

**Minutes of a meeting of the Bosworth Community Forum held  
at Norton Juxta Twycross Village Hall  
on Thursday 26 March 2009**

Present

Cllr Sutton (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council) – in the Chair

In attendance

Mr J Aldridge	Sheepy Parish Council
Mr G P Betts	Market Bosworth Parish Council
Mrs R Camamile	Leicestershire County Council
A Cormack	Resident, Sheepy
M Cormack	Resident, Sheepy
Mrs P Crane	Desford Parish Council
Cllr W J Crooks	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
K Dunn	Resident
Kathleen Elkin	Nailstone Parish Council
Mary Gallagher	Twycross Parish Council
Mr A C Gough	Sheepy Parish Council
Geoffrey Gretton	Resident, Twycross
Wendy Gretton	Resident, Twycross
M D Hayward	Resident, Twycross
A Hebbes	Resident
Denise Hughes	Resident, Twycross
Ann Marshall	Twycross Zoo
Richard Morgan	Resident
Andy Nicholas	Resident
Beryl Orme	Resident, Twycross
Peter Orme	Resident, Twycross
Mr I Ould	Leicestershire County Council
Mr C Peat	Carlton Parish Council
Adrian Roai	Twycross Parish Council
Anne Senter	Resident, Twycross
Mr W R Sharp	Carlton Parish Council
J Stilgoe	Resident, Twycross
Sarah Sykes	Twycross Parish Council
Mr R M Symonds	Market Bosworth Parish Council
Robert Vero	Twycross Parish Council
Deborah Walker	Resident, Twycross
Sara Deryn Whitaker	Resident, Twycross
R E Wilson	Resident, Twycross
Ms S Windybank	Sutton Cheney Parish Council

### Partner Agencies

Insp Martyn Ball	Commander, Hinckley and Bosworth Local Policing Unit
PC Ryan Ludlam	Leicestershire Constabulary
PC Dave Riley	Leicestershire Constabulary

### Officers

Matt Bagley	Travellers Sites and Liaison Officer, Leicestershire County Council
Katanya Barlow	Principal Planning Officer, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Edwina Grant	Strategic and Community Planning, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Ron Grantham	Community Safety Manager, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Ian Grierson	Highways Area Team Manager, Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management, Leicestershire County Council
Helen Harris	Better Places Team Leader, Leicestershire County Council
Andy Hitchcock	Area Youth Officer, Leicestershire County Council
Beverley Ireland	Committee Officer, Leicestershire County Council
Sabrina Malik	Community Engagement Manager, Leicestershire County Council
Juan Pardo	Community Engagement Officer, Leicestershire County Council

Apologies for absence were received from Maureen Cook (Witherley Parish Council), Mrs J Crooks (Newbold Verdon Parish Council), Judy Handford (Age Concern, Hinckley and Bosworth), Cllr K Morrell (Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Sheepy Parish Council) and Lindsey Short (Hinckley and Bosworth Community Transport).

### 32. Election of Chairman

It was moved, seconded and carried that Cllr Brian Sutton be elected Chairman for the meeting.

Cllr B Sutton in the Chair

### 33. Welcome and Introductions

Cllr Sutton welcomed everyone to the meeting and drew their attention to information about the Sports England Fund laid out in the hall.

34. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2008, having previously been circulated, were agreed as a correct record.

35. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman invited those who wished to do so to declare any interests in respect of items on the agenda.

No declarations were made.

36. Highways Update

Ian Grierson provided the Forum with the following updates on local highways matters:

- i) Grass Cutting – The urban cuts had begun week commencing 16 March 2009. All parishes had been informed that the number of cuts had been increased by 3 to 12 per season (on a roughly 3 week cycle). An extra rural cut would also be undertaken (making 4 per season), aimed at improving visibility at junctions and combating noxious weeds. It was noted that information on grass cutting could be found at: <http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/grasscutting>. The pages would be updated weekly.
- ii) Carlton to Market Bosworth footpath – The project was progress through close liaison between the two Parishes and the County Council. The work done was providing valuable information to be used in similar projects in the future. There had been a site visit on 20 March during which the route had been walked and the specification of the design discussed. It was agreed that Carlton Parish Council would consider accepting responsibility for parts of the maintenance of the footpath. The Forum noted that it had been decided that it would not be practicable to use volunteers to lay the footpath, so it would be constructed either the Highways department of the County Council or a qualified and accredited contractor. Carlton Parish Council would be contributing to the funding and the County Council's Highways department would provide the full specifications for the project as its major contribution. The full specification and costings were to be agreed before making submissions for grants. It had been agreed that, if necessary, the work could be completed in phases, possibly in different years, if the project could not be fully funded in one go.
- iii) Information for parish clerks – The Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management had produced a sheet for parish clerks in Hinckley and Bosworth, detailing information on how to report highway defects, raising wider concerns, grass

cutting, the function of Highways Forums, etc and were circulating them to all parish clerks. A copy of the sheet is attached to these minutes.

