

**PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD**  
**13 APRIL 2011**

**The Mayor – Councillor Keith Sharp**

**Present:**

Councillors: Allen, Arculus, Ash, Benton, Burton, Cereste, M Dalton, S Dalton, S Day, D Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Fower, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goldspink, Goodwin, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Jamil, Khan, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Lowndes, Miners, Morley, Murphy, Nash, Nawaz, Newton, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Sharp, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Todd, Walsh, Wilkinson and Winslade.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dobbs, Shaheed and Thacker.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were received:

Councillor Sharp declared a personal interest in item 7(ii), motion one, in that he was a member of Innova Board.

Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest in item 7(ii), motion four, in that he was a member of the Electoral Reform Society.

Councillor Hiller declared a personal interest in item 7(ii), motion one, in that he had been involved in the orchestration of the current state of the hydrotherapy pool.

Councillor Fitzgerald declared a personal interest in item 7(ii), motion five, in that he was a member of the Police Authority.

Councillor Lee declared a personal interest in item 7(ii), motion five, in that he was a member of the Police Authority.

**3. Minutes of the meetings held on 23 February 2011**

The minutes of the meetings held on 23 February 2011 were agreed and signed by the Mayor as an accurate record.

**4. Communications Time**

**4(i) Mayor's Announcements**

Members noted the report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period 13 February 2011 to 3 April 2011.

**4(ii) Leader's Announcements**

Councillor Cereste addressed the meeting and stated that the launch of the war memorial had been a success and a company in Peterborough had donated the first £5k towards the fund. Further donations towards this worthy cause would be welcomed and encouraged.

Group Leaders were invited to respond to the announcement and all offered notes of support and thanks.

In response, Councillor Cereste thanked the Group Leaders for their support.

#### **4(iii) Chief Executive's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

### **5. Community Involvement Time**

#### **5(i) Questions with Notice by Members of the public**

There were no questions raised.

#### **5(ii) Questions with notice by Members of the Council relating to ward matters to Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen**

There were no questions raised.

#### **5(iii) Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities**

Questions were asked to the representative of the Police Authority in respect of the following:

- Payments for full time police officers and Police Community Support Officers working at the Private Finance Initiative Schools (PFI) in Peterborough and the hospital; and
- The reduction in the hours of the villages' Police Constable (PC).

A summary of all questions and answers were raised within agenda items 5(iii) are attached at **Appendix A**.

#### **5(iv) Petitions submitted by Members or Residents**

Councillor Todd submitted a petition from the residents of Glenton Street and Eastgate with regards to improving the state of their footpaths.

### **6. Executive Business Time**

#### **6(i) Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive**

Questions were asked to the Leader and Members of the Executive in respect of the following:

- Speeding traffic on David's Lane;
- Private Sector landlords and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs);
- Flytipping;
- Services provided by Enterprise following loss of staff;
- Trees and shrubs in Cathedral Square; and
- Webcasting.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda items 6(i) are attached at **Appendix B**.

## **6(ii) Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions**

Members received and noted a report summarising:

- Decisions from the Cabinet Meetings held 21 March 2011;
- Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the last meeting;
- Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the last meeting; and
- Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 15 February 2011 to 31 March 2011.

### **Questions were asked about the following:**

#### Neighbourhood Council Review – Part 2

Councillor Ash queried whether the work of the Neighbourhood Councils would overshadow and duplicate the work undertaken by the local residents and community associations and the Parish Councils. Councillor Cereste responded and stated that the concept was for the Neighbourhood Councils to be decision making bodies, enabling the public to be involved in the way the city was run. Ultimately some duplication may occur, but this would be addressed going forward.

Councillor Sanders questioned whether the further inclusion of Parish Councillors could be explored in the future, including affording one member from each Parish Council a vote at the meetings. Councillor Cereste responded that there had been a number of recommendations made in relation to Parish Councils and there was nothing to say that this point could not be explored further in the future.

