



**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
5 MARCH 2014**

The Mayor – Councillor June Stokes

Present:

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

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Todd, Simons, Maqbool and Johnson.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Mayor advised Members that in November 2012, the Audit Committee had granted a general dispensation for all Members, should they have any disclosable interest that enabled them to debate and vote on the budget item.

Councillor Miners stated that he had previously declared a pecuniary interest in relation to decisions on Children's Centres, in that his partner worked for one of the service providers and would be affected by the new proposed delivery of the service. He had sought legal advice on the matter which clarified that he did not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in the budget item, as the Children's Centres formed only a small part of the overall budget decision, however he advised that he would not speak or vote on the budget amendment from the Independent Forum as the Children's Centres featured heavily within it.

Councillor McKean declared a similar interest to Councillor Miners and advised that he would take the same approach to debating and voting on the budget.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 29 January 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 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 27 January 2014 to 2 March 2014.

The Mayor stated that on Friday 28 March 2014, Councillor Cereste was to take part in a charity event, "Jail or Bail", which would raise money for Ormiston Children's Centre and Families Trust, details of the event would be emailed to Members.

The Mayor further announced that there was a lot of business to consider within the agenda, and it was therefore requested that all those present within the Chamber and the public gallery remained respectful and refrained from calling out during the meeting.

5. Leader's Announcements

Councillor Cereste stated that an application to the Government for a Green Deal Grant of £3.9m had been approved. This would enable occupants of 2000 homes across the city to be brought up to standard and in turn would save them at least £100 a year. Each property would have the equivalent of £8,500 spent on it and would bring an investment to the city of around £13m. Further information would be available in due course and Councillors would be requested to assist with identify qualifying properties.

Councillor Khan welcomed the news, stating that it was long overdue and that he would work with Councillor Cereste as his ward would benefit greatly from the proposed works.

Councillor Harrington expressed his support for the scheme and thanked officers for securing the grant.

Councillor Sandford stated that the Green Deal was a major green policy, put forward by the coalition government. Whilst it had not been set up as quickly as first thought, it was nonetheless positive that it was being implemented and would have the potential over time to enable each house in the country to have access to some degree of energy saving materials. The grant was welcomed and it was hoped that all parties would be involved in taking the initiative forward.

Councillor Cereste responded that it was positive that all Group Leaders supported the initiative and cross party working would be encouraged. The grant was extremely important for the city, with it being the start of better things to come.

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. Usage of the replacement 406 bus service;
2. Restricted parking along Fulbridge Road; and
3. The waste bin situated after the underpass from Carron Drive to Dukesmead.

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

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

10. Petitions Submitted by Members or Residents

Mr Darrell Goodliffe submitted a petition signed by residents of West Ward and others across the city, calling upon the Council to oppose the introduction of a levy for the collection of brown bins.

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. The mural removed from Bridge House;
2. The amount of money spent on advertising within the Council;
3. The caseloads of social workers;
4. Salary increases for senior officers;
5. The Bourges Boulevard development; and
6. The impact made by Operation Can-do.

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 taken at the Cabinet Meetings held on 3 February 2014 and 24 February 2014;
2. 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 the decision taken by Cabinet on 3 February 2014 relating to 'The Future Direction of Children's Centres Delivery';
3. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had been invoked once since the previous meeting in relation to the decision 'A1139 Fletton Parkway Junction 17 A1(M) – Junction 2 Widening Scheme – Appointment of Construction Contractor' – FEB14/CMDN/13; and
4. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 24 January 2014 to 17 February 2014.

Questions were asked about the following:

Ground Mounted Solar and Wind Farms at America Farm, Morris Fen and Newborough

Councillor Martin sought clarification regarding the solar and wind farm proposals. Following the decision made by Cabinet, Scrutiny had been of the opinion that the proposals should not be pursued. However, Cabinet had merely adjusted the decision and proceeded, was this how the Scrutiny procedures were meant to work? Councillor Seaton stated that the report presented to Cabinet explained in detail what had changed following the Rural Scrutiny meeting and Councillor Martin was welcome to attend the call-in meeting, due to take place a week on Wednesday.

Funding Peterborough's Future Growth

Councillor Murphy expressed concern in relation to the proposals for a Joint Venture Company, specifically highlighting concerns relating to offshore tax avoidance. Tax avoidance should in no way be encouraged. Councillor Cereste stated that he agreed with

Councillor Murphy and advised that all proposals would go through the correct scrutiny and decision making procedures.

Councillor Lane sought clarification regarding the proposals for office consolidation and stated this was the second time such a project had been considered. There might be growth but it would come at a cost, such as capital footprint and rent. He asked if there were other suitable locations and for reassurance that through the proposed move, there would be definite value for money realised. Councillor Cereste stated that he would want to be assured that the best value for money was reached and reiterated that any decision would go through the correct scrutiny and governance processes of the Council.

