

## NOTICE OF MEETING

MEETING	<b>PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON MEETING</b>
DATE:	<b>WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY 2010</b>
TIME:	<b>6.30 pm</b>
VENUE:	<b>TOWN HALL</b>
CONTACT:	<b>Alex Daynes</b> <i>Telephone: 01733 452447</i> <i>e-mail address alexander.daynes@peterborough.gov.uk</i>
<i>Despatch date:</i>	<i>12 January 2010</i>

### AGENDA

	PAGE NO
<b>1. Apologies for Absence</b>	
<b>2. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 18 November 2009</b>	<b>1 - 4</b>
<b>3. Village Design Statements</b>	<b>5 - 6</b>
To consider the strength, relevance and validity of Village Design Statements.	
<b>4. Site Allocations DPD</b>	<b>7 - 12</b>
To be consulted on the most recent Development Plan Document.	
<b>5. Budget for 2010/11 and the Medium Term Financial Plan</b>	
Receive a presentation on the coming year's budget.	
<b>6. Neighbourhood Councils</b>	<b>13 - 16</b>
Receive an update on Neighbourhood Councils and actions so far.	
<b>7. Parish Question Time</b>	
Opportunity for Parish Councillors to raise further issues and queries.	
<b>8. Parish Council Liaison Work programme</b>	<b>17 - 18</b>

## **Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours**

*In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the Cathedral. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair.*



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Alex Daynes on 01733 452447.

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of a meeting of the Parish Council Liaison Meeting held at the Council Chamber -  
Town Hall on 18 November 2009

## **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councillor David Over (Chairman)  
John Bartlett, Thorney Parish Council  
Denis Batty, Glinton Parish Council  
David Buddle, Thorney Parish Council  
Marion Browne, Ufford Parish Council  
Henry Clark, Peakirk  
Carol Fuller, Thorney Parish Council  
Howard Fuller, Thorney Parish Council  
Andy Goodsell, Eye Parish Council  
Martin Greaves, Werrington Neighbourhood Council  
Frieda Greling, Ufford Parish Council  
Angela Hankins, Peakirk Parish Council  
David Hedges, Werrington Neighbourhood Council  
Jayne Mann, Castor Parish Council  
Pat Murphy, Thorney Parish Council  
Tim Pearson, Wansford Parish Council  
Roy Pettitt, Peakirk Parish Council  
Sydney Smith, Helpston Parish Council  
Andy Totten, Bainton & Ashton Parish Council  
June Woollard, Barnack Parish Council

## **OTHER ATTENDEES:**

Councillor David Harrington, Newborough Ward Councillor

## **OFFICERS PRESENT:**

Cathy Summers, Team Manager - Passenger Transport Contracts and Planning  
Peter Tebb, Traffic Manager  
Teresa Wood, Group Manager - Accessibility and Travel  
Leonie McCarthy, Neighbourhood Manager  
Sally Crawford, Community Governance Manager  
Paul Phillipson, Executive Director Operations  
Richard Astle, Langdyke Trust

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Gillian Beasley, Ian Dewar, Geoff Smith (Werrington) and Nick Lodge (Southorpe).

### **2. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 September 2009**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2009 were approved as a true and accurate record.

### **3. The Leader's Vision**

The Leader of Peterborough City Council addressed the meeting highlighting his ambitions and aspirations for the city. These included higher aspirations and attainment for residents in

education and employment and a successful growth agenda and the infrastructure needed to support it.

Questions were raised and responses given including:

- Neighbourhood Councils will enable Parish Councils to have a greater influence on council spending and actions in parished areas.
- The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities has been established to ensure a rural voice in the development of Peterborough.
- Parish Council involvement in Neighbourhood Councils is vital to ensure their success.
- Neighbourhood Councils will have more devolved powers than Ward Councillors currently have and should therefore appeal to a wider cross section of the community.

