

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
10 JULY 2013**

The Mayor – Councillor June Stokes

Present:

Councillors Arculus, Ash, Casey, Cereste, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Forbes, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goodwin, Fower, Harper, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Lamb, Lane, Lee, McKean, Miners, Murphy, Nadeem, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Sylvester, Thulbourn, Todd and Walsh.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allen, Dalton, Davidson, Kreling, Martin, Maqbool, Nawaz and Thacker.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 22 May 2013

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2013 were agreed to be an accurate record subject to noting that a question was raised at the meeting requesting confirmation of the number of councillors on the conservative group.

4. Mayor's Announcement Report

Members noted the updated report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period commencing 22 May 2013 to 7 July 2013.

The Mayor addressed the meeting further highlighting some of the events attended so far.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME

7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

Five questions had been raised by members of the public, these were in relation to:

1. Time allocated to public questions at full Council meetings;
2. The reduction in funding to the 410 bus service;
3. Reduction in funding to the bus service enabling Sunday bus walks;

4. Bus services in Fengate; and
5. Plan B if the solar farm project was not successful.

A summary of the question and answers raised within agenda item 7 is attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

8. Questions with Notice by Members of the Council Relating to Ward Matters to the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen

Questions relating to Ward matters were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Parking in Werrington;
2. Appearance of Western Avenue;
3. Development scheme in Dogsthorpe;
4. Tesco in Werrington;
5. Former John Mansfield School site;
6. Resurfacing of Ullswater Avenue;
7. Bus service for Garton End Road;

Due to the time limit for the item being reached, questions relating to the following topics were responded to in writing outside the meeting:

8. Traffic on Hodgson Way; and
9. Resurfacing of Eskdale Close.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 8 are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

9. Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Fire Authority and Police and Crime Panel

One question was received relating to the expenses and allowances of Police and Crime Panel Members and the salaries and expenses of the Police and Crime Commissioner and his Deputy.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 9 are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

10. Petitions Submitted by Members or Residents

Councillor Harrington submitted two petitions from residents: to retain the 413 bus service; against the suspension of Newborough to Peterborough bus services; and from members of the Young Farmers Club against the proposed solar and wind farms on the council's farms estate.

Councillor Rush submitted two petitions from residents to retain the 407 bus service.

Councillor John Fox submitted four petitions from residents opposing cuts to the 406 bus service.

Councillor Todd submitted a petition from residents requesting a continuation of bus services in Fengate.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

11. Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive

Questions to the Leader and Members of the Executive were raised, with all of the questions being taken as read, in respect of the following:

1. Grass verges and cutting regimes;
2. Personalisation of Adult Social Care;
3. Action to tackle rural poverty;
4. ICT servers in the council;
5. Results from parking service's smart car;
6. Bedroom Tax for separated parents;
7. Bees and pesticides;

Due to the time limit for this item being reached, the following questions were responded to in writing:

8. Discrimination and equalities in organisations in receipt of council funding;
9. Bus service subsidies;
10. Street cleaning and litter bins.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 11 are attached at **APPENDIX B** to these minutes.

12. Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions

Members received and noted a report summarising:

1. Decisions taken at the Cabinet Meeting held on 1 July 2013;
2. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting;
3. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting; and
4. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 11 April 2013 to 26 June 2013.

Questions were asked about the following:

Passenger Transport – Subsidised Service Provision

Councillor Sandford requested whether a government grant that would be available in January 2014 would be applied for to mitigate some of the impact of the budget reduction. Councillor Cereste responded that if the grant was available the Council would investigate ways to obtain and use it.

Councillor Sandford queried why current services could not continue until January 2014 when the government grant became available. Councillor Cereste responded that no official information was available about the grant money so no decision could be taken in relation to it and therefore the Cabinet decision would still go ahead.

Councillor Fower queried what information could be given to concerned residents about the future of the 406 bus service. Councillor Cereste responded that more advice could be given once the procurement exercise had been completed.

Councillor Over expressed concern about travel options for school children in his ward and requested what alternative arrangements were being made. Councillor Cereste responded that provision for school children would be a priority in the procurement exercise.

Councillor McKean requested that adequate resources were applied to the procurement exercise to ensure the October deadline for services was met and councillors were made aware of the proposals. Councillor Cereste responded that information could be provided after a certain stage of the procurement process but not earlier.

Councillor Murphy queried whether grant monies in January could affect the services provided from October. Councillor Cereste responded that there was no guarantee that the council would receive any grant money in January.

Councillor Sandford raised a point of information that although an equality impact assessment had been carried out for this Cabinet decision no similar exercise was undertaken for the budget decision in March 2013.

Councillor Forbes queried whether a reduction of service rather than a full cut could have been achieved for the 407 bus service and whether any replacement service would be affordable to use for residents. Councillor Cereste advised that the procurement process would identify any options for future service provision options.

Councillor Ash queried whether Cabinet fully considered the findings of the Advisory Group that was set up to advise on the issue. Councillor Cereste advised that the findings were considered but difficult decisions had to be taken.

Councillor Harrington queried whether service users would be fully consulted following the procurement exercise. Councillor Cereste responded that they would be.

Councillor Goodwin queried whether Stagecoach could be approached to extend existing bus routes following the procurement exercise. Councillor Cereste responded that this could be done.

Budget Monitoring – Final Outturn 2012-13

Councillor Saltmarsh queried whether the £135,000 under-spend from the 2012/13 financial year could be put towards maintaining Play Services in the city. Councillor Seaton advised that the under-spend was a one-off saving and would not be able to fund the service in the future.