Special Urgency and Waive of Call-In Provisions

Councillor Sandford sought clarification as to whether 'damage to the reputation of the Council' being used as a reason for the use of special urgency and waive of call-in for the 'A1139 Fletton Parkway Junction 17 A1(M) – Junction 2 Widening Scheme – Appointment of Construction Contractor' decision was deemed appropriate and sought reassurance that processes had been properly applied. Councillor Cereste stated that the reasons for the use of special urgency and waive of call-in were set out within the document and significant consideration had been given to the potential loss of funding should the works fall behind schedule.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

13. Executive Recommendations

(a) Funding Peterborough's Future Growth

Cabinet at its meeting of 24 February 2014 received a report which included detailed proposals for the delivery of growth and regeneration schemes in Peterborough and for the Council's involvement in those schemes. The report made a number of recommendations, which included a number of recommendations to Council.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. He provided a further overview of the project, highlighting that the delivery of regeneration sites in the city was required in order to enable growth going forward. The Joint Venture development would give opportunity for this regeneration to be realised, bringing many thousands of jobs and income for the city and ultimately making it a better place to live.

This was seconded by Councillor Hiller who stated that the Council was in an unprecedented financial situation and the entrepreneurial thinking of the administration had allowed the city to prosper in difficult times. To do nothing would be inconceivable going forward.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- Money had been lost on a number of ideas including solar panels;
- There was a rise in land prices but there was a property bubble happening which might burst in a few years. There needed to be options to pull out of the deal at a later date;
- Opportunity Peterborough had been trying for a long time to create something on the site;
- The Council was being asked to make a decision on the partners without knowing who they were;
- Where was the source of funding coming from?
- Growth was not just about spending money and having funding arrangements. There needed to be opportunities for networking;

- Growth so far had been in housing on the periphery, which hadn't added much to the centre and it's vibrancy;
- There were interesting buildings within the city which made Peterborough what it was and these needed to be preserved;
- Consultation needed to be undertaken with the people of the city to ensure their input was taken on board;
- Investment of millions of pounds of Council funds needed to be undertaken prudently;
- This was the first project of its kind in the country and therefore Peterborough was effectively a guinea pig;
- Offshore funds where tax avoidance was an issue was going to be cracked down upon. If it was to be regulated in the UK, why did it need to be an offshore fund?
- There was a lack of transparency within the proposals;
- Peterborough was not a guinea pig with regards to this matter, but instead leading and breaking new ground;
- There were key sites worth £25-30m in the city and assurances needed to be provided around achieving value for money. There also needed to be clarity as to when there would be a return on investment;
- The scheme would save money, generate capital, increase income, would be subject to full scrutiny and be controlled under English law. The land would be independently valued. This was a visionary proposal;
- The question remained as to who the investors actually would be. There were therefore significant concerns regarding transparency;
- Growth, investment and regeneration were welcomed, but there were concerns relating to the partnership being 50:50. The Council only had a limited amount of money, would the Council therefore be an equal partner in realistic terms?
- The efficacy would be dealt with by the fund management and could be monitored closely by Members going forward by the usual scrutiny route;
- There was not an infinite amount of money around, and this was exactly why the Council needed to engage in the venture;
- The fund was based in Guernsey which was where most major investment was based;
- Identities of investors could not be revealed because there was no legal entity in existence at the time, until the decision had been made;
- The simple question was whether the Council wanted regeneration in the city; and
- The policy was about unlocking the value in property assets in the city.

Councillor Cereste summed up as mover of the recommendations, responded to issues raised by Members and provided a further overview of the Joint Venture, expanding on how it would work in the future and an overview of the benefits to the city.

A vote was taken (36 for, 10 against, 4 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council agree:

(numbering as per original Cabinet report)

- (6) Amendments to the Capital Strategy and Asset Management Plan as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy to be approved by Council to include the revised capital programme, the sites listed in this report on the asset disposal list and the approach to granting Option Agreements;
- (7) Amendment to the Treasury Management Strategy as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy to be approved by Council to allow the Council to elect to take the benefit of land transfers as units in the fund;

(8) Amendment of the Constitution 'Appointments to external organisations' to include the joint venture company and the Fund within the 'key partnerships category' to enable the Leader to appoint members to:

- a. the Board of the Joint Venture Company
- b. the Fund investment committee
- c. the Fund management board

Councillor Arculus requested that his vote be recorded in the minutes as being in favour of the recommendations.

(b) Budget 2014/15 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/2024

Cabinet at its meeting held 24 February 2014, received a report as part of the Council's agreed process for integrated finance and business planning. The purpose of the report was to recommend to Council the budget proposals for 2014/15 through to 2023/24, in line with the final local government finance settlement for 2014/15 and in advance of some Department for Education specific grants being finalised.

Members were advised that the full recommendations could be found within book two of the agenda and that an addendum document, containing further consultation responses, had been included within Members files for inspection.

