

Public Document Pack



PETERBOROUGH NORTH AREA COMMITTEE (NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL N&W2)

DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 22 SEPTEMBER 2010, 7.30 p.m.

Members Present:

Chairman	Cllr Nash
Paston	Cllrs S Day and G Simons
Werrington North	Cllrs JR Fox, J Fox and S Lane
Werrington South	Cllrs C Burton, D Fower and P Thacker

Officers Present:

Julie Rivett	Neighbourhood Management, PCC
Alex Daynes	Democratic Services, PCC
Ross Burton	Transport Planning Officer, PCC
David Marshall	Senior Enforcement Officer, PCC
Leonie McCarthy	Neighbourhood Manager - City Wide, PCC
Gemma Wildman	Principal Strategic Planning Officer, PCC
Mike Roberts	Senior Development Management Officer, PCC

Others Present:

21 members of the public attended the meeting including representatives of the Peterborough LINK, Urban Police Panel, Evening Telegraph, Transport Team (PCC), Morland Court Residents Association, Werrington Neighbourhood Council and Accent Nene.

ITEM	DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS	ACTION
1. Apologies	Cllrs Sandford and Shaheed.	
2. Declarations of Interest	None.	
3. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2010 were agreed as an accurate record.</p> <p>Matters arising from the Neighbourhood Manager included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop kerbs in Werrington – relevant officer is Richard Bean, points system in place to prioritise installations, can use CLF monies too to prioritise in the queue system – will provide update to Members; • Allotments at Gunthorpe Rec and Werrington Paddocks – ongoing work, updates went to elected Members, dates for further consultation to be circulated – Q. Cllr Fower - should not need further consultation as residents already given opinions; • Rail freight terminal – involves South Holland District; Garry Alexander, lead officer can come to next meeting. Initial consultation already finished but lots of time still for input. Q - D Hedges – Depot is one aspect but also the proposed increase of traffic on the line and its implications esp. with the crossings; • Pavement Repairs programme – will circulate in due course. 	<p>JR</p> <p>JR</p>

	<p>ACTION: 1) Provide information on drop kerb scheme and list; 2) Circulate programme of pavement repairs.</p>	<p>Julie Rivett</p>
<p>4. Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3)</p>	<p>Chair had asked for information about shuttle bus from bus station to new hospital and a tourist bus for promotion of and travel to local attractions including Flag Fen, Nene Valley Railway etc also issue about bus lane in Bourges Boulevard.</p> <p>The Transport Planning Officer introduced the LTP3 including the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This meeting forms part of the consultation on LTP3 which covers the next 5 years; • LTP is what the transport system should become over next 5 years; • Leaflets were sent to every household to submit views. <p>Comments, questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Fower - if a motion went to next council and approved to implement a shuttle service (e.g.), would it have to then be included in the LTP3? • What is the plan? - <i>There is a spatial element to improve areas and viable city centres, some is linked to certain developments and others to specific projects e.g. park and ride, water bus etc;</i> • Honey Hill resident – will there be shared pedestrian and cycle routes proposed? – <i>depends on location, where appropriate should be a white line to separate the two;</i> • Cllr Fower – recent survey from Werrington NC showed support for an extra train station in the rural area;– <i>request for additional stops must have Network Rail support but funding is a big issue to develop and cannot force Network Rail to invest to do this;</i> • Cllr Fower – if Network Rail was willing to spend some money could another rail stop be provided? – <i>Yes, in principal assuming land and access issues can be addressed;</i> • If LTP3 is over five years, could plans not be drawn up in the chance that funding became available? <i>LTP3 to be finalised in April so all comments should come in for suggestions;</i> • D Hedges - if a rail operator made an approach to PCC, what would the response be from Network Rail? <i>Will take question away to investigate.</i> <p>ACTION: 1) provide response to Cllr Fower regarding motion to council; 2) provide response concerning PCC stance to Network Rail on development of extra stop if request by rail operator.</p>	<p>AD</p> <p>RB</p> <p>A Daynes R Burton</p>
<p>5. Dog Control Orders</p>	<p>Cllr Lane introduced issues around dog control orders in the neighbourhood area. The Senior Enforcement Officer (SEO) advised that PCC could take on board further legislation and strengthen current enforcement practises.</p> <p>Cllr Lane advised that five different Dog Control orders were available:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of Dog Fouling; • Not keeping on lead; • Not putting on lead when asked; • Not going onto excluded land; • Taking more than a specified number of dogs onto land. <p>The SEO advised that currently, fixed penalty notices were issued for dog fouling but no Dog Control Orders were in place. Comments, questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair – there is no visible enforcement for dog mess issue; • SEO – only one dog warden at the moment but no delegated powers to investigate and enforce as enforcement rests with Neighbourhood officers; • Chair - need enforcement officer to go out at the busiest walking times to catch offenders. • Cllr Lane – would like to focus on opinion regarding enforcement and Dog Control Orders – <i>would need public consultation in relevant areas if these were to be adopted, opinions could be given then;</i> • Resident – is a big problem even around children’s play equipment. Lots of unleashed dogs on routes to play areas and in play areas – dangerous for children; • Swallowfield Resident – some places do need Orders but need service enforcement action to back them up. Police cannot take in dogs. Need a compound for stray dogs, wardens at key times including Saturdays and Sundays when most offences take place; • Cllr JR Fox – maybe a dog licence should be introduced. Need more enforcement and is a long standing problem; • Neighbourhood Panel chairman – who would Police it? Can police enforce? What is cost of putting up signs? • SEO – there is a process to follow; need a proposal, then decide what offences should be covered and what areas designated to apply it to. Recommended that the SEO completes some further research which is submitted to Members for support, then, if agreed there could be a public consultation, submit a final proposal to Members for approval; • Swallowfield Resident – maybe just publicity of unacceptable behaviour would also help; • Cllr Judy Fox – did ask for signposts to request dogs kept on leads. If orders are implemented, do we have the resources to enforce? • Cllr JR Fox – a private company is employed to catch litter bugs, could a private company not do the same for this? • What is a stray dog? – <i>Unattended dog in a public place. Dog Warden works from 9-5 and a vet in city centre will accept stray dogs if caught.</i> <p>Cllr Lane proposed that Officers research and develop proposals and arrange consultation to take place with Members to gauge support for dog control orders for the Neighbourhood Area. This was seconded by Cllr Fower and AGREED by members of the committee.</p>	David Marshall
6. Census 2011	The Neighbourhood manager – City Wide - presented information around the Census 2011 and advised the need to access hard to reach	

