

**C31/1 North Werrington Development Working Group
23rd May 2006
Meeting held at the Royal Oak, Walton**

Minutes

1. Introductions

Glinton PC

Bob Johnson
Andy Wareham
David Wragg
Councillor John Holditch
OBE

WNC

David Raymond
Vince Moon
Martin Graves
Janet Goodman
Paul Curtis

AHE

Martin Chandler
Neil Osborn

2. Attendance (WNC Item 1)

DR pointed out that there were no Werrington Councillors present and questioned whether the working group should be confined to members of the Glinton and Werrington Councils "*the Councils*" and not extend to City Councillors "*PCC*". He expressed concern that numbers should be even on both sides.

JH pointed out that he was a member of Glinton PC and noted that there were more members of WNC present than has been expected.

DR said there were more WNC Members here because they didn't know who was going to turn up but the paper circulated by Roy Beard proposed a limit of three from each side.

3. Membership (WNC Item 1)

NO said that he had not invited Peakirk PC and asked whether they should be involved. It Peakirk PC has been dissolved and those present agreed that the scheme had little relevance to the interests of Peakirk.

Agreed – the working group should not involve Peakirk PC

BJ asked if WNC could get a Werrington PCC Member to attend and suggested that PCC Members be invited to monitor proceedings but not speak. AW agreed

JH pointed to the importance of getting the constitution right, as he wanted this to be a model for consultations elsewhere in the City, pointing out that the approach taken by AHE and the communities was pioneering.

It was agreed that membership should comprise three members from each of the two local councils plus one PCC Member from the respective wards.

BJ pointed out that Cllr Fox had come to the initial meeting

There was discussion whether the PCC Member from each side should participate. JH pointed out this would preclude them from voting at such time as an application came to the Council, but felt that it was important that the PCC was represented. Neither he nor the majority of the Werrington Members were members of the relevant committees.

It was agreed that the PCC Member from each side should participate in the meeting

4. Constitution (WNC Items 2 + 5)

Agreed that the Councils should each appoint a spokesperson through whom all questions, correspondence and minutes of the meeting should be channelled.

**Agreed that the spokespersons should be
Glinton – David Wragg
WNC – Roy Beard**

DJ pointed out that they should not be held at a licensed premises.

MC indicated that AHE would be content to meet any expenses incurred in hiring a venue

Agreed that future meetings should be hosted alternately by Glinton PC and WNC, the next meeting to be held in Werrington at a venue to be determined by the spokesperson of WNC

The frequency of meetings was discussed. NO said that he expected the planning application to be made in the autumn and that would leave the opportunity for a number of working group meetings necessary to explore the issues and consider options.

Agreed that the working party should meet monthly until such time as it no longer has a role to play in the preparation/addressing of the planning application

NO stated that he expected AHE to organise a formal public consultations some time in the early autumn (possibly September/October). He expected there would be a number of complex questions and that each working group meeting might want to concentrate on a particular aspect e.g. design, highways.

Agreed that the developer should keep and circulate the Minutes (to the spokespersons) within 7 days (WNC Item 3)

5-6. Objectives and Timescales

DR explored the issue of how the working group should report back to their respective Councils, to members of the community and the need for transparency.

JH said that this exercise was about protecting the community by enabling elected representatives to have an input into the preparation of the scheme

DR said that it was important that ordinary people were not gagged and would have the opportunity to have their say

JG said that it was important to get the options so that these could be discussed with the public.

It was generally agreed that the development was likely to proceed but that it would be important for the community to contribute to the form of the development

MC said it would always be difficult grappling with how you carried out the consultations. This was something done by PR companies in the past but it was now time for developers to be more hands-on.

It was generally agreed that until such time as the working group understood the options and had the opportunity to contribute to how they were formed there would be nothing material

that they could offer to the public other than the assurance that the public would be properly consulted. JH said it was important for the working group to get the scheme ready for public consultation in the autumn.

There was a discussion regarding the status of the minutes to be produced by the working group. BJ and AW pointed out that as a Parish Council they were obliged to publish their minutes and made a practice of posting them on the notice board and on their web site. It was understood the WNC were not under similar obligation but did make minutes available.

AW subsequently sought clarification; he had understood that the outcome of the working group meeting would be reported in full to Members (and therefore by implication to the public) but now seemed to understand that this was not to be the case

There was debate about the extent to which working group discussion could be made public at this stage. JG said it was important for the working group to begin to form an understanding of what was actually being proposed and there was a request that plans be made available to members of the working group at the next meeting in order that they could begin to have a constructive input.

Agreed that the detailed minutes of the working group would not be published but the report of the spokesperson would be included within the respective Council minutes (WNC Item 7)

Agreed the date of the next working group meeting should be 27th June at 7pm in Werrington

Agreed that the development shall be known as North Werrington and the working group shall be known as the North Werrington Development Working Group (WNC Item 4)

There was debate about the proposal of WNC that the WNC should be the prime consultee in any consultation/decision making process

JB said that there were 22 hectares in Glinton and 50 in Werrington but could not agree that WNC should be the prime consultee

JG and VM said that they understood the reference to relate to any instance where the name North Werrington was considered for change.

DR said that WNC have a meeting on Bank Holiday Monday and he would clarify the position

AW said that the WNC note was in any case superseded by this meeting. DR and JB agreed.

Agreed that the working group is now the primary consultee and not the individual constituent Councils or Members (WNC Item 6)

7. Status of the WNC project report (WNC Item 8)

Status of the WNC project report (referred to by Roy Beard in previous correspondence to NO) was discussed. It was understood that this was not a formal report in preparation

8. Progress Reports

NO provided a brief update of work presently being carried out with particular reference to

1. The preparation of a community governance strategy (copies to be available for members to consider at the next meeting)

2. Meetings held with
 - PCC transport department
 - Peterborough PCT
 - Children's services (education provision)
 - Work in progress on a population and demographic profile study
 - Work in progress on the environmental assessment with particular regard to:
 - Foul and surface water drainage
 - Noise assessment
 - Air quality assessment
 - Ecological assessments
 - Land survey
 - Community provision with particular reference to a prospective meeting with the owners of the Werrington centre,
 - affordable housing and the provision of care for the elderly

There was a brief discussion on a number of these topics and NO circulated the April draft plans (the most up to date currently available).

Agreed these will form the basis of discussion at the next meeting to which the architect will be invited.

MC answered questions about sustainability particularly in relation to matters such as drainage, grey water recycling and water supply

There was discussion about accessibility particularly the safe access to schools and members asked if the highway engineer would attend a meeting to note at first hand particularly the issue of road crossing of Lincoln Road in Glinton

Agreed NO to arrange for the highway engineer (Adrian Bullen) to contact the spokespersons directly

MC outlined briefly the Company's need to address issues such as lifetime homes, affordable and sheltered housing etc

There was a suggestion that a particular provision needed to be made for elderly persons including the provision of bungalows

There was a question about the provision of employment and some suggestion of sensitivity about the location of any employment land and the need for high-tech jobs rather than warehousing was stressed

NO/MC noted the comments and will have regard to these in preparing an agenda for a further working group meeting

9 – 11. Discussion/ Next Meeting /AOB

It was agreed that these items had been covered in earlier discussions

The meeting finished at approximately 9.30pm