Councillor Seaton introduced the Budget for 2014/15 and accompanying MTFS 2023/24, moving the recommendations as detailed within the Budget Book. He thanked everyone who had contributed to the development of the budget proposals and further highlighted; the evidence of success across the city; the opposition to certain areas contained within the budget and the balance against the need to achieve the required level of savings; the feedback received in relation to the Hydrotherapy pool and the support sought from the NHS; comments in relation to brown bin proposals and that the service would be kept under regular review; the 40% grant reduction due to occur in 2015/16; the responsibility of the Cabinet to deliver a balanced budget; the commitment to improving the city; prosperity, education and quality of life being at the centre of all decisions made by the Council; a vibrant arts and recreational scene being essential to the success of any great city and the ongoing support of the culture trust and vivacity; the responsibilities to the most vulnerable being taken extremely seriously and the number of schemes available such as Heataborough and the Green Scheme; Peterborough being the sixth lowest in the country for council tax and the proposal to freeze council tax for the next two years.

In summarising, Councillor Seaton stated that he believed that the budget proposed struck the right balance between supporting vulnerable people and minimising the impact on services, meeting the financial challenges, placing the Council on a sound financial footing going forward and improving the city for all residents. This was seconded by Councillor Elsey who reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor advised that an amendment to the budget proposals had been submitted by the Independent Forum (attached at **APPENDIX C** to these minutes). Councillor Harrington introduced the amendment and highlighted the main aspects which included the proposed retention of all Children's Centres but with a reduced grant; retention of the hydrotherapy centre and additional bus provision. A further overview of the proposed savings was provided including cutting Member's Special Responsibility allowances; cutting the AMEY budget for bedding plants and shrub maintenance in the city; to delay the Long Causeway development and a reduction in the communications budget. Councillor Harrington further expressed concern in relation to the list of assets targeted for disposal as detailed within the Capital Receipts summary, these included the farm estates and primary school land. There was also further concern that alternatives to Peterborough City Council's data storage had not be tabled, it was therefore requested that this be reviewed by the Sustainable Growth and

Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee prior to any proposals being progressed. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Murphy who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- The Children's Centres were being restructured, and the provision of services transformed, they were not being closed;
- The amendment failed to take into account the extra £10m received from Central Government for 2-4 year olds, which would be likely to increase by 50% in 2015;
- Taking 30% out of every Children's Centre for the first year, and a percentage each subsequent year, would run the risk of making them unviable;
- Delaying the Long Causeway project would have a detrimental impact on accessibility and mobility within the city;
- The amendment had been given to Members too late in the day to be seriously considered and aspects of it was poorly thought out;
- There were significant risks contained within the amendment and there were elements which needed further review;
- Details regarding the proposals for Brewster Avenue Children's Centre would be communicated to Members;
- The extra £10m Government funding had nothing to do with Children's Centres;
- The proposed sale of excess land around the schools would in no way affect the educational provision of children in the city;
- The proposals contained within the amendment would not give the certainty to local families that the original proposals within the budget did;
- The amendment document had been prepared in haste because the group of Members who had put it together had only met recently;
- The improvements already undertaken in the public realm had brought investment into the city, therefore delaying the refurbishment of Long Causeway would be detrimental to the long-term growth of the city and would negatively impact upon employment; and
- The amendment would force the Council to manage change in a much better and succinct way.

Councillor Murphy exercised his right to speak and in so doing advised that the amendment would enable the Children's Centres to remain open and the good work undertaken at the centres to continue. He further expressed his thanks to those who had been involved in the preparation of the alternative budget. He further stated that; the lack of consideration for the alternative budget reflected a lack of consideration of all other options; the funding for 2-4 year olds had nothing to do with the children's centres and was a separate issue; the children's centres were run by professionals and handing them over to other providers was risky; day centre provision and adult social care provision in the budget had also been poorly thought out.

Councillor Seaton exercised his right of reply as mover of the original motion and addressed a number of points raised by speakers on the amendment and on aspects of the amendment itself including; the lack of time available to consider the alternative budget presented; that the amendment in relation to Children's Centres ignored fixed costs, would not get past Ofsted and did not target the areas of greatest need; the long term issues which would be faced by the proposals; the regeneration needed in Long Causeway and the alternatives for data storage needed to be looked at, which would save money over time.

A recorded vote was taken on the budget amendment, as per recently circulated Government guidance which had suggested that all budget votes should be recorded votes. Members voted as follows:

Councillors For: Ash, Fletcher, Forbes, Harrington, Jamil, Khan, Knowles, Martin, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sharp, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester and Thulbourn.

Councillors Against: Allen, Arculus, Casey, Cereste, Dalton, Davidson, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fower, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Kreling, Lamb, Lee, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Stokes, Thacker and Walsh.

Councillors Abstaining: JR Fox, JA Fox, Lane, McKean and Miners.