#### **4. Quality Council Scheme/CALC**

The Chairman of Peterborough Association of Local Councils (PALC) gave his apologies for previous cancelled meetings and advised those present that there would be another meeting soon.

Diane Bayliss from Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils (CALC) addressed the meeting to advise Councillors of the Quality Council scheme. The representative from CALC advised that the requirements to achieve quality status had increased from 7 tasks to 10 and went on to advise the meeting of those tasks. The CALC representative advised that in order for CALC to provide support for the Parish Councils in Peterborough to achieve quality status, funding would be needed to be made available from Peterborough City Council.

Questions were raised and responses given including:

- Quantitative benefits of achieving quality status can be provided.
- A website is now required to achieve quality status.

The Neighbourhood Manager – City Wide from Peterborough City Council agreed to liaise with CALC regarding the requirements and benefits of quality status and report back to the Chairman.

#### **5. Land Trusts (Langdyke Trust)**

Richard Astle presented information on the Langdyke Trust and the success experienced in its establishment as an example of what could be achieved locally to enhance areas previously taken up by quarries or waste land.

The Chairman advised that a legitimate use of Council funds would include reopening of footpaths to enable better access to features in the countryside such as nature reserves.

#### **6. Traffic Mitigation**

The Traffic Manager from Peterborough City Council advised those present of current legislation and consultations concerning speed limits and traffic management. Following the submission of a report to the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities, the main issues identified and recommended were the speed limits outside rural schools (reduce to 20mph) and the speed limits between rural settlements (reduce to 50mph).

The Traffic Manager advised those present that to enable a speed reduction, more signs would be needed thus increasing 'street clutter' which was undesirable. If a national recommendation was approved at 50mph in rural areas, this would ensure that the cost of

implementing the change would not fall completely with the Local Authority. However, there would be a period of approximately 3 months for any changes to be implemented.

Questions were raised and responses given including:

- The current government consultation due in December 2009 looked to address major changes from government. Local issues such as lighting and surface condition would be resolved later.
- A local scheme with Police called Community Speed Watch has already proven effective in some areas.

## **7. Bus Routes - Review for Rural Communities**

The Chairman advised those present that only new issues should be discussed as the Review had already been widely consulted on.

The Group Manager - Transport & Sustainable Environment from Peterborough City Council update those present on the current recommendations in the latest version of the Bus Service review. Councillors were advised that a call connect service would initially operate for the West area of Peterborough on Monday to Saturday from 7am until 7pm and could be expanded at a later date. Some services initially proposed to be cut had been reinstated and any changes would be implemented from April 2010 following submission of the Review to a suitable Council meeting for approval.

Thanks were expressed to the Group Manager for considering and incorporating views of residents into the review.

## **8. The Soke of Peterborough**

The Chairman asked those present to consider the re-introduction of the title of Soke when referring to parished or rural areas of Peterborough. The Neighbourhood Manager – City Wide, advised members of the meeting that this issue had also been raised at Neighbourhood Council meetings.

Parish representatives would consider this proposal and respond at the next meeting.

## **9. Parish Question Time**

Representatives from Werrington Neighbourhood Council requested that it was not referred to as 'the other' neighbourhood council in Council documents. The Neighbourhood Manager – City Wide advised that alternative names for the Neighbourhood Councils established by Peterborough City Council would be considered at future meetings of those councils and also whether they should be referred to as Neighbourhood Councils at all as this was a title used for an existing statutory body.

A request was made to receive training on Standards issues as part of a future meeting. The Chairman agreed that this could be incorporated into a future agenda.

A final request was made that Cllr Cereste attend the meeting again for a further question and answer session. It was proposed that each parish council could prepare a number of questions in advance of the meeting for Cllr Cereste to respond to at the meeting.

## **10. Parish Council Liaison Work programme**

Members considered the current work programme and made the following recommendations:

- Include a discussion on the Soke of Peterborough on the next agenda.
- Include an agenda item on Youth Service Provision on the next agenda.
- The meeting on 31 March 2010 could be used for a Q&A session for Cllr Cereste with Gillian Beasley if possible.
- A representative of the Neighbourhoods team to attend each meeting.