Councillor Sandford queried why the name 'Area Committees', as proposed by the Task and Finish Group, had been changed to 'Neighbourhood Committees' by Cabinet, and what consultation had been undertaken prior to putting that name change forward? Councillor Cereste responded and stated that the name 'Area Committees' was too impersonal. Cabinet wanted to convey a clear message that the Committees were about neighbourhoods and the people who lived in those neighbourhoods. With regards to consultation, Councillor Cereste stated that he wasn't aware that this was required on this point.

Councillor Sandford expressed concern at the nature of the powers to be afforded to the Committees, requested clarification from the Leader as to what their powers would be, and to confirm that they would not become purely talking shops. Councillor Cereste stated that the Committees would be given all the powers possible that the rules allowed.

Councillor Khan stated that he broadly welcomed the decision of the Cabinet, however could the Leader assure him that the Committees would receive the support and attention they deserved? Councillor Cereste responded and guaranteed support for the Committees.

Councillor Miners stated that he believed it should be the decision of each of the individual Neighbourhood Committees to decide its own seating arrangements, therefore he believed that section 13 of the recommendations should be deleted and taken back for further consideration. Councillor Goodwin responded and stated that the meetings were only the front facing aspect, the real work was undertaken within the Neighbourhood Management Team, and it was therefore not important where people were seated. Councillor Cereste further responded and stated that it would be acceptable for each of the Committees to identify their own seating arrangements.

Councillor Arculus stated that the report contained references to Area Committees. Councillor Arculus was assured that this point would be addressed.

Councillor Fower queried whether the Peterborough North Area Committee would be required to change its name and if so would Councillor Cereste be happy to attend a future meeting to explain to those present why their chosen name was no longer to be used. Councillor Cereste stated that he would be happy to attend and explain the point.

Councillor Fitzgerald sought clarification as to the formal wording change to point 13 in the recommendations with regards to seating arrangements. Councillor Cereste stated that this point would be explored.

## **7. Council Business Time**

### **7(i) Executive Recommendations**

#### **a) Long Term Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan (LTP)**

Cabinet at its meeting of 21 March received a report following a Joint Meeting of the Environment Capital and Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committees and Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities as part of the democratic process leading to the adoption of the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) at Full Council in April 2011. Cabinet considered the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) and recommended it to Council for adoption.

Councillor Hiller introduced and moved the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Cereste seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

During debate, concerns were raised over the ongoing issue of parking on verges and also of the bus strategy on page 43 of the document.

A vote was taken (48 in favour, 0 against and 3 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

Adopt the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016).

### **7(ii) Notices of Motion**

1. Council agreed to accept an altered motion from Councillor John Fox. Councillor John Fox moved the following motion (deletions are shown):

That this Council:

- (i) Recognises the extent of the work being carried out at the hydrotherapy pool, located at St George's Centre, and its benefits to all the communities across Peterborough;
- (ii) ~~Requests that the Leader of the Council considers amending the Community Leadership Fund (CLF) criteria to cover city wide projects, and if agreed:~~
- (iii) Requests that all Councillors ~~be asked to~~ consider making a donation of ~~£500~~ from their annual CLF allocation towards the running costs of the hydrotherapy pool.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Judy Fox and she reserved her right to speak.

Following a brief debate this motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

2. Councillor Sandford moved the following motion with an amendment from Councillor Seaton (shown below):

That this Council:

- (i) Notes that the last Labour Government closed over 5,000 post offices, including several in the Peterborough area;
- (ii) Welcomes the Coalition's Governments plans for post offices, which involve:
  - Post offices becoming a one-stop shop;
  - Investment of £1.3 billion in the post office network;
  - Post offices opening longer;
  - 80% of bank accounts being accessible in your local post office;
  - Post offices remaining a central point of our community life;
  - Post offices offering information for jobseekers;
  - Post office services being offered at the shop till; and
  - Small, local shops providing some post office services.
- ~~(iii) Will endeavour to put as much business through Peterborough's post office network as possible, i.e. council tax payments and other council services;~~
- (iii) Will endeavour to put business through Peterborough's post office network where possible, where value for money and subject to procurement legislation.
- (iv) Instructs the Chief Executive to write to Postal Affairs Minister, Ed Davey MP, giving this Council's full support to the Government's proposals.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Fower who reserved his right to speak.