Following the vote (15 For, 32 Against and 5 Abstentions) the budget amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Members were invited to debate the substantive motion and in summary raised points including:

- Despite concerns regarding the Children's Centres, there had been good communication with regards to the situation in Werrington South and some fears had been alleviated. The users of the hydrotherapy pool were now more reassured since the Leader had visited;
- The Council had overspent, increased Special Responsibility Allowances and invested in other areas of wasteful spending;
- Selling the Town Hall should be considered, as should alternative modes of transport and ceasing use of the Mayor's car;
- Peterborough used to be an area of low investment, Queensgate was on the verge of closing down and unemployment was rising. There were now two university campuses, all senior schools had been refurbished, 5,000 new primary school places had been created, 12,000 new jobs and 5,000 new houses had been built;
- Peterborough was the fastest growing city in the country and was in the top 50 for places to invest. The Council was delivering on its promises;
- There would be further cuts to come and it was important to manage the Council's finances effectively going forward;
- The Council needed the ability to generate its own funds;
- The Dementia Resource Centre was being delivered;
- The Town Hall should not be retained if the majority of staff were to be moved to a purpose built building. The Town Hall was expensive to run and not energy efficient;
- The communications budget should be reduced, as should excessive pay increases for senior officers, reducing Amey landscape and tree management budget, cutting special responsibility payments and grandiose redevelopments in the city centre;
- Council tax should be increased, at least to keep up with inflation;
- There would be more centrally imposed cuts going forward;
- There had been numerous comments from local residents in relation to the brown bin charge, which represented an effective increase in council tax;
- A private company would profit from the garden waste collected by the Council, this fact was likely to be unknown to most people;
- Pensioners would be the hardest hit in relation to the charge for brown bin collection;
- The brown bin charge for collection of garden waste was at odds with the Council's stated aim to make Peterborough an Environment Capital;
- The brown bin charge was optional, people would not have to pay if they did not use their bins;
- The responsibility of the administration was to set a balanced budget which best supported the residents of Peterborough. The Conservative administration had undertaken this year on year;
- Residents would start putting garden waste into landfill and could lead to additional costs in the long term for the Council;

- The Council had not built any new houses, but it was proposing extra money for bed and breakfast;
- There was good work being undertaken, for example stopping the use of agency staff; and
- Other councils were expected to be self-sufficient in future years.

Councillor Eley exercised his right of reply as seconder of the substantive motion and responded to points raised by Members during debate including; the brown bins not being paid for as a separate amount within council tax; council tax being only 20% of the funding coming into the council; the brown bin collection being a discretionary service; the garden waste being collected by a private company which meant that the waste did not go into landfill and therefore saving the Council significant landfill charges; there being 103 councils in the country which charged for a brown bin collection and out of the five council's aiming towards becoming an environment capital or something similar, four of those incorporated a charge for garden waste collection. In summarising, it was advised that the alternatives put forward by the opposition were not feasible and the budget was commended to Council.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the substantive motion, responded to a number of points and commended the budget to Council.

A recorded vote was taken and Members voted as follows:

Councillors For: Allen, Arculus, Casey, Cereste, Dalton, Day, Eley, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Kreling, Lamb, Lee, McKean, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Stokes, Thacker and Walsh.

Councillors Against: Ash, Davidson, Fletcher, Forbes, Fower, Harrington, Jamil, Khan, Knowles, Lane, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Sharp, Shaheed, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester and Thulbourn.

Councillors Abstaining: JR Fox and JA Fox.

Following the vote (29 For, 21 Against and 2 Abstentions) it was **RESOLVED** the Council approve the recommendations for the budget for 2014/15 and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to 2023/24 as below:

- a) The revenue budget for 2014/15 and the medium term financial strategy to 2023/24, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy;
- b) The capital programme for 2014/15 to 2023/24 and associated capital strategy, treasury management strategy and asset management plan;
- c) The council tax freeze in 2014/15 with indicative forecasts of a freeze in 2015/16 and indicative increases of 2.00% in 2016/17 to 2023/24 for planning purposes;
- d) The setting of fees and charges for 2014/15
- e) The reserves position;
- f) The council tax setting resolution as set out in appendix A of the budget book.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 11.00pm

FULL COUNCIL 5 MARCH 2014

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions have been received under the following categories:

<u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME</u>	
7.	<p><u>Questions with notice by members of the public</u></p> <p>None received.</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 Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement</p> <p>Many of the residents in my ward considered the 406 bus service a lifeline and are disappointed that this administration decided to cancel the support for it. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please tell me, since its demise, how many times the replacement service has been used and if possible how many times it has been used by residents living in the South Werrington and North Gunthorpe area?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>The changes to subsidised bus services were necessary given the very significant reduction in funding to the Council from Government. As part of the 2013/14 budget, Council agreed to cut the amount it spends on subsidising bus services from £1.1 million to £600,000 as part of the budget setting process. However, it would have cost up to £1.9 million per year to continue to operate all subsidised services as the Local Link Service was operating at a loss.</p> <p>The new services cover as much of the Peterborough area as possible and importantly, every resident has access to some form of public transport. It is also important to recognise that the majority of bus services were unaffected by these changes, as they are operated on a commercial basis rather than subsidised by the Council.</p> <p>The replacement services have been running since 1 October 2013 and we are collating detailed passenger information to inform a review of the new services to ensure they are giving the people of Peterborough the best possible service with the money that is available. We will share this information with Members when we have it put together.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>From my point of view as Ward Councillor in South Werrington and North Gunthorpe, myself and Councillor Davidson we have had a lot of responses from residents in that area who do feel that they have been significantly let down by the Council in regards to the decision to cut that particular service. I do recognise that the service was making a loss but if all things that were making a loss were ceased, then the Council would be in trouble. I recognise that there is going to be a review taking place and I wonder if the</p>