CHAIRMAN  
6.30 - 8.15 pm

<b>PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON MEETING</b>	<b>Agenda Item No. 3</b>
<b>20 JANUARY 2010</b>	<b>Public Report</b>

## **Report of the Executive Director Operations**

**Report Author** Simon Machen – Head of Planning Services  
**Contact Details** e-mail: simon.machen@peterborough.gov.uk  
Tel: 01733 453475

### **THE ROLE OF VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to explain the role of Village Design Statements in the determination of planning applications and appeals.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That this report be noted.

#### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 By law, planning decisions have to be made in accordance with the 'Development Plan' unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise (Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). For Peterborough, the Development Plan primarily comprises the Peterborough Local Plan 2005 and the East of England Plan 2001-2021, also known as the Regional Spatial Strategy (the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan, and Aggregates (Minerals) Local Plan also form part of the Development Plan). Government's Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes are recognised material planning considerations.
- 3.2 The Council's emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) will eventually replace the Peterborough Local Plan 2005.
- 3.3 In implementing the LDF system, no provision was made by Government to allow Village Design Statements previously Adopted by the Council to become 'saved policy' (only the Local Plan itself is 'saved' policy until the LDF is in place). This means that legally only very limited weight can now be given to Village Design Statements when planning applications are being decided by the Council, or appeals by the Planning Inspectorate. The Council cannot rely solely on a Village Design Statement to refuse planning permission and would not normally refer to such a Statement in a reason for refusal of consent. To do so would run the risk of an award of costs against the Council at subsequent appeal. However, a Village Design Statement could be used to help justify the case where refusal is based on Development Plan policy, particularly at appeal. It also helps the Council's planning officers to understand local consensus about what is important in a village and this is used in informal pre-application discussions with potential developers.
- 3.4 To have greater weight in the planning process, any future Village Design Statement would have to be incorporated as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in the Council's LDF and would have to go through associated legal and consultation processes.
- 3.5 Parish councils may wish to retain and continue to use an existing Village Design Statement, or prepare a new non-SPD Statement. These can help to inform applicants and Council officers about locally important issues or the history of particular sites, influencing design discussions. They can also form part of the evidence base for the emerging LDF, helping to shape policies

and allocations at a local level.

**4. CONSULTATION/KEY ISSUES**

N/A

**5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

N/A

**6. APPENDICES**

None



<b>PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON MEETING</b>	<b>Agenda Item No. 4</b>
<b>20 JANUARY 2010</b>	<b>Public Report</b>

## Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

**Report Author** – Richard Kay – Strategic Planning Manager

**Contact Details** – [richard.kay@peterborough.gov.uk](mailto:richard.kay@peterborough.gov.uk) 01733 863795

### **SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD – UPDATE (AND LINKS TO VILLAGE STATEMENTS / PARISH PLANS ETC)**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

To update Members on the preparation of (and forthcoming consultation on) the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), and the wider implications for planning and development in village and rural areas.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That this report be noted and in particular that Parish Councils note, and subsequently respond to, the forthcoming public consultation on the Site Allocations document in late February or March 2010.

#### **3. SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD**

##### **3.1 Introduction**

The Site Allocations Document will allocate new land for housing, employment and Gypsy and Travellers to deliver the growth targets set out in the Peterborough Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets the overall vision and ‘headlines’ for growth, and the Site Allocations Document will allocate the precise boundary of sites to accommodate that growth.

##### **3.2 Already Completed Consultation Stages**

In October 2008 a consultation document was published which contained all sites submitted to the council as potential housing and/or employment sites. Sites were proposed by developers, landowners, agents and parish councils. At this stage no sites for Gypsy and Travellers were received.