Following a brief debate this motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

3. Councillor Fower moved the following motion:

That this Council:

- (i) Recognises the litter problems created, especially in those areas designated District Centres, where there are a high proportion of takeaway food outlets;
- (ii) Requests that, unless there are pressing logistical reasons not to do so, a standard planning condition for planning applications for such developments will be automatically imposed for provision of a litterbin at the applicant's expense in the vicinity of the development.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Sandford who reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Hiller moved amendments to the motion to leave out words from paragraph 1 and to replace words in paragraph 2 as below:

That this Council:

- (i) Recognises the litter problems created, especially in those areas designated District Centres.

- (ii) Requests that, unless there are logistical reasons not to do so, planning officers, when considering all retail outlets' planning applications, investigate the potential to condition litter disposal methodology to endeavour to reduce the problem.

The amendments were seconded by Councillor Sam Dalton.

Following a brief debate a vote was taken on the amendments to the motion and they were **CARRIED**: 48 in favour, 2 against, 3 abstentions.

No further debate took place and the substantive motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

4. Councillor Fower moved the following motion:

That this Council:

- (i) Supports moves to change our parliamentary voting system, which will see Peterborough Members of Parliament elected under a fairer system;
- (ii) Calls on the Returning Officer to take steps to promote participation in the Referendum.

This was seconded by Councillor Sandford.

Following a debate in which views both for and against the motion were given, a vote was taken and the motion was **DEFEATED**: 4 in favour, 44 against, 3 abstentions.

5. Councillor Fower moved the following motion:

That this Council:

- (i) Notes that the Government wants to have directly elected police commissioners with the intention also to axe police authorities, and that the LGA is opposing this change;
- (ii) Expresses deep concern that this will lead to the politicisation of Cambridgeshire Police and jeopardise their operational independence. Such a radical change would be a diversion, at an estimated cost of hundreds of thousands of pounds, in precious resources away from front-line policing;
- (iii) Believes accountability of the police in Peterborough would be best served in strengthening the ties, by other means, between our local neighbourhoods and Councillors;
- (iv) Requests that the Leader of the Council to write to our local MPs informing them of this motion and asking them to oppose the Government's proposals for elected Police Commissioners.

This was seconded by Councillor Sandford.

Following debate the motion was **DEFEATED**: 10 in favour, 38 against, 2 abstentions.

## **7(iii) Reports and Recommendations**

### **a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document**

Council received a report informing it of the publication of the Inspectors Report and its conclusion which found the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 'sound' and recommending that Council approve the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD including Proposals Map C, incorporating the changes recommended by the Inspectors Report.

Councillor Hiller introduced and moved the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Cereste seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

During debate, Councillor Sandford raised concerns over the content of page 103 of the document relating to the potential disposal of low level radioactive waste in Cambridgeshire. Councillor Cereste advised that it would be for the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee to agree to any use of Peterborough land for the disposal of such waste and therefore could not envisage this happening.

A vote was taken (45 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the conclusions of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the Council's submitted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document; and
2. Approve the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document, incorporating the changes as recommended by the Inspector, for adoption on 19 July 2011 following approval by Cambridgeshire County Council on that date.

#### **b) Programme of Meetings**

Council received a report presenting for the consideration of Council the annual programme of meetings for 2011/12 and the draft programme of meetings for 2012/13.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendations in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Rush.

A brief debate was held in which Councillor Sandford queried the necessity to hold some Committee meetings in the daytime and Councillor Rush advised of a clash of dates in June 2012 with the Queen's Jubilee bank holiday.

It was **AGREED** to carry the recommendations in the report to:

Approve the programme of meetings for 2011/12 and approve, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2012/13.