	<p>Leader of the Council could let us know in some detail as to when that information would be made available</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I would be delighted to share the information with Councillor Fower as soon as I have it.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement</p> <p>Fulbridge Road in Werrington has seen an increase in homeowners/occupants having more than one vehicle.</p> <p>Would it be possible to have restricted parking on Fulbridge Road introduced at peak times, as car owners are taking to parking cars on the road creating a bottle neck effect?</p> <p>There has also been a marked increase in cars parked on grass verges and pavements in this area. Is there anything the Council can do to prevent this from happening?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Officers have requested further details from Councillor Davidson of the location to assess the parking situation and any possible restrictions that may be required to improve the traffic flow.</p> <p>If there are parking restrictions such as double (or single) yellow lines present on the road then these markings also prohibit parking on adjoining footways and verges enabling the Council's enforcement officers to issue Penalty Charge Notices. The introduction of bollards to prohibit such parking is considered as a last resort as it detrimental to the visual amenity of area and conflicts with the desire to reduce street furniture.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I have had some feedback from the officers stating that they conducted a survey over a year ago. May I request that a new survey be conducted and carried out so that a more actual response can be taken from the over parking we are seeing on Fulbridge Road, and not just Fulbridge Road, but other areas of Werrington too.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I will consult with my officers to find out whether that is possible.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Waste Management</p> <p>A couple of years ago, a general waste bin was located at the bottom of the steps, leading up to the bus stop, just after the underpass leading from Carron Drive through to Dukesmead. This, subsequently disappeared, although you can still see it on google maps! Since then both Councillor Davidson and myself have been asking for a replacement, at one point Enterprise quoted us a verbal cost of £800 for the work, could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me if they consider this amount to be a fair costing of such work and whether they will now work to help local resident get this bin reinstated?</p>

	<p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>As Councillor Fower may recall, the request for a bin in this location was previously reviewed and rejected on 22 May 2012, when it was identified that there was already a post mounted bin on the path down to the underpass from Helmsdale Gardens and two pavement mounted bins, one at each of the bus stops either side of Lincoln Road. All of these are emptied twice weekly as standard and more frequently if this becomes necessary.</p> <p>I have been advised however that the bus stop is not directly serviced and that the nearest bin is c60 metres away so I can confirm that I am prepared to review the position again. In the event that the case can be made, the cost to install the bin would be £315 in line with the contract price, not £800.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I welcome the news that you will be willing to review it, however the figure of £315 does seem rather excessive and I wondered what your view was on that?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>My thoughts on it are, that is how much it costs to buy and site a bin and that's how much it is. So my views are irrelevant really.</p>
9.	<p><u>Questions with notice by Members to Council representatives of the Fire Authority and Police and Crime Panel</u></p>
	<p>None received.</p>

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

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

1. **Question from Councillor Shearman**

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

The mural on Bridge House was removed and placed in storage in May 2012. A planning officer said at the time... 'the search for a new home is on-going and we will continue to be looking at a number of options'.

Could the Cabinet Member let me know how close we are to finding a new home for the mural?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The sculptured façade (bas-relief) of part of the western elevation to the former Bridge House building (former offices of Mitchell Engineering Ltd.) is conserved and in secure storage. A wonderful piece of architecture that should be preserved in Peterborough.

The aim is to re-erect the mural as part of the future redevelopment of the Fletton Quays site (South Bank). This will retain its association with the site and likely give the best opportunity to appreciate the work in the public realm. The ideal location would be to erect the mural close to its original position to be viewed from Town Bridge and this option will be encouraged in bringing forward the Fletton Quays regeneration scheme.

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

Can the Leader give some indication of when we might see the mural on display in the public place?

Councillor Cereste responded:

I am assuming that if the first major building goes onto the Riverside it's unlikely to start work within 18 months, it's likely to be 18 months before we break ground, subject to everything being approved this evening. Once that is done, it may take a year or so for the first building to go up and if that building happens to be by the side of the Town Bridge I will try and encourage the developers to include the mural in that building so the whole city can see it. So two and half years to three years before we are actually going to see it in place.

2. **Question from Councillor Fower**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

Could the relevant Cabinet Member please tell me how much money the Council has spent on advertising, promotion or marketing through local media e.g. newspapers, magazines, websites and radio, during the financial year 2013/14 and could you break this down by company and how much each received please?

Councillor Seaton responded:

Last year the Council spent £151,915.48 on advertising, promotion or marketing. £80,000 of that was statutory notices, we recover the cost of many of these from utility companies so the net spend is much lower.

£14,000 was spent on Adoption & Fostering; £10,000 for Local Link; £10,000 on Collective Switching; £7,500 on the Great Eastern Run; £7,000 on other City Centre events and £3,500 each on Public Health, Environment Capital, Social Care to give the main examples. There are 30 other suppliers on the list and I would be happy to supply a full breakdown in writing to Councillor Fower.

Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:

I would ask if Councillor Seaton would be kind enough to not only share that with myself but also with other Members?

Councillor Seaton responded:

Yes, I am happy to do so.

3. **Question from Councillor Davidson**

To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Caseloads for Social Workers is supposed to be 17 whereas currently some social workers have between 25 and 33 cases?

Could the Cabinet Member for Children's Services tell me what is being done to ensure that social worker caseloads do not become excessive, considering the possible impacts that could have on the quality of care they are able to provide to the families.

Councillor Scott responded:

There are greater challenges for my department now than there has ever been due to the increasing complexity of many cases and therefore the cases need to be open for longer, which does have an impact on caseloads and there has been some extra pressure on social workers.

The service strives for an average of 17 – 20 children per social worker. This may vary according to the complexity of the work involved and the number of children in the family. It is not unusual to have sibling groups of 5 or more children.

The average case load in the service is 20 children.

Some social workers will have more or less cases depending upon their experience and skills. Some social workers have children on their caseload where they are working with one child in the family and that child has a high number of siblings. All children in the family are opened as cases.

We constantly monitor caseloads through supervision and performance meetings to ensure that social workers provide a qualitative service.

Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:

What additional resources are provided to social workers and how are they prioritising other caseloads, how do they balance their cases that are not deemed as a priority or

	<p>cases that are going to court?</p> <p>Councillor Scott responded:</p> <p>That is an operational question which I will happily get a Director to respond to, however I want to say to you that one of the key drivers in the department is to make sure that cases that are finished, are closed, so that is one way of taking the pressure off the social workers. These are skilled social workers, particularly the more experienced ones and they are good at prioritising their work, however if you want to I will arrange a meeting for you with the Director to just go through the support that is available to social workers through mentoring, through supervision to help them to achieve the outcomes that you are identifying.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement</p> <p>Could the Leader of the Council tell me what increases in salary are being paid or are planned to be paid to each of the Directors and Executive Directors of the Council as a result of the senior management restructuring and/or the review of senior officer pay scales and salaries? And can he also tell us when and where this information will be published so that members of the public can see how their council tax payments are being spent?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>You will be aware that Employment Committee have approved the implementation of the revised Senior Officer pay scales and have also approved the job descriptions for the Directors under the Chief Executive's proposed restructure. The restructure means that some Directors have gone completely, those posts have been deleted and there is a saving of nearly £700k within that executive management team. We must also remember that all of the senior directors are doing different jobs and the workload that did belong to other directors that were working for us in the past have been spread around and things have been reorganised.</p> <p>Employment Committee subsequently met to decide on the salaries for the Chief Executive and Directors, as the determination of salaries at this level is a matter for Employment Committee to decide.</p> <p>As the change is a variation to the employee's contract of employment, we are currently waiting for confirmation of acceptance from all the Officers involved, who under the restructure have the right to appeal the outcome of Employment Committee's decision.</p> <p>Once confirmation has been received from all of those Officers, which is not the case to date, publication will follow and the information will be placed on the council's website as a matter of public record.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Would Councillor Cereste agree with me that the fact we are missing such relevant data regarding salaries that the concept of agreeing a budget is borderline nonsensical because how can someone truly understand what they are voting on and agreeing to when the data is literally not there. Are there any senior officers that have requested backdating of their pay?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p>

	<p>Could Councillor Fower explain what it is that he has just asked me?</p> <p>Councillor Fower responded:</p> <p>I can ask another question, are there any senior officers that have requested backdating of their pay?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I need to ask legal advice as to whether I am allowed to speak about anybody's specific position within this authority until such time as everything has been agreed.</p> <p>The Legal Officer responded:</p> <p>I think you have already responded to that in the substantive answer you have given that because this affects employment contracts and those matters are confidential until the matters are settled you're not entitled to discuss them, however there is transparency around senior officer pay and all of that will be published in due course.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement</p> <p>The Council proposals, in relation to the development of Bourges Boulevard, to plant trees to improve the look between Crescent Bridge and the fire station has developed an issue due to the fact that there is a sewage pipe 1.4 metres in diameter running along the proposed tree line development. Can the Cabinet Member please explain as to why this was not picked at the stage of initial planning?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>It has always been recognised that this section of Bourges Boulevard would have a number of utility services beneath it, which may need to be accommodated within the scheme. There is a sewer pipe, 1.4 metres wide, that crosses the proposed tree lined widened central reservation at one point, however due to a new pedestrian crossing facility and junction located here also, in itself this will have a minimal impact on the proposed trees at this point. As with any project we are working with the utility companies to accommodate all features within the overall scheme design.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson did not have a supplementary question.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Shearman</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion, Safety and Public Health</p> <p>Operation Can-Do was launched in September 2011 as an 'exciting and ambitious long term initiative' whose vision was to 'improve the quality of life of people living and working in the Gladstone, Millfield and New England areas'.</p> <p>We are now approaching the end of phase two and although some notable successes have been recorded, e.g. the introduction and successful implementation of the Cumulative Impact Policy, numerous successful operations by the police and our enforcement officers, and the transformation of Victoria Gardens, the two key planned outcomes which provide the strategic underpinning of Operation Can-do ('A master plan</p>

to maximise opportunities for growth and regeneration' and 'Integrated plans to maximise economic growth to develop the area as a place people choose to live and work') have, as far as I am aware, not been completed.

