

## PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Neighbourhood Council – South 2 (Orton with Hampton, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville) held on Tuesday, 20 October, 2009 at 7.00pm held at The Bushfield Sports Centre, Orton Centre, Peterborough.**

**Present:** Councillors Goodwin (Chairman), Allen, North, Scott, Trueman and Winslade.

**Officers Present:** Kim Sawyer - Head of Legal (Commercial)  
Adrian Chapman – Head of Neighbourhoods  
Julie Rivett – Neighbourhoods and Empowerment Manager  
Lisa Emmanuel – Neighbourhood Manager  
Peter Heath-Brown – Planning Policy Manager  
David Blackburn – Principal Democratic Services Officer (Clerk)

There were 35 persons present in the audience.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Elsey and Seaton.

### **1. Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Council, Councillor Goodwin, welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed a wish that the meeting would be as successful, if not more so, than the Neighbourhood Council meeting held at the Stanground College three days earlier.

### **2. Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **3. Overview of the Neighbourhood Management Council Model**

The Chair, Councillor Goodwin, introduced items on:

#### **1. The Role of the Neighbourhood Council including its terms of reference**

The Chair referred to background information that had been circulated to everyone in the room about Neighbourhood Councils. It was explained that this was a new concept in community engagement for Peterborough and in order for it to be successful, it relied upon everyone working together for the benefit of the local area regardless of where they lived and what political party they supported. The main objective of the Neighbourhood Council was to involve local people more closely in the decisions affecting the areas in which they lived.

#### **2. The Naming of the Neighbourhood Council**

The Chair asked everyone present to submit their ideas for the name of the Neighbourhood Council and leave their suggestions on the comments forms provided. Proposals were discussed to give the Neighbourhood Council a distinctive identity through a name that reflected the geographical area it covered as well as a colour that could be used for all promotional materials.

3. Standing Invitations to Meetings of the Neighbourhood Council

The Neighbourhood Manager proposed bodies and individuals who might receive standing invitations to attend meetings of the Neighbourhood Council.

It was agreed that:

1. The terms of reference of the Neighbourhood Council be noted;
2. The naming of the Neighbourhood Council be deferred to the next meeting to enable suggestions from the public to be considered; and
3. Standing invitations to attend meetings be extended to:

Core Group:

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Cambridgeshire Police  
Children's Services (City Council)  
Community Safety Officer (City Council and Cambridgeshire Police)  
Cross Keys Homes  
NHS Peterborough  
Parish Council(s)  
Peterborough Council for Voluntary Services  
Peterborough Youth Council

Further Invitations (subject to confirmation with parties below):

Goldhay Residents Association  
Herlington Community Association  
Street Leader  
Malbourne Resident (Lisa Berry)

**4. Community Action Planning**

The Neighbourhood Manager delivered a presentation on the community planning process which incorporated baseline statistical information for Orton with Hampton, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville. It was explained that the plan would provide an opportunity to identify priorities for local communities and seek to make a difference by focussing upon action. Objectives would have to be realistic as there was no additional money allocated to support the Neighbourhood Councils. However, there was an opportunity to use existing resources more effectively through a better targeted approach and the development of strong relationships between the Neighbourhood Management Team and local people.

The following responses were given to comments from members of the Neighbourhood Council:

- Hampton would be included in the community action planning process.
- The amount of funding available to each Neighbourhood Council had not been established however, choices would need to be made locally over the priorities for funding as no additional funding would be available for the area.
- The dates, times and venues of meetings of the Neighbourhood Councils had been publicised via local radio, the Evening Telegraph, "Your Peterborough" newsletter and the Council's website and details of the following meetings would

also be announced at each meeting. Members of the public were invited to suggest places in the local community where posters and flyers might be most effectively deployed to publicise future meetings with suggestions to be given to the representative of the Council's Media Team at the end of the meeting

Members of the public made the following points:

- Orton was not a deprived area but services needed to be targeted to deal specifically with fly-tipping and litter and to improve the overall appearance of the area.
- New investment appeared to be concentrated in new areas rather than existing communities.
- The public could still not influence decisions unless the Neighbourhood Councils were given real decision-making powers.
- The idea of Neighbourhood Councils was a major step forward in public engagement and that it was up to the public to make their views known so that the Councillors could "fight their corner" when it came to the allocation of resources.

In response, it was identified that:

- Funding would be determined by the full Council but that Neighbourhood Councils would be able to take decisions within their remit.
- Development proposals for the city would be covered in the next item of business on the agenda which was on the core strategy.

At this point in the meeting, Councillor Goodwin explained that she was experiencing difficulties hearing the comments made by those present because of the acoustics of the room and an ear infection. Therefore, she invited Councillor North, the vice chair, to take the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

It was agreed that:

1. The feedback received regarding advance publicity for the meeting be noted and proposed future methods of communication be reviewed; and
2. Updates on the community action planning process be submitted to future meetings.