#### **c) Grouping of Borough Fen and Newborough Parish Councils**

Council received a report to approve the grouping of the parishes of Borough Fen and Newborough and to allow a common parish council under the name of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council to be formed, and to make an Order to bring the parish council into force.

Councillor Harrington moved the recommendations in the report.

This was seconded by Councillor Cereste.

It was **AGREED** to carry the recommendations in the report to:

1. Group Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Councils under the name of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council;
2. Authorise the Solicitor to the Council to draw up an Order to group the parish councils to include the following electoral arrangements:
  - (i) the number of parish councillors should be twelve, eight representing Newborough and four representing Borough Fen;
  - (ii) the current parish councillors elected in 2010 for Newborough and Borough Fen should continue to represent the new parish council, elections will be held at the end of their term of office in 2014.

Meeting closed at 9.05 p.m.

MAYOR

## COUNCIL MEETING – 13 APRIL 2011

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

<b><u>AGENDA ITEM 5 - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME</u></b>	
<b>5(i)</b>	<b><u>Questions with notice by members of the public</u></b>
	There were no questions raised.
<b>5(ii)</b>	<b><u>Questions with notice by Members of the Council relating to ward matters to Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen</u></b>
	There were no questions raised.
<b>5(iii)</b>	<b><u>Questions with notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities</u></b>
1.	<p><b>Councillor John Fox asked the representative of the Police Authority:</b></p> <p>Would the Council's Police Authority Representative please confirm to me how the full time Police Officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), working at the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Schools and the hospital are paid for and assure me that they are not being paid for by the taxpayers of Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald, the Council's Police Authority representative responded:</b></p> <p>The Safer Schools Partnership works with the schools identified as having pupils at risk of becoming involved in crime and anti-social behaviour. Resources are allocated according to a risk profiling methodology which takes into consideration for example absence, excluded pupil numbers and the level of emerging or existing risk. There is no distinction between PFI financed and directly funded schools. Until the end of 2010/11 one part-time sergeant, three police officers, three full-time and two part-time PCSOs worked on the partnership – resources are moved around the schools as risks emerge. These posts were in the main funded from the main police staffing budget with short-term funding from Local Public Service Agreements (LPSAs) and the Home Office. Contributions were made by three schools. Going forward negotiations are ongoing with partners and schools to seek similar contributions to keep this vital partnership running into 2011/12. The situation is similar within the hospital and the allocation of resources is based purely on policing need. The answer refers to the Safer Schools Partnership, which like all these things, are all in jeopardy and I sit on the board for the Voyager School and having spoken to Chief Superintendent Hebb, he would be happy to give you more details about the issues as they stand at the moment, because they are operational and not really authority matters. I think the only promise of finance is likely to come from the schools as budgets are tight everywhere. But they are doing what they can to keep us going. Chief Superintendent Hebb would be happy to speak to you more on that issue if you require further information.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fox asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I am not against the project, but common sense would say that a sergeant, three PCs, the equivalent of four PCSOs, their wages would come to about roughly £170k. If you</p>

	<p>were to employ eight retired police officers who could quite easily do that job, it would only cost in the region of £100k which would be quite a big saving. Would that be something the Police Authority would consider in the future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald, the Council's Police Authority representative responded:</b></p> <p>I very much doubt that as, again, it is an operational matter and the question would be best directed to the police force itself and I am sure Chief Superintendent Hebb would be happy to have that conversation with you.</p>
2.	<p><b>Councillor David Over asked the representative of the Police Authority:</b></p> <p>Could the Council's Police Authority Representative explain why the Peterborough Villages Police Constable (PC) has had one third of his duty hours dedicated to work patrolling the new Peterborough Hospital rather than continuing to police the 20 plus villages in Peterborough's rural areas?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald, the Council's Police Authority representative responded:</b></p> <p>This is an operational matter. The resource allocation is informed by regular assessments of crime figures. A review of crime figures in the villages policed by PC Norman McCallum (Maxey, Etton, Wittering, Sutton, Glinton, Northborough and Barnack) in January 2011 by Inspector Karen Newton didn't justify the attention of a full-time officer in the area. At the same time it was identified that additional resources were needed in West Ward and at the new city hospital, which accounted for a quarter of all incidents in that area in December 2010. PC McCallum was tasked to spend a third of his shifts in the Bretton/West Ward/Ravensthorpe areas. He arranged the initial contacts at the hospital, which is used by people from across the city, before handing over to a PCSO so he could focus on the rest of West Ward. February's crime figures for these rural villages do not show the decision has caused an adverse effect, in fact there has been a reduction in total crime in February compared to the previous month and the same month last year. Chief Superintendent Hebb has made the same offer, due to it being an operational issue, to Councillor Over and I have communicated and put them in touch with each other directly.</p>

