



Cllr Allen (Chairman)
Stanground Central: Cllr M Cereste, Cllr B Rush & Cllr I Walsh
Stanground East: Cllr C Harper
Fletton: Cllr F Benton, Cllr M Lee & Cllr L Serluca, Cllr F Benton

DRAFT MINUTES

Of a meeting of the

FLETTON, STANGROUND AND WOODSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD

COMMITTEE

(Area South 1)

Held on Tuesday 28 June 2011 at 7.00 pm

At Stanground College, Peterborough

*****PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL
CONFIRMED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD
COMMITTEE*****

Members Present:

Chairman	Councillor Allen
Stanground Central	Councillors Cereste, Rush and Walsh
Fletton	Councillor Serluca

Officers Present:

Lisa Emmanuel	Neighbourhood Manager, PCC
Jonathan Lewis	Assistant Director, Education & Resources, PCC
Javed Ahmed	Locality Manager, PCC
Susan Schofield	Community Based Youth Worker, PCC
Gemma Edwards	Community Based Youth Worker, PCC
Pep Cipriano	Safer Peterborough Communications Manager, PCC
Bethan Griffiths	Media & Communications Officer, PCC
Gemma George	Senior Governance Officer, PCC
Dania Castagliuolo	Governance Officer (acting), PCC

Also in Attendance:

Sarah Shuttlewood	Director of Acute Commissioning (NHS)
Dr Mike Caskey	Lead Commissioner, PCT
Simon Goldsmith	Neighbourhood Policing Sergeant, Cambs Constabulary
Maureen Lazaretti	Cross Keys Homes

Members of the public attended including young people from the Youth Forum and representatives of the following community organisations: Woodston Community Association, The Evening Telegraph, Stanground Community Association and the police.

Item	Discussion and Actions	Action
1. Apologies	Apologies were received from Councillor Lee, Councillor Harper and Councillor Benton.	
2. Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.	
3. Minutes from the previous meeting	The minutes from the previous meeting held 3 March 2011 were agreed as a true and accurate record.	
4. Election of Vice Chair.	Councillor Walsh was nominated by Councillor Rush. This nomination was seconded by Councillor Cereste and Councillor Walsh was duly elected as Vice Chairman of the Committee.	
5. Youth Forum	<p>Gemma Edwards and Susan Schofield, Community Based Youth Workers were present with a number of representatives of the Youth Forum.</p> <p>Gemma Edwards, addressed the Committee and stated that the young people from Fletton, Stanground and Woodston met on a monthly basis and their vision was to make a difference in the community. She further advised that the funding allocated from last year's budget had been spent on a path that went from Southfields to Stanground Community Centre. Future funding ideas had been sought local young people and it had been highlighted that the Stanground Skate park needed lighting and seating and the young people would like to see Stanground Community Centre opened as a Youth Club.</p> <p>Going forward, young people were due to help out at the Peterborough Festival (in July) where they would be handing out leaflets. The next meeting of the Youth Forum was scheduled to take place on 12th September 2011 and would be held at Heritage Park Primary School.</p> <p>Councillor Rush addressed the meeting and informed that money from the Community Leadership Fund had been secured for two park benches for the Skate Park. Ideas for the location of these two benches were sought. In response, Susan Schofield advised that she would follow up this query and get back to Councillor Rush.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Manager advised that funding had also been secured for lighting in the park and further feedback would be provided once a meeting had been held with Ward Councillors.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>LE</p>
Urgent Item – NHS Peterborough	<p>The Chairman addressed the Committee and advised that an urgent item of business was to be discussed next.</p> <p>Sarah Shuttleworth, Director of Acute Commissioning, NHS and Dr Mike Caskey, Lead Commissioner, PCT introduced themselves to the Committee and stated that they were present in order to raise awareness of the 'The Right Care at the Right Time' consultation, which outlined the possible ways forward with regards to the Primary and Urgent Care Strategy in Peterborough.</p> <p>The 'Right Care at the Right Time' Consultation had been launched</p>	

in May 2011 and views were sought on the options contained within. The Committee was advised that brochures containing full details of the proposals had been made available on every table.

