

Public Document Pack



Cllr J Goodwin (Chairman)
Orton with Hampton: Cllr N North, Cllr S Scott & Cllr D Seaton
Orton Longueville: Cllr P Winslade & Cllr G Murphy
Orton Waterville: Cllr S Allen, Cllr G Elsey & Cllr J Stokes

DRAFT MINUTES

Of a meeting of the

Ortons with Hampton Neighbourhood Council (Area South 2)

held on Thursday 16 December 2010 at 7.00 pm at

The Herlington Centre, Orton Malborne, Peterborough PE2 5PR

*****PLEASE NOTE THAT THESE MINUTES REMAIN DRAFT UNTIL CONFIRMED
AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL*****

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cllr J Goodwin (Chairman)
Cllr N North
Cllr D Seaton
Cllr P Winslade
Cllr J Stokes

OFFICERS PRESENT:

Lisa Emmanuel	Neighbourhood Manager - South
Alana Diffey	Governance Officer
Carlos Harrison	Community Based Youth Worker
Jez Tuttle	Senior Engineer (Development)
Mandy Ward	Media & Communications Officer

Also in attendance:

Peter Wightman	Interim Director of Primary Care, NHS Peterborough
Ed Moss	Eaga (Digital Switchover Help Scheme)

34 members of the public attended, 6 young people from the Youth Forum and representatives of the following community organisations: Herlington Community Centre, Family Action – St Mary's Church, Hampton Police Station, Cross Keys Homes, Hampton Parish Council, Orton Medical Practice and Orton Waterville Parish Council.

ITEM	DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS	ACTION
1. Apologies	Apologies were received from Cllr Allen and Cllr Elsey.	
2. Declarations of Interest	There were no declarations of interest.	

3. Minutes of the previous meeting	The minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record.	
4. Digital Switchover Help Scheme	Mr Ed Moss of Eaga gave a brief presentation on the Digital Switchover Help Scheme, which sought to assist eligible individuals to prepare for the change to digital television. Mr Moss informed the meeting that it was estimated that there were at least 95,000 people in Peterborough who were eligible to receive support through the scheme and encouraged attendees to ensure those people that they thought may be eligible came forward for help.	
5. Youth Forum	<p>Representatives of the Youth Forum attended the meeting and made the following points during their presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Forum was comprised of a group of determined young people brought together by youth workers. The Forum aimed to have more consistent meetings in the future, where young people could discuss issues across many different areas and work together to find solutions, and to look at youth provision and available facilities. ▪ A training day was held recently where young people were able to discuss their concerns regarding youth provision and how to fairly spend funding. Councillor Goodwin had attended and talked to the Forum about the Neighbourhood Council. The day had also given young people the opportunity to make new friends, talk about their own neighbourhood areas, to see what they could learn from each other and to develop their public speaking and presentation skills. ▪ The Forum had also met to discuss funding issues and were seeking to improve provision for young people in the Ortons, including new and improved graffiti walls in Hampton and perhaps a youth café similar to the one operating out of the street bus in Hampton. The Forum felt that it was important to provide for young people, as young people did not want to be hanging out on the streets or wanting to make life difficult for people – they want something to do, a way to contribute and to improve their local area. <p>In response to questions raised, the representatives of the Youth Forum responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Youth Forum was seeking a shop front or similar premises to use as a permanent focus for youth facilities, eg drop in centre. The Forum was dedicated to assisting with raising funds to furnish the premises, however they did need assistance. ▪ The Youth Forum would like to continue to contribute to the Neighbourhood Council, to build connections with other groups in the area and to help foster a sense of community. 	