Bearing in mind Operation Can-Do was built on the success of the hugely successful police operation entitled Op Steam 2, has Operation Can-Do itself now run out of steam?

Councillor Walsh responded:

Operation Can-Do was launched in response to heightened community tensions and in recognition of steady decline in the Gladstone, Millfield and New England areas. The Council, with our Police partners, initiated the operation and committed to a minimum 10 year programme, beginning with addressing the 'here and now' problems, moving through to more strategic and longer term projects and improvements. Reported crime and ASB is improving faster in this area than anywhere else in Peterborough, and quality of life, as measured by a range of indicators, is also improving. This way of working, i.e. The Microbeat Model, which is delivering proven positive outcomes is now being rolled out to other areas of the city, namely the Ortons and the West Town.

Although much work has been done to consider longer term regeneration strategies for the area, these have not yet been developed. For these to be meaningful it is essential that they are developed in close consultation and cooperation with the community. Officers continue to work with the local community board to help them to develop their skills and capacity in order to begin the development of these longer term strategies. In fact, I understand that a bid is currently under consideration with respect to the management of the Gladstone Park Community Centre.

The economic development of the area, especially the business area along Lincoln Road, is also an important part of the Operation, and we hope to secure EU funding via our Local Enterprise Partnership to develop an economically focussed economic renewal programme.

All in all I would say that Operation Can-Do is alive and well and far from running out of steam.

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

I acknowledge that there has been a great deal of good undertaken in that area and I do link some of the achievements, but I am still concerned that those building blocks of long term strategy aren't really in place yet and here we are at the end of phase 2 of the project. It does seem to me and many other people in the Can-Do area, and also shared with a number of Councillors, that the Can-Do Board is actually the organisation that is causing a blockage for the real development of the Can-Do ideals. I believe and others do that the Board is dysfunctional and actually inhibiting progress on the planned outcomes and I would also like to ask you would you look at the composition of the Board, because I don't think it is right that four members of the same extended family should be members of the Board, by doing that they are not reflecting the whole of the community.

Councillor Walsh responded:

Yes I will look into that further and I will look at the composition of the Board and if indeed there are blockages they do need to be unblocked.

COUNCIL MEETING 5th MARCH 2014

BUDGET AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

Amendment to be moved by Independent Forum as follows:

The motion is that that the proposed budget as set out in the budget papers be amended by the updates in sections 1-3 of this motion, plus the relevant appendices.

The updated recommendations to Council are as follows (with changes highlighted in italics):

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S
FROM : Executive Director - Resources
<p>That Council is recommended to approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The revenue budget for 2014/15 and the medium term financial strategy to 2023/24, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy, <i>including the updates from the alternative budget proposal</i> b) The capital programme for 2014/15 to 2023/24 and associated capital strategy, treasury management strategy and asset management plan, <i>including the updates from the alternative budget proposal</i>; c) The council tax freeze in 2014/15 with indicative forecasts of a freeze in 2015/16 and indicative increases of 2.00% in 2016/17 to 2023/24 for planning purposes; d) The setting of fees and charges for 2014/15 e) The reserves position f) The council tax setting resolution as set out in appendix A; g) <i>That Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee reviews proposals for moving to an externally hosted data centre, which currently has funding in the 2014/15 capital programme of £1.35m, plus on-going revenue costs of £250k per annum</i>

The formal Council tax resolution is unchanged by this amendment, and remains as per the Council papers.

1. Revenue Budget Amendments:

The following revenue budget amendments are proposed:

Description	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k	2017/18 & beyond £k
Extra Costs				
Retain Hydro-therapy centre	45	45	45	45
Remove current Childrens centre savings	931	1,181	1,181	1,181
Fund additional bus services				
Parish Councils could bid for additional bus services, run by current providers, for their parishioners.	40	40	40	40
Total extra costs to be funded by savings	1,016	1,266	1,266	1,266
Savings				
Revised Childrens centre savings				
Reduction in funding to providers of a third, equally applied across all centres (see appendix 1)	-853	-853	-853	-853
Savings from AMEY Budget (Bedding cut 30%)	-7	-7	-7	-7
Savings from AMEY Budget (10% reduction in shrub maintenance.)	-20	-20	-20	-20
Long Causeway - delay 2 years (see capital amendments in section 2 below)	-45	-130	-85	0
Member Special Responsibility allowances				
20% reduction in all SRA's (Cabinet, Cabinet adviser and Committee chairs). Specific proposals will be brought forward to the next Council meeting on April 16 th . This will require the support of 12 Members, as a Council decision on allowances has been made within the last 6 months. As such the first years saving is reduced to take account of this.	-41	-46	-46	-46
Reduce communications budget				
Cut the remaining edition of "Your Peterborough" and the council tax leaflet plus a post in communication	-50	-50	-50	-50
Total saved	-1,016	-1,106	-1,061	-976
Net Impact on Budget – extra costs	0	160	205	290
Additional childrens centres proposals				
Savings to be increased from £0.853m to £1.028m in 2015/16 and £1.154m in 2016/17 (see appendix 1). Further work would be needed to assess the proposal		-175	-301	-301
Overall impact on Budget	0	-15	-96	-11

The full ten year position is included in appendix 2.