Housing Related Support Programme

Councillor Khan queried whether service level agreements were in place or whether conditions were attached to the grants. Councillor Seaton responded that the details were included in the full decision notice and agreements did apply to the grants.

Discretionary Rate Relief

Councillor Murphy queried the justification for some of the awards. Councillor Seaton advised that the issue could be raised at Audit Committee if required.

Provision and Management of Sport Facilities at Bretton Park

Councillor Khan queried what policy this grant was awarded under. Councillor Seaton responded that it was considered the right decision for residents and was authorised under his delegated powers. The Monitoring Officer advised that the Local Government Act allowed decisions of this nature in order to provide such facilities.

Councillor Saltmarsh queried whether the new facilities would be open to the public. Councillor Seaton advised that improved facilities would still be available for public use.

Councillor Sandford queried how the adjacent semi-ancient woodland of Highlees Spinney would be protected. Councillor Seaton advised that he could respond outside the meeting with details.

Energy Performance Contract

Councillor North queried whether the Cabinet Member agreed that the contract would be a great opportunity to save energy and money. Councillor Seaton agreed and advised that savings could be around £500,000 per annum.

School Term Dates 2014/2015

Councillor Shearman queried whether the council would liaise with the schools that were able to set their own term dates in order to reduce any impact of different timings. Councillor Holdich confirmed that this would be done.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

13. Notices of Motion

1. Councillor Harrington moved the following motion:

That this Council:

1. Notes the widespread concern and opposition to energy park plans on tenant farms; the financial and project risks are considerable and that the council has moved away from its core activities in the establishment of Blue Sky Peterborough on which Councillors and officers hold directorships;
2. Believes that enough time and money has already been spent on solar farm energy schemes; and
3. Recommends to Cabinet that it takes note of residents' concerns and cuts its losses through the introduction of a moratorium on any further expenditure on solar farm schemes on our tenant farms and on the Blue Sky Peterborough organisation.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Murphy who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

Council debated the motion raising issues including the need for revenue generating schemes, the extent of possible efficiency savings across the council, the size of the development, the loss of grades 1 and 2 agricultural land, the scale of borrowing required to fund the scheme and the need to consider alternatives to the scheme.

The Monitoring Officer advised that members of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee could vote on the motion before them and continue in their role on the planning committee as long as they remained pre-disposed (keeping an open mind) and not pre-determined when the application was presented to the committee.

A recorded vote was requested and the motion was **DEFEATED** (20 for, 27 against, 2 not voting).

(Councillors who voted in favour: Ash, Fletcher, Forbes, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harrington, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Shabbir, Sharp, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester, and Thulbourn. Councillors who voted against: Arculus, Casey, Cereste, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fower, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Lamb, Lee, McKean, Nadeem, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Todd and Walsh. Councillors who did not vote: Lane, and Stokes).

The meeting adjourned at 9.15pm and reconvened at 9.40pm.

2. Councillor John Fox moved the following motion:

That this council:

1. Acknowledges that the council has a duty to protect its vulnerable residents;
2. Agrees that more could have been done to make vulnerable residents aware of their obligation to pay the new charges prior to receiving the notice;

3. Acknowledges that frustration and distress was caused to some residents upon receipt of a summons for non-payment of the new council tax requirement;
4. Agrees that a review of the Council's communication policy and that of its strategic partners is carried out to ensure that the lessons learned from the council tax summons letters are implemented and the unnecessary disruption and distress that was experienced by vulnerable residents is not repeated; and
5. Ensures that monitoring of the impact on residents of the change to the council tax support scheme takes place with a report to be taken back through scrutiny for any further recommendations to be made.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Forbes who highlighted that the new charges affected the poorest and most disadvantaged in society who often did not have the money to pay additional charges.

Councillor Seaton pledged that if the motion was withdrawn, the principles of the motion would be supported and a report would be presented to the relevant scrutiny committee and to DIAL.

Councillor Fox agreed to this proposal and with the consent of Council the motion was **WITHDRAWN**.

3. Councillor Shearman moved the following motion:

That this Council:

- Notes with grave concern that a recent OFSTED report reveals the proportion of disadvantaged pupils in Peterborough schools achieving the Government's benchmark standard at GCSE is the lowest in the country;
- Notes that the OFSTED report highlights the success of a programme of support known as the London Challenge (City Challenge in other areas), and that as a group disadvantaged pupils in the Local Authorities participating in this programme achieved, and in many cases exceeded, the Government's benchmark standard at GCSE;
- Notes that the additional funds received by our schools for meeting the needs of these pupils in the current year (known as the Pupil Premium) totals £7.2 million (indicative figures); and
- Notes that in a report published by OFSTED in September 2012 entitled 'The Pupil Premium', Inspectors identified a number of areas for improvement in the way this money is used in schools.

In view of this Council resolves to:

1. Set up a Task and Finish Group tasked with:
 - (i) examining the way in which the Pupil Premium is used in all secondary schools particularly insofar as it meets the recommendations outlined in the OFSTED report; and
 - (ii) investigating the way in which the needs of disadvantaged children are being met in all secondary schools; and in both instances report back its findings and recommendations to full council by the end of the Spring Term 2014.

And specifically:

2. Request from all secondary schools information on the way in which the Pupil premium is being used, and publish that information on the council's website.
3. Ensure the Chairs of Governing Bodies in all Peterborough secondary schools understand the importance of maintaining a strong focus on the way in which the Pupil Premium is used;
4. Ensure that all secondary schools in Peterborough understand the value and importance of developing a strong and supportive link with a successful UK secondary school facing similar challenges; and
5. Urge the Coalition Government to replicate something similar to the London Challenge on a regional basis across the country, as recommended by the Chief Inspector.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Jamil who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

During debate on the item issues raised included that some schools in Peterborough were already performing well, Ofsted was already monitoring improvements being made, disadvantaged children must not be failed by the council and some 'poorer' Authority areas were performing better than Peterborough.