	<p>During discussion, it was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ there had been plans for many years to increase and improve provision for young people but that matters were slow to progress. ▪ the budget was difficult for Peterborough at the moment, however £8,000 from the Neighbourhood Council's own capital budget was being dedicated to youth projects in the area. ▪ a room would be available to the Youth Forum in the children's centre in Hampton once constructed, which could be used as a youth club venue. <p>ACTION:</p> <p>Cllr Seaton agreed to meet with the Neighbourhood Manager and the Youth Forum to further discuss plans and to assist in identifying any possible premises for use as a permanent Youth Forum presence.</p>	LE
6. Orton Medical Practice Proposals	<p>Peter Wightman, Interim Director of Primary Care at NHS Peterborough had been invited to the meeting to talk through the proposals for Orton Medical Practice and to inform attendees on how they could take part in the consultation.</p> <p>In presenting the item, the Interim Director of Primary Care made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Interim Director of Primary Care was responsible for planning surgeries, dentists and other primary care provision across the whole of the Peterborough area. ▪ NHS Peterborough was planning to undertake a consultation event in relation to future of primary care for Peterborough in March 2011 which would include services in Orton. Peterborough was facing a situation where in 5 years time, 1 in 5 GPs would be over 60 and this needed to be planned for. ▪ There were quite a few small surgeries in Peterborough, and NHS Peterborough were trying to attract new doctors and nurses to the area. There had been greater success in attracting doctors and nurses to work in larger practices. ▪ NHS Peterborough were facing many financial challenges and needed to ensure accessibility and continuity of services. <p><u>Options & Issues in Orton</u></p> <p>The Interim Director of Primary Care went on to discuss the local area specifically, making the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Orton currently had 3 surgeries, two of which operated out of Orton Medical Centre. One of these surgeries operated 	

on a permanent contract, the other on a temporary contract. The third surgery was Nene Valley Medical Centre, which was a larger practice located in good, modern premises with a list of around 10,000 patients. Those surgeries operating out of Orton Medical Centre were relatively small and it was felt that in the future it would be difficult for these practices to meet the standards of care to which NHS Peterborough aspired.

- NHS Peterborough was not at all considering closure of Orton Medical Centre, simply options for the best way forward. Option 1, for example, being to continue with two practices operating from Orton Medical Centre, and Option 2 to continue with one practice.
- The Interim Director of Primary Care had met with Dr Cartmel, where there was discussion about extending the contract on a temporary basis through the consultation period with a decision on the preferred outcomes for the future of Orton Medical Centre being expected to be considered by the NHS Peterborough Board in July 2011. Any changes would see a transition period of 3 months and patients should not expect any disruption to services.

During discussion, the following points were noted:

- Some patients had received information headed 'Save Orton Medical Practice' which had given the impression that the centre was closing and that patients would have to look for a new surgery. The Interim Director of Primary Care assured attendees that this was absolutely not the case and that the information had not come from NHS Peterborough.
- Some patients had written to NHS Peterborough to raise concerns over the apparent closure of the Centre, and had not received the same reassurance as provided by the Interim Director of Primary Care that the centre was definitely not at risk of closure. The Interim Director of Primary Care acknowledged that plans had not been well communicated and that communication of the proposals would be improved.
- Questions were raised as to why there was such a process to go through when it seemed to make sense to amalgamate the existing practices, as most patients attending either practice at the surgery were very happy with the service they received. The Interim Director of Primary Care explained that there were technical reasons for the process that must be undertaken, which was mostly to do with NHS contracts which did not allow for doctors to amalgamate contracts. Old contracts would have to be ended and new ones started, and for that to happen NHS Peterborough would have to go through a consultation process. Again the Interim Director of Primary Care acknowledged that the process had not been well communicated, but that NHS Peterborough was keen to keep things moving forward to secure the best outcome for

the future of the service.

- It was felt that the surgery was perfectly positioned to cater to a large number of patients, as it was well located with bus service links, was easy to access on foot, had a large car park and an on site pharmacy. The Interim Director of Primary Care explained that to ensure the future of the surgery, 2 or 3 younger doctors with support were needed to start to build the practice for Orton.
- The Interim Director of Primary Care advised that it was for the practices to grow themselves as they were the providers and this was their responsibility, though NHS Peterborough could provide mentoring support. Young doctors want to work in larger, supportive practices.

It was acknowledged that despite the reassurances given at the meeting, it was evident that many patients were worried by the misinformation they had received and that this needed to be rectified immediately. The Interim Director of Primary Care agreed to work with Orton Medical Practice to ensure a consistent NHS Peterborough message on what to expect was delivered.