Key points were advised as follow:

- In order to face the ongoing challenges of providing primary and urgent care in Peterborough, changes would have to be made;
- The scope of the strategy was outlined and included self care under primary care and walk in centres under urgent care;
- There were certain areas which were outside of the scope of the strategy and these included NHS Direct, dentists, optometrists and the ambulance service;
- The needs of Peterborough were changing. There was a growing population with a lot of older people in the area;
- There were new communities being established within the Peterborough area with various different languages being spoken;
- Peterborough had large areas of high relative deprivation with lower life expectancies;
- GP practises would need to adapt in order to meet these changing needs;
- Current premises were affecting services and would not meet new standards going forward. This would ultimately mean that 1 in 3 patients would be affected in some way;
- A large proportion of GPs within the Peterborough area had life term contracts, therefore a strategy for retirements and contracts ending was required;
- It was currently difficult for patients at some surgeries to make an appointment, therefore this point needed to be addressed also;
- With regards to urgent care services within Peterborough, patients had reported that the system was difficult to navigate and there were too many overlaps;
- There were too many minor cases attending the emergency department;
- There were two walk in centres within the city which were duplicating the service hours at GP surgeries and it was highlighted that the City Care Centre was not utilised to its full potential;
- NHS Peterborough needed to identify extra funding for the increase in demand and for new treatments, the increasing costs and maintaining infrastructure and for repaying historical debt;
- The NHS needed to save £40m per year by 2015/2016 from its £350m budget in order to fund the service pressures;
- The vision for primary care was to move to fewer larger practices over time in order to improve quality and efficiency;
- The vision for urgent care was to provide a good emergency department and to make sure services were available;
- The development of a minor injury and illnesses unit was proposed;

- The vision outlined three different levels of care, level one primary care which incorporated home care, community pharmacy and GP practices and level two urgent care being the minor injury and illnesses unit and level three urgent care being the hospital;
- There were three specific options being considered going forward and all of these options would incorporate:
 - Access to GP appointments by ensuring that every practice achieved a minimum standard;
 - Patient information, meaning patients would be provided with extra information in order to help them choose the right service and GP practice;
 - Working alongside smaller practices to plan future retirements; and
 - A competitive process in order to select a GP out of hours and walk in centre provider.
- There were three options highlighted within the consultation. Option three was the preferred option which would fully achieve the vision outlined for the area;
- Option one was to do nothing and option two would partly achieve the vision for the area;
- When fully implemented, it was highlighted that option three would achieve net savings of £0.8m per year;
- Benefits of the preferred option would include a larger team in a new health centre and a new minor injury unit at the City Care Centre;
- Consultation was due to close on August 18 2011 and if option three was agreed then a timetable would be followed culminating in the implementation of new health centres in North Street, 63 Lincoln Road, Hampton and Dogsthorpe in Spring 2014;
- Views and comments were sought from the Committee and attendees were advised that they could respond to the consultation in a variety of ways. Those of which were outlined to them;
- A further meeting to discuss the proposals was also due to take place in the Town Hall Reception Room, on 30 June 2011 from 6.30pm until 8.00pm.

A local resident questioned whether comments and questions raised at the meeting that evening would be included as part of the consultation. In response, Sarah Shuttlewood advised that the presence of both herself and Dr Caskey was merely to provide a background to the consultation and to raise awareness of the meeting due to be held on 30 June. Therefore comments raised would not be included as part of the consultation.

Councillor Rush further commented that as Chair of the Health Scrutiny Commission, he had requested their attendance at the meeting in order to raise awareness of the consultation.

Councillor Serluca questioned when a final decision would be made on the options put forward within the consultation. In response, Sarah Shuttlewood advised that there was a PCT Board meeting due to take place in September where the final decision would be made. Prior to this, all analysis from the consultation would be sent to the Health Scrutiny Commission.