Following debate a vote was taken (22 for and 25 against) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

4. Councillor Peach moved the following motion:

That this Council:

1. Recognises the importance to local business and via business and employment the stability to Peterborough residents of having a clear legally binding route to a referendum on future membership of the EU; and therefore
2. Supports the current private members bill going through Parliament by Conservative MP James Wharton and the Lib Dem manifesto pledge at the last election to hold a referendum in 2017 or before, thus giving Peterborough voters a say on their relationship with the EU.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Serluca who reserved her right to speak later in the debate.

During debate clarification was sought on the accuracy of the motion and whether it correctly reflected the Liberal Democrat manifesto. Further debate included the need for stability for local businesses, the EU was different now to many years ago and a referendum on membership was required sooner than currently planned.

A recorded vote was requested and the motion was **CARRIED** (29 for, 3 against, 14 not voting).

(Councillors who voted in favour: Arculus, Ash, Casey, Cereste, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Goodwin, Harper, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Lamb, McKean, Miners, Nadeem, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Sharp, Simons, Todd and Walsh. Councillors who voted against: Fower, Sandford and Shaheed. Councillor who did not vote: Forbes, John Fox, Judy Fox, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Lane, Murphy, Shabbir, Shearman, Stokes, Sylvester and Thulbourn).

14. Reports and Recommendations

a) Submission by Peterborough City Council on Council Size to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) – Report of the Electoral Review Group (ERG)

Council received a report that requested approval of the submission of the ERG and to agree that this report could be presented to the LGBCE as the Council's formal submission under this part of the review.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Peach who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

During a brief debate points raised included that councillor numbers should be reduced to save money but also that Peterborough had a rising population and therefore an increase in the number of councillors to represent residents was needed.

A vote was taken (44 in favour, one against and one not voting) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note and approve the submission of the Electoral Review Group, who are the cross party working group; and
2. Agree that this submission can be presented to the LGBCE for their consideration in determining Peterborough City Council's 'Council Size' as part of their electoral review of the Council.

b) Approval of the Updated Children in Care Pledge

Council received the updated Children in Care Pledge for approval subsequent to full endorsement from the Corporate Parenting Panel.

Councillor Scott moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Day.

Council **AGREED** to:

Approve the amended Children in Care Pledge.

c) Governance Update

Council received a report to approve various governance functions.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Peach who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

A brief debate was held in which concern was raised that the membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board had only Cabinet Members and not wider representation. In response, it was highlighted that the membership of the Board already included a variety of other partners and public representatives.

A vote was taken on each recommendation separately as below:

1. Council **AGREED** to note the appointment of Councillor John Holdich as Deputy Leader of the Council;
2. Council **RESOLVED** (29 in favour, 5 against, 11 not voting) to Appoint Councillor Walsh, as Cabinet member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health, to the Health & Wellbeing Board as an additional member to the Board; and
3. Council **AGREED** that the post of Head of Governance be designated as the Authority's scrutiny officer under section 9FB of the Local Government Act 2000.

d) Temporary Appointment of Parish Councillors to Marholm Parish Council

Council received a report that sought approval for the temporary appointment of one Councillor to Marholm Parish Council to enable the work of the Parish Council to continue until other councillors are elected to take up office.

Council **AGREED** that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make an Order under Section 91 of the Local Government Act 1972 to appoint one Councillor of Peterborough City Council to Marholm Parish Council on an interim basis until a sufficient number of elected parish councillors have taken up office.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 10.45pm

FULL COUNCIL 10 JULY 2013

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME</u>	
7	<u>Questions with notice by members of the public</u>
1.	<p>Question from Alex Terry</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Given that Community Involvement Time is a crucial element of an open and democratic council, will this council reaffirm its commitment to democratic principles by permanently extending Community Involvement Time during full council meetings to at least 30 minutes if required?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded on behalf of the Leader:</p> <p>I'm sure I speak on behalf of all members when I say that we are fully committed to open and transparent local government in Peterborough.</p> <p>And so, we already allow up to 30 minutes for Community Involvement Time as part of our monthly agenda.</p> <p>I think that Ms Terry actually meant to ask if it would be possible to extend the time within Community Involvement Time for questions from members of the public. This currently gets 10 minutes out of the 30 minute slot.</p> <p>That is already being considered by the Constitution Review Group who will be reporting back to a later Council meeting.</p> <p>Alex Terry asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Would any Member would be willing to propose an extension in time to the Community Involvement Time?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded on behalf of the Leader:</p> <p>I don't know whether there is any Member willing to do that. The extension in time to the Community Involvement Time is being explored by the Constitution Review Group and the outcome will be reported back in due course.</p>