In response to questions about the future of the NHS, the Interim Director of Primary Care advised that the NHS had been through a number of reorganisations and whatever body succeeds the Primary Care Trust would be responsible for commissioning services such as these and would face similar issues. In the future, GPs would be responsible for commissioning services but not for managing their own contracts.

In response to a question from Cllr Goodwin about the consultation process, the Interim Director of Primary Care advised that:

- a consultation document would be published which would cover the future of primary care for Peterborough as a whole, and would contain a recommended way forward. Public meetings would take place during March – June 2011 to allow people to come forward and give their views on the proposals. The Board would then meet in public in June or July 2011 to make a decision.
- The best way to determine the views of the community was still being investigated, as the consultation document would be large and very detailed, and would cover the whole of Peterborough, not just the proposals raised in relation to Orton.

In response to a question from Cllr Seaton about the future of the service in Hampton due to unsuitable premises, the Interim Director of Primary Care advised that the only way to make it work would be to find additional resources, and this would also be considered during the primary care consultation process. The Interim Director of Primary Care advised that NHS Peterborough would meet with groups of councillors for the areas affected by the consultation proposals and admitted that there would need to be some prioritisation across Peterborough as there was quite a

	<p>backlog of primary care issues i that needed addressing.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Interim Director of Primary Care for his attendance at the meeting.</p>	
<p>7. Peterborough City Council Budget</p>	<p>The Chairman read a statement which explained the impact of the central government's budget settlement being received later than expected on the Council's ability to consult on budget proposals for the forthcoming year. The Chairman advised that a consultation event would take place on 6 January 2011, commencing at 6pm in the Bourges and Viersen Rooms at the Town Hall. Following the consultation event, the budget proposals would then be considered by a Joint Scrutiny meeting in the Council Chamber, which members of the public were welcome to view from the public gallery.</p> <p>The statement read by the Chairman was as follows:</p> <p><i>Peterborough City Council will receive a £15 million cut in Government funding over the next two years.</i></p> <p><i>According to the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement released on 13 December 2010, the city council will lose £8.9 million (10.1 per cent) of its formula grant for 2011/12 and a further £5.6 million (7.8 per cent) for 2012/13.</i></p> <p><i>The announcement appears to show that the council will receive £2.6 million less than it had predicted in its October budget report for 2011/12. The announcement also appears to show the council will receive £4.3 million less than was predicted for 2012/13. The council said the reason its predictions were different to the Government's announcement is because of changes in the way the Government calculates how funding is allocated.</i></p> <p><i>Leader of the council, Councillor Marco Cereste, said: "All councils knew they would be getting less funding next year as part of the Government's strategy to cut the national deficit. However, the announcement yesterday shows we will receive less Government funding than we predicted in Peterborough because of changes in the way the Government calculates how it distributes its funding.</i></p> <p><i>"I still believe Peterborough is in a very strong position because of the work we have already put into this year's budget process. In putting together our budget proposals at the end of October we made predictions about how we thought Peterborough would be affected by the cuts. We published these proposals earlier than most other councils to give residents, businesses and our partners the opportunity to give their feedback on our ideas.</i></p> <p><i>"We will now be working with our finance team and senior managers to decide how we take this budget forward and any changes we may need to make. However, at this stage I do not believe that we need to make any significant changes in light of this announcement or that it will lead to many more job losses than already announced.</i></p> <p><i>"The Cabinet and I will now be looking to assess all the feedback</i></p>	

