

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
16 APRIL 2014**

The Mayor – Councillor June Stokes

Present:

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

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Seaton, Simons and Walsh

2. Declarations of Interest

The Mayor announced that the Pay Policy report included information concerning the Senior Manager Pay decisions. The officers in attendance had declared a conflict of interest relating to their pay and were therefore required to leave the Chamber at the appropriate time.

Furthermore, the Mayor announced that if issues relating to the Senior Manager Pay were to arise during the course of the meeting, the officers would also have to leave the Chamber at that point.

3. Minutes of the Meetings held on:

(a) 26 February 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2014 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(b) 5 March 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2014 were approved as a true and accurate record.

4. Mayor's Announcements

Members noted the report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period commencing 3 March 2014 to 13 April 2014.

The Mayor stated that this would be the last time she would chair Full Council and she thanked all Councillors and officers for their support during her term of office. She also thanked her Chaplain for the civic service held in Orton Waterville the previous Sunday and for his support during her term.

The Mayor also gave a reminder of the Last Night of the Proms concert, due to be held on Sunday 27 April 2014 at the Key Theatre and announced that tickets were still available for purchase from the Civic Office.

5. Leader's Announcements

Councillor Cereste proposed a vote of thanks to the Mayor and paid tribute to her daughter who had served as Mayoress. He thanked Councillor Stokes her for her work in the community and her work and dedication as Mayor over the past year. Councillor Cereste also proposed a vote of thanks to Councillor Nadeem, the Deputy Mayor and thanked him for all of his work and support for the Mayor over the past year.

Councillor Cereste further proposed a vote of thanks and paid tribute to those Councillors leaving public service including Councillor Dalton, a Member for ten years and Councillor McKean, a Member for two years as they were stepping down and would not be running for re-election. Their contributions to the Council during their years of office. Tribute was also paid to Councillors Todd, Kreling and Simons who were also retiring.

Councillor Khan thanked the Mayor for her fairness and impartiality over the past year and wished all those Councillors retiring the best and wished all those standing for election the best of luck.

Councillor Harrington echoed the Leader's comments and congratulated the Mayor on her year of office and wished all those retiring the best for the future.

Councillor Sandford endorsed the Leader's comments and stated that the Mayor had chaired meetings fairly and impartially. He also endorsed the Leader's comments thanking those who had served on the Council.

Councillor Cereste responded once again thanking the Mayor and all those retiring for their service.

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

There were no questions submitted by members of the public.

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. Graffiti in Park Ward and its impact on the community;
2. Pot Holes in Werrington South Ward; and
3. A cycle crossing facility in the barrier at Goodwin Walk, Werrington.

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 the Police and Crime Panel

There were no questions with notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Fire Authority.

Questions to representatives of the Police and Crime Panel were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. The creation of new posts since the introduction of the role of Police and Crime Commissioner;
2. Compliance with legislation; and
3. An increase in the precept.

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 North submitted a petition on behalf of residents of Farriers Court relating to problems with parking caused by the new owners of the garage.

Councillor Shaheed submitted a petition on behalf of numerous residents citywide objecting to the proposal to charge for the collection of brown bins.

Mr Darrell Goodliffe submitted a petition opposing the recent decision of the Employment Committee on Directors pay.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

11. Questions without 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. Plans for a nuclear waste facility in Peterborough;
2. The ambulance contract for Peterborough hospital;
3. The decline in recycling rates;
4. Public organisation contributions towards costs;
5. Brown bins;
6. New jobs created in the city; and
7. Replacement of lamp posts around the city.

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

8. Air quality across the city;
9. Selling off the Town Hall; and
10. An update on Waste 20/20.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 11 is 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 from the Extraordinary Cabinet Meeting held on 26 February 2014;
2. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 24 March 2014;
3. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had been invoked once since the publication of the previous report to Council, this was in respect of a decision taken by Cabinet on 24 February 2014 relating to 'Update on Proposed Ground Mounted and Wind Developments at Newborough, Morris Fen and America Farm';
4. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting; and

5. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 4 March 2014 to 28 March 2014.

Questions were asked about the following:

Transforming Day Opportunities for Adults Under 65

Councillor Murphy stated that there had been concern expressed with regards to referrals to current provision, for example referrals not being taken at the Kingfisher Centre, compounded by the closure of the Gloucester Centre. How many people were therefore not receiving a service because there was no vacancies because of the closure programme. Councillor Fitzgerald stated that he could only respond with regards to the decision and therefore the question was not relevant, but he would be happy to discuss the matter with Councillor Murphy at a later opportunity.

Debts in Excess of £10,000 to be Written off as Uncollectable (MAR14/CMDN/23 and MAR14/CMDN/25)

Councillor Murphy queried why monies owed to the council had been written off, particularly those owed by Cambridgeshire County Council and asked why the Tory shires were being effectively subsidised. As Councillor Seaton was absent, Councillor Cereste stated he was not aware of the comments made by Councillor Murphy, but he was happy to investigate further.

Councillor Lane asked, regarding the write-off of £195,000 of invoices to Westcombe Industries, why it had been left until recently to reclaim. Councillor Cereste responded that there was a logical explanation, for which he had received a briefing, and that he would respond to Councillor Lane in writing.

Long Causeway Public Realm Improvements

Councillor Sandford queried when the eight mature trees that had been taken out would be replaced. Councillor Cereste said that there was no question that the trees would be replaced at an appropriate time. Councillor Sandford further queried whether Amey would be responsible for planting the trees as they had been given £2k of community leadership fund money to plant trees to counteract cars parking on grass verges in the Walton area, however it had taken a year for this tree planting to be realised. Could the reasons for the delays be explored. Councillor Cereste stated that the question was irrelevant to the decision taken in the paper but that as a courtesy he would aim to follow this up.

Closure of West Town Primary School, Academy Transfer Agreement and Lease of Premises

Councillor Arculus asked regarding the closure of West Town primary school. He asked if there would be adequate provision made for sporting facilities at the primary school and if sporting facilities and access for parents and parking would be adequately considered. Councillor Holdich responded stating that planning permission would not be given unless Sport England were happy with play facilities and the planning authority were happy with the transport arrangements to the new school. Therefore

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

13. Executive Recommendations

(a) Environmental Capital Action Plan

Cabinet at its meeting of 24 March 2014, received a report which sought its support for the Environment Capital Action Plan (ECAP) and to recommend it to Council for adoption.

The ECAP had been prepared to outline how the city intended to deliver against the 'Creating the UKs Environment Capital' Strategic Priority and Council was recommended to

adopt the ECAP.