2.	<p>Question from Vicky Forster</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>As the 410 bus service is discontinuing I would like to ask if you are able to give the people of Fengate any guarantee with regards to a replacement bus service there are a number of elderly and infirm residents that rely on this mode of transport?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Fengate has been identified as an area that has a number of elderly and vulnerable residents which is why it is one of the priority areas that will be getting a replacement services – probably a demand responsive type of service, but it will be a replacement service.</p> <p>Vicky Forster asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Does this demand service give an immediate response to people who might need to get into town very quickly?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Within reason, yes it does. I believe you can ring up and ask for the service in advance and where it is possible they will arrive on an appointment, where possible.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Rohan Wilson</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Every Sunday the Local Link bus service serving Peterborough’s countryside carries a group of walkers known as “Peterborough Bus-Walks” on a pre-planned, led walk in the best countryside west of the city. The walks bring business to rural pubs and cafes, using a bus service which enables us and other visitors to Peterborough to visit Burghley (which is our city’s most famous rural visitor attraction), John Clare Cottage, the villages and our National Nature Reserves.</p> <p>“Each week Peterborough Bus-Walks attracts between 12 and 22 walkers who join us without pre-booking from a mailing list of over 100, which we are expanding by recruitment through The Ramblers and the posters we place in Queensgate Bus Station. We take a pride in welcoming people of all ages, backgrounds and abilities. We are confident that what we do boosts people’s health and quality of life, and increases their knowledge and pride in Peterborough.</p> <p>“We understand that the Cabinet intends to withdraw the Sunday rural Local Link service. Our first reaction is that we shall have to disband our group.</p> <p>“Can the Council suggest a way we may continue to run Peterborough Bus-Walks, if the bus service which we have been supporting for 12 years is withdrawn?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Due to the reduction in funding from Central Government and the difficulty we have had in finding new revenue streams in order to support those reductions, the Council has had to look very closely at what services it subsidises. We have had to prioritise services and have chosen to target our residents who need to access public transport to satisfy their basic needs. This means targeting transport at children so they can get to school, workers who do not have another way of travelling and elderly and vulnerable</p>

	<p>people so that they are able to do their food shopping, banking and other essential activities.</p> <p>The areas that you mention above are all served by commercial bus services on Mondays to Saturdays so residents and visitors are still able to enjoy these fantastic locations.</p> <p>Rohan Wilson asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>What were the levels of funding subsidy required to maintain the Sunday rural service, and what was being done to explore how this funding gap could be bridged?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I do not have that information at the moment. We are certainly looking at all alternatives and we have gone out to procurement. It is not until that procurement system is part way through until we are able to give you a firm idea of what will happen.</p> <p>I am quite happy to meet with you and your colleagues and explore alternatives to see if there is something that we can do within the budgets that we have available to us.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Angela Smith</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>How far away will the nearest bus stop for disabled and Senior Citizens living on the Fengate Semi Retirement Mobile Home Park be situated?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>The replacement transport service that we are looking to procure will stop right outside the entrance to the Mobile Home Park which is where the existing bus stops are located.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Dawn Clipston</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>I was concerned to hear you mention in the weeks leading up to the Morris Fen Planning Committee (17.6.2013) that you do not have a plan B. Please confirm IS the future of the city's finances in jeopardy if the power plant proposals are not successful because there are no contingency plans for such an eventuality?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>The Council is responsible for bringing in a balance budget and it is illegal not to do so. There are not currently any opportunities that can deliver revenue on the scale of the proposed energy parks. Should the proposals not go ahead, the city council will need to review its medium term expenditure plans accordingly in order to make up for the shortfall.</p> <p>Dawn Clipston asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Did you mean to reassure me in your response that the city's future finances aren't in jeopardy should this proposal not go ahead, because failure to do so could be seen as influencing Councillors to take a predetermined view in favour of the scheme knowing you have no financial alternatives?</p>

	<p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I think I have answered the question.</p>
--	--

8	<p><u>Questions with notice by Members relating to ward matters To the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen</u></p>
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Residents parking in Hythegate in Werrington are causing huge concerns with excessive parking. Currently there are no restrictions in force and the area leads to a narrowing road. Residents may have not only personal cars being parked but also have work related vans and caravans, blocking access and regress. In the event of the emergency services requiring access this would be extremely difficult to gain access e.g. fire, ambulance, police or a duty doctor.</p> <p>Can the residents be informed of any by-law or ruling to address this matter?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Inconsiderate parking such as that being described causes a considerable nuisance and inconvenience to communities, and can often lead to significant safety concerns.</p> <p>Where formal restrictions exist, the Council works hard to eradicate such behaviours through both enforcement and educational activities.</p> <p>Unfortunately though, without parking restrictions being in place the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers are unable to take enforcement action. As the police have powers to deal with obstructions caused by vehicles parked on public footpaths and highways your concerns have been raised with them so that they can consider taking action to address the problem.</p> <p>In addition, if residents feel that the introduction of parking restrictions may be something that they would wish to be explored, advice can be obtained from the Councils Planning, Transport and Engineering Service.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member advise me if he would take steps for the area of the former school land between the College and Western Avenue, to have works carried out to present a more attractive face to the College which will also give residents along Western Avenue something better to look at?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>This Council is pleased to have been instrumental in delivering such a positive outcome for the Dogsthorpe community and for the rest of the city. The John Mansfield Centre is an excellent example of Big Society in practice – local people working with the Council and our partners to bring about the regeneration of the former secondary school to create a modern and vibrant space for everybody to enjoy and benefit from.</p>