iv) Updates from previous meetings –

1. Golf Course access, Station Road, Market Bosworth. This matter had progressed slightly: requirements for access that had now been agreed between the developer and Leicestershire County Council Highways Development Control but a formal signed agreement was still awaited. The developer had not yet announced a start date.
2. Twycross Zoo. In addition to the planning application reported to the Forum at the meeting on 9 October 2008, a further application had been made in November 2008 relating to the provision of a right turn lane on the A444 Burton Road, to be funded by a Section 278 agreement<sup>1</sup>. Leicestershire County Council would supervise the works.

AGREED:

- a) to note the updates;
- b) to request Ian Grierson to raise with the relevant authorities the possibility that Parishes could access the monitoring system for highways works using a drop down menu rather than having to access a code number that was easily forgotten.

37. Youth Services

Andrew Hitchcock introduced himself to the Forum and provided an overview of the work being done in the area by the Youth Services Team.

He explained that central government dictated who the ages of the young people the County Council should work with, currently 11-19; although, for young people with special needs, they continued to work with them up to the age of 25. There were 4 cornerstones to youth service work: participation; empowerment; equality; and education. The Service was inspected by Ofsted and did offer qualifications e.g. the Duke of Edinburgh Awards.

The youth services in Leicestershire were currently being redesigned, as the Government were asking them to work more closely with other organisations working with young people. The local youth worker was Sebastien Mainard. Hinckley and Bosworth was one of 2 pilots for the new Integrated Youth Support Services (IYSS). IYSS consisted of 4 strands:

---

<sup>1</sup> Private-sector funding of works on the strategic road network are made under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, as amended by section 23 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. These agreements provide a financial mechanism for ensuring delivery of mitigation works identified and determined as necessary for planning permission to be granted.

1. Positive Activities for Young People
2. Voice of Young People
3. Information, Advice and Guidance
4. Targeted Youth Support.

A recent innovation in the area was the mobile resource – mobile youth club – which was available to visit rural areas. Andrew also drew attention to <http://www.thejitty.com/>, a website by young people for young people in Leicestershire.

In response to a question asking if younger children could be permitted to access the services available on the mobile resource, Andrew explained that, while, it was clear that younger children could also benefit from the mobile resource, the Youth Service's remit was only to provide services to the 11-19 age group. There would be a problem in allowing younger children to join activities; for example, they could be exposed to information about sexual health, which might be considered inappropriate for them.

### 38. Community Safety Partnership

Ron Grantham and Martyn Ball provided the Forum with an update on the priorities for the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Community Safety Partnership for 2009/10. The key priorities would be:

1. Anti-Social Behaviour
2. Violent Crime – often alcohol related but also focusing on domestic violence and hate crime.
3. Substance abuse – Hinckley and Bosworth were not areas with particularly notable drug problems but it did exist, even in rural areas. Alcohol was often a factor in the first two priorities.
4. Serious acquisitive crime.

As background, Ron explained that the Partnership dated back to 1998, when the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 had introduced the requirement for local authorities to set up such partnerships to work with a variety of agencies, including: Youth Services; schools; NHS; magistrates, etc., as well as the police.

Martyn reported on the Partnership's recent success in being awarded a Beacon Award "After Dark" for its work on managing the night-time economy. It was the first instance of an Award going to a partnership and brought with it prize money of £125,000.

Martyn reported that Bosworth was not a high crime area and did not have knife or gun crime problems. Generally, crime figures had fallen for the last 10-12 years; however, the public confidence had not risen to reflect this. It was noted that the Government had made the reduction of fear of crime the sole target for police, albeit a target that

encompassed a variety of earlier targets. One of the ways this was being tackled in the area was through the Neighbourhood Watch Superstrength scheme which had been expanded to include Newbold Verdon, Desford and Peckleton.

Martyn Ball also drew attention to the Policing Pledge and Crime Maps that were now available on the website [http://www.leics.police.uk/campaigns/95\\_crime\\_mapping\\_launched/](http://www.leics.police.uk/campaigns/95_crime_mapping_launched/). It was noted that some of the figures involved were very small and care should be taken in looking at them, e.g. a 100% increase may mean an increase from 1 to 2.

