

**RURAL NORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE
 (AREA NORTH AND WEST 1)**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 DECEMBER 2012, 7PM
 AT THE EYE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL, EYE**

Members Present:

Bainton	Councillor Over (Chairman)
Eye and Thorney	Councillor McKean and Sanders
Glington and Wittering	Councillor Holdich and Lamb
Newborough	Councillor Harrington

Parish Councillors Present:

Ailsworth	Councillor Richard Perkins
Bainton and Ashton	Councillor Nicola Clough
Eye	Councillor Andy Goodsell
Glington	Councillor Denis Batty
Helpston	Councillor Joe Dobson
Peakirk	Councillor Henry Clarke
Thorney	Councillor John Bartlett and Jon Rowe
Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council	Councillor William Cave

Officers Present:

Officers	Laura Almond, Assistant Neighbourhood Manager, PCC Gary Goose, Strategic Safer and Stronger Peterborough Manager, PCC Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer, PCC
----------	--

Others Present:

Eighteen people registered their attendance at the meeting.

Item	Discussion and Actions	Action
1. Apologies for Absence	Apologies were received from Councillor Hiller. Apologies from Parish Councils were received from Councillors Jane Hill, Rob Butterwick and Brian Chilcott.	
2. Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.	
3. Minutes from the previous meeting	Minutes from the previous meeting The minutes from the meeting held on 19 September 2012 were	

	agreed as a true and accurate record.	
4. Issues arising from previous Meeting	<p>The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager advised the Committee that it was not possible to present the wind farm item at this meeting due to the subject being discussed at a meeting in Newborough on the same evening. Members commented that better organisation should be applied to ensure that meetings were not scheduled for the same evening to discuss high public interest matters.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the action point on Neighbourhood Committee Capital project costs, the Assistant Neighbourhood Manager advised that the information would be produced for the next meeting.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding grants expected by Parish Councils arising from an agreed Neighbourhood Committee capital budget allocation, the Assistant Neighbourhood Manager advised that the Grant Agreements would be sent out next week with payment to follow.</p>	
5. Matters for Committee Decision	<p>Capital Budget Allocation 2012 – 13</p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider proposals and vote on the remaining allocation of the capital budget of £25,000 allocated for N&W1 Rural Neighbourhood Committee.</p> <p>The combined estimated cost of the proposed capital projects was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase of various outdoor gym equipment for Ailsworth - Green Gym Project – £500; • Southorpe – purchase of cycle racks and storage approximately - £400. • Southorpe – purchase of IT equipment – £500; • Helpston - purchase of grasscrete – approximately £900; and • Wothorpe – purchase of IT equipment – approximately £900. <p>Resolved:</p> <p>Following a unanimous vote in favour of the projects the N&W1 Rural Neighbourhood Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered the proposals for allocation of the capital budget of £25,000 for 2012/13; • Approved the proposals which would receive an allocation of the budget; • Agreed to a reduction in the individual allocations should the approved proposals exceed the £25,000 budget, to be determined by the Neighbourhood Manager, • Agreed that the Neighbourhood Manager would be responsible for determining the final detail of the project in consultation with ward Councillors and other relevant parties. 	

	<p>Projects approved were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase of some outdoor gym equipment for Ailsworth - Green Gym Project – £500 • Southorpe – purchase of cycle racks and storage approximately – £400 • Southorpe – purchase of IT equipment – £500 • Helpston - purchase of grasscrete – approximately £900 • Wothorpe – purchase of IT equipment – approximately – £900 <p>Reasons for the decision</p> <p>The budget assigned to Neighbourhood Committees was assigned specifically to spend on projects which address priorities from the communities for each Neighbourhood Committee area. To enable the £25K to be spent within this financial year Members were asked to bring forward capital spend projects which helped to meet some of these emerging priorities. This active Member involvement ensures the money is spent on the most appropriate projects to benefit communities.</p> <p>Alternative options considered</p> <p>Not to spend the money. This would lead to proposed local projects not receiving funding resulting in no benefit to the local area.</p>	
<p>6. Updates on Matters of Interest Relevant to the Committee</p>	<p>a) Feedback and updates from Parish Council Conference and Parishing the City</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Committee received a presentation from the Strategic Safer and Stronger Peterborough Manager regarding the recent Parish Council Conference. Plans were to review support provided by Peterborough City Council (PCC), to Parish Councils, in order to explore improved ways of operating.</p> <p>The Parish Councillor for Peakirk also advised the Committee that the Leader of PCC and Parish Councils were to explore ways in which to deal with service issues for the community in order to avoid duplication of roles currently carried out by the Rural Neighbourhood Committee N&W1.</p> <p>Members commented that the proposed changes to how Parish Councils would be supported was welcomed and in addition requested that consideration should be given to direct funding management to Parish Councils for some community service requirements.</p> <p>Members also commented that the current 5% calculation of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding was extremely low.</p> <p>The Strategic Safer and Stronger Peterborough Manager advised the Committee that the CIL funding imposed on developers was used for local community infrastructure services which was usually allocated to the ward that had received the development; however,</p>	