	<p>The land at the front of the site doesn't form part of the boundary for the Centre itself, and will eventually be marketed for sale. In the meantime, I can confirm that the land will be made good and that officers are in discussion with City College Peterborough to offer opportunities for students based at the Centre to cultivate it as part of their learning programmes.</p> <p>Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Is the Council aware that the John Mansfield Centre got off the ground due to the hard work of local people to get it where it is today? What kind of work will be done and will discussions include Ward Councillors and local residents?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>I think it should include Ward Councillors and residents and that is part of the negotiations with the City College. Yes it is important, I can't tell you exactly what it is because that has got to be discussed with the local people and the City College Peterborough.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods:</p> <p>For over a year a great deal of work has gone into an improvement scheme for the area in front of the shops on Central Avenue Dogsthorpe. Meetings have been held to discuss the proposal to improve the landscaping, create further parking spaces and increase the safety of children crossing the road to attend the Infant and the Junior schools. Plans have been drawn up and local residents have attended a consultation event at the local library. Tenants of the shops and of the flats above them, the police, the schools, the Old Dogsthorpe Residents association and ward Councillors were made aware of the proposals and invited to comment on them.</p> <p>Can you please advise me when this scheme will be delivered?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>Following discussions with the local community on this important and much needed scheme, further detailed design work has been carried out. The original budget provision for the scheme was £125,000 but it has become clear that this is insufficient to deliver the quality of scheme expected by the local community and that a sum of £210,000 will be required. A further capacity bid will therefore need to be considered as part of the 2014/15 budget setting process.</p> <p>Councillor Saltmarsh asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Nobody had been informed of a hold up to the scheme, could you please ensure that this doesn't happen again?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>I would be happy to look into the reasons why and I am happy to meet with you outside the meeting and look at towards any future schemes and the future of this scheme.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Please provide an accurate update as to what is happening with the Werrington Centre. Are Tesco Plans to develop and re-invent this area going to happen? No recent</p>

	<p>communication has been available and the residents would welcome some indication leading to the development of the site. Yet again another outlet which was formerly Storrington news is now closed.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you for bringing this important local issue to my attention. Our officers are in ongoing discussion with Tesco and have a meeting with their representatives later this month, after which they hope to be able to update members on the scheme. You will appreciate however that ultimately it will be Tesco's decision whether or not they progress the redevelopment of their site.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources:</p> <p>It has been 5 years since consent to build on the former school sites at Western Avenue and the playing field of Poplar Avenue was given by the Local Planning Authority. Since that time the two sites have remained undeveloped and uncared for and are considered by many residents to blight the area. Can the cabinet member give me and local residents an indication as to when the two sites will be developed and does he agree with me that a well designed and constructed development, either by a single developer or several, will show what can be done for the area and demonstrate the potential and overall wellbeing of the city to anyone visiting the area as a well designed development would make a better show piece for visitors to the area and particularly to anyone visiting the City College in Western Avenue?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>As with all land the decision as to whether development proceeds is largely determined by financial viability. We keep sites such as this under constant review and when the time is right we will take it to the market.</p> <p>I agree with the other sentiments expressed by Councillor Ash regarding development but not just on this site but anywhere in the city.</p> <p>Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Is it good for the city to have the site derelict? Was it helpful to wait, as the site was bringing in no income and does he agree with that approach?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Any development proposal is determined by its financial viability. I would be happy to meet with Councillor Ash at that site to see if that is anything that could be done about how it currently looks.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member let me know why the footpath along Ullswater Avenue has never been resurfaced since the 1960s, resulting in the elderly pedestrians and users of mobility vehicles having to use the road due to the uncertain and unlevel manner of the footpath and when local taxpayers can expect to see resurfacing work done along this stretch of road?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p>

	<p>I can confirm that Ullswater Avenue is scheduled to be included in next years (14/15) micro-asphalt surface treatment programme that as well as sealing the surface and extending the of the footway will also address the surface irregularities providing a more uniform and level surface.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Do you know which month it would be?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>I do not know which particular month, but I am happy to find out an indicative date and let Councillor Fower know.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Shearman</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.</p> <p>I have no doubt the cabinet member is aware that it is not only rural communities that will suffer from the withdrawal of Local Link bus services, but also discrete communities within the City which may find themselves isolated. In my own ward elderly residents living in Garton End Road, and the roads leading off it, are particularly concerned over the withdrawal of Route 406.</p> <p>Could the cabinet member advise me how to respond to a resident who has written with the following words? <i>'My mother, who is in her 80s, lives on her own in Sallows Road. I am disabled and rely on the bus service that currently runs down Garton End Road to be able to visit her. If this service is removed the nearest bus stop would be Park Road Corner, which would simply not be possible for me'</i>.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>In the urban area, we believe the majority of residents can access commercial bus services. However, there are going to be a minority of people who are unable to access commercial services. For these urban residents they have two services available to them. The Community Link, a dial-a-ride service, which takes residents into the city centre or a supermarket. Alternatively, for more individual requirements such as the situation you describe above, there is the Royal Voluntary Service social car scheme. There would be a small charge for this but gives vulnerable or disabled residents door-to-door transport.</p> <p>Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I am in the process of arranging a meeting with Jonathan Woodhouse, who is the manager of Stagecoach and I proposing to him that he looks at the idea of re-routing bus route number 2 down Elmfield Road and Garton End Road. Would you be prepared to come along with me to that meeting, and it may be that some of the questions raised this evening could be answered by re-routing the Stagecoach routes?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I would be happy to attend the meeting and I think you have a valid point which we have been exploring in other places.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Judy Fox</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods:</p>

The results of two recent traffic surveys carried out in Hodgson Avenue, Werrington have revealed that there is a large volume of traffic exceeding the speed limit.

With the proposal of moving the Post office from the Werrington Centre to Hodgson Avenue, should this happen then there will be a large increase of elderly, disabled and vulnerable people will be crossing this road to reach the Post Office.

Can this council reassure the residents of Werrington that everything will be done to ensure their safety when crossing this road and consideration be given to providing a pedestrian crossing at this location?

Councillor North may have responded:

The safety of all our residents is of paramount importance to us.

Speed surveys were previously undertaken at this location in August 2009 and February 2011, both confirming average speeds in each direction of between 27 and 33 mph.

