



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON MEETING HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL ON 25 MARCH 2015

Members

Present:

Councillor Jason Merrill, Bretton Parish Council
Councillor John Brooks, Thorney Parish Council
Councillor Ian Allin, Orton Longueville Parish Council
Councillor Keith Lievesley, Ufford Parish Council
Councillor Sarah Rodger, Castor Parish Council
Councillor Andy Goodsell, Eye Parish Council
Councillor Richard Clarke, Wansford Parish Council
Councillor Olive Leonard, Hampton Parish Council
Councillor Fiona Rowlands, Castor Parish Council
Councillor Marion Browne, Ufford Parish Council
Sandra Hudspeth, Deeping Gate Parish Council (Clerk)
Councillor Jane Hill, Deeping Gate Parish Council
Bernard Champness, Bretton Parish Council (Clerk)
Councillor Henry Clark, Peakirk Parish Council
John Haste, Glinton Parish Council (Clerk)
Councillor Denis Batty, Glinton Parish Council
Councillor Bob Randall, Glinton Parish Council
Councillor Graham Fletcher, Bainton & Ashton Parish Council
Catherine Franks, Bainton & Ashton Parish Council (Clerk)
Councillor John Bartlett, Thorney Parish Council
Councillor Paul Froggitt, Orton Waterville Parish Council
Councillor Teri Star, Hampton Parish Council
Ian Dewar – CPALC

Also Present:

Joe Frost, Sales and Marketing, Gigaclear
Anne-Liza Roux, Gigaclear
Paula Cuthbertson, East Coast Main Line Deputy Project Manager
Philip Clark, East Coast Main Line Local Engineering Manager
Councillor Peter Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services, PCC

Officers

Present:

Cate Harding, Community Capacity Manager, PCC
Richard Godfrey, Assistant Director; Digital Peterborough, PCC
Dania Castagliuolo, Democratic Services Officer, PCC
Andrew Tatt, Head of Peterborough Highway Services, PCC
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer, PCC

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from:

Sarah Rodgers
Councillor Vijay Patel
Councillor Roy Pettitt
Councillor Joseph Dobson

David Hedges

2. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 17 December 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2014 were approved as an accurate record.

3. Tackling Digital Isolation in Rural Areas – Update on Superfast Broadband

Richard Godfrey gave a verbal update to the group. Key points raised included:

- By December 2015 over 90% of villages in Peterborough and Cambridgeshire would have access to broadband.
- The Council had looked at how broadband could be improved and introduced Gigaclear to provide fibre between Peterborough and Stamford.
- The first village will be live by June 2015.
- Peterborough City Council Did not have a contract with Gigaclear.
- Gigaclear was running its own project.

Questions and comments included:

Was there anything available to improve the 3G coverage in villages?

The issue was that there was not currently a good fibre core network in place. This may improve as British Telecom roll out their fibre into villages.

Joe Frost from Gigaclear advised the group on the work of Gigaclear. Key points raised included:

- Gigaclear had been working in nine villages within the Peterborough Vale area.
- Gigaclear worked by building up pure fibre networks in rural communities, by doing this it eliminated connection issues and broadband performance became consistent.
- Everybody in the village would get the same broadband speed.
- The broadband speed started at 50MB and went up to 1000MB.
- If it was to be installed in an area where there was bad mobile phone coverage, they could plug in to the broadband and work efficiently.
- Gigaclear built in villages where there was demand for fibre. In the nine villages they were working in there was a very active broadband group.
- Gigaclear would fund and pay for networks on the basis that they had 30% of a village's residents to sign up in advance.
- There would be a £2m investment across the nine villages and these villages would have the best broadband service in the country, which should last for around 50 years.

Questions and comments from the group included:

What was the cost per household for fibre optic broadband?

There was a connection fee of £100, an installation cost of £100 and a monthly rental of £38.00. Customers had the option to perform the installation themselves which would save them £100.

Has the website been updated as it seemed the dates advertised were not accurate.

The system was updated regularly. Ufford would be the first village to go live in June.

How would it work for new developments?

There would be the option for existing fibre cables to connect to the houses on a new development.

What priority was given to maintenance of the fibre connections and had there been any previous issues?

There was a customer care team available. Fibre was stored underground and was safe. To date there had been no issues with broken fibre.

What was the service level agreement for customers?

Usually an issue could be fixed over the phone, if this was not the case then the service level agreement was 3 days and if it was a physical problem this would normally be resolved within 24 hours. Business could have up to a 4 hour guaranteed fix.