Councillor North introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. He provided further background to the plan and advised that it would form the basis of the Council's action on climate change over the next 36 years, should it be approved by Council.

It was further advised that the city had adopted the strategic priority of creating the UK's Environment Capital in 2008 and this aspiration was aimed to build on the long standing role of being one of the UK's four environment cities, a status awarded in the early 1990s. The Plan provided a clear vision of how this aspiration would be delivered; it was intentionally short and could be broken down into ten areas comprising local and national context and interim targets to 2016 and vision to 2050; it was intended to be a true reflection of what stakeholders were able to commit to within existing resources and whilst the Plan would be led and developed by the Council, it would be a document owned by the city with the aim of delivering its shared priority. This was seconded by Councillor Goodwin who reserved her right to speak.

Members debated the recommendation and in summary raised points including:

- Where some of the targets realistically achievable in light of current policies such as proposals to remove the brown bins;
- How many respondents were there and what were their backgrounds? Different people from different areas had very different needs. The document did not give an overview of the needs of people from different areas;
- The report conflicted with other parts of council policy with regard to local food production and sustainability. 900 acres of best farm land was sought to be taken out of production;
- The goal of becoming an environmental capital should be a means of promoting genuine environmental change and not just a PR slogan for the Council;
- Many of the short-term targets were not very ambitious and could go further;
- In a number of areas, the administration seemed more concerned with cost-cutting rather than environmental performance, e.g. cutting public transport subsidy;
- Recycling rates had decreased in recent years and the introduction of a charge for brown bin collection would have a further knock on effect;
- The Council's performance on renewables was not good. Only one wind turbine planning application had been approved in the last few years;
- Being green needn't always be expensive and measures such as reducing grass-cutting measures could actually save the Council money and improved environmental performance;
- Could the percentage of people using water meters be measured rather than the number of installations alone?
- The report was clear and people in the city were coming to understand issues around the environmental capital a lot better; and
- Could sources of data be published in future?

Councillor Goodwin exercised her right to speak and in doing so stated that doing nothing was not an option, and therefore the recommendation should be supported.

Councillor North summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing responded to a number of issues raised by Members which included; brown bins were not being removed, a charge was being implemented for the service; ensuring local food was being used was being addressed; renewables were being explored and in Councillor North's knowledge only one had been refused in the past five years; there was great commitment by local schools; Anglia Water did supply figures for used water meters and further exploration could be undertaken on this point; and all figures

contained within the report were obtained from reputable sources and a further breakdown could be provided.

Following debate, a vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED:**

That Council adopt the Environmental Capital Action Plan (ECAP).

14. Committee Recommendations

(a) Annual Report of the Audit Committee

Council received a report from the Chairman of the Audit Committee that requested it to note the work carried out by the Audit Committee in improving the governance arrangements across the Council.

Councillor Lamb introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. It was advised that the report showed how the Audit Committee had continued to make a positive contribution to the Councils governance and control environments, covering internal control, risk management and financial reporting amongst others, as well as Member standards. The Audit Committee could challenge and scrutinise the activities of the Council and it was to be noted that 2014/15 would be a testing time for all councils with the resources available becoming more important and the risk management of priorities, resources and partnerships would be vital notwithstanding the risk of fraud. Councillor Lamb further thanked the Members of the Committee and officers for their support throughout the year. This was seconded by Councillor Harper who further thanked all those involved with the Committee.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED:**

That Council note the work carried out by the Audit Committee in improving the governance arrangements across the Council.

15. Notices of Motion

1. Council John Fox moved the following motion:

That this Council:

1. Notes that the terms and conditions of tenancy of City Council owned allotments does not permit the burning of garden waste on the Council owned allotment gardens;
2. Agrees that a blanket bonfire ban on the allotment gardens is both unfair and impractical for the tenants, particularly in relation to the disposal of diseased plants;
3. Acknowledges that the burning of garden waste is a more environmentally friendly approach than sending the waste for landfill;
4. Agrees that a more practical, common sense approach to the issue is required which would bring Peterborough City Council's terms and conditions in line with those of many other Local Authorities across the country; and
5. Recommends that Cabinet reviews the Council's current allotment terms and conditions of tenancy, with a view to allotment tenants being permitted the same rights as the occupants of domestic dwellings.

In moving his motion, Councillor Fox requested that the Council review the ban on bonfires at allotments bringing the rights of allotment holders in line with those of the occupants of domestic dwellings. The motion was seconded by Councillor Judy Fox

who reserved her right to speak later in the debate.

Councillor Murphy moved an amendment to the motion, inserting words into paragraph 3 to read:

3. Acknowledges that the burning of garden waste is a more environmentally friendly approach than sending the waste for landfill; **but also acknowledges it is not the most environmentally friendly means of disposal and that the development of composting on site and the provision of chipping equipment, brown bins and the means for the removal of treated wood are to be considered.**

In moving his amendment Councillor Murphy raised points which included concerns around errors within the motion presented. It was highlighted that composting should be encouraged at allotment sites; hard wood could be chipped and used as mulch; certain materials should not be burnt as it contained toxins and could put the public health of surrounding residents at risk; and some limited burning should perhaps be allowed but a blanket allowance was not desirable.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Knowles who understood the difficulty of disposing of waste on allotments however burning did appear to be a last resort.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- A test of three sites had been agreed with the Allotment Holder's Association, the Council and Amey where the allotment holders could demonstrate their capability to burn waste in a sensible way. Therefore the motion may not be necessary as there is already a trial being put in place and if it was successful it would be rolled out across all Peterborough sites;
- The proposals put forward by the Allotment Holder's Association was very stringent in what was allowed to be burned and the burning of window frames would be prohibited;
- Burning garden waste was not environmentally friendly and produced smoke which caused air pollution. Emissions from bonfires could also cause annoyance to neighbouring properties;
- More support should be given to allotment holders wanting to compost and recycle;
- The stringent rules should be relaxed somewhat, but going ahead without a trial period would be wrong;
- The amendment was not relevant to much of the motion as it related to issues of recycling and not in relation to the essence of the original motion;
- Many allotment sites were close to residential areas. Bonfires could last for days which could upset residents. Whilst a pilot may be appropriate and policed accordingly, should it be rolled out across all allotments making sure it is policed would be difficult.

Councillor Fox addressed Council and moved to withdraw his original motion as Councillor Eley had stated that burning on allotments would go through a trial period on three pilot locations.

A vote was taken (36 for, 13 against, 3 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

The original motion be withdrawn.

Following the vote, a query was raised as to the appropriateness of moving to the vote whilst in the middle of an amendment. It was requested that this matter be referred to the Constitution Review Group for further explanation.

