



Cllr P Nash (Chairman)  
 Northborough: Cllr P Hiller  
 Barnack: Cllr D Over  
 Glinton and Wittering: Cllr J Holdich & Cllr D Lamb  
 Newborough: Cllr D Harrington  
 Eye and Thorney: Cllr R Dobbs & Cllr D Sanders

## **DRAFT MINUTES**

### ***of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Council (N&W1) - Rural North held at the John Clare Primary School on 16 September 2010***

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chairman: Cllr P Nash  
 Barnack: Cllr D Over  
 Northborough: Cllr P Hiller  
 Newborough: Cllr D Harrington  
 Eye and Thorney: Cllr R Dobbs, D Sanders

#### **OFFICERS PRESENT:**

Peter Heath-Brown Planning Policy Manager, PCC  
 Barry Kirk Infrastructure Planning & Delivery Group Manager, PCC  
 Julie Rivett Neighbourhood Manager, PCC  
 Alex Daynes Senior Governance Officer, PCC

37 members of the public attended the meeting as local residents and also representatives from Eye Junior Youth Club, Eye Open Space Group, Peterborough LINK, Children's Services (Cherry Lester), Evening Telegraph, Thorney Pensioner's Association, Helpston Parish Council, Ailsworth Parish Council, Ufford Parish Council, RAF Wittering, Eye Parish Council, Bainton & Ashton Parish Council, Glinton Parish Council, Barnack Parish Council, Thorney Parish Council and Peakirk Parish Council.

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1. Apologies	Apologies were received from Cllrs Holdich and Lamb.	
2. Declarations of Interest	None.	
3. Minutes of the last meeting	The Members of the Neighbourhood Council agreed the minutes from the meeting held 17 June 2010 subject to the following additions and amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions from item 3 will be dealt with in item 8, Feedback from Rural Road Safety Meeting, of tonight's agenda.</li> </ul>	
	The Chair announced that the order of the agenda would change with the Neighbourhood Council budget (previously item10) being dealt with as item 6 on the agenda.	
4. Local Transport Plan	The Infrastructure Planning & Delivery Group Manager introduced the item and advised that consultation on the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) had begun and he was seeking further ideas and comments from this meeting for inclusion in the consultation.	

	<p>The Chairman requested that the need for a shuttle bus from the city centre to the new hospital and a tourist bus for tourist sites such as Flag Fen, Nene Valley Railway etc be included in the consultation responses. Further comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Sanders – use of public transport should be encouraged but consultation overlooks need for car use;</li> <li>• Cllr Over – improved links to other towns and villages needed, not just to central Peterborough;</li> <li>• Cllr Harrington – buses are very important for rural transport and travel to access services;</li> <li>• Dale McKean – rural bus service needs to be more reliable;</li> <li>• Park and Ride was good at Christmas but should not increase in price or the incentive to use it is reduced.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. Site Allocations Document</p>	<p>The Clerk advised that Members were not obliged to vote to show support or opposition tonight but officers were requesting opinions and comments on the proposed sites for development in the area. Comments from elected Members would not bind them to that point of view for future meetings discussing the Site Allocations Document.</p> <p>The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Site Allocations plan and the approval process within the council that was needed before a final document was approved including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is latest version on current recommendations from officers which will go to Cabinet (8 November), then full Council (8 December) to approve a draft version for 6 week consultation then on to the secretary of state and inspector and finally to full Council (possibly December 2011)for formal adoption;</li> <li>• Some sites already have planning permission in this area;</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller pitches now dropped from the document; none will be allocated. A transit site will not be in this area;</li> </ul> <p>Comments and responses to questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Sanders – Eye and Thorney residents have already given responses at previous consultations; Parish councils’ opinions should be foremost in planning considerations; officers must collate previous consultation responses before a final draft is presented;</li> <li>• Thorney Parish Council – what happened to sites proposed in flood plain areas near Thorney? <i>These sites were removed as the Environment Agency opposed on the basis that they are in a higher risk flood zone. Flood zones are based on the assumption that there are no flood defences (as they could fail). It would therefore be difficult to put these sites back in; Why additional site off Sandpit Road after the previous document? There was an initial concern with the site which has now been reconsidered as acceptable;</i></li> <li>• Helpston Parish Council – 61 new dwellings proposed for Helpston when 45 were earmarked for the village envelope in total. Are figures from Core Strategy still valid? Requests city councillors object to the Site Allocations document;</li> <li>• Glinton Parish Council – Concerned that city council will seek</li> </ul>	