At the time of consultation in October 2008 no assessments had been carried out and no decision had been made as to the suitability of any site. The full consultation document, including a brief description and map of each site, can be viewed at:

[http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/site\\_allocs\\_io\\_dpd/site\\_allocs\\_io\\_dpd?pointId=243162](http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/site_allocs_io_dpd/site_allocs_io_dpd?pointId=243162)

(This link also includes all comments received during the consultation period.)

In January 2009, further sites were consulted upon. These can be viewed at: [http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/site\\_allocs\\_io\\_dpd/saas/sa\\_additional\\_sites](http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/site_allocs_io_dpd/saas/sa_additional_sites)

A further few additional sites have subsequently been received throughout 2009, and legally the City Council has to consider these as well (though they have not had the benefit of previous formal consultation). These additional sites have been included in the assessment process, as described below.

##### **3.3 Extra Consultation Stage for Parish Councils Only**

On 8<sup>th</sup> September 2009, the GPP Rural Working Group wrote to all Parish Council Chairs, setting

out an extra consultation period for Parish Councils only – see Appendix 1 for details. A limited number of responses were received, and these have been included in the material considered by officers.

### **3.4 Method for Assessing Housing and Employment Sites**

During 2009 a detailed assessment has been undertaken of all sites (i.e. all sites from October 2008, January 2009 and the further additional sites received). This assessment included site visits and desk-based research (including research across council departments, selected partners and utility providers). A comprehensive database has been created to record all information and site assessment. Each site has been scored against a wide-ranging list of criteria.

To help ‘weed out’ clearly unsuitable sites, ‘major criteria or constraints’ include:

- Flood Risk
- Proximity to European, nationally and local wildlife sites
- Proximity to Hazardous installations and Pipelines

Any site resulting in a negative impact against one of the above criteria will automatically be rejected, as it will be unsuitable for future development.

A wide range of other issues have also been taken into consideration in assessing sites. A separate Sustainability Appraisal has also been carried out to identify the most appropriate and sustainable sites.

### **3.5 Method for Assessing Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation**

No sites were voluntarily submitted by landowners for assessment as candidate Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation during the early consultation periods. This has resulted in the City Council having to prepare, and then implement, a methodology for selecting sustainable, appropriate and deliverable sites, based on the Core Strategy (Policy CS 7) and taking advantage of large-scale major developments (development areas over 4ha, whereby a small element can be set aside for Gypsies and Travellers).

### **3.6 Next Stages**

Based on this thorough assessment of all sites, recommendations on the preferred location for new developments are now being made. The full Site Allocations Document listing all preferred sites will be going to the Council’s Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2010 and Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2010. It is then intended to go out for a 6-week public consultation on the preferred sites in late February or March 2010.

Any changes as a result of the consultation period will then be made, followed by a further public consultation on the “pre-submission” version of the document in late 2010 before the document is submitted to the Secretary of State. An independent public examination will take place by a Planning Inspector (in 2011) who will issue its final decision/recommendation on all sites. The Site Allocations Document can then be adopted by the Council in late 2011.

### **3.7 LINKS TO VILLAGE STATEMENTS / PARISH PLANS ETC**

The Site Allocations Document is the only place that a site can be allocated for development in a Plan in order for it to have a statutory status, and hence have any significant weight when determining planning applications.

Village Statements, Parish Plans and similar documents should not allocate land for development. If such a document did, it would have virtually nil status in planning terms.

As such, it is vitally important that if a village or parish wishes to see a piece of land come forward for development (or not, as the case may be), then it must do so via the Site Allocations Document process and not via Village Statements / Parish Plans.

This is not to say that Village Statements / Parish Plans should not continue to be prepared or

updated (see previous agenda item), but it is important they avoid attempting to allocate land for development as this would not only be wasted effort but could also confuse communities.

**4. LINKS TO CORPORATE PLAN, SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY (SCS) AND LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT (LAA)**

Direct relates to the SCS and LAA.