	<p>in some cases there was a requirement to fund other developments such as junction improvements, which would span across more than one ward.</p> <p>The Committee was also advised that the rate for CIL was developed following the required constitutional processes.</p> <p>The Council's aim of the Parish Council review was to provide local people with influence over local decisions and that a balance between PCC and Parishes was to be found.</p> <p>Action Agreed</p> <p>The Committee noted the presentation.</p> <p>It was agreed that:</p> <p>Further information would be provided at a future Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities and a Parish Liaison meeting over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The calculations of CIL funding and the allocation to the respective developed areas; and • The recent Roger Tym's study. 	GG/CDS
<p>7. Open Session</p>	<p>Attendees of the meeting were given the opportunity to ask questions and raise issues affecting the areas in which they lived. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Councillors sought confirmation over the litter bin funding process. <p>A discussion was held by Parish Councillors and members of the public over the forthcoming proposals regarding the Energy Park which would include installation of solar panels and wind turbines. Key concerns and comments raised were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse appearance of rural landscape in ten years time; • Councillors and Parish Councils should consider the proposals seriously and provide support to the community over the decision making process; • The consultation period and dates for approval appeared to be rushed; • The quoted figures of investment over £1m from the installation of solar panels compared to land farming turn over of circa £1.2m did not appear to balance; • There was a triple energy out-put required in order to operate wind turbines; • Residents were not opposed to the benefits of renewable energy, however, installation of sustainable energy producing devices on private properties should be given consideration by PCC; • Sourcing food from other areas would increase carbon emissions which would in turn increase shopping costs; • The installation of solar panels or wind turbines would pose a threat to tenant farmers' livelihoods; 	

- Council Tax payers would suffer financially if the scheme was to fail;
- Installations would take place in Newborough, Thorney Peakirk and Helpston;
- There were areas such as Barnack, Wittering and Burghley that should be given consideration to avoid installation of sustainable energy producing devices on farm land;
- Tenant farmers had no rights over farming land and would not receive compensation;
- PCC were the land owners and would also conduct the planning transactions which appeared not to be a transparent process;
- There appeared to be some ward Councillors that were not championing the rural parishes cause over this issue; and
- There was no confidence over the land becoming available for agriculture use if the scheme was not successful and concerns were raised that the land could become available for housing development.

Councillors raised comments and concerns as follows:

- Members advised that the consultation had been approved by Cabinet and Scrutiny over the Energy Park proposals;
- The Planning Committee would consider the applications in March 2013 for installation of solar panels;
- Did the Directors of Blue Sky have any experience of managing an energy company?;
- Members supported the Parish Councils over the concerns raised;
- The Peterborough Fens were unique and it appeared that PCC had neglected to recognise how important they were to locals;
- Peterborough held the best industry opportunities in farming and held the potential to become leaders in the field;
- There were other energy investors that could provide better results, which may lead to PCC being burdened with a with product that was unsuccessful, due to competitive prices available in the market;
- There was uncertainty over the transfer of capital receipts and what Blue Sky's involvement would be; and
- Concerns were raised over the transparency of the OJEU process that had been followed by PCC.

Agreed Actions

It was agreed that the Assistant Neighbourhood Manager and Governance Officer would:

- Provide details of PCC's Client Team's process over the funding allocation of litter bins; and
- Refer to the Planning Committee the Parish Councillors request to grant extended speaking time for parish council representatives on the Energy Park (solar panel installation) applications due to be heard at Planning Committee in March 2013.

LA
KSD

8. Next Meeting	The next meeting of the Rural Neighbourhood Committee – N&W1 was to be held at Northborough School on 7 March 2012.	
------------------------	---	--

Meeting Closed pm 8.35

ACTIONS

DATE	ACTION	WHO AND WHEN?	STATUS
	Arrange for a Cabinet Member notice to be published outlining the agreements for the Neighbourhood Committee Capital budget allocation of £25,000 on Neighbourhood projects for Rural Neighbourhood Committee N&W1.	Governance Officer	Complete
	Further information would be provided at a future Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities and a Parish Liaison meeting over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The calculations applied for CIL funding and the allocation to the respective developed areas; and • The recent Roger Tym's study. 	Strategic Safer and Stronger Peterborough Manager/ Councillor Sanders	
	The Assistant Neighbourhood Manager would provide details over PCC's Client Teams updated process of funding allocation of litter bins.	Assistant Neighbourhood Manager	
	Refer to the Planning Committee the Parish Councillors request to grant extended speaking time for parish council representatives on the Energy Park (solar panel installation) applications due to be heard at Planning Committee in March 2013.	Governance Officer	Complete