The issue of speeding on Hodgson Avenue was raised as a Neighbourhood Panel Priority during the last quarter and consequently a more recent survey was carried out in June, which resulted in:

- 12 speed enforcement checks. Of 519 vehicles checked, 98 were exceeding 35mph (19% of traffic). The majority of speeding vehicles were checked on David's Lane
- 3 Speed Watch checks. Of 277 vehicles checked, 17 vehicles were exceeding 30mph, 3 exceeding 35mph (1% of traffic). Speed Watch is a non-enforceable educative approach, whereby volunteers and/or police monitor traffic speed using visible handheld devices. Those identified as over the speed limit receive a letter to their home address.

The Council has now been informed that the Post Office will indeed relocate and, given the implications of this, the Road Safety Team will conduct a more detailed analysis of traffic speed in the area to enable safety solutions to be considered.

9. **Question from Councillor Fower**

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.

Can the cabinet member please inform me when work to resurface the road at Eskdale Close will occur and why it has been left so long to become so worn and torn, with the road markings in some sections barely legible?

Councillor Cereste may have responded:

The Council's Major Road Maintenance Programme is formed on the basis of the results of annual structural condition surveys completed over the full Peterborough road network. These surveys provide condition data in order that planned maintenance work can be effectively prioritised. A major factor considered as part of the selection process is road hierarchy whereby the roads 'importance for usage' and traffic volume is taken into account. From an engineering perspective and taking consideration of current budget allocations roads like Eskdale Close are unlikely to rate high enough for major maintenance when compared to other strategic roads on the network. The remaining option for such roads is to complete targeted routine repairs and/or cost effective surface treatments in order to meet our statutory duty and extend the life of the surface.

With regard the bellmouth area that is showing more deterioration than the remaining length of Eskdale Close, in the short term small reactive repairs have already been

	<p>completed and these will be followed by localised patching and the renewal of the junction markings.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p><u>Questions with notice by Members to Council representatives of the Fire Authority and Police and Crime Panel</u></p>
	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health.</p> <p>Is it policy to remunerate Police and Crime panel members and since the shadow panel and panel were established, what expenses have been paid to whom and what expenses and salaries have been paid to the Commissioner and Deputy to date?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Members of the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel receive no remuneration whatsoever for their role. This is the case for both elected councillors on the Panel and lay members who have been co-opted onto it.</p> <p>The Home Office awards a grant to support the expenses of Panel members of up to £920 per member per annum. Since the Panel was formally launched in November 2012, only £644.78 has been claimed in expenses <u>in total</u> by the <i>entire</i> Panel.</p> <p>The annual salary for the Police and Crime Commissioner is set by the Home Office and is £70,000 per annum. The salary for the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner is set by the Commissioner and is £28,000 per annum.</p> <p>Details about the expenses claimed by the Commissioner and Deputy can be found on the Commissioner's web site, but in summary the Commissioner incurred £1,367 expenses in 2012/13 and, to the end of June, £748 in 2013/14. The Deputy Commissioner has so far incurred no expenses.</p>

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME**11 Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive****1. Question from Councillor Davidson**

To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management.

How overgrown do the verges past the metre maintenance strip have to be before they need to be cut back; the impression that it gives of the city is not good?

Councillor Elsey responded:

Under the terms of the current maintenance regime for parkway road verges, Enterprise Peterborough are required to regularly cut to the point where the verge bank starts. We are currently working on a cyclical regime which sees each verge cut on a four weekly basis across the city. The banks themselves however are contracted to be cut but once a year. This single annual cut regime is due to their location and the safety aspect of asking members of the workforce to regularly drive ride on mowers up the steep banks. I would also point out that the current Council policy is to wherever possible to allow for grassed areas to grow freely with wild flowers as part of a biodiversity programme, something which was resolutely supported by the majority of the Chamber not least the Liberal Democrats. I do however completely concur that where there are bends in roads or areas where visibility for motorists is obscured, we have a duty to ensure visibility is at its maximum.

2. Question from Councillor Thulbourn

To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.

Could the cabinet member responsible for adult social care provide an update on how the personalisation of care is proceeding, with particular reference to adults with medium/severe disabilities; how is this process working elsewhere and are there any changes to policy or implementation expected due to the feedback you are getting from services already up and running?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

Delivering a personalised approach to care is a key priority for adult social care to ensure people have choice and control over how individual outcomes are delivered. The latest performance report indicates that 88% of people eligible for self-directed support have a Personal Budget, with 19% taking their Personal Budget as a Direct Payment. This is a doubling of performance from April 2012 when 49% of eligible people had a personal budget and 10% received this as a Direct Payment. This indicates that the systems to support personalisation are in place across all customer groups. However, we are aware that we also need to ensure that we are supporting the delivery of personalised outcomes and that further work is needed.

The Adult Social Care (ASC) department is currently working with Serco on the transformation of the adult social care customer journey to ensure that people are able to access information, advice and preventative services that maximise independence, health and wellbeing and ensure that people who require it can access longer term high quality and personalised social care support. This transformation programme will review all elements of the ASC system and ensure that independence, community engagement, personalisation and choice and control are central to all aspects of ASC support.

The ASC department is currently consulting with customers, their families and other stakeholders on the development of personalised services, in particular on the development of day opportunities and community support. A recent Visioning Event focussing on the development of day services for people with a Learning Disability attended by service users and their carers there was clear support for the development of services that offer personalised and flexible arrangements alongside acknowledgement that the Council must think carefully about how it supports people with more complex needs. This feedback will be factored into future day service developments as they become clear.