	<p><i>we have received so far, and any further feedback still to come in, to enable our final budget proposals to be considered by Cabinet on 7 February 2011. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those people who have already given their views and remind people there is still time to have your say on our budget proposals."</i></p> <p>Cllr Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources reminded attendees that the budget documents and proposals were available from the Peterborough City Council website and it was believed that the Council could keep to the figures already worked up prior to receiving the settlement.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cllr Seaton advised that funding for the Cathedral Square project had come from central government for the regeneration of cities, and had not been funded from Council tax. If Peterborough had not bid for the money, another council would have. It was acknowledged that the project should have been completed more quickly. ▪ Whilst the Council had paid £8 million toward the POSH stadium, it was believed that over time the project would attract additional grant funding to allow the development of a training centre and that this would eventually pay for itself. 	
<p>8. Neighbourhood Council Budget</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Manager provided a quick update on progress on Neighbourhood Council capital budget allocations of £25,000, stating that the Neighbourhood Council had agreed some provisional areas for spending at its meeting in September 2010. It had been recognised that Neighbourhood Councils were still relatively new and a more formal way of allocating funds would be established for the future. Those proposals agreed had been linked to key areas already identified in the Community Action Planning process and were priorities identified by local communities.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Manager went through the summary of agreed spends, which were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smartwater Kits £3000 ▪ Community noticeboards £1500 ▪ No fly-tipping/dog fouling signs £1000 ▪ Noise monitoring equipment £500 ▪ Improvements to parks/open spaces £5000 ▪ Equipment for community use £1000 ▪ Provision for young people £8000 ▪ Improvements to public footpaths £5000 <p><u>Smartwater Kits</u></p> <p>In response to questions raised, Inspector Matt Snow advised that Smartwater was a type of invisible ink that contained a unique barcode that could be used to mark items. If those items were stolen and recovered by police, the Smartwater could assist with reuniting the property with its owner. The use of Smartwater needed to be very targeted as it was expensive, but in houses where Smartwater was used and a sticker advertising that fact was</p>	

clear, it proved to be an useful deterrent.

Community Notice Boards

Community notice boards were being funded to address the lack of communication in some areas. The Neighbourhood Manager had been working with councillors to look at designs, and working with the City Council's planning department to determine the permissions required to install the boards. Locations currently being considered for notice boards included areas of high footfall, for example around the Herlington Centre.

No fly-tipping/dog fouling signs

The 'no fly-tipping' and 'no dog fouling' signs would be ordered in the near future when an order for another Neighbourhood Council was ready, to ensure better value for money. It was the work of the neighbourhood officers to identify areas that required the signs and what to purchase, which had resulted in some of the funds being left over.

Noise Monitoring Equipment

With regard to the purchase of additional noise monitoring equipment, a provider had been identified and an order had been placed for 4 additional pieces of equipment.

Pool of Equipment

A decision is being awaited regarding a pool of equipment being developed in the north and west area and in the central and east area, as these Neighbourhood Councils had made very similar budget proposals. Officers were still awaiting decisions for purchasing together with these other Neighbourhood Councils for better value for money. Neighbourhood Managers were in discussion with Councillors about where to store the equipment, and a protocol on use and access was to be developed.

Provision for young people

The Neighbourhood Manager reported that it had been fabulous to see young people working together at the recent Youth Forum training day at the football ground. Now that the Forum had developed some ideas on how they wanted to take things forward, together with the offer to meet with Cllr Seaton, it was expected that spending would go ahead in the near future to get activities up and running.

Improvements to footpaths, parks and open spaces

Neighbourhood Officers had been working closely with City Services and Highways Inspectors to identify areas of priority and to maximise the use of the small amount of funding allocated. Some areas had already been flagged for improvement, and more detailed costings were being worked up.

With regard to areas that attracted antisocial behaviour, for example areas around Pennington and Stagsden, City Services