The Legal Officer advised that this point would be referred to the Group.

16. Reports and Recommendations

(a) Programme of Meetings

Council received a report that requested it approve the programme of meetings for 2014/15 and to approve, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2015/16. Councillor Eley moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor North who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the meeting schedules and the following points were raised:

- One of the Corporate Parenting Panel meetings was scheduled for 13th September which was a Saturday; and
- Was Cabinet Policy Forum a public meeting and were there records of its proceedings which could be made available to Members.

Councillor North declined to exercise his right to speak.

Councillor Eley summed up and advised that the Cabinet Policy Forum was not a public meeting, but was an opportunity for Cabinet to meet and discuss ideas.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council approve the programme of meetings for 2014/15 and approve, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2015/16.

(b) Variation to Standing Orders

Council received a report that requested it to vary and adopt the Council Standing Orders as detailed, and for the Constitution Review Group to consider the revisions following six months of operation and to report to Council as necessary. Councillor Casey moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Holdich who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the Standing Orders and the following points were raised:

- Assurance was sought that the petition scheme would come back to Full Council for approval and that the '500 residents' signature' threshold would not be increased to 2000, as had been suggested. As a member of the Constitution Review Group, Councillor Sandford responded that there had not been cross-party agreement on what the new petitions scheme should be, specifically around a lack of agreement around the number of signatures. The Legal Officer confirmed that this item had been taken away for further separate consultation;
- The petition scheme would be presented to Cabinet and then would come to Full Council for approval;
- It was requested that a spelling mistake in the document be corrected at 15.11(a)(i); and
- Until the new petitions scheme had been agreed, the current situation would remain, this being 500 signatures.

Councillor Holdich declined to exercise his right to speak.

Councillor Casey summed up and advised that any further decisions around the structure of the petition scheme would come back to Full Council for debate.

A vote was taken, (44 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

1. Standing Orders were varied in that Council:

(a) revoke the following Standing Orders as set out in the Constitution at:

- (i) Part 4, Section 1 of the Council's Constitution
- The Council's Rules of Procedure;
- (ii) Part 4, Section 2 of the Council's Constitution
- Standing Orders which relate to Committees only; and
- (iii) Part 4, Section 3 of the Council's Constitution
- Standing Orders which apply to Council and Committees; and

(b) adopt the Council Standing Orders set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

2. That the Constitution Review Working Group consider the revisions following six months of operation and report to Council as necessary.

(c) Submission on Ward Boundaries for the Council

Council received a report that requested it to endorse and recommend the submission contained within on revised ward boundaries to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England on behalf of Peterborough City Council. Councillor Peach moved the recommendations in the report, incorporating two further amendments which had been submitted, these being:

i) Amendment by Councillor Rush:

To change the name of the new 'Fletton and Stanground Ward' to East Fletton and Stanground Ward (page 8 of the submission document).

ii) Amendment by Councillors John Fox, Judy Fox and Stephen Lane:

To alter the boundary between the Werrington and Gunthorpe ward, as detailed on a map circulated to Members and add the wording to the submission as follows:

"This new ward proposal will also include Welbourne School, where most of the children who attend live in the nearby estate in North Werrington. There is a sheltered housing complex named Martins Court which also boundaries onto North Werrington, by having this complex in this proposed new ward it would assist residents in accessing their local polling station more easily.

Werrington Hall (former Manor estate for Werrington) falls with SWE2, this should remain in Werrington ward".

Councillor Peach thanked all of the officers responsible for the work undertaken in compiling the submission and further commented that the process had been difficult due to the commission's criteria, which specified wards of three members. Thanks were also extended to Members for their contributions towards the submission.

It was advised that the changes in some wards had been minimal however in others, there had been substantial changes, such as the boundary changes to two Member wards. Following the submission to the Boundary Commission for England, there would be a further consultation process undertaken where members of the public and Members would be able to comment further. It was also to be noted, that the issue relating to the number of Councillors was not up for discussion as it had been previously decided.

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

Members debated the submission and the following points were raised:

- There were currently 11 Councillors serving the Werrington area, this was to be reduced to nine. Where were the other two Councillors to be placed?
- The needs and identities of local communities had not been given adequate consideration. West Town, for instance, was still split under the proposals and there were other communities which could have been identified and brought together;
- The proposals unduly benefited the Conservative Group. The proposal to have three member wards across the city excluded a Conservative area in which there would be a single Member ward. There were a number of areas of the city where the variants indicated that the areas would be underrepresented, with a number of areas being even further underrepresented, particularly in the northern area, following a number of proposed developments in the city:
- The Liberal Democrat Group rejected the proposals and had submitted a set of proposals to the Boundary Commission;
- The proposals were unlikely to ever please every Member in the Chamber;
- There should be single Councillors for individual village areas in order to make them more accountable to the electorate, but the number of Councillors should be reduced, not increased;
- Decades ago, the Council had been administered by 27 Councillors and without the need for consultants. There was no need for 61 Councillors considering the extent to which the Councillors roles and responsibilities had been diminished due to the outsourcing of services;
- The number of Councillors per person had gone down, not up. The Boundary Commission did ultimately make the rules and the submission represented the best proposal for the city;
- The Boundary Commission would take into consideration all comments prior to their submission of recommendations to the Council; and
- The submission did take projected growth in Norwood and Paston into account;
- The Conservative group submission had not been the same as the one before the Council; and
- The submission before Council was the best measure taking into account the whole city.

Councillor Hiller exercised his right to speak and in doing so stated that the submission was the result of consultations with the cross-party group. He further reiterated that there would be further consultation upon the document with the final recommendations expected in early 2015.

Councillor Peach summed up and in so doing highlighted the rationale behind some of the changes to the numbers of Councillors per ward; furthermore he highlighted that the submission was for 61, with one single Member ward. In response to comments relating to the overall number of Councillors, and the lessening responsibility falling to Councillors, it was to be acknowledged that although there were many outsourced services, there were also many more queries from residents to deal with in relation to these services.

A vote was taken, (29 in favour, 19 against and 2 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council endorsed and recommended the submission on revised ward boundaries to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England on behalf of Peterborough City Council.

The meeting was adjourned for a five minute comfort break.

(d) Peterborough City Council Pay Policy Statement for 2014/15 and Senior Management Pay Report

Due to the earlier declared conflict of interest, the Chief Executive and other Directors had departed the meeting and in his role as an independent legal advisor, the item was being supported by Mr Philip McCourt.