## **5. Core Strategy**

The Council's Planning Policy Manager gave a presentation on the development of the Core Strategy with particular reference to Orton with Hampton, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city to 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009. The strategy would then be published for formal public consultation in January/February and then referred to the Planning Inspector; any further representations received would be considered at a public inquiry.

The primary growth locations for the city were Great Haddon, the City Centre, Norwood/Paston, Stanground, Hampton and some additional limited growth in rural

areas. The specific proposals relating to the area covered by the Neighbourhood Council were the urban extension of Great Haddon, retail provision in Orton District Centre (Phase 2) and regeneration of existing communities.

A number of comments arose out of the discussion on the Core Strategy which were as follows:

1. Councillor Scott referred to the concentration of development in the south of the city with 40% of the proposed 25,500 additional homes due to be built in that area. This would impose significant pressure on the local infrastructure and was bound to have an impact on existing communities such as at Orton Longueville. It was important that the views of local people were taken into account regarding the traveller's site to the south of the river, the recycling centre on the edge of Great Haddon and the wider implications for the city of the concentration of growth in the south.
2. In response to a question from a member of the public about the need for growth, the Planning Policy Manager stated that this question had been addressed at the regional tier of government where it had been decided to respond to population growth through concentration of development in the cities of the region.
3. A local resident expressed concern about the potential impact of the huge scale of development proposed for the south of the city and referred to the apparent scarcity of proposals in the core strategy for the regeneration of existing communities.
4. Another resident was concerned that the pressure on the road network would be overwhelming and commented on the need to ensure that the road network was developed in conjunction with any additional housing development. In response to these comments, the Planning Policy Manager said that work had been undertaken with colleagues specialising in transport and the need for investment in new roads and increased use of public transport had been identified.
5. A member of the public commented on the need to provide clear maps of the neighbourhood for local people and Parish Councils to understand the potential shape and impact of the proposals. The Chair agreed with the need to make the proposals as clear as possible and responded that there would be further opportunities to make representations after the meeting.
6. A member of the public commented upon the need for health facilities to be provided to support the proposed development and suggested that a standing invitation be extended to a health professional to attend meetings of the Neighbourhood Council. In response, it was identified that there had been liaison with NHS Peterborough and that organisation would be invited to appoint a representative to attend future meetings of the Neighbourhood Council.
7. Councillor Murphy suggested that it was difficult for the public to make representations at the right time and in the right manner as they did not necessarily understand the process and decision route.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair thanked everyone for their views about the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that all the views expressed at the meeting be submitted to the full Council meeting on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009 as part of the item on the Core Strategy.

## **6. Open Session**

The Chair invited members of the public to raise any matters affecting their communities. The main issues raised during this part of the meeting were as follows:

- A Parish Council representative questioned whether or not the Neighbourhood Council would be any more effective and well supported than the existing Parish Council meetings. The Chair responded that he could not guarantee that the Neighbourhood Council would be successful but he was very encouraged by the level of attendance at the first meeting and the contributions made by members of the public.
- A representative of Neighbourhood Watch commented on a recent problem encountered with the travelling community and praised the efforts of the Police and local councillors in dealing with the problem. There was a real opportunity to address such problems through joint working and it was important to promote and explain the purpose of the Neighbourhood Council in order to engage with local people and it was suggested that the Neighbourhood Watch might be involved with this process.
- A local resident spoke about the level of crime in the Ortons which in their opinion was aided by the number of footpaths in the area. They also suggested that drinking in public spaces should be banned in the area. Councillor Murphy said that a similar proposal had been examined a number of years previously but it had proved to be impossible to introduce because of the way that the legislation was drafted. There were some drinking bans in specific parts of the city but not across larger areas. Another resident stated that there appeared to be a particular problem with drinking and anti-social behaviour in the Braybrook area. A PCSO responded that there had been a significant amount of work undertaken to reduce under-age drinking and that there had been reports to the Neighbourhood Panel meetings. The next Panel meeting would be held at the Orton Goldhay Centre on 6 January, 2009.
- Councillor Scott referred to parking problems particularly on Oakley Drive. In response, a suggestion was made that a presentation be made on parking across the city.

It was agreed that arising from the discussion, matters that should be reported on at future meetings of the Neighbourhood Council would be:

1. underage drinking and the introduction of bans on the consumption of alcohol in public places;
2. the situation regarding local footpaths and their association with crime and anti-social behaviour; and
3. car parking in residential areas.

## **7. Next Meeting**

The Chair identified that meetings would be held 4 times per year and in addition, there would be an Annual Forum which would be a joint meeting between both

Neighbourhood Councils covering the south of the city. There was a discussion about possible venues for future meetings.

It was agreed that:

1. The next meeting be held on Monday, 7 December, 2009 at 7.00pm; and
2. Subject to availability, the meeting be held at the Goldhay Community Centre.

CHAIRMAN  
7.00 – 8.55PM