During discussion, the following were among the points raised:

- The fear of crime was measured through the British Crime Survey (carried out annually) which included a question on how safe respondents felt. In Leicestershire, CRAVE (Confidence, Reassurance, Accessibility and Visibility Evaluation) Surveys would be used to monitor local progress.
- A recent exercise, which had involved setting up a 'knife arch' at a local nightclub, had only found 1 small penknife, which was part of a key ring, in checks on 12,000 people.
- The fear of crime had dominated recent public meetings held within the Borough on the Local Development Framework. There were serious issues regarding perceptions of certain groups in society; for example, only a very small number of young people actually commit crime but it was very difficult to get the media to report stories about the majority who were law abiding.
- Leicestershire Constabulary had signed up to the Policing Pledge, which set out what the public could expect from police, e.g. response times, diarised appointments, etc.

#### 39. Frequency of Forum Meetings

It was noted that the Forum currently met twice in a year, a pattern that had been agreed to fit in with the two Parish Forum meetings held each year in the Borough. It was felt that the two Fora had distinct agendas, both of which were valid and different memberships.

AGREED:

That the Community Forum continue to meet twice a year.

#### 40. Site Allocations

Katanya Barlow briefly outlined the consultation process being undertaken on the Site Allocations and Development Control Policies Preferred Options document of the Local Development Framework. The consultation would end at 5 p.m. on Monday 6 April 2009.

Sites in the following settlements had been suggested for gypsy and traveller provision:

Barlestone – 5 pitches (extension to existing site)  
Cadeby – 1 pitch (existing site)  
Groby – 5 pitches  
Higham on the Hill – 1 pitch (extension to existing site)  
Markfield – 5 pitches (regularisation of existing unauthorised pitches and 1 pitch extension)  
Newbold Verdon – 4 pitches (extension to existing site)  
Ratby – 4 pitches  
Thornton – 10 pitches  
Stoke Golding – 4 pitches (extension to existing site)  
Hinckley – 10 caravans (transit).

The key local housing sites identified for this Forum were:

100 houses in Market Bosworth – 2 sites identified  
20 houses in Twycross  
20 houses in Sheepy Magna  
10 houses in Congerstone.

The Site Allocations and Generic Control Policies Development Plan Document, which set out the preferred sites was available on the website:

<http://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/siteallocations>. The Plan set out the Borough Council's preferred options and also the alternative options that had been considered. The Borough Council were hoping to receive responses that set out whether the respondent agreed with the sites suggested; if not, whether the respondent preferred one of the alternatives already looked at or could they suggest other sites that had not yet come to the Council's attention. The numbers of houses, pitches, etc were set; the consultation now was on where they should go. Once the consultation had closed it would take several months to analyse the responses, amend the Site Allocations document where necessary and consult on the amended document, before it was submitted to the Secretary of State and went for public inspection. It was hoped that the 6 week final consultation on the Site Allocation document, as amended in the light of the current consultation, would take place around October 2009 and would be submitted to the Secretary of State in February or March 2010.

In response to a question, Katanya explained how the numbers of houses had come to be allocated to the settlements. The detail of how the numbers had been calculated and allocated was in the Rural Housing Methodology paper available at [www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/corestrategy](http://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/corestrategy). The Borough Council had an allocation of 11,700 houses to be provided by 2026. This was to be distributed across the Borough, with the majority in the urban areas and a small

number distributed across the rural communities. The key rural settlements, which had a good range of services, were getting the majority of these, with the remainder going to villages that had a primary school, community/leisure facilities and a bus service.

Arising from discussion, the following principal points were noted:

#### Twycross

- Despite the Borough Council's attempts to ensure all residents were aware of the plans to place 20 houses on a site in Twycross, it was clear most residents were not. It was suggested that many households may have binned the colourful leaflet notifying them of the proposed site allocation the consultation in the belief that it was a commercial flyer.
- The Parish Council had also been sent posters advertising the consultation to display on Parish notice-boards.
- If people are aware of other, deliverable (i.e. the land owner would be willing for the land to go for development), sites that they thought would be better for development, these should be submitted as part of the Site Allocations consultation. The Borough Council would then look into these sites in more detail.
- A developer proposing to construct the 20 houses allocated to Twycross would need to look at the Housing Market Assessment to determine the sort of housing suitable for that settlement.
- The preferred option did not include building on the playing field.
- Although the Parish Council had expressed its agreement with much of what the residents were saying and the Borough Council had held public meetings to hear the comments of residents, there was considerable concern expressed that the views of residents were not being heard or listened to and acted upon. Residents expressed their frustration that their strength of feeling on these issues had not been adequately reflected to the Borough Council.
- The residents of Twycross were collecting signatures for a petition setting out their opposition to the proposed development in the village.

#### General

- The house building was to take place over the next 20 years, so many of the proposed developments would not be completed straightaway.
- The figures the Borough Council had based the housing need on, from the Regional Plan, had been drawn up before the advent of the recession. Whilst the recession is having an immediate effect, in the longer term, the requirement for additional housing will remain, and is in fact expected to increase.
- Many of the sites identified could take more houses than were being proposed and there were significant concerns expressed

that developers would go ahead and propose much bigger developments, which would strain existing services in communities.