	<p>to build more houses to gain from government incentives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eye Open Space Group – Previous opposition to growth in Eye was not listened to. Over 1000 people opposed to growth outside the current village envelope wrote to the council. Need employment in the village, not outside the village. Concerned about size of proposed housing developments for Eye as employment site not now included;</li> <li>• Cllr Over – Developments are not sustainable as people have to work and shop outside villages because no employment development for rural areas. No evidence that more houses are needed or wanted. Little infrastructure at the moment so wouldn't cope with more people. This area will lose valuable agricultural land and countryside if housing developments take place;</li> <li>• Eye Junior Youth Club - Concern that no consideration given for impact on local doctors, youth clubs, schools and amenities etc which are already oversubscribed;</li> <li>• <i>Planning Policy Manager - Parish Councils can provide land for cemeteries; 3 sites for a city council cemetery proposed in the Castor and Ailsworth area currently open for consultation;</i></li> <li>• <i>Re Core Strategy – sites proposed in the document were due to full Council voting on that level of development in the rural area so officers are now obliged to find the sites to meet the agreed development level;</i></li> <li>• Helpston Parish Council – Must ensure that the government Inspector receives correct information from officers in the first instance when considering sites.</li> </ul> <p>The clerk was requested to note that no favourable comments to support the Site Allocations Document were forthcoming.</p>	
6. Neighbourhood Council Budget	<p>Cllr Hiller updated members on the allocated £25k advising that three projects had been submitted so far. Comments, questions and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood Manager – no decisions made yet on the bids received. Would have to be a city councillor decision on which bids were approved. No current closing date to receive bids for funding;</li> <li>• Clerk advises – as it is city council funding, it would be city council Members to take a final decision on funds;</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Manager – the funding is allocated for the 2010-11 financial year;</li> <li>• Cllr Harrington – need to know the criteria for applying and how to apply for the funds.</li> </ul> <p>Neighbourhood Manager advised that there would now be further communication forthcoming to elected Members.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Cllr Hiller to take comments on board and ensure communication with community regarding criteria to apply for budget.</p>	Cllr Hiller, J Rivett
7. Census 2011	<p>The Neighbourhood Manager provided information on the Census 2011 and requested that residents aide the council in contacting hard to reach groups to ensure that the census was as comprehensive as possible so funding provision from government was accurate.</p>	

	<p>Comments and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glinton Parish Council – very important as sets money for GPs, policing/service figures for the city area so must ensure all residents are included in the census response;</li> <li>• D McKean - put in village magazines/newsletters; maybe have a workshop for a day in villages to help people to complete the forms;</li> <li>• Helpston Parish Council – was Census 2011 abandoned? <i>No. But might be after 2011;</i></li> </ul>	
8. Protection of Rural Roadside Verges	<p>Cllr Over introduced a proposed project to manage the protected verges in rural areas which could also be applied to the whole of the rural area. Frieda Gosling, a Barnack resident continued, including the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many verges are protected and PCC managed with no cutting from June to August but then everything is cut;</li> <li>• Wild flowers and wildlife habitat is destroyed when cut;</li> <li>• Propose placing wooden sign posts to indicate protected areas (£40 a post, 23 needed for Barnack area and £97.70 for necessary signs = £1017.70 total);</li> </ul> <p>Comments and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Posts are 2.4m high but partly embedded in the ground – similar to footpath posts.</li> <li>• Why need posts? Just tell PCC not to cut it, a management issue – <i>hasn't worked in the past;</i></li> <li>• Barnack Parish Council – previously had posts but they rotted away and now verges have been cut back;</li> <li>• Cllr Harrington – must ensure junctions are cut back to ensure safety;</li> <li>• Glinton Parish Council – could this be a delegated power for Parish Councils?</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Liaise with relevant officers re the cutting of verges and the issues of cutting them.</p>	JR
9. Feedback from Rural Road Safety meeting	<p>The Neighbourhood Manager updated members following a Road Safety meeting held over the summer.</p> <p>Cllr Over – pass thanks to Clair George for work in Barnack and propose the same work in Helpston.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> contact Cllr Over for Helpston proposals.</p>	Clair George
10. Rural Affairs Working Group Update	<p>Henry Clarke updated the meeting on the proposed changes to how the Neighbourhood Council could operate following initial meetings of the Rural Parish Working Group including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to raise awareness of rural issues within the city council to reflect in its policies and plans;</li> <li>• Combine Rural Working Group, Parish Council Liaison and Neighbourhood Council into a Rural Affairs Committee to be made up of Ward and Parish Councillors in order to develop</li> </ul>	

	<p>policies and strategies to put forward to Council and Cabinet and to engage more effectively with other partners and service providers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final proposal for the next meeting;</li> <li>• Next working group on 7 October at 6.30pm in Town Hall.</li> </ul> <p>Comments and responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Only elected representatives would form the group to ensure accountability to residents;</i></li> <li>• This Neighbourhood Council already brings local representatives together outside Parish Council meetings and Ward councillor surgeries;</li> <li>• Inclusion of community leaders could add value to the strategies from the meeting - <i>community leaders could access the new meeting through ward councillors;</i></li> <li>• <i>Would only apply to this area;</i></li> <li>• Leader of the Council wanted this Neighbourhood Council to be inclusive for all, not just parish councils;</li> <li>• Cllr Over – supports this and welcomes parish and ward councillors coming together to clarify voting rights and responsibilities;</li> <li>• Glinton Parish Council – could consider proportional representation so larger villages have greater representation? <i>Will consider; What delegated power? Cllr Over - must keep the budget allocated to Neighbourhood Council;</i></li> <li>• J Bartlett – when go to Council to adopt this? <i>Need to draw up the terms of reference and aims and have Cllr Hiller and Cereste support before going to full Council;</i></li> <li>• Ensure no clashes in functions with Parish Councils.</li> </ul>	
11. Open Session	<p>Audience members were asked to raise further issues or questions important to them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J Bartlett re public speaking at planning committee – original report changed at Full Council when adopted – so must share only 10 minutes for speaking with ward councillor – Strongly oppose this; agenda item for next time.</li> <li>• Not all information goes to parish clerk from PCC. Not always made aware of issues so cannot get involved. Info should go to clerk in first instance. Must ensure posters for meetings include more information;</li> <li>• Not all standing invitees attend so how can anyone ask questions of them?</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> 1) J Rivett to ensure contact details are correct for all parishes; 2) add planning committee speaking scheme to next agenda.</p>	<p>JR</p> <p>JR</p>
12. Next Meeting	<p>The next meeting is scheduled for Monday 13 December 2010, venue to be confirmed.</p> <p>Next meeting clashes with Thorney Parish Council, can it be changed?</p>	

Meeting closed at 9.15pm.

This page is intentionally left blank