Council received a report that requested it to adopt the Pay Policy Statement for 2014/15 and to note the decision made by the Employment Committee in relation to the Senior Manager Pay Review. Councillor Holdich moved the recommendations in the report, acknowledging the large amount of interest that the issue had attracted. It was further advised that; decisions regarding staff pay and conditions were the Council acting as an employer through its Employment Committee and not on political decisions taken by the Executive; there was a requirement to comply with good employment practice under law; the Senior Management Restructure had been previously approved by the Council and had so far saved £687k; Employment Committee had approved new job descriptions, new job evaluation methods and payscales and had appointed new senior officers to some of the roles and agreed the pay.

The Committee had taken its responsibility seriously and after discussion had made the decision to recruit to the roles through internal advert, which had saved money on external advertising, potential redundancy costs and had seen the promotion and retention of good managers; each of the new roles had considerably more responsibility and it was imperative that the Council had experienced and capable officers in these necessary roles, therefore the market rate needed to be offered; the Employment Committee had opted to accept senior manager payscales at a middle range, unlike some authorities paying comparable to the private sector; and there was now a stable, skilled and committed senior manager workforce, capable of supporting the Council during the difficult years ahead.

Councillor Holdich further proposed that the Pay Policy be agreed by Council, thus permitting the Employment Committee to be asked to revisit senior officer's salaries in the new municipal year and to make recommendations to Council on any changes it saw fit, including reducing senior officers' pay. Furthermore, every Councillor would be invited to this meeting and the press and public able to attend. Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendations and Councillor Holdich's additional proposals and reserved his right to speak.

Prior to the start of debate, Councillor Davidson, Councillor Fower, Councillor Sandford and Councillor Shaheed left the meeting, standing against the proposals.

Members debated the proposals and the following points were raised:

- The Council had been shackled by legal obligations and the general consensus from local citizens, taking into account over one hundred responses, was that they were outraged at the proposals;
- Officers were more than sufficiently rewarded for the work which they undertook, taking into account the lessening responsibilities of the Council;
- The authority was a relatively small one and could not be compared to other authorities representing a larger electorate;
- The Directors were remunerated appropriately and they should refuse the any increase in the interest of the public;
- The pay policy statement should be rejected, as the agreement of the policy was now overdue;
- Many public sector employees would only see a 1% or even a 0% pay increase, and were also having their pensions cut whilst senior officers were getting large pay increases;

- There should be a movement towards a living wage, seeing a reduction in the ratio between the lowest and highest paid employees of the Council;
- It was outrageous to increase salaries and to consider backdating pay during times of austerity;
- The positions should be advertised externally in order to attract a wider pool of candidates;
- There was a cost of living crisis and people were an average of £1,600 worse off a year since 2010;
- Pay had been frozen and pension contributions were going up. There were increased bills, food costs and childcare, etc. People were increasingly struggling to make ends meet. The jobs available were often zero-hour contracts or part time. 91% of respondents to a survey conducted so far have said they felt worse off since 2010;
- People are asking why officers were being awarded pay rises larger than most people's salaries. Like the rise in Councillor allowances, the rise in officer salaries should be voted against;
- No promotion should be worth £20,000 or more when people in the city were receiving that as their yearly salary. Most people were getting rises no more than inflation at best. The pay rises were therefore unjustifiable given that services were being cut due to budgetary considerations;
- Vivacity relied on volunteers, e.g. for the Great Eastern Run. Community groups and charities were losing funding, yet Members were being told that good officers could be lost if the appropriate pay was not offered. If officers were not happy with their pay, they could move on. Most of the senior officers had not been with the council that long and many other experienced employees were only given a 1% pay increase;
- There was a general consensus that the Council needed to deliver more for less and this should also apply for senior officers. The Council should be moving away from the Joint Negotiating Committee;
- Senior Officers were encouraged to show the similar level of restraint as was shown by Members when choosing not to award themselves an increase in Member's Allowances;
- It was not possible to claim that these salaries represented the market rate as the market had not been tested;
- Any savings made during the reorganisation had appeared to be put back into the salaries of senior staff;
- Other members of staff had been made redundant, one of the effects of which is that other employees have had increased workloads. Why should these individuals therefore not be afforded better pay rises;
- Senior Directors were being given large increases however consultants were still being utilised, was the expertise really there in house and was value for money really being achieved?
- The kind of increases proposed would be unthinkable in the private sector;
- Councillors had been offered an increase but refused it due to the financial position faced by the Council. As an employer, an example had therefore been set and should be followed through in this instance;
- The job descriptions had been agreed by a cross-party committee and the job descriptions determined the pay bands;
- The perception of the situation had not fully been taken into account. Residents had been constantly told that the Council was short on funds and the pay increases made communicating with residents problematic because it made the decision making of the Council seem inconsistent;
- The matter should be referred back to the Employment Committee and senior officers were urged to refuse the pay increases;
- If the recommendations as outlined by Councillor Holdich were approved, and the pay policy approved, the decision would be taken back for review by the Employment Committee. The value of the new posts had been assessed

externally and the savings would be £700,000 pounds if the policy was approved as it was, rising to £1m;

- The decision taken did not reflect pay increases to officers, although it was acknowledged that this could be the perception. There were two positions not receiving any rise and the other four posts were newly created posts, and these new posts had been pay graded accordingly;
- People working 60 hour weeks for a year in the city were getting less than some of the back pay being proposed. Approving pay rises would send a bad message to the residents of the city;
- The Hay Group was a recruitment agency which supplied executives to councils, surely there was a conflict of interest in them providing advice to the Employment Committee;
- The workload of the officers had increased substantially; and
- The salaries which had agreed to by Employment Committee were lower than those recommended by Hay; and
- Councillor Lee addressed Council and wished it to be made known as a matter of public record his opposition to the pay awards, but recognised that the only way to bring forward action on the matter was to vote in favour of the recommendations in order for the matter to be further debated.

Councillor Fitzgerald exercised his right to speak and in doing so stated that the market ultimately dictated the worth of senior executives and Peterborough City Council was no exception to that. The Hay Group acted independently and there was no conflict of interest present in utilising them for recommendations about executive pay. The Employment Committee had been entrusted in reaching its decision and had done so based on the information available to it. There were no pay increases, but rather there had been new roles created. Furthermore, without adoption of the pay policy, the decision could not be referred back to the Employment Committee at a future date.

The Legal Officer addressed the Council and for clarify provided an overview of the decision being requested by Council.

Councillor Holdich summed up and in so doing advised that the senior officer salaries represented a £75,000 investment for a £1 million saving; six people had lost their jobs during the process and the salaries awarded represented the median figure available. All members and residents were welcome to attend the forthcoming Employment Committee meeting should the recommendations be approved.