2. Capital Budget Amendments:

2.1 The following Capital programme amendments are proposed:

Description	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k	2017/18 and beyond £k
Delay Long Causeway project to 2016/17	-2,000	0	2,000	0
Net Impact on Capital Budget	-2,000	0	2,000	0
Revenue impact of capital changes (transferred to revenue amendments above)	45	130	85	0

2.2 The Peterborough Independents consider a review of the planned expenditure on the proposed ICT data storage system is required. They consider it is sensible to delay expenditure on this programme to review options. However, in the time available, the Peterborough Independents had to give regard to officer advice that the capital expenditure of £1.35 million cannot be removed from the budget. Instead we recommend a full scrutiny of the figures and a review of need before starting the procurement process.

This recommendation is made because:

- Alternative solutions for Peterborough City Council's data storage have not been tabled.
- The forecasted £1.35 million capital spend on the programme is open to question.
- Councils have a duty to seek good value for money and assess need before proceeding with any capital programme.

Therefore it is recommended that Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee reviews proposals for moving to an externally hosted data centre, which currently has funding in the 2014/15 capital programme of £1.35m, plus on-going revenue costs of £250k per annum

3. Impact on the Overall Budget:

	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k	2017/18 £k	2018/19 £k
Current MTFS 'Bottom line'	0	17,603	22,236	23,593	26,107
Net impact of alternative budget amendments	0	-15	-96	-11	-11
Revised Surplus (+) / Deficit (-)	0	17,588	22,140	23,582	26,096

The full ten year position is included in appendix 3.

Appendices:

1. Childrens Centres proposal, plus Director advice
2. 10 year MTFS figures for amendments
3. Impact in overall MTFS

Childrens Centres

Proposal by the Independent Group

In 2014/15 reduce provision to all centres by 33%, and then reduce provision by a further 20.5% in 2015/16. Finally reduce provision by a further 11% in 2016/17. Children's Centres would continue to receive a grant at this level in further years. It is up to centres to decide how to operate at this level. All centres would have the opportunity to remain open and to find the necessary cuts. Centres could share resources and possibly staff in order to economise. Co-operation between centres could improve the level of security for children centre funding. Furthermore this will result in fewer redundancies than the current plans. We propose each local centre would also work with the local community and formulate a plan to increase their provision with alternative funding.

Looking at the figures from 2012 - which were the only figures the financial department could release for the Independents to consider - there are areas for significant efficiencies. We trust that each centre would be happy to use our reduced budgets in order to ensure that no centres are closed and each community retains its local provision. Local provision will also prevent unknown hidden costs impacting upon proposed savings of £931 and £1181. (Eg. Under disability act - the current plans may be liable to provide transport for people with disabilities)

Commentary from Director of Communities

The budget information shared with the working group for children' centres were budgeted costs as at February 2012 prior to the service being outsourced to Spurgeons and Barnardos. At the time of transfer, the budget was reduced (by 7%) so spend would have been less but equally the two organisations would have changed their spending patterns so it's no longer applicable to target cuts at particular spend headings. Therefore an expected delivery against subjective headings such as stationary, printing etc. cannot be assumed.

In addition, a significant element of the costs for running the centres are fixed and the savings will not be proportional in relation to reduced opening hours i.e. rates bill is fixed and will be consistent regardless of opening hours.

Any reduction in hours will need to be negotiated with the service provider and they may not be agreeable to this change or may generate more costs e.g. redundancies.

Further salami cuts of the budget of this service will simply lead to an accelerated degradation of service delivery. The process currently underway to review using the existing buildings and still providing a range of services will probably be more effective than a further universal cut on services. The saving also increases in 2015/16 and 2016/17 in the proposal, and further slicing of service will mean we are unlikely to meet the requirements of operating as a children centre under the revised Ofsted framework.

At this late stage, it is not possible to accurately review the change in service that will be forthcoming as this could take several weeks and therefore the risks of this approach are significant.

Appendix 3

Overall Impact on MTFS

	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k	2017/18 £k	2018/19 £k	2018/19 £k	2019/20 £k	2020/21 £k	2022/23 £k	2023/24 £k
Current MTFS Deficit	0	17,603	22,236	23,593	26,107	28,610	30,675	32,131	30,597	34,705
Net impact of alternative budget amendments	0	-15	-96	-11	-11	-11	-11	-11	-11	-11
Revised Deficit	0	17,588	22,140	23,582	26,096	28,599	30,664	32,120	30,586	34,694