	<p>A local resident commented that the services offered at the walk in centre were not flexible enough. In response, Dr Caskey advised that that is one of the reasons for the whole system being looked at. Lack of flexibility within the services was a major issue across the city.</p> <p>Sarah Shuttlewood addressed the Committee and advised that there was a questionnaire at the back of the consultation books which could be filled in and returned. As many responses to the consultation as possible were sought and all comments received would be taken on board.</p>	
6. Stanground College	<p>Councillor Irene Walsh and Jonathan Lewis, Assistant Director – Education and Resources, addressed the Committee and gave a presentation which outlined the proposals for the new build and academy status.</p> <p>Key points were advised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A decision for Stanground College to pursue academy status had been taken at a recent Governors meeting and the school was to form part of an Academy Trust already providing schools across the country; • The selection process for an academy provider was due to take place on 4th and 5th July 2011; • Once selected, the academy conversion process would begin and would be likely to take 3-4 months, with the new academy to be opened by April 2014; • Building Schools for the Future had been cancelled in July 2010; • Following feasibility work with Kier, the Chief Executive and the Council Leader had decided to go ahead with the project with PCC funding of £22.4m; • The plans included proposals for a brand new swimming pool; • The new building will be started in early spring 2012 with the new building being completed in September/December 2013. Building would not be easy, as the school would have to be kept running at the same time as construction taking place; • The school had been previously classed as vulnerable and had had problems with recruiting a new Head Teacher. Academy status would bring prestige and help to attract staff going forward; • The shortlist for the academy provider included four of the top academy providers in the country; • The Governors at the school were aware of the issues faced by the school previously and were in full agreement with the proposals; • The size of the school was proposed to be increased in order to ensure that children within the local community could access their local school; • The new school was to be built behind the old school in order to keep the old school running smoothly; • There was due to be a public exhibition on the build held on 19th July 2011. This would provide a more detailed 	

	<p>overview of the build.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste addressed the Committee and queried when children would be able to move into the new school building. In response, Jonathan Lewis advised that it was aimed to provisionally move the children over to the new school by September/December 2013. It was unlikely to happen before this date.</p> <p>Councillor Allen sought clarification as to the involvement had by students with regards to the design and function of the new school. In response, Jonathan Lewis advised that all year groups would have the opportunity to comment on the build and it was envisaged that Kier would also be taking on student apprentices.</p> <p>Councillor Rush questioned whether the school would change its name. In response, Jonathan Lewis advised that it was the view of the Governors that the name should remain the same.</p> <p>A local resident requested further background on the potential academy providers. In response, Jonathan Lewis advised that all four of the providers had excellent track records and were involved with schools with outstanding Ofsted results.</p> <p>Councillor Serluca commented that the possible apprenticeships with Kier should be advertised as this was positive for the city. In response, Jonathan Lewis advised that further work would be done around this and also Kier would be required to purchase a certain amount of materials and to hire a certain amount of staff from the Peterborough area.</p>	
<p>7. Neighbourhood Council Review</p>	<p>Councillor Cereste addressed the Committee and gave a presentation which provided an overview of the recent Neighbourhood Committee review which had been undertaken by the Strong and Supportive Scrutiny Committee. The review had been carried out between March and June 2011 and had been undertaken in order to review the process and principles of Neighbourhood Committees, taking into account what had happened during their first year of operation, in order to produce recommendations for their continued development.</p> <p>Key points were advised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of the review, a number of recommendations, thirty in total, had been made and all apart from three had been subsequently agreed at Cabinet; • One of the first recommendations had been to change the name from 'Councils' to 'Committees'; • There was a need for clearer vision in order to provide a clearer understanding to members of the public in relation to their functions; • There were three key outcomes identified, those being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To develop and monitor Community Action Plans to address the strategic and key priorities affecting the area; ○ To establish ward forums prior to the start of meetings; and 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To maintain Committee action plans to capture all issues raised in ward forums and meetings for follow up. • There would be a minimum of two local area tours to visit problem sites and areas of success; • The agreement that as much revenue and capital funding to support local priorities would be delegated in addition to the continued allocation of £25,000 capital budget. <p>Councillor Cereste further advised that the implementation of the Localism Bill, which was currently going through parliament, would mean that more issues would fall at the feet of Neighbourhood Committees going forward, including planning issues. Recently he had taken a walk from Aldi card park along South Bank and he highlighted that there were some lovely areas which could be transformed. This would be a good project for the Neighbourhood Committee going forward.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Manager addressed the Committee and stated that there was to be continued allocation of £25k funding to the Neighbourhood Committee and action plans were to be drafted and talked through at the next scheduled meeting, due to be held in September 2011.</p> <p>Councillor Serluca reminded all of the local residents present that they did not have to wait until the next Neighbourhood Committee meeting to address issues in their ward. Ward Councillors had regular surgeries and could be contacted at any time.</p> <p>A local resident commented that September was short notice in order for residents to put forward their views on how the funding should be spent. In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that the process was to be similar to that which had been undertaken the previous year. Any decisions made had to be in line with the Council's strategic priorities. The Community Action Plans had been put on hold due to the introduction of the localism bill, however now early details had been released the strategic plan could be progressed.</p>	
<p>8. Open Session</p>	<p>Attendees of the meeting were given the opportunity to ask questions and raise issues affecting the area in which they lived. These included:</p> <p><u>Street Cleaning</u></p> <p>A local resident addressed the Committee and advised that he had phoned six weeks ago with regards to cleaning that needed to be undertaken in the street in which he lived, Fellowes Gardens, however nothing had been done so far. Was Enterprise doing their job properly? In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that reporting issues through the switchboard's 747474 number was encouraged as it was important that all issues were logged.</p> <p>Councillor Serluca queried whether Enterprise had their own direct telephone number. In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that Enterprise did not have a direct number as they were contracted by Peterborough City Council.</p>	