A vote was taken on the motion (25 in favour, 17 against and 3 abstentions). Following the vote, it was **RESOLVED** that:

1. Council adopt the Pay Policy Statement for 2014/15 and note the decisions made by the Employment Committee in relation to the Senior Management Pay Review; and
2. Employment Committee would revisit the senior officer's salaries in the new municipal year and make recommendations on changes as it saw fit, including reducing senior officers' pay.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 11.00pm
APPENDIX A

FULL COUNCIL 16 APRIL 2014

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions have been received under the following categories:

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME

7. Questions with notice by members of the public

None received.

Questions with notice by Members relating to ward matters To the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen

1. Question from Councillor Shearman

To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods (in the absence of Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health)

Residents in Park Ward are concerned about the increasing levels of graffiti appearing on private property across the ward, and the problems they face in getting this removed. Is the administration concerned about the visual impact this is having in the ward, and what help are they able to offer residents who care about their communities?

Councillor North responded:

We are aware that graffiti is an issue, not only in Park Ward but across the city. It is a blight on our communities and impacts directly on the quality of life for our residents.

A cross-agency Task and Finish Group is being established to review the current arrangements for tackling graffiti in Peterborough, including graffiti on private land.

This group will also research how other local authority areas are dealing with this matter and investigate how the new tools available to us towards the end of 2014 as part of the new Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Bill could potentially assist.

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

Is it no possible to deal with graffiti on private property in the same way that the Council deals with accumulations of rubbish. As I understand it, the owners of the property are warned and asked to remove the rubbish and then after a specific time if that rubbish is not removed the Council will remove it, or Amey will remove it and then bill the owner for the removal costs. Can we not do the same for graffiti?

Councillor North responded:

As Councillor Shearman will be aware this is Councillor Walsh's area of expertise but my understanding is that the graffiti on private property is an issue and it is difficult to deal with. I certainly think where it is racially offensive or offensive in other ways it needs to be dealt with urgently. I will get a written response sent to you as to how far we can go down the line of dealing with private individuals who refuse to deal with it themselves.

2. Question from Councillor Davidson

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

Pot holes are becoming frequent in Werrington South Ward, this must be costing the city council an exhaustive amount of money, can you clarify the exact amount to the Council?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Our records do confirm that pothole numbers have increased in Peterborough over the last 5 years specifically as a result of the severe winters we have experienced since 2009. And as you know, Peterborough is not alone in suffering this increase in potholes with local authorities nationally reporting similar problems.

It is not possible to identify the exact spend repairing potholes year-on-year but when considering total revenue expenditure on carriageway and footway repairs over the past five years, there is a rising trend.

I would also like to assure Council that we are looking at another experimental method of repairing potholes which at the moment appears to be more cost effective and last longer. But we will report back to Council if that becomes something that we are going to use in the future.

Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:

What is the policy for the works to be surveyed and completed and can the Cabinet confirm if any claims have been made to the city council for damage caused by potholes from car owners. Several have been noticed in our ward and I daresay in other areas, this has also been reported to Peterborough City Council. What is the timescale for a temporary repair to be done to a permanent repair to be done?

Councillor Cereste responded:

I'm afraid I can't answer all those details but I would be quite happy to drop you a line and let you have the answer to that.

3. **Question from Councillor John Fox**

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

Could the Cabinet Member please inform why there has been such a long delay by the Highways Authority in putting a cycle crossing facility in the barrier at Goodwin Walk, Werrington, thereby giving access to cyclists, the elderly and disabled residents into a beautiful walk through the nearby woods?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The need for the crossing was identified as part of the infrastructure improvements required for the redevelopment of the Werrington Centre. This was a crossing where the developer funding would have been used to install the crossing had the redevelopment gone ahead.

The redevelopment of the Werrington Centre also included the removal of both the petrol filling station access and the bus layby exit in the vicinity of the proposed crossing location.

This means that an evaluation will have to be undertaken to establish the feasibility of installing a crossing at this location now, and I have asked that this be actioned immediately.

Councillor Fox asked the following supplementary question:

That wasn't actually the junction I was talking about. It's even simpler than that, there are five footpaths that go through a wooded area, they cross five main roads, one of

	<p>them is the infamous Staniland Way roundabout. All five junctions are dropped kerbs, there's no signs to say cyclists crossing or elderly people crossing, disabled people crossing or anything, but when we get right to near Rowland Court all I want to do is put a crossing there, no an actual crossing like a pelican crossing just a gap in the gate so people can get through, obviously caravans can't get through but people can, and that helps people walking their dog, the elderly from the sheltered housing complex to walk through. I've been trying for ages, I've done a Powerpoint presentation to the Northern Footpath Forum, they think it's a marvellous idea, I've taken senior officers on walks through it and they think it's a marvellous idea but for some unknown reason we can't get the barrier removed and another barrier put in similar what they have got in Northborough. I've spoken to Councillor Hiller, he's had one recently fitted it works adequately, it's safe, it won't cost much money for some unknown reason, logic is not prevailing and we've not got it. it doesn't make any sense at all.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Well clearly on what Councillor Fox has just said it would seem nonsensical not to do it, I will speak to the Director in charge. We will have a look at it and if the costs are reasonable and safe we will try and get it into the budget so we can get it done.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management</p> <p>I have been contacted by local residents living near to Norwood School who tell me that the trees on land used by the school have now been removed. Could the Cabinet Member please let me know how many trees have been removed, who paid for this work, how much it cost and what the reason for this action was?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>In February this year, one tree (a Chestnut tree) was identified for removal due to poor condition, presenting an identifiable hazard. A second tree (a Willow tree) was identified for the removal of deadwood but not for complete removal. These two operations along with the remainder of the works at the school were completed on the same day.</p> <p>The Council paid £582 for this work.</p> <p>The school subsequently directly procured the contractors to remove the Willow and paid for this work directly.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member confirm whether the Trees and Woodlands Strategy applies in this instance and given that the tree was felled and that it wasn't in need of felling, whether the Cabinet Member will be seeking to replace the tree with one, or possibly two, new trees?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>The short answer is yes.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Judy Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member please review the cost to the cost to the Council of having the fly-tipping material regularly removed each Monday from the recycling area at</p>