	<p>had already started doing some work to improve these areas, for example turfing areas that had previously been concrete, and the replacement of bushes and shrubs that had come to the end of their life. The work across multiple service areas demonstrated the positive impact the Neighbourhood Council has had in the community.</p> <p>During discussion, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents queried what was happening with regard to the Cross Keys Homes bin stores where rubbish kept collecting and the area couldn't be effectively maintained. Residents felt that the area needed to be more open and accessible, so that it would be easier to spot vandalism and fly-tipping. In response to these comments, Maureen Lazaretti of Cross Keys Homes advised that at the time the bin stores were installed, there had been a lot of issues raised, including that of fire safety. Lessons had been learned as this approach had not been used in Peterborough before and it was acknowledged that the bin enclosures had not been perfect. ▪ With regard to the community notice boards, residents asked what notices were going to appear on them and who would be responsible for keeping the boards up to date. The Neighbourhood Manager advised that officers were working with colleagues across the Council and with other partners to identify locations for the boards and to agree who would be responsible for keeping them up to date. Parish Councils would also be able to use the boards, and it was hoped that they would be installed by March in time to advertise the Orton Medical Practice consultation. <p>The Neighbourhood Manager advised that a budget update would appear on every future agenda for this Neighbourhood Council along with a financial statement. The way in which funds had been allocated this year had been a one off process, and new financial processes for the future allocation of funds were being worked up. The expenditure of funds by the Neighbourhood Council would be open and transparent and up for scrutiny.</p>	
<p>9. Open Session</p>	<p><u>Adoption of Roads</u></p> <p>In response to questions raised, the Senior Engineer (Development) advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a map showing which roads were going to be adopted would become incomprehensible and it was felt that using blue adoption notifications for cross referencing the plan to see the timings for adoption was a more transparent way of showing what was taking place. There were not specific timescales for adoption because the Council was not the authority building the roads, and the Council was relying on the developers to build them. ▪ There were many reasons why some roads were not yet adopted, for example no adopted road to link to, or the road was currently landlocked. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Council does use the bond scheme to ensure developers deliver roads, however it was felt that working effectively with developers was a better way of achieving outcomes, especially with developers feeling the same financial difficulties as the Council at present. ▪ Information had not been published to the Council web site as previously agreed as officers were reviewing the way in which the information was presented. The main difficulty faced was finding the resource to publish the plans every time they were updated, and it was hoped that this would be addressed in the near future. It was acknowledged that regular updates were requested and the Senior Engineer (Development) agreed to bring regular updates to the Neighbourhood Council meetings. The plans were public documents and could be published on the Council web site and the community and parish councils websites where required. <p>It was acknowledged that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ there had been a lack of communication in relation to this issue and that it was important to identify a point of contact in the community so that the information could be communicated effectively. ▪ A current map of roads in Hampton would be welcome, especially for emergency services, as satellite navigation systems often tried to navigate you down roads that did not yet exist. The Senior Engineer (Development) agreed to advise residents on how to obtain a map that is produced and updated every 3 months by O&H. <p>ACTIONS:</p> <p>Neighbourhood Manager to provide the O&H map to health and fire services on a regular basis. Senior Engineer (Development) to provide the map to Hampton Parish Council on a regular basis.</p> <p>The Senior Engineer (Development) to bring updates on road adoptions to the Neighbourhood Council on a regular basis.</p> <p><u>Bushfield Library</u></p> <p>With regard to rumours that the Bushfield Library was going to be closed, Councillor Winslade advised that whilst the current library building would eventually be demolished, the library would be incorporated into the Bushfield School.</p> <p><u>Litter Bins at the Herlington Centre</u></p> <p>Following concerns raised by residents, two new litter bins had been installed at the Herlington Centre, and officers now believed that there were enough bins in the area. Residents argued that there was not enough capacity to cope with rubbish over the weekend. Councillor Goodwin agreed to go back to City Services to discuss more regular emptying.</p>	<p>JT / LE</p> <p>JT</p> <p>LE</p>
--	---	------------------------------------

	<p><u>Roadworks on A15</u></p> <p>It was noted that where Clayburn Road is supposed to intersect with the A15, nothing had been done on the roadworks for about a year, and the location has become dangerous. Cllr Seaton advised that he had recently met with officers regarding this issue and that ultimately that junction would become a roundabout. O&H had encountered difficulties as it had not sold as much land as anticipated, though there was a verbal commitment to finish the roundabout once one of the corner plots sold. Cllr Seaton could not say how quickly that may take place, and whilst the Council was not happy with the situation there was no alternative as the Council did not have the £800,000 required to do the works.</p>	
10. Next Meeting	The Chairman advised that the next meeting of the Ortons with Hampton Neighbourhood Council would take place on Thursday, 24 March 2011 at Orton Longueville School.	

Meeting closed at 8.52pm.

This page is intentionally left blank