	<p>groups in the city. A project team was now in place and the census questionnaires would be sent out in February with 27 March being census day. There were opportunities for Local people to get involved.</p> <p>Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D Hedges – info was included in the Werrington Neighbourhood Council newsletter. 	
7. Name of Community Committee	<p>Councillor Fox introduced the item stating that the name of the meeting was confusing, too long and should be shortened. The following alternative names were put forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterborough North Area Committee; • Peterborough North East or North East Committee; and • Northern Community Committee. <p>The committee members AGREED the need to change the name.</p> <p>Cllr Fower proposed that the meeting be called the Peterborough North Area Committee, Cllr Lane seconded this. Following a vote it was AGREED (5 for, 1 against) to rename the meeting the Peterborough North Area Committee.</p>	
8. Site Allocations Document	<p>The Principal Strategic Planning Officer introduced the item advising that the map showed the latest proposed sites allocated for development over the next 15 years. This area had mainly mixed use development with some residential. Gypsy and Traveller sites were removed apart from the transit site at Norwood lane.</p> <p>Comments, questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr John Fox – concern over Werrington centre re housing – how many and where? <i>Don't know yet as just proposals, maybe 100 homes for that centre;</i> • Cllr Lane – a development north of Werrington? <i>No longer required as Norwood and Greater Haddon used for the large residential development in the core strategy;</i> • Cllr S Day – Traveller transit site no longer at Norwood? – <i>Possibly still the preferred site but can investigate;</i> • Housing allocations on the sites, what numbers overall? – <i>one is Lincoln Road approx 60-70, Itter Crescent approx 25, Honey Hill School approx 50.</i> • Not many houses for this area in the overall city development? - <i>Over 1000 houses in Norwood development for this area;</i> • D Hedges – some areas will receive lots of S106 funding others very little. <i>S106 has to be linked to the development so if no development little justification for S106;</i> • Cllr Thacker – why Norwood for the transit site as Travellers have stated they would not occupy it? – <i>was proposed as best site. If you feel is not right site, can raise this at Council, in the public consultation and to planning inspector. Not finalised yet.</i> <p>ACTION: provide information on whether Norwood is still the preferred location for Traveller Transit Site.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">GW</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Gemma Wildman</p>
9. Neighbourhood	The Neighbourhood Manager introduced the item and advised that	

Council Budget	<p>officers would begin the process to spend the £25k allocated budget but would need to do so in line with local need and the priorities identified in the community action plan. At the next meeting a formal presentation and vote on how to spend the fund allocation would be taken.</p> <p>Comments, questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr JR Fox – any suggestions already? <i>Yes from you and Cllr Thacker. Will circulate headline priorities again to encourage suggestions;</i> • Accent Nene – deadline for spending monies, surplus into next year? <i>Don't foresee surplus as not a large amount of money. Will have a deadline of a month for suggestions to come back from elected members – other groups should contact elected ward councillors to put forward proposals;</i> • Werrington Neighbourhood Council – what were priorities? - <i>Based on 4 priorities; improving open space, cycle ways, health care, plays areas etc; will circulate the priorities from the Community Action Plan with the minutes;</i> • D Hedges – must have chosen priorities in public domain to ensure proper community engagement. - <i>Decisions will be made at next committee meeting but asking for suggestions outside the meeting – headline priorities should be in mind when monies are agreed.</i> 	
10. Updates	<p>The Neighbourhood Manager had updates on two issues:</p> <p>Parking issues in Lincoln Road - updates in due course from Neighbourhood officers and will circulate to members;</p> <p>Hurn Road Travellers Pitch – consult on the application. The Senior Development Management Officer introduced details of the application for a permanent site in Hurn Road. Originally recommended for refusal on noise due to proximity to railway. Now the application included a large barrier to run around the site bordering the railway – 1m high earth and 3.5m sound barrier (4.5m altogether). Still concerned if barrier was sufficient. No footpath along Hurn Road and other issues to consider before approving or refusing. October 12 to committee for determination. Questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Fower – when is the officer recommendation due? <i>Tuesday 28 September;</i> • Will residents need to resubmit new objections as this is a revised application? <i>Some have been asked and can include original letters;</i> • Plans to undertake wildlife study? – <i>re Great Crested Newts, no study yet. Not before the application but will consult with English Nature.</i> • Cllr Lane – declared that he is on the Planning Committee but would not be making any decision tonight. Cllr Burton and Cllr Thacker declared the same. 	
11. Open Session	<p>Audience members were given the opportunity to ask questions and raise issues affecting the area they lived in. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Smith, Honeyhill resident – want to improve car parking in 	