	<p>Tesco's car park, Werrington.</p> <p>Could these units be relocated in a more secure area so the culprits can be seen dumping by nearby CCTV or removed completely?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>Fly tipping is paid for out of the fixed cost within the Amey contract. Our estimate is that it costs the Council around £1,000 per year to clear fly tipping from this location.</p> <p>We are currently reviewing all of the bring banks sites to assess whether they are in the correct location and have the correct bin types in place to reduce the incidences of fly tipping. We also recognise that signage can be improved to better inform residents of what they can and cannot place in the bins.</p> <p>Once we have made these improvements if we are still getting incidences of fly tipping we will work with enforcement and explore the use of CCTV, which we are now doing in collaboration with both the Councillor Fox's.</p> <p>Councillor Judy Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I have since discovered that the area has fly tipped rubbish removed on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday at a regular basis each week now. When you consider that the recycling bins are in fact on private land, should the owners of the land have some responsibility in policing this to cut down the cost or can the cost be levied towards them?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>Again the short answer is yes, it's on private property so therefore the owner, in this case Tesco, should be taking some responsibility for the fly tipping which occurs on their property. We will be working with them and the Councillors to ensure that this problem is eradicated.</p>
<p><u>Questions with notice by Members to Council representatives of the Fire Authority and Police and Crime Panel</u></p>	
<p>1.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Khan, Police and Crime Panel Representative</p> <p>Would the Police panel please tell me how many new posts have been created since the introduction of the role of Police Commissioner was introduced and at what cost to the taxpayers of this City.</p> <p>Councillor Khan responded:</p> <p>Thank you for the question, I can confirm that it will be referred to the Panel for the appropriate response, the next Panel meeting is the 19th June 2014.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Khan, Police and Crime Panel Representative</p> <p>It has been reported and verified that Cambridgeshire police lied to those they tried to recruit as spies, threatening to prosecute a woman involved in Unite Against Fascism (UAF) if she told anyone about the attempt to recruit her. In recent months four people have come forward to say that Cambridgeshire Police officers tried to recruit activists to</p>

spy on Unite Against Fascism, UK Uncut and Cambridge Defend Education.

Is the Police and Crime Panel aware of the video evidence which came to light in November last year and does the Panel agree that what the police said to that woman is completely despicable and it is important her story has finally come out; the actions taken by the Cambridgeshire police are human rights violations, specifically violating Article 8 of the Human Rights Act of 1998. What steps are the Cambridgeshire Police Service taking to ensure that they now comply with this legislation and what deliberations have been made to the Panel, what representations have been made to the panel and/or commissioner and how have these been dealt with?

Councillor Khan responded:

Thank you for the question. I can confirm that this is an operational issue and not for scrutiny by the Police and Crime Panel. It will therefore be referred to the Chief Constable.

Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:

The reason I'm asking a supplementary on this one is because a member of the public who was involved in this when to the Policing Panel to ask if they were in breach of the legislation and to ask about people being recruited as spies. I know he has written to you and I. He was refused, he tells me the ability to address the matter to the Commissioner.

Councillor Khan responded:

That is very difficult to answer on behalf of someone else. If he was refused, I'm sure there must have been some good reasons. But as I said in my response, this is an operational matter, it cannot be discussed at the Panel it has to be referred to the Chief Constable.

3. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Khan, Police and Crime Panel Representative

What is the view of the Panel concerning the Conservative Commissioners decision to break his election promises and decide to increase the precept and spend more on his office, expenses, deputy and his personal staff than was under the previous police authority budget.

Councillor Khan responded:

Thank you for the question, I can confirm that this will be referred to the Panel for a response. The next Panel meeting is the 19th June 2014.

Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:

Didn't this go before the Policing Panel and didn't the Policing Panel express a view that it didn't want the Council tax precept increased and concern that he is spending more on his office and his mates now than was being spent under the previous police authority arrangement and he broke his promise and lied and put up the Council tax.

Councillor Khan responded:

Very difficult for me to speak on behalf of the Police and Crime Commissioner, he was elected by the public and I suppose if he has broken his promises then he should, when he stands up, be accounted for.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive

1. **Question from Councillor Thulbourn**

To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement

Could the Leader confirm that there are no plans for a nuclear waste facility in Peterborough both now and in the future?

Councillor Cereste responded:

I can confirm that at present officers, and Councillors, within the planning department are unaware of any plans for such facilities within the Peterborough City Council administrative area.

Councillor Thulbourn asked the following supplementary question:

Were you aware that there had been a focus group set up about four weeks ago with a number of residents and on that focus group they were told that Peterborough was on a short list of areas for high level nuclear waste and the focus group was looking at responses to allow them to formulate a plan and part of the decision making process. And also, do we actually have control over this within the city council, would it be imposed or would we have a veto on anything like this coming up?

Councillor Cereste responded:

No matter what we would have a say in it, I'm not quite sure what the legal position would be over a nuclear waste facility but no matter who, or even if the process was considered to be of national significance and was decided nationally, we would still have very much a say in it. I cannot tell you any more, I do not know anything about it and no one has approached me and I don't know whether I would be too happy about it if they did

2. **Question from Councillor Davidson**

To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement

Can the Cabinet Member confirm and explain why the ambulance contract is a regional contract and not specific to Peterborough City Hospital?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The main reason is that the East Anglian Ambulance Service (EAST) provides a service under a National Specification to 19 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), they replaced PCTs, and their performance target is measured at Regional level of performance, not a local or locality level.

All ambulance services around the country are commissioned in the same way, through a collaborative or consortium approach. No ambulance service is commissioned specifically for a hospital either, as the ambulance service covers a population and not a provider, as vehicles can and are needed to travel across hospital sites such as up to Leicester or

Cambridge.

A hospital specific contract is unlikely to be cost effective or clinically viable. However, it is my personal experience that I would like to say that if they did change the way of doing things, we might get a better Health Service.

Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:

Are you aware of the policy criteria to warrant a transport service? And subject to the eligibility, the transport is covered from other regions as you have rightly said such as Bury St Edmunds, Milton Keynes and some crews from as further afield as Norfolk. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group are supposed to be providing care for our elderly and that is failing miserably, can the Cabinet confirm the costs for this service and why are there no provisions to safeguard our aging population?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The simple answer is that it is nothing to do with us, but what we should be doing is we should be looking at this through the Health and Wellbeing Board to see if what you are saying is correct and to see if there is anything that we can do, but the reality of it is that when we lost our own PCT in this city and when we lost the ability to have our own commissioning group that looked after Peterborough alone, we were given a great disservice by those people that made that decision. You all know, and some Members worked and fought very very hard to keep that for Peterborough, we were overruled and I think that is the worst thing that's ever happened for the Health Service here in this city.

3. **Question from Councillor Ash**

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

News from Amey states that "the recycling rate for January was 37%, slightly lower than January 2013".

This was due to the "pause in collection" Once the charges for brown bin collection come into force does the Cabinet Member anticipate a further decline in recycling rates? And if so does he anticipate an increase in recyclable garden waste going to landfill?

