

Present:

APC:

Joan Pickett
Anne Perkins
Jon Phillips
Richard Moon
Jenny Rice

CPC:

Neil Boyce
Fi Rowlands
Steve Davies
Dennis Surgeon

Others:

Dai Rowlands (Chair)
John Hodder
Sue Nash (for item 2)
Andrew Nash (for item 2)
Martin Chillcott
Helen Daly

1. Apologies for absence

Michael Samways, Megan Ellershaw, Jane Greene, John Haste and David Shaw.

2. Climate Change

2.1 Despite the constraints due to the current Covid 19 restrictions Sue & Andrew had established a small working group to consider how best to take things forward. In due course it was envisaged that the group could expand. They had also followed up the information provided by Neil and been in contact with Orton Longueville PC who had initiated a Climate Change Action Plan. Funding from PCC is available to PCs for this and it was suggested that both APC and CPC should look at the Orton initiative and each consider making similar declarations in line with the maxim 'Two Parishes - One Community'.

Action: APC & CPC.

2.2 It would be useful to consider what other PCs have done - there was a good deal of information available via Google. The working group were currently focussing on small, achievable ideas to put to the community via the PCs, posters and the Community Facebook page in due course. As a first step they were looking at energy use in households within the parishes and were developing proposals for the two PCs to consider in the New Year.

Action: Sue & Andrew and PCs.

3. Declarations of interest

None declared.

4. Action Points from previous meeting 9 September 2020

4.1 Action point 9 re-the water charges was ongoing. APC had emailed CPC for further information as there had been difficulties in checking the readings on the meter due to it being under water. Problems with leaks had been resolved and APC would check the reading again and liaise with CPC in the event of any further difficulties. For the longer term it was suggested that a separate water supply for APC might provide a more satisfactory solution.

Action: APC.

4.2 The remaining action points from the previous meeting had been dealt with, were ongoing or covered in agenda items below.

5. JPLG Terms of Reference (action point 12.1 from previous meeting)

The Terms of Reference approved by APC and CPC in October and November of 2019 respectively provided for annual review. Both PCs had considered the text as agreed at the previous meeting and no revisions were necessary.

6. Speedwatch

Anne Perkins had made further enquiries and volunteers had been sought via the village Facebook page. Eight volunteers had come forward (some from each village) and it was suggested that a joint working party be formed by the PCs to develop arrangements and take things forward in the new year - involving one member of each PC, volunteers and others with experience of speeding issues. CPC had also been investigating a new speed indication sign for Castor and would forward details to APC as it would be consistent to have similar signs at each end of the two villages. There remained the need to sort out problems with speed limit signage etc. before Speedwatch could operate effectively. Progress with PCC was slow and it was suggested that the PCs should seek the assistance of the Ward Councillors in order to progress this.

Action: APC & CPC as above.

7. Ongoing review of JCAP actions

JCAP 1.3 and 4.3 Woodlands: Current building work was expected to be completed around March next year and the position regarding the sports facilities was as updated at the last meeting.

JCAP 2.3 to 2.6 - New wording in respect of the nature recovery initiative had been provided by Megan as a revised single entry JCAP 2.3 to subsume existing entries 2.3 to 2.6 and a cross reference will be added in a revised JCAP 4.6. Each parish was developing proposals for the nature recovery programme led by the Langdyke Trust. Meetings with Langdyke continued and some funding was available. The programme was moving forward and a pilot could be taken forward in Castor parish. Liaison with landowners would take place as necessary and, for the longer term, it was suggested that the PCs might give thought to proposing tree planting to form a 'carbon sink' in the area North of the villages.

JCAP 3.3 20 MPH - the brief reference to Speedwatch will be updated.

JCAP 3.5 - It was noted that there is a new title 'GOOD NEIGHBOURS - Rural Peterborough' and that following the formal launched on 3 November it had been publicised by a mail drop to all households.

Action: **John Hodder** will update the JCAP to reflect the above and circulate for formal PC approval.

8. Neighbourhood Plan

8.1 Each PC had migrated the evidence documents to their own website and liaised with PCC to make appropriate re-direction links against the adopted NPs on the PCC website. On receipt of the renewal notification for the domain name both PCs had notified Athene of the intention not to renew it and it appeared that the joint website had since been closed. However, PCC had not yet published the appropriate re-direction links. Both PCs would need to inform their PCC contact of the website's closure and ask them to now publish the appropriate re-directions. It was also suggested that each PC should add a cross reference on their own website to the NP section on each other's website.

Action: PCs.

8.2 APC and CPC had considered progress against the delivery and implementation plans in Section 7 of their NP and were content that they were on track. It was noted that although the development at Woodlands was not 'housing' as such, Government advice on housing delivery provided a formula for calculating a care home's contribution to housing numbers. The Woodlands development might therefore be construed as counting towards the housing target in CH2 of the Castor NP. However, as the development was sanctioned under the separate NP policy CRV1 it should perhaps be viewed separately. Nonetheless it demonstrated that the parish was not opposed to appropriate development. How this is reflected should be considered at the time of the formal NP review.

Action: CPC when the NP is reviewed.

8.3 It seemed that there had been a U turn on the Government White paper on planning and the use of an algorithm to dictate increases in housing need. Peterborough currently had sufficient housing supply in hand for the coming years so an large, imposed increase was no longer expected for the immediate future.

Action: The PCs (and PRP) would continue to monitor.

8.4.1 Both the Ailsworth and Castor NPs state that they will be reviewed every five years and this would fall due in December 2022. Links to current Government and Locality NP guidance had previously been circulated to PC members and it was clear that the extent of a formal review exercise was dependent on the degree to which NP policies would need to be changed. Major changes would require a more formal exercise much as when the NPs were first created.

8.4.2 As a first step, it would be helpful for each PC to begin the thought process now; to look closely at each of their NP policies and to consider their continued relevance in light of experience since the NPs were adopted. This would indicate the extent to which policy changes might be needed when the actual review takes place.

8.4.3 Once the PCs have a view of the level of change that might be required, advice from the PCC NP adviser on the requirements of the review process would be helpful to establish what the formal review process would entail. Subject to advice, a joint questionnaire to canvass residents' views might then be useful to gain local feedback on the NPs. A joint working group to include members of each PC could then be formed later next year to prepare for and action the formal review.

Action: PCs to consider as in 8.4.2/3.

9. Village Shop

Work on the rebuilding of the shop in Ailsworth and its neighbouring building had started. Both PCs recognised its importance to the villages as expressed by parishioners during the NP consultations and

were keen to see the business keep going during the renovations. It was understood that the use of a temporary wooden building on site was currently envisaged to sustain the business.

10. Village Health Care

Anne Perkins had written as agreed at the previous meeting and there had been a swift response from the surgery in terms of partial opening. However, concerns remained and contact with representatives on the practice's patient panel might be helpful. Anne will continue to monitor concerns and write again as necessary. PC members will let Anne have details of concerns they are aware of and possible contacts on the patient panel.

Action: Anne Perkins and others as above.

11. Follow up action to the Bus Questionnaire

It was recognised that the route had proved unprofitable and there was currently little that could be done. The call connect service was available but had limitations. The bus service could be revisited longer term, perhaps when initiatives on climate change are considered.

12. COVID 19/Coronavirus

The informal Covid support group which had come together in the parishes would be subsumed by the Good Neighbours scheme in due course. The current infection rate in Peterborough as a whole was currently causing concern and could lead to a change in the current tier rating.

13. Any other business?

No points arose.

14. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 17 March 2021.