How easy would it be for a very rural group of only 8 houses to obtain the service?

It would be incredibly difficult as most rural villages already had some fibre and once installed it would not be usable by other companies. Gigalear would have to start by asking the owners of the fibre if they could use their connections..

4. East Coast Main Line (ECML) Level Crossing Closures

Paula Cuthbertson updated the group on the East Coast Mail Line (ECML) Level Crossing Closures. Key points highlighted included:

- Feedback had been received from the initial options consultation which was carried out in July 2014.
- The preferred option had been developed, working together with Peterborough and Lincolnshire Councils.
- To date a base model had been produced along with a traffic model.
- WSP had been asked by Parish Councils to extend the consultation, therefore it would remain open until 2 June 2015.
- In the meantime ESP would be referring to the traffic model and carrying out an environmental impact assessment.
- Moving forward, funding would need to be secured.

Andy Tatt advised the group through the whole process, the Council had been very pleased with the way the consultation had been conducted and if Parish Councils had not seen the presentation on the Level Crossing Closure Programme then they should speak to Paula Cuthbertson, as she would be happy to bring the presentation to Parishes.

Questions and comments from the group included:

If crossings were closed then traffic would be diverted to the A15 and Glington which would cause a gridlock in peak times. Some Parishes would prefer to have the crossings in place rather than force traffic issues on to other villages.

The traffic on the A15 was being monitored and a solution for the potential traffic issue was being investigated.

Kings Street should not be a relief road to the A15. Due to its characteristics, Kings Street was struggling to sustain the traffic flow it had at present, an increase would only worsen the situation.

The opening year of the project would be 2020, therefore future projecting would need to be carried out and extra mitigation could be put in place.

When performing the traffic modelling did ECML consider filming peak hours, especially on the bottle neck sections.

Filming was not considered although ECML were happy to listen to all ideas. Rubber tubes were placed on the roads and video cameras were in place to monitor traffic. A journey time survey was also carried out to ensure the model was replicating journey times.

Were provisions being made for horse riders at the bridge going over woodfront.

The proposed route would also be the new bridal way route.

Traffic issues could extend to Peakirk, how was the model going to be validated.

An extensive data collection exercise would be carried out along with independent checks. There would be the same volume of traffic, just reassigned to other areas.

Who would be funding the mitigation of the project.

Network Rail would obtain the money from Government. Work would not commence until funding for mitigation was in place. If mistakes were detected then Paula Cuthbertson must be advised. Peterborough City Council would not agree commencement of any work unless the model was correct.

5. Rural Vision and Parish Charter

Keith Lievesley introduced the Rural Vision and Parish Charter document which had been circulated to the group.

The following key points were highlighted:

- The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities decided at their meeting in November 2014 to create a new Rural Strategy document.
- The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities co-opted four parish Councillors on to the Commission to help them create the document.
- The document would go out to consultation before being presented to Cabinet.
- The vision document was aimed at rural communities and the Parish Charter was aimed at both urban and rural communities.
- Parish Councillors were encouraged to attend the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities meetings.

6. New Council Award Scheme

Ian Dewar introduced the item and advised the group that the Quality Council Scheme no longer existed, it had been modified and was now called the Council Award Scheme. There were three levels to the scheme:

1. Foundation Level
2. Quality Level
3. Gold Level

The following key points were discussed and highlighted:

- All applications were completed online and all Councils involved in the scheme must have access to a website with editorial control. The charges were as follows:
 - Foundation Level - £50
 - Level 2 - £60, £80 and £100
 - Level 3 - £100, £150 and £200
- The scheme verifies what a council were doing right and picks up on what they were doing wrong.
- There scheme promoted a strong similarity to the transparency code.
- The scheme was scheduled to be launched on 1 April 2015.
- The scheme's website was very well explained.
- There was a good history that by joining the scheme there was a better chance of winning grants.
- The scheme gave independent certification that a Council was competent.

7. Future Agenda Items

Cate Harding advised the group that the Parish Liaison working group usually set the agendas for the meetings and requested that the group discussed suggestions to feed in to the working group for future agenda items.

ACTION AGREED

The group requested the following items to be considered for future agenda items:

- Funding and relocation of Litter Bins.

8. AOB

There was no other business discussed.

CHAIRMAN

6:30 – 7.52pm

This page is intentionally left blank