	<p>Councillor Serluca commented that she would report the issue directly to Enterprise herself as she did see them around in the ward.</p> <p><u>The Carbon Challenge and S106 Money</u></p> <p>A local resident addressed the Committee and queried when the breakdown in spend for the S106 monies for the Carbon Challenge Site, was going to be identified? So far, only spend on primary school improvements had been highlighted. In response, Councillor Cereste advised that spend of the S106 money was a case of public record and there would be nothing hidden.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Manager advised that she would take this point back and identify where the S106 monies were to be spent. This would then be fed back at a later date.</p> <p><u>Fletton Cemetery</u></p> <p>Local residents queried how long it was estimated to take to finish the improvement works on the entrance to Fletton cemetery. In response, the Neighbourhood Manger advised that there had been a slight delay due to the transfer of services to Enterprise. Progress was chased on a regular basis.</p> <p>Residents further questioned whether it was likely that the entrance was going to be tarmaced. In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that she did not believe that the entrance would be tarmaced, however she would seek further information on the project and feedback to all those concerned.</p> <p><u>Residents Parking</u></p> <p>Residents wished it to be noted that they were extremely grateful for the work undertaken by Councillor Matthew Lee with regards to the implementation of residents parking in the area. It was working, and it was being policed properly.</p> <p><u>No's 18 and 61 Fletton Avenue</u></p> <p>Local residents sought an update on the headway being made on the two properties 18 and 61 Fletton Avenue. In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that it was a long and slow process. She was still pursuing the Housing Enforcement Officers and she was constantly checking. Once a breakthrough had been made she would report this back to the Committee.</p> <p>Councillor Serluca stated that she would get a Housing Enforcement Officer to attend the next residents meeting and to give further information on the situation..</p> <p><u>Adult Day-care Centre in Fletton</u></p> <p>Local residents commented that the fencing at the back of the adult day-care centre in Fletton was broken. Could money be spent on fixing this? In response, the Neighbourhood Manager advised that</p>	<p>LS</p> <p>LE</p> <p>LE</p> <p>LE</p> <p>LE</p> <p>LS</p>
--	--	---