Councillor Thulbourn asked the following supplementary question:

Personalisation is driving suppliers to remove the base that these individuals are using, specifically the niche with severe handicap problems. There was a lot of anecdotal evidence to this effect.

Are you going to look after that niche of people, their social needs? They are people, they need support and their families need support. It's not happening and you do need to address this. When will you address it?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

I think to say needs are not being supported is a harsh thing to say. I don't believe there are people who are unsupported in this city. The dangers of making inappropriate changes has been previously discussed at Cabinet, but we do need to make changes and we need to modernise our services and we need to put the services in the hands of the users. We recognise our duty to care for those people for whom we have a responsibility for.

3. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health:

Should council policy address rural poverty and why did the latest report of the executive on the impact of welfare reform to the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities not address rural poverty?

Councillor Walsh responded:

The Council is developing its strategy to tackle poverty, which is being supported by a cross-party working group of the Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities Scrutiny Committee. Its accompanying action plan will include a wide range of interventions including those that specifically support rural areas.

In addition, the Council is working closely with a range of partners to look at the impact that Welfare Reform will bring to all communities, including rural. The first stage of this work has seen the introduction of the Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme (PCAS). PCAS has been in operation since April 2013 and has provided support to people to help them deal with crisis situations and offer advice to help prevent their recurrence.

This work remains live and responsive to rapidly changing issues. Only a small part of the welfare reforms have so far been implemented, and so the report that recently went to all scrutiny committees could give no more than a general overview of some of the early trends and issues. As a result of the discussion at the Rural Scrutiny Commission, a more in-depth exercise is underway to better understand the impacts of reform in rural communities.

	<p>Part of this work is to review the demand for PCAS support over the first three months of operation. This will allow the council to understand the needs of clients accessing the scheme and identify any gaps in provision, including those within rural communities.</p> <p>The second phase of PCAS will see elements of the scheme extended from the city centre out to neighbourhoods and rural communities.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Why did the report, submitted to the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities, not include any rural poverty matters e.g. lack of access to food banks and internet access?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>The first phase of the project did consider more central areas of the city, however it will be extended to other areas. If you have any information regarding anyone suffering from hunger or destitution in the rural communities please let me know.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Resources provide me with information about the councils' ICT infrastructure in particular the number of servers that are running, the age of those servers, the efficiency records of the servers, the allocation of the overall ICT budget given to the maintenance of the servers and what measures are in place to consider and identify savings option on ICT systems and staff?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>The Council has approximately 330 servers of which just over 200 are virtual servers following an extensive project undertaken by Serco. The majority of the servers are now over 4 years old and not as capable as newer modern servers. However, they are reliable and any failures experienced by Councillors or Officers are more likely to be an application or operating system issue. Serco ICT are working with our Strategic Client Services to identify the most cost effective method of replacing these servers whilst improving services to staff. A range of options are currently being considered for this as new technologies and service models are evolving. We do not have a specific budget to maintain the servers as this is just one element of the overall ICT support contract.</p> <p>With regards the measures in place to consider and identify savings options on ICT systems and staff, this is under constant review by our Strategic Client Services Team, with for example £200k worth of savings in the current year and further significant savings in 2014/15.</p> <p>Councillor Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Can you therefore reassure me that you will look into this area fully to see if there is anywhere you can save any money and will you report your findings back to the Council?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>I am doing exactly that and we already have savings built in to this year's Medium Term Financial Strategy and next year's. I would not bring that back to Full Council as a report but I am happy to share details of the savings we are making, and the approach we are to take in due course with the Council servers, with Councillor Fox.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p>

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.

As Leader of the City Council you previously said that the little council car with a camera on it WOULD be used around schools to capture inconsiderate people who park on double yellow lines, while either dropping children off or collecting them from school, rather than park a few hundred yards away in a safer and legal location. Has this occurred, where is the data from this work in regards prosecutions? Both Cllr Davidson and myself would welcome the information specifically on how many visits have occurred over the last couple of years to known problem areas like Norwood School and Werrington Primary?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The Enforcement vehicle has been a significant success in Peterborough since it was launched, tackling illegal parking, and providing enforcement coverage across a larger area of Peterborough and in specific hotspots, and acting as a visual deterrent.

The CCTV car is used along with foot patrols to deter inconsiderate parking as well as enforcing against drivers contravening parking restrictions through the issuing of the civil sanction Penalty Charge Notices.

Parking patrols have been carried out at 55 different schools across the City during the last two years. The vehicle has patrolled at Norwood and Werrington Primary Schools over 30 times during that period, and has issued 41 Penalty Charge Notices as a result.

The value of the CCTV car however far exceeds the number of tickets issued as both parking behaviour and driving speed of those taking and collecting children from schools significantly improves when the CCTV car is deployed.

Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:

Where can I access the data in regards to the research undertaken?

Councillor Cereste responded:

If it is legal for us to let you have the data, I will do. We will make it available unless someone tells me that we can't.

6. **Question from Councillor John Fox**

To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods.

With regards to the bedroom tax, can residents be assured that divorced or separated parents who both live in social housing will not be financially penalised for retaining a spare bedroom to ensure adequate space is provided for their visiting children?

Councillor North responded:

Unfortunately the national rules for Local Housing Allowance only allocate a room to the parent who is the primary carer for any child they receive the child benefit for.

Where an absent parent retains a room for their child's use they would be deemed as under occupying and would be affected by the social size criteria or 'bedroom tax'.