SCS vision is about growing a bigger and better Peterborough. The Site Allocations Document enables that growth to occur in the right places, at the right time and for the right purposes. Without the SA, growth would either not occur or would occur randomly and largely uncontrolled.

A number of LAA objectives and targets and similarly linked to the growth of Peterborough.

**5. CONSULTATION/KEY ISSUES**

See section 3

**6. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

See section 3

**7. APPENDICES**

1. Letter to Parish Chairs, Sept 2009

## Appendix 1 – Letter sent to Parish Chairs, September 2009



THE GREATER  
PETERBOROUGH  
PARTNERSHIP

25 Priestgate, Peterborough PE1 1  
T 01733 20734  
www.gpp-peterborough.org.uk

8<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Dear Parish Chair

PCC must prepare a document, known as the Site Allocations DPD, which will allocate new sites for development (such as housing, employment and retail).

An initial consultation took place in 2008, known as the Issues and Options stage. This was a weighty document which contained all sites put forward by developers and landowners. The public were asked to comment upon these 'options'.

The next consultation stage is due in Spring 2010, when PCC will issue a revised document which sets out which sites it thinks are good sites for development and which sites it has rejected. In both cases there will be reasons why. The public will be asked for their opinion as to whether PCC has got its views right for each site.

However, partly because of the relatively limited response from some parishes to early formal consultation rounds, the Rural Working Group has had discussions with Peterborough City Council, and it has kindly agreed to permit Parishes to have a second informal opportunity to comment on the sites that were put forward. PCC is not required to do this, but is doing so as it is committed to gaining as much information, local knowledge and views from Parishes as possible before it forms opinions on which sites to choose for new development. **This is a great opportunity to bring relevant facts to the attention of PCC before the final site selections are made.** The earlier that comments are made the more likely they are to have an effect.

This 'extra' consultation period until 30 Oct 2009 is purely voluntary and not a formal consultation stage. We hope Parishes take up this opportunity, especially those which struggled to put in comments at the earlier formal consultation stages.

The template enclosed should be used by Parishes to complete for each site in its area. Please note that PCC are not looking for additional sites, only comments on those already put forward. It is too late in the statutory process to put forward completely new sites for consideration. The sites, and their reference numbers, can be found via the already published 'Site Allocations Issues and options document'. The full document can be found via <http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/page-12420> and you will be able to find the sites which lie in your parish at <http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/page-15535>. Hard copies of the document were sent out to Parishes at their time of issue, and unfortunately further hard copies are no longer now available.

There is no requirement for Parishes to complete the attached template form, especially if they feel they sent in their views at the formal consultation stages in 2008. In addition, some Parishes may prefer to wait to see the next formal consultation stage in Spring 2010 before making any further representations, when they will have the benefit of seeing the reasons why PCC are recommending certain sites should be developed whilst others should not. However, for those Parishes that do take this opportunity now, they will of course also get a further opportunity at the next formal consultation stage in Spring 2010 to make its views known.

If you have any questions, the Greater Peterborough Partnership (Nick Goodman) will help. Alternatively, you could approach your PCC ward councillor.

Yours sincerely,

*Henry Clark*

Henry Clark  
Chair, Rural Working Group

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON</b>	<b>Agenda Item No. 6</b>
<b>20 January 2010</b>	<b>Public Report</b>

## **Report of the Director of Operations, Paul Phillipson**

**Report Author** – Leonie McCarthy, Neighbourhood Manager - City wide  
**Contact Details** – 01733 864308, leonie.mccarthy@peterborough.gov.uk

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

To update Parish Council Liaison on Neighbourhood Councils.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Parish Council members note the contents of the report and feedback any comments to the Neighbourhood team representative.

#### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Neighbourhood Management is a vehicle for improvement and change. Improvement in service delivery, where necessary, and change in the way service delivery agencies and other bodies relate to one another and the communities they serve. Its focus is on changing the way key mainstream services are delivered, tailoring them to the needs and priorities of neighbourhoods, and making a local team responsible for making sure that those improvements and changes are delivered. It requires effective participation by local people and organisations and commitment from service agencies to work in partnership at a neighbourhood level.
- 3.2 Neighbourhood management is a new idea for Peterborough but one which has worked well in other parts of the country. The Greater Dogsthorpe Partnership (GDP) trialled neighbourhood management in Peterborough between 2006/2010 and their model was mainstreamed by PCC. GDP was a four year £1.6 million project, funded by Central Government's Safer and Stronger Communities Fund and was designed to bring about lasting positive social, environmental and economic change for residents across the Dogsthorpe ward, most of North ward and a number of streets in Park ward.
- 3.3 These councils are an extension of the PCC's decision making structures to support the local needs of the community and are chaired by elected members. Parish, resident and community members will make up the councils. The Councils have an Advisory Panel of high level key partners including Peterborough Probation, Courts, Health, Education and Young People, Fire and Rescue and the Police. The key to the success of Neighbourhood Councils is input from the community. The existing mechanisms for engaging with communities, including the Neighbourhood Panels and Parish Councils will continue and be strengthened and these Panels will feed the Neighbourhood Councils. Neighbourhood Councils will meet quarterly and meetings will be held in the area to which they serve.
- 3.4 A series of Neighbourhood Council Meetings have been held throughout December – summary below.
- 3.5 **Central & East 1 - Now named Central and North Neighbourhood Council.**
- 3.5.1 Average attendance over first two meetings has been approx 35 members of the public.

- 3.5.2 **Key Issues Raised:** Houses of multiple occupation, enforcement issues in relation to parking, planning and illegal trading, out of date information on demographics.
- 3.5.3 **Key Challenges:** Cohesion with area having major influx of migrants, perception of being over consulted but no follow up action. Neighbourhood Investment Plans commissioned but with no status within council structure – no significant growth or regeneration plans intended in area in foreseeable future. Attachment to city centre and how resources may be used in inequitable manner and how city centre stats could distort data for the council area. Statistically one of the most deprived areas of the City.
- 3.5.4 **Positives:** Neighbourhood Investment Plans available tool to inform community action plans, successful networking to support enhanced partnership working in area.
- 3.6 Central & East 2 - Now named Dogsthorpe, East & Park Neighbourhood Council**
- 3.6.1 Average attendance over first two meetings has been approx 25 members of the public, including great attendance of young people participating in discussions and voicing their concerns and aspirations for the area.
- 3.6.2 **Key Issues Raised:** Enforcement issues in relation to parking, planning and illegal trading, street lighting and bus service in Parnwell, road works at the Eye roundabout, lack of community facilities in Park ward.
- 3.6.3 **Key Challenges:** Maintaining locality based presence of Neighbourhood Management Team after success of Neighbourhood Management Centre in Dogsthorpe, reassurance to active residents involved with Greater Dogsthorpe Partnership that they can still influence decisions in their area via the Neighbourhood Councils.
- 3.6.4 **Positives:** Greater Dogsthorpe Partnership operating in area over last 4 years and existing staff members in new Neighbourhoods structure to provide continuity. Neighbourhood Management Centre to remain in Dogsthorpe for foreseeable future to provide locality based office as key point of contact
- 3.7 North & West 1 – Now named Soke and Isle Neighbourhood Council**
- 3.7.1 Average Attendance over first two meetings has been approx 30 members of the public
- 3.7.2 **Key Issues Raised:** Relationship/Partnerships between Parish Council and Neighbourhood Councils; growth in rural area and impact on the communities in these areas; Footpaths across the rural area; Use of Renewable energy in the rural areas. Transport links across rural area
- 3.7.3 **Key Challenges:** To gain the confidence of the Parish Council members to believe in Neighbourhood Councils.
- 3.7.4 **Positives:** Headway already being made in cementing a good working relationship with Parishes. LM - City Wide Manager attending meetings to build on partnership. Neighbourhood Management Teams are engaged with local communities to resolve issues such as footpaths and transport links i.e. agreement to move Northborough bus stop to more suitable location.
- 3.8 North & West 2 - Now named Gunthorpe, Paston, Walton and Werrington Community Committee**
- 3.8.1 Attendance was 15 at October's and 40 at December's meeting; the latter had greater attendance due to issue topic about Gunthorpe allotments and residents wanting to raise their concerns for this issue.
- 3.8.2 **Key Issues Raised:** The Naming of the Neighbourhood Councils as in the wording



