

**ORTONS WITH HAMPTON NEIGHBOURHOOD
 COMMITTEE
 (AREA SOUTH 2)**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 SEPTEMBER 2012, 7.45PM
 AT ST BOLTOPH'S**

Members Present:

Orton with Hampton Councillor David Seaton,
 Orton Longueville Councillors Graham Casey (Vice Chairman) and Lisa Forbes
 Orton Waterville Councillors Sue Allen (Chairman), Gavin Elsey and June Stokes

Officers Present:

Lisa Emmanuel, Neighbourhood Manager, PCC
 Carlos Harrison, Community Based Youth Worker, PCC
 Greg Hutton-Squire, Waste 2020, PCC
 Niamh Kingsley, Youth Council Representative
 Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer, PCC

Others Present:

Ten people registered their attendance at the meeting including residents and representatives of Hampton Parish Council and the Youth Council.

| Item | Discussion and Actions | Action |
|---|---|--------|
| 1. Apologies for Absence | Apologies were received from Scott, Goodwin and North | |
| 2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations | There were no declarations of interest. | |
| 3. Minutes from the previous meeting | The minutes from the meeting held on 27 June 2012 were agreed as a true and accurate record. | |
| 4. Issues arising from previous Meeting | <p>The Neighbourhood Manager advised that updates and details of completed actions were provided on tables.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton provided an update on project concerning Silver Hill and that the funding was to go ahead.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| <p>5. Youth Forum</p> | <p>The Committee received a presentation from the Youth Council representative, regarding the developments for the mixed use play area for the over sixteen's and that the developments for the Hampton Urban Sports Park (HUSB) proposals were underway.</p> <p>Key points within the presentation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young People had put forward a petition for a mixed used recreation area for teenagers to be developed in Hampton; • An allocated £102k had been made available within the Council's budget for the HUSB; • The Youth Council's ongoing work with young people and local residents to move the project forward; • Site surveys had been carried out for the proposed location of Eagle Way; • The site was chosen because of easy access for the public, emergency vehicles, excellent natural surveillance and sufficient distance from nearby properties; • Community Garden and Outdoor Table Tennis; • Graffiti Boards and Climbing Boulders; • Outdoor Gym and Youth Shelter; • Residents with concerns were to be invited to a further consultation evening in order to address any issues they had; • Design ideas were being obtained from companies; and • Businesses had been approached to promote sponsorship and fundraising opportunities. <p>Comments and responses to questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public had expressed an opinion that although a specific car park for the HUSP was not necessary, there was a need to provide a place for ambulance access; • Funding required for the HUSP project was estimated to be around £250k. Currently the funding committed totalled approximately £160k and letters been sent to local businesses with the aim to obtain additional funding pledges or sponsorships; • The Project Team were currently preparing a bid in order to raise additional funding grant of £75k through WREN; • The maintenance of the HUSP would be built into the current contract with Enterprise Peterborough (EP). Some residents had also offered their support to provide maintenance for the HUSP; • Companies such as Biffa and Lafarge had offered funding grants for similar youth projects and Officers should consider initiating contact with them; • The youth club was running a Friday night football club and a Thursday night session at Hampton Youth Centre; • Members commented that there should be a policy drawn up to ensure that use of the HUSP would be treated properly and with respect by all; and • A member of public suggested that six monthly charity | |
|-----------------------|---|--|

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | funding events in order to support the HUSP may be worth exploring, by the Youth Council. | |
| 6. Matters For Committee Decision | <p>Neighbourhood Committee Budget 2012/2013</p> <p>The Committee received presentation of a report from the Neighbourhood Manager for Ortons with Hampton S2, which outlined the proposals for the Neighbourhood Committee capital budget allocation of £25,000 for 2012/2013.</p> <p>The Committee was asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider the proposals for allocation of the capital budget of £25,000 for 2012/13; 2. Approve the proposals which would receive an allocation of the budget; 3. Agree to a reduction in the individual allocations should the approved proposals exceed the £25,000 budget, to be determined by the Neighbourhood Manager; and 4. Agree 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>Proposals which sought approval from Members were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to parking area and open space at Lythemere - £16,700.00; • Creation of additional parking bays at Pennington - £2,100.00; • Improvements to communal areas within Brudenell - £2,255.00; • Installation of “pedestrians in road” warning signs and supporting “slow” signs on road at Blackmead. - £700.00; • Works to prevent unauthorised access to open space at Gostwick - £1,725.00; and • Removal of trip rails, improvements to highways and painting remaining rails in Paynels - £1,500.00. <p>Comments and responses to questions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The installation of bollards and bunds at Lythemere, was necessary due to the access arrangements of the area; and • Broken railings at Paynels would be replaced. The railings that were in good working order would remain and be refurbished. <p>The allocation of funding for the above projects was agreed unanimously by Members.</p> <p>Following a vote the committee agreed the following:</p> <p>The Committee approved:</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposals for allocation of the capital budget of £25,000 for 2012/13; 2. The proposals that would receive an allocation of the budget; 3. To a reduction in the individual allocations should the approved proposals exceed the £25,000 budget, to be determined by the Neighbourhood Manager; and 4. 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>The Committee agreed funding allocation for the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to parking area and open space at Lythemere - £16,700.00; • Creation of additional parking bays at Pennington - £2,100.00; • Improvements to communal areas within Brudenell - £2,255.00; • Installation of “pedestrians in road” warning signs and supporting “slow” signs on road at Blackmead. - £700.00 • Works to prevent unauthorised access to open space at Gostwick - £1,725.00; and • Removal of trip rails, improvements to highways and painting remaining rails in Paynels - £1,500.00. <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 £25,000 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 was 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>7. Updates on Matters of Interest Relevant to the Committee</p> | <p>a) Enterprise Peterborough’s Waste Management Team</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Committee received a presentation from the Waste 2020 representative, from PCC regarding the launch of the forthcoming food waste collection service being introduced to Peterborough with the aim to reduce the current waste to landfill issues.</p> <p>Key points within the presentation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadshows were held in Queensgate and other locations in | |