Those affected in this way would have the option to apply for a Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) to support them financially to maintain the arrangement, however this may only be a short term option until they are able to locate and secure alternative, more affordable accommodation. Any households affected by this should be encouraged to

	<p>Speak to their landlord or seek advice from the Citizen's Advice Bureau.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor North Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods:</p> <p>A year or so ago, the former Deputy Leader of the Conservative group told me that the proposed motion submitted by myself calling on this Council to stop the use of neonicotinoids on their managed farms, to help prevent the decline of local bees, was not possible to enforce, due to contracts and other such bureaucracy reasons. Can the cabinet member now please inform me how they therefore intend to adhere to the EU decision earlier this year to officially ban the use of neonicotinoids and how this will be enforced to ensure that local farmers adhere to this project?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>Restrictions on the use of various insecticides were adopted by the EU Commission earlier this year. They apply from 1st December 2013.</p> <p>The restrictions apply for a two year trial period at which time the EU will conduct an evidenced based review. The scientific community is divided on the risk Neonicotinoid products pose to bee and other pollinator populations. The UK along with several other countries voted against the ban in the EU Commission debate on the basis that the scientific evidence for a ban was weak and the use of alternative, less targeted sprays to control insects could pose greater overall risk to pollinator species.</p> <p>As landlord of let agricultural holdings on its Farms Estate, the Council does not have the power to control its tenants' use of sprays nor the specialist expertise and resources to monitor it. However, under the terms of their agreement, the tenants are required to comply with legislation and failure to do so could endanger their tenancies.</p> <p>Farmers and growers are required to record the operations carried out on their farms, including recording the sprays used and the dates and times applied. Failure to record this properly can lead to fines, loss of EU subsidy and rejection of crops by grain traders. Consequently there are very strong incentives for farmers to comply with the new controls.</p> <p>In the event of the EU deciding that the Neonicotinoid group of insecticides are unduly harmful to pollinators, it is reasonable to expect permanent legislation banning their use to be introduced. In this event the products would not be available for purchase. The current Council policy is to rely on EU & UK legislation and to encourage tenants to adopt environmentally friendly practises where possible.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Will you follow the lead of the Conservative MP for Peterborough and show his support for the campaign?</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>It is important that we look into everything that damages nature in our city and we support that and I support it personally.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health.</p> <p>Does the Council have a legal duty to ensure organisations that are grant aided or funded by PCC comply with anti-discriminatory practice and equalities legislation and what steps</p>

are taken to ensure compliance and good practice takes place?

Councillor Walsh may have responded:

The Council is fully committed to tackling discrimination and ensuring equality in all of its services and functions.

However, in relation to this specific question, the Council does not have a *legal* duty to ensure organisations that are grant aided or funded by the Council comply with anti-discriminatory practice and equalities legislation.

However, in the context of a contractual relationship with a contractor or service provider where they are providing a service on behalf of the Council, the contractor or provider will be required, contractually, to assist the Council to discharge its public sector equality duties.

In a contractual relationship, the steps taken to ensure compliance and good practice with regard to these duties are:

- Assessment of the organisation's equalities policy and review of any unlawful findings of discriminatory practice at pre-qualification/selection stage
- Insertion of a provision in the contract requiring compliance with equalities legislation
- Termination of the contract, where breach of this term is sufficiently material to justify termination

9. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement.

Why did the cabinet set up a cross party working group to look at the proposed cuts in public transport subsidies and then subsequently ignore the recommendations which it put forward?

Councillor Cereste may have responded:

The cross party **advisory** group was set up for the following purpose:

To make recommendations establish the passenger transport subsidised service that will be provided by Peterborough City Council from the 1st of October 2013.

A number of instructions regarding the scope of the group were also given to the group and number 1 in that scope was as follows:

Scope

1. To recommend a preferred option for provision of all these services within budgetary levels available, (£600K per annum)

The £600,000 budget was set as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and was agreed by Full Council on the 6th of March 2013.

The group was unable to give a recommendation within the budgetary requirement specified above as their recommendation would have cost approximately £780,000.

The cross party advisory group therefore asked for an officer to make a recommendation to Cabinet that would meet the budgetary requirement.

	<p>As the cross party advisory group was unable to meet the requirements set out in the terms of reference the Cabinet considered the officers recommendation.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management.</p> <p>I have received complaints and heard general comments that our streets and recreation areas are not cleaned and cleared of rubbish. I understand from a recent email that Enterprise are “mapping” litter bins. Can the cabinet member give assurances that our contractors, who ever they may be, know where all the litter bins are, that bins are emptied before they are over full and spill rubbish onto the street and that our streets and parks are kept clean and free of rubbish; and does he agree that the cleansing regime needs to be sufficient to ensure that our city looks clean, feels clean and is clean? I am sure that he would agree with me that failure to meet adequate criteria gives a poor impression and has the potential to be an environmental hazard.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey may have responded:</p> <p>Enterprise Peterborough is fully aware and regularly maintains all the litter and dog bins across the City. The contract states that Enterprise should empty litter bins prior to or as soon as they become full. The mapping exercise currently being undertaking is to understand the frequency to which bins are being emptied and if they are positioned in the correct location. Through this we hope to be able to relocate bins that are currently not being fully utilised to other areas of need.</p> <p>This financial year Enterprise has not had any KPI failures against their Street Cleansing service. They have kept all streets in tolerance with regards to their level of intensity and the EPA grading that you should all have received in your ward Councillor packs. I am confident that through the work done to reschedule the Grounds and Street Cleansing service Enterprise are attending to all areas across the City as require within the contract. We also need to be conscious that increasing cleansing regimes will not eradicate the problem merely mask it, we need to promote Enforcement working closely with Enterprise to ensure that people who are dropping the litter / fly tips etc are reprimanded for their actions.</p>