Councillor Elsey responded:

Recycling rates are not declining. The overall performance for recycling, composting and reuse from 2012-13 was 50.47%. Unaudited figures for 2013/14 show an improvement to 51.62% (these may be subject to change as final data continues to come in).

The combination of an increase in home composting and the introduction of a paid-for garden waste service will have an impact on recycling, some positive and some potentially negative. We expect an increase in the short term of garden waste going into the black bin but experience elsewhere suggests only a very percentage will end up in landfill.

Over time we expect to reduce or remove this through ongoing support for home composting, investment in the new Energy from Waste Plant and the new Household Recycling Centre and continuing education.

Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:

How comparable is Peterborough to other areas in terms of demography and how people behave and the other question is something that came my way today, I understand that the only way people can pay is remotely, that's over the phone by credit card or by debit card or through the internet, does he think that if people can't come in and pay by cash or

	<p>in person, that would decrease the uptake of the brown bins.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>I can't give you the answer to your first question tonight but I will gladly get a comparison of other authorities to you in writing. The second point is with relation to people who don't have a credit card or a bank account to be able to set up a direct debit, there is potential for them to be able to pay at the cash desk at Bayard Place, if they are in that circumstance, however we are encouraging people not to because the people at the cash desk in Bayard Place are already extremely busy with Council Tax, but it is possible.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Thulbourn</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods (in the absence of Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources)</p> <p>With the pressures on services and the obvious reduction in provision in some areas would council policy allow public organisations to contribute to costs which would allow specific and targeted increases of a particular service? For example a school to contribute to traffic enforcement to ensure a safe environment during the start and finish times of the school with an enforcement officer in the area at these specific times.</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>As Councillor Thulbourn rightly points out, we do indeed face very challenging times with our finances. As a result, I do not see any reason why this sort of approach should not be welcomed. There are already some examples of this happening – indeed in my own ward, Hampton Parish Council currently fund a lengthsman specifically to clean their streets. He's very popular with local people and does an excellent job, Councillor Seaton, whose area this is, is more than happy to meet and discuss further the particular issues that Councillor Thulbourn is considering in his ward.</p> <p>Councillor Thulbourn did not have a supplementary question.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Shearman</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management</p> <p>There is increasing confusion amongst residents in the city over what is to be done with brown bins that are no longer required by residents. Could the Cabinet Member give a definitive statement over what is to happen to these bins?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>Garden waste will be collected as usual until 24th May – residents should present brown bins as normal. Residents can sign up to the new service – £36 before 20th May, £39 thereafter.</p> <p>We are encouraging residents to keep their brown bins in the short-term. Bins were provided to the property and householders may change their mind about the service and indeed householders may move – and new residents may wish to sign up.</p> <p>Residents not subscribing immediately to the paid-for service are encouraged to retain their brown bins and are free to use them for whatever purpose(s) they choose.</p> <p>Anyone who decides not to opt-in to the paid-for service and feels they cannot make any other use of the brown bin should call customer services after the 27th May to request the bin be removed. We will then make arrangements for collection.</p>

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

That's just what I think the public in Peterborough wanted to hear, when this ill-conceived plan was first mooted it was made quite clear in the press and in various ways that residents would not be able to return their brown bins, but it would be necessary to keep them on their premises, indeed and I don't really understand this, we were told that the bins were not allocated to residents but they were allocated to the residency, I just don't understand that but that is great. I'm glad you've cleared that up because this issue has caused a lot of confusion and anger throughout the city. people realising, as many people said when it was first introduced that this was an ill thought plan. would you agree with me that this is a member of the Cabinet listening to the public or is it a giant u-turn that could have been avoided had you thought it through in the first place?

Councillor Elsey responded:

No.

6. **Question from Councillor Fletcher**

To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement

Following on from the Leaders announcement that 12,000 jobs have recently been created in Peterborough, I do agree with him that that is a fantastic achievement.

So that there can be no doubt as to the veracity of this claim, would the Leader now highlight exactly which companies are responsible for making such a marvellous contribution to the economy and reputation of Peterborough?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Whilst statistics around unemployment and claimant counts are collected relatively easily by the Office for National Statistics, it is extremely difficult to provide exact figures of jobs created as there are any number of routes that a company take to recruit new employees (Job Centre Plus, private recruitment agencies etc.). This is not unique to Peterborough but all cities face the same issue.

To address this, Opportunity Peterborough collates all 'job announcements' for this city, on a monthly basis and many of those companies actually work with Opportunity Peterborough to deliver the investment in our city. Unfortunately, this can only ever be a 'proxy' figure, as the figures for actual jobs created may be different from one company to another and whereas some may announce a few hundred, they may have a few hundred more etc. but it is a good indication of the investment in the city. It does, however, provide the opportunity for us to understand what is happening in Peterborough.

Now based on these figures, it is certainly reasonable to suggest that Peterborough has ridden the recession relatively well. As we know from the recent Centre for Cities report, Peterborough is second in the UK for private sector jobs growth at 5.5%. This been generated both by indigenous company growth and through new investment coming in to the city. This confidence has been created through a number of positive initiatives driven by both Peterborough City Council and its economic development company and of course the policies of this Conservative administration and Group. Opportunity Peterborough: direct approaches to companies to attract new investment; proactive marketing campaigns at London railway terminals; investment in the city's physical infrastructure and Peterborough's growth agenda; shift in perceptions of Peterborough – so we are no longer the UK's best kept secret, people are now beginning to realise what is happening in our wonderful city – is leading to the delivery of high profile projects and programmes.

A record of the 'jobs announcements' in the city from May 2010 to April 2014, four years just, is available in table format, which I am quite happy to circulate to all Members should they so wish it. This is of course where I made the misrepresentation to Council, the actual number of jobs created was 16,000, not 12,000. However if you take a net number, it could come down to about 12,000 so perhaps I didn't mislead Council I just didn't take as much credit as the Conservative Group should have done for doing the hard work they did. Of course at this point I expect Councillor Fletcher to congratulate the Conservative Group and the Administration for the hard work its done in order to create new jobs in our city and put Peterborough at the forefront of economic growth in this country.

Councillor Fletcher asked the following supplementary question:

I thank Councillor Cereste for his honesty, it's very nice to hear it for a change from that side, but however the other thing in the same breath we were told is that Peterborough is the fastest growing city in the UK. I wonder if he could clarify how he arrives at that. the fastest growing in what? Because I go to another city which I have a big interest in and it's a big city, so I can't really compare it with this, but I can compare the suburbs of that city, Castleford for instance, it's not a city it's a much smaller place but there is far more investment going in Castleford than you've got here, much more. So maybe it can just be clarified in what way is this city of Peterborough the fastest growing city in the UK compared with others that have got all this investment, new ruby pitches going up, ski slopes etc.