- The minimum densities for housing developments were: urban areas – 40 dwellings per hectare; rural areas – 30 dwellings per hectare. It was considered unlikely that any applications that came in for the sites currently proposed would be significantly denser than the minimums.
- The overall LDF process, leading up to the Site Allocation document, had begun in 2005 and had already been the subject of several consultations. A new framework was needed to inform planning decisions.
- It was accepted that there was a need for more social housing but there was concern that if the majority of the planned developments were for sale on the open market they would not necessarily benefit local families.
- There were particular issues around the siting of housing and a care home in Stoke Golding.
- In an ideal world, all the necessary services and infrastructure would be in place in any settlement where major development was proposed; however, it was often the case that such services would only be attracted to a community if there were considered to be enough households already present to sustain it.
- The Borough Council's preference was to see brownfield sites developed.
- Villages were currently growing organically, often on 'in-fill' land and this was felt by those present to be a more sustainable form of settlement development. If taken over a 20 year period, it was suggested that much of the required housing growth would be achieved by this means and multi-dwelling sites were not required.
- Section 106 money<sup>2</sup> would be sought to provide amenities and services wherever possible. The Borough Council would support proposals brought forward by villages to develop services.
- The Green Infrastructure Strategy was intended to promote walking and cycling routes and biodiversity corridors across the Borough. A map of how Market Bosworth could be linked to the National Forest had been included in the Site Allocation paper for comment at this stage.

#### AGREED:

That the views reported above be taken into consideration by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in its consultations on the Site

---

<sup>2</sup> Under S106 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990, as amended, planning authorities can request contributions to the costs of providing community and social infrastructure from developers, where the need for the infrastructure has arisen as a result of a new development taking place.

Allocations and also in considering how such consultations should be carried out in future.

41. Question Time

	<u>Question</u>	<u>Submitted by</u>	<u>Question to</u>
1.	Can Carlton Parish Council please have £5,000 towards a path to Market Bosworth	Chris Peat	Community Forum/Local Strategic Partnership
2.	Can Market Bosworth please have £5,000 towards the Carlton-Bosworth Rural Footpath	G P Betts	Community Forum/Local Strategic Partnership
3.	How does the Borough Council expect young people to be able to afford to buy the houses in the areas of development taking into account current financial climate and previous housing prices that price one and all out of their areas?	Anon	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council  No response received.

Questions 1 & 2 arose out of the discussion on Minute 42 – Participatory Budgeting. (To be discussed in the coming months with other project ideas.)

42. An Introduction to Participatory Budgeting

Edwina Grant gave an update on the plans for participatory budgeting, which formed part of central government’s intention to devolve power and influence to local communities and was being piloted in Leicestershire. She reported that Leicestershire Together<sup>3</sup> was making £20,000 available to each Community Forum to be spent by March 2011. It would be for Forum members to decide on priorities, carry out shortlisting and make a final recommendation on how to allocate the monies to the District Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), who had the delegated power to spend the money.

There would be some criteria set down: the Forums needed to take account of existing evidence for the priorities of an area (e.g. Local Area Agreement, Sustainable Community Strategy, Priority Neighbourhoods, etc); and there would need to be robust evidence that the Forum had consulted in reaching its decision, which would probably require them to go out to reach people, rather than expect the public to

---

<sup>3</sup> Leicestershire Together is the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) for Leicestershire. It brings together numerous partnerships all seeking to deliver improved services for the people of Leicestershire. Its Sustainable Community Strategy outlines the issues that local people see as a priority and its Local Area Agreement sets out how those issues are being tackled.

come to the Forum. It was being left for the District LSP to devise the approach for the Hinckley and Bosworth Community Forums.

It would be possible to spend the funds on one key project or on a number of things. A Forum might opt to put the funding alongside other funding to finance a larger project, or to pool resources with another Forum from the Hinckley and Bosworth area to tackle a common problem.

Edwina reported that the Local Strategic Partnership wanted to make the process as simple and straightforward as possible to get bids in. It was suggested that each Community Forum might wish to establish a task and finish group to decide how to achieve consultation and bring forward proposals over May. It was hoped to be able to implement the consultations late June to August and bring the proposals to the Community Forum for decision at its meeting in October.

AGREED:

- a) that officers will circulate to all Parish Councils the criteria for making bids;
- b) that further consultation be undertaken with the Parish Councils as to how to progress the issue further

43. Date of Next Meeting

It was AGREED that the next meeting be held at 7.00 pm on Thursday 15 October 2009.

Members were asked to pass suggestions for future items and venues for future meetings to Sabrina Malik ([samalik@leics.gov.uk](mailto:samalik@leics.gov.uk)).

7.00pm – 8.45pm  
26/03/09