'Neighbourhood Council'; Enforcement issues in relation to street lighting and bus service in Werrington; main issue being the proposed changes for Gunthorpe allotments.

3.8.3 **Key Challenges:** The issue over the naming of the Neighbourhood Council due to confusion as already a Werrington Neighbourhood Council; Empowering local Cllrs and resident association members to overcome negatives and see the positives of Neighbourhood Councils

3.8.4 **Positives:** A recent agreement from Legal/Democratic Services that changing the wording Neighbourhood Councils is an option for a way forward and the name for NW2 would be following a vote by Gunthorpe, Paston, Walton and Werrington Community Committee. Following a meeting with Transport and Sustainable Environment Group and local Cllr, a suggestion for the way in which funding prioritisation towards bus stop requests has been made which could give way to some additional requests being agreed.

### 3.9 **North & West 3 - Now named Peterborough West Neighbourhood Council**

3.9.1 Average attendance over first two meetings has been approx 55 members of the public

3.9.2 **Key Issues Raised:** A large volume of enforcement issues in relation to parking, tree heights, street lighting in the Bretton and Ravensthorpe area. Concerns over the effect to local residents from two local developments; Edith Cavell New Hospital complex and the Grange Development for a new all weather sports centre and housing development.

3.9.3 **Key Challenges:** To develop the reports of enforcement issues to be taken to Neighbourhood Panel Meetings rather than Neighbourhood Councils. Providing reassurance to residents that we are listening to their concerns.

3.9.4 **Positives:** Following two public consultation meetings one in regards Edith Cavell and another for the Grange site public have been able to have questions answered and concerns listened to and taken forward by lead officers to look for solutions, meeting public reassurance challenges.

### 3.10 **South 1 – now named Fletton, Stanground & Woodston Neighbourhood Council**

3.10.1 Average attendance approximately 15 – 20 members of the public.

3.10.2 **Key Issues Raised:** Parking and traffic issues particularly on match days and the proposed introduction of residents parking in areas of Stanground.

3.10.3 **Key Challenges:** To draw down funding to support development of community facilities in Stanground South in line with timescales set out in Section 106 agreement.

3.10.4 **Positives:** Fletton Study to be used to inform the Community Action Plan, good engagement in the Community action Planning process.

### 3.11 **South 2 – now named Orton with Hampton Neighbourhood Council**

3.11.1 Average attendance approximately 20 members of the public.

3.11.2 **Key Issues Raised:** Parking in Orton, drink related anti-social behaviour in Church Drive area, lack of facilities for young people.

3.11.3 **Key Challenges:** The ongoing development within the South area and learning from experience in Hampton, not to be duplicated in Great Haddon. Difficulty in accessing Hampton College for community activities and lack of community provision in Hampton generally.

3.11.4 **Positives:** Good interaction between Council Members, officers and public with a willingness to work together to ensure the process is effective. Good engagement in the Community action Planning process.

**4. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

None.

**5. APPENDICES**

None.



**Parish Council Liaison Work Programme**

**2009/10**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Item</b>
20 January 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Parish Plans, Village Design Statements – what value do they have?</li><li>2. Site Allocation Documents</li><li>3. Neighbourhood Council review</li><li>4. Budget</li></ol>
31 March 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Planning Committee changes</li></ol>

This page is intentionally left blank