check has established that there is an overlap with those who have responded to the consultation. The exact extent of this has not been established.

## Considerations

The Parish Council has a duty to make the best decision it can on behalf of **all** the people of Ruddington. The consultation is important information for parish councillors to consider but does not determine the outcome.

The returns from the consultation show very near equality on 'Acceptable' responses and 'Not Acceptable' for Option 1. This is, however, clearly the most acceptable of the options put forward.

In terms of 'the Village speaking' this is the option that has the most support by a clear margin (and the least against by a small margin).

If Option 1 is chosen and successful it needs to be acknowledged that the new, larger public open space and the new Village Hall will have been made possible because of the original gift of the land from Frederick Sellors. The Estates Working Group should investigate ways to achieve this.

Regarding Option 1 a number of people have mentioned the extra distance young children would have to walk to get to any new play facilities on the land north of Packman Dyke. It would be possible (obviously resulting in reduced sale income) for the Parish Council to retain the area of Sellors Playing Field that currently contains children's play equipment.

## Recommendations

1. The agreed objectives are to: 1. Provide a new, larger public open space on land north of Packman Dyke, and 2. Build a new Village Hall on land north of Packman Dyke. This would mean the sale of Sellors Playing Field and the Village Hall.
2. Estates Working Group to move the negotiations forward with Bloors to establish a price and conditions for the sale of Sellors Playing Field. The final sale to be approved by Parish Council.
3. Estates Working Group shall investigate ways of acknowledging the Sellors legacy.
4. Estates Working Group shall consider ways of providing play facilities for children under 10 years old near to the existing Sellors Play Area.
5. Estates Working Group is given authority to progress this project and commit expenditure up to £10k per item from the Major Projects Earmarked Fund where it is considered necessary. Expenditure to be reported back to the next meeting of Parish Council.

Estates Working Group 2/9/15

## Appendix 1: Options.

1. Sell Sellors Playing Field,  
Sell the Village Hall,  
A new public open space on land north of Packman Dyke,  
Build a new Village Hall on land north of Packman Dyke.
2. Sell Sellors Playing Field,  
Sell the Village Hall  
A new public open space on land north of Packman Dyke,  
Build a new Village Hall on Elms Park.
3. Keep Sellors Playing Field,  
Sell the Village Hall,  
Increase Ruddington Parish Council element of Council Tax by 31.4%,  
Build a new Village Hall on Elms Park.
4. Do not sell Sellors Playing Field,  
Sell the Village Hall,  
Increase Ruddington Parish Council element of Council Tax by 31.4%,  
Build a new Village Hall on Sellor's Playing Field.
5. Sell Sellors Playing Field,  
Partially rebuild the Village Hall and add a small hall,  
A new public open space on land north of Packman Dyke
6. Keep Sellors Playing Field,  
Partially rebuild the Village Hall and add a small hall,  
Increase Ruddington Parish Council element of Council Tax by 14.3%.