Peterborough in order to inform residents of the Food Waste Collection system. The consultation had highlighted that a minority of the public were in favour of the proposed scheme;

- The scheme was aimed to contribute to the essential part of the 60% plus recycling goal;
- Food waste contributed to 40% of the weight of black bins;
- Landfill food alone was estimated to cost approx £1.8m per year by 2014 (at current recycling rates);
- Food waste would be collected and turned into an alternative power source and soil conditioner;
- Diversion from landfill was intended to save 6,500 tonnes CO2 per year;
- A source of renewable electricity;
- The scheme was intended to highlight to householders how much food waste they were producing. One of the Council's aims was to encourage householders to buy less food;
- Potential significant indirect savings for all taxpayers;
- Residents to be provided with one small five litre caddy for the kitchen and a larger twenty three litre locking caddy;
- Residents to place larger caddy out every week with black or brown and green wheelie bins;
- PCC to provide residents with the first roll of biodegradable liners; and
- Almost half of Councils nationwide collect food waste.

Comments and responses to questions were as follows:

- The renewable energy produced by using the food waste digestion system would be sold to companies through Peterborough City Council's tendering process;
- All grey food waste bins would be made from recycled plastic;
- The public are encouraged to mark their grey waste bins with a house number in order to avoid theft;
- There would be no charge to the public for replacements if a waste bin had become lost or stolen;
- Evidence had shown nationally that there were no huge concerns over theft of the food waste bins;
- A roll of Biodegradable bags would cost an estimated two to three pounds and should last each household a month;
- There would be no penalty to residents if they chose not to use the grey food waste bins; however, it was up to residents to adopt the scheme;
- It was predicted that using the grey food waste bins would reduce the smell currently caused by the use of black bins;
- PCC had decided not to use the garden waste bin system, which had been adopted by other Councils, due to the limitations of raw waste that would be recycled and the processes involved;
- Members commented that not everyone shared the view that anaerobic digesters would blend in with the

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>countryside;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents may use newspaper as opposed to the biodegradable liners; however, it was important to note that the use of supermarket plastic bags would not be suitable; and • The original idea of creating a space for a grey food waste bin within the current black wheelie bin system had caused many challenges and health and safety concerns for PCC, which was why it wasn't adopted. <p>The Committee noted the presentation.</p> | |
| | <p>b) Community Action Plans</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Committee received a presentation from the Neighbourhood Manger for Ortons with Hampton on the progress of Community Action Plans (CAPs)</p> <p>Key points within the presentation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven plans were currently being developed for Neighbourhood Committees and would continue to be compiled; • Consultation, data and statistics had been compiled; • Strategic recognition developed within PCC linking to other strategies and plans; • Final versions agreed and detailed action plans being finalised; • Ways residents can influence the CAPs; • Annual reviews; • Web page version being developed, which would summarise the key priorities for Neighbourhood Committees; • Priorities for 2012; • Priorities for making Peterborough Greener; Cleaner Safer and Stronger; • Action plans to meet all of the priorities. <p>Comments and responses to questions were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAPs were being discussed at PCC's Disability Forum meetings. <p>The Committee noted the update.</p> | |
| <p>8. 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.</p> <p>These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options were being considered to reactivate the speed camera at Goldhay Way; • Residents were urged by a member of the public to review a recent planning application to allow for a higher building | |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | on a cold store unit near Great Haddon, which was located at land to the east of Alwalton Hill and Fletton Junction 17, planning application number: 09/01369/OUT. The deadline for comments was to be sent to the Planning Department by 10 October 2012. | |
| 9. Next Meeting | The next meeting will take place on Tuesday, 18 Dec 2012 at the New Ormiston Bushfield Academy. | |

Meeting Closed 9.06pm

ACTIONS

| DATE | ACTION | WHO AND WHEN? | STATUS |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| 27 September 2012 | | | |
| Item 6 Matters For Committee Decision | A Cabinet Member decision notice to be published outlining the agreements for the Neighbourhood Committee funding allocation of £25K on Neighbourhood projects for Ortons with Hampton (S2) | Governance Officer | Complete |

This page is intentionally left blank