## COUNCIL MEETING – 13 APRIL 2011

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**AGENDA ITEM 6 – EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME****6(i) Questions with notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive****1. Councillor John Fox asked the Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning:**

Would the Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning please reassure the residents of Werrington that Officers will seriously consider putting speed activated signs at both ends of David's Lane as both areas are regular black spots for Road Traffic Accidents and although Highway statistics may not reflect this, as most are damage only non-recordable accidents, you can be rest assured that the level of accidents does make it a serious black spot for local residents and it will not be much longer before we have a serious fatality at either end of this stretch of road?

**Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:**

Officers have investigated the recorded personal injury collisions on the bends at either end of David's Lane. In total 6 personal injury collisions have occurred over the past 5 years and Cambridgeshire Constabulary has attended 4 recorded damage only incidents on David's Lane since 2009.

Casualty data revealed that one of the factors involved in a number of the collisions was a slippery road surface in the wet. I have instructed the Highway Maintenance Team to add David's Lane to its programme of carriageway skid resistance testing that is undertaken between May and September of each year.

A 24 hour seven day speed survey will be undertaken on this road. In the meantime, various agencies will meet to discuss enforcement/education activities which can be undertaken in the area.

Currently the location does not feature on the accident cluster site list and is therefore not included in the 2011/12 approved safety engineering programme of works which has been approved. However the results of the speed survey will be discussed in more detail to see what and if further action is required and needs to be brought forward including Vehicle Activated Signs.

**Councillor John Fox asked the following supplementary question:**

I thank the Cabinet Member for his immediate response to my request for action to be taken. Within a week there were the relevant cameras put in situ and hopefully that will result in a positive outcome. But, can he reassure me that he will be listening to all Members of this area, Councillors Lane, Burton and Over live in this area and they will, i'm sure, 100% back me that this is definitely a black spot and there is not a week that goes by where there is not an accident. The sad thing is that they are non-recordable. So if he could reassure me that he will take further action.

	<p><b>Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:</b></p> <p>Yes Councillor Fox, you do have my reassurance.</p>
2.	<p><b>Councillor Adrian Miners asked the Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Community Development:</b></p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please help to clarify a concern I have, that may not be justified, namely is it true to state that private sector landlords no longer need to apply for planning permission for Houses in Multiple Occupation, meaning that the public has no protection from houses being converted into hostels next door to them without any opportunity to inspect plans or consider what support arrangements are in hand for residents?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:</b></p> <p>There have been a number of changes in planning law relating to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) since April 2010. However, where the HMO is occupied by more than 6 persons (not living as a family) there has been <u>no change</u> as planning permission is still required.</p> <p>In April 2010, Government introduced a new planning Use Class, 'C4 - small scale HMOs this was defined as a dwelling occupied by between 3 &amp; 6 people who are unrelated. In doing this Government also made changes so that planning permission was required if the owner of a normal family dwelling wanted to change it in to a C4 small scale HMO.</p> <p>However, in October 2010 the Coalition Government revised this decision so the change from a normal family dwelling to a C4, small scale HMO is now permitted development. This effectively takes us back to the position prior to April 2010. Councillors will be aware of our officer's pursuit of illegal HMOs and this will continue to be a very high priority for the protection of vulnerable people and neighbourhood amenity. If this Council wishes to remove permitted development rights for the change of a normal family home to a small scale HMO then this may be done through the designation of an area to be controlled under an article four direction. I do emphasise that such a direction would need to have evidence based support and if it was designated it means that permission would have to be applied for in accordance with the relevant Local Development Framework Policy against which such applications are considered. It doesn't mean that there would be a ban on small scale HMOs per say.</p> <p><b>Councillor Adrian Miners asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>What was the rationality or the reasoning behind the Coalition Government in reversing this decision to control the C4 small scale HMOs when some local communities do suffer acutely from rogue landlords?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:</b></p> <p>I will find out why the policy has changed and I will let you know.</p>
3.	<p><b>Councillor Adrian Miners asked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning:</b></p> <p>Noting the concerns about fly tipping and the decision made by this Local Authority to remove the free bulky waste collection service, isn't it about time to consider re-instating the Local Community Skip Service as other local authorities still operate such</p>