Councillor Cereste responded:

Everybody seems to use the same methodology for measuring growth and I again refer to the Centre for Cities report and it clearly says that we are growing as a percentage 1.6% per annum, which is faster than any other city in the UK, that is a matter of fact. Now whether Councillor Fletcher wishes to believe that, that is another point. But let me also point out another thing, we have done that and achieved that by the hard work of the people of this city and this administration. We do not receive millions and millions of structural funds, investment grants from the Government, growth funds from the Government, everybody north of Peterborough - Sheffield, Manchester, Leeds – they are all getting millions of pounds and we are getting a very small percentage compared to what they are doing and yet we are still outperforming them, I think it is an opportunity for people to actually understand how well the people of this city have done, it's one of the few places in the UK where our economy hasn't actually gone backwards. We've been growing in the face of the worst economic times that this country has ever known and it's really about time people gave themselves, not me or my administration, but themselves for the credit for what's going on because as he economy turns we will be ahead of the game and it will be our children and grandchildren that will benefit.

7. **Question from Councillor Shearman**

To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement

Could the Cabinet Member please let me know the Council's policy on timescales for replacing broken or damaged lamp posts?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Columns that are creating an immediate health and safety risk are made safe within one hour of the risk being identified or reported.

If a replacement column is the Council's standard six metre galvanised steel column, the new column will be installed within seven day of the works instruction being raised.

Occasionally the replacement column will be of a specialist design and not held in stock, in which case it will have to be ordered. This can unfortunately take up to 12 weeks.

Following installation of a new column the Council has to liaise with UK Power Networks for the electrical connection to their network. This work cannot be ordered until the new column is installed, as UK Power Networks require an Installation Certificate.

General maintenance faults are attended to within seven days. Large numbers of day burners in one area or a sequence of lights out in one area are classed as urgent calls and attended to within 24 hours.

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

He talks about seven days, 12 weeks. Seven months ago an Amey dustcart knocked down a lamppost in Isherwood Close in my ward, and today after many many delays the Council and the electricity people turned up and they found that they were unable to repair it, unable to turn on the power supply, now that was not down to the Council, but one thing that is down to the Council, early on in this time, there was a change of staff, the order hadn't been chased up and this has dragged on and on and this is actually on a bend in a narrow cul-de-sac where is it very dark at night. Could you have a word with your officers please Councillor Cereste and ensure that in these circumstances an order is expedited as quickly as possible in order to ensure that the residents don't fear for their lives as they have to walk down a narrow dark cul-de-sac.

Councillor Cereste responded:

All I can say is if the thing is as serious as you say it is I'm really disappointed that you wait to come and ask for a question in Council rather than getting hold of me straight away to get it sorted out. If people are in fear of their lives in this street then why has it taken you so long or why do you choose this route to make known of it.

Councillor Shearman raised the following point of information:

I have something like 50 emails and so does the resident in Isherwood Close of constantly chasing this up backwards and forwards. I feel sorry for the officer working for the Council as she is having to take all the flack over this. But let me assure you we have been working on this and for seven months.

8. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Environment Capital and Neighbourhoods

In recent weeks, considerable concern has been expressed about severe deterioration in air quality in various parts of the country, including levels of particulates, nitrogen monoxide and other noxious gases.

Could the Cabinet Member for Environment Capital tell me what is being done in Peterborough to monitor levels of air quality, what any measurements have been showing recently and what is being done to bring about improvements?

Would he also recognise that this issue is of particular importance given the plans which the Council has for building of new houses and employment areas, for expansion of the city centre and for building of new roads and widening of existing ones across the city over forthcoming years and decades.

Councillor North may have responded:

National air quality objectives are set out in regulations, specifying standards considered

	<p>acceptable for the effects of each pollutant.</p> <p>Local Authorities must assess air quality against these standards. Where exceedences are likely, they must declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and set out the measures it intends to put in place in pursuit of the objectives.</p> <p>Pollutants are assessed against the air quality objectives, by screening, modelling and monitoring.</p> <p>There is currently one AQMA in Peterborough for Sulphur dioxide from brickworks in Fenland District Council area. The exceedence relates to 2 small areas in the Flag Fen locality.</p> <p>The planning system has an important role in improving air quality and reducing exposure to air pollution. Both the development of local planning policy and determination of individual applications are important.</p> <p>Industrial emissions are controlled through the Environmental Permitting regime. Peterborough City Council issues permits to 66 installations controlling emissions.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development, Business Engagement and Environment Capital (in the absence of Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources)</p> <p>In recent months the idea of selling off the Town Hall has been discussed by a number of groups, could the Cabinet Member let me know if he has actually undertaken any work into researching this viable option, and if he has, how many valuations he has secured and how much the is the old Town Hall valued at?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</p> <p>The last study that looked at alternative viable uses of the Town Hall was completed in April 2013. This looked at a number of options that ranged from conversion to residential, retirement apartments, student accommodation, offices and various combinations. In all instances it was assumed that the Council would retain the 'Ceremonial' areas. In order to develop its use, planning permission is assumed and it will require investment to address condition issues, reorganise and modernise the building. Depending on the option selected the value of the Town Hall ranged from a loss on disposal of £3.22m to break even. No further work has been undertaken since this time.</p> <p>The Joint Venture company intends to review the future use of the Town Hall and a full valuation will feature as part of the options appraisal around future office accommodation for the Council.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management</p> <p>In 2008, the Council agreed to a new policy on waste management entitled 'waste 2020, doing nothing is not an option'. This set out an ambitious target that the Council would recycle or compost at least 65% of all domestic waste by 2020.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me how we are getting on? i.e. what the current rate of recycling is, how it has changed over each year since the policy was adopted and whether he expects the 2020 target to be achieved?</p>

Councillor Elsey may have responded:

The Council resolved this policy in February 2007.

The combined performance for recycling, composting and reuse from 2012-13 was 50.47% an improvement over the 2007-08 figure which was 46.62%. Unaudited figures for 2013/14 show a further improvement to 51.62% (these may be subject to change as final data continues to come in).

The target to get to 65% is ambitious and best in class. Delivering it will always need to be balanced with the investment required to achieve it. Nonetheless, it remains council policy and we continue to make progress towards achieving it, through investing in the new HRC, education and awareness raising work with PECT and Amey.

I am confident that with the investments we are making and the continuing support of Peterborough residents we can reach the target.