	<p>a service, with one local authority that I am aware of providing community skips at a ratio of 1-skip per 100/150 households and a rotation system around its Wards each month?.</p> <p><b>Councillor Lee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning responded:</b></p> <p>Let me firstly assure you of our commitment to keeping our environment as clean as possible. Our new strategic partners, Enterprise Peterborough, are in their second month with us and i'm very pleased about the way things have gone so far and i'm very positive about the future benefits.</p> <p>For me, the acid test is whether flytipping has increased since we began charging for bulky waste collections. The answer is that it has remained broadly consistent year on year while the numbers of incidences have gone up very slightly, 29; the tonnes of flytipping which have been collected has reduced by 182 tonnes. That said, no flytipping is acceptable and we would like to see none at all.</p> <p>We have re-examined starting a community skip scheme but for the reasons it stopped in the first place a decade ago they remain just the same and are relevant today if not more so. Skips do not encourage residents to be more responsible about their waste, quite the opposite, skips need to be manned in order to avoid hazardous or industrial waste being tipped and because the waste is mixed all of it ends up in landfill and the costs of that are rising.</p> <p>With the bulky waste collection, we recycle as much as we can. This has a financial benefit for the Council in the value received for these recycled materials and in the reduced fee that we have to pay for landfill.</p> <p>For these reasons I do not think that community skips are consistent with our ambitions to be the environment capital. Responsible residents are willing to pay a small charge for this service. Whether the service is free or not makes little difference to the amount of flytipping in our city. We suspect some of the flytipping that is created in the city comes from people that live outside of the area. So no Mr Mayor, I do not believe that we should re-introduce a local community skip scheme.</p> <p><b>Councillor Adrian Miners asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Noting the localism agenda of this Coalition Government, should not our own local Neighbourhood Committees decide for themselves whether a local community skip service be introduced in their local areas and not left to the Cabinet Central Committee to decide?</p> <p><b>Councillor Lee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning responded:</b></p> <p>I do not agree with that question Mr Mayor for the reasons that I outlined in my first answer.</p>
4.	<p><b>Councillor Stephen Goldspink asked the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning:</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member let me know if there has been any change in policy regarding the level or frequency of services provided by Enterprise, following the loss of some temporary staff, and explain how services are being maintained with fewer staff and also advise if other departments and contractors providing services in the community for the Council continue to do so even though they have reduced resources?</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Lee, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning responded:</b></p> <p>Enterprise’s proposals to deliver the services align with the Council’s requirements. As part of ongoing service delivery, they will review the way services are carried out, looking for more efficient ways to do this, whilst ensuring that Peterborough’s streets are maintained to a high standard and providing value for money to local tax payers.</p> <p>Additional temporary staff were used to ensure that all areas of Peterborough were up to standard avoiding any disruption, while the predominantly permanent team were being briefed and trained during the hand over period.</p> <p>Temporary staff were only intended to be used for a fixed period and were released shortly after the partnership commenced.</p> <p>Enterprise has approximately fifty four street cleaners and seven temporary staff. This is broadly the same number that the Council had in September last year.</p> <p>Generally, Council departments and contractors have to consider improved ways of working as well as maintaining quality of services to the Council.</p> <p>The design concept behind Cathedral Square allows us flexibility in the way in which we use that space. Any greenery that is permanently planted in the space obviously significantly reduces that flexibility</p> <p><b>Councillor Stephen Goldspink asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member assure me that the level of hedge cutting and litter picking, gully emptying, foot path resurfacing, new speed limits and new bus services that i’ve seen as i’ve recently toured around Stanground and Fletton, will be maintained after the first week of May?</p> <p><b>The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Strategic Commissioning responded:</b></p> <p>Mr Mayor I’m not entirely sure that all of the items that the Councillor just read out there had anything to do with the first question which was about temporary staff and Enterprise Peterborough. Enterprise Peterborough though, for those Members that took an interest, and I did involve as many Members as possible, have a commitment to improve services whilst reducing costs and that is something we went into in great detail and I would have urged the Councillor to have taken part in those debates and those information sessions at the time if he had any concerns.</p>
5.	<p><b>Councillor Nick Sandford asked the Leader of the Council:</b></p> <p>Regardless of what you think of the fountains or how much they cost to maintain, could the Leader of the Council explain why as an aspiring environment capital we now have a main square in the city centre without a single tree or a single shrub or plant of any description?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council responded:</b></p> <p>City Operations are fully aware that the areas surrounding St John’s and Cathedral Square require some form of organic aesthetic displays to enhance the already visually appealing areas. Therefore City Operations are currently working in partnership with Enterprise Peterborough and the surrounding businesses to introduce floral</p>

	<p>arrangements and greenery.</p> <p>By the end of May, which is usual timing for Summer bedding plants to be bright and vibrant, there will indeed be planters and hanging baskets around the areas in question.</p> <p>I am also pleased to say that Pizza Express are investing in newly refurbished furnishings outside which does include planters, so they will take the opportunity to enhance our Cathedral Square at their expense.</p> <p>The design concept behind Cathedral Square allows us flexibility that we never had before in the way in which we use that space. Any greenery that is permanently planted in the space obviously significantly reduces that flexibility.</p> <p><b>Councillor Nick Sandford asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I'm pleased with the response up to a point, as when I asked a similar question to someone from Opportunity Peterborough I was told that it was their policy not to have any trees and shrubs or greenery. Will the Leader consider putting trees in Cathedral Square, as we are embarking on a forest of Peterborough project to try and dramatically increase the number of trees in Peterborough and a number of people have commented to me that it's slightly anomalous that our major square doesn't have a single tree?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council responded:</b></p> <p>The answer to the question is, that if the trees move, then yes but if you want them permanently planted then no. There was, in the original project, a row of trees in planters alongside St John's Square but the retailers objected because they thought it would interfere with their businesses and after listening to the consultation that was removed. However, I repeat, if they can go in planters and they can be moved so that we can maintain the flexibility of the square, absolutely I think it's the right thing to do.</p>
6.	<p><b>Councillor Darren Fower asked the Cabinet Member for Resources:</b></p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member please clarify whether the proposed plans to webcast Council meetings are still going ahead, and if so why has this not happened yet?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</b></p> <p>The subject of webcasting has been explored fully resulting in a briefing note being prepared in September 2010. The matter was due to be discussed at the next Leaders' meeting. However, no Leaders' meetings have taken place since September 2010 therefore this matter is still subject to discussion.</p> <p><b>Councillor Darren Fower asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member kindly give both myself and everyone in the Chamber the Cabinets position on whether they are in favour or not in favour of the webcasting?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</b></p> <p>This administration is very keen on improving communication to all residents, however clearly with a cost of around £60k a year, equivalent to council tax income from over 30 homes we do need to be cognisant of the cost. With technology becoming ever cheaper, this is something we will keep under regular review and consideration.</p>

