

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 13 JULY 2016
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Sims, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh, and Whitby

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Azher Iqbal, and Serluca.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Hiller and Councillor Holdich declared an interest in item 11, 'Questions on the Executive Decisions made since the last meeting', in relation to the decision 'Council Office Consolidation', in that they both sat on the Peterborough Investment Partnership. It was advised that Councillor Seaton would respond to questions on this matter.

The question of whether Councillors in line for a prospective Chairmanship would be permitted to vote on the matter was raised, in light of the allowances provided to Chairman. The Legal Officer advised that the decision before Council was in relation to appointments to Chair, not allowances. As such, all Members were entitled to vote.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on:

(a) 23 May 2016 – Annual Council Mayor Making

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2016 – Annual Council Mayor Making were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the amendments:

- Reference to Jackie Martin be corrected to Janet Martin; and
- Reference to Jackie Martin as Deputy Mayoress be corrected to Mayoress.

(b) 23 May 2016 – Annual Council

The minutes of the meeting held 23 May 2016 – Annual Council were approved as a true and accurate record.

(c) 27 June 2016 – Extraordinary Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 June 2016 – Extraordinary Meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

4. Mayor's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Mayor.

Councillor Shearman thanked the Mayor for his attendance at the Victoria Gardens event.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

There were no questions with notice from members of the public.

8. Petitions

(a) Presented by members of the public

There were no petitions from members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

Councillor JR Fox presented a petition signed by 56 residents concerning the need for tree pruning in Livermore Green.

Councillor Shearman presented a petition signed by 32 residents concerning noise and anti-social behaviour in Century Square.

Councillor Murphy presented a petition signed by 55 residents concerning parking problems in the Deaconscroft area.

9. Questions on Notice

(a) To the Mayor

(b) To the Leader or member of the Cabinet

(c) To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee

Questions (b) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. The installation of a digital real time information sign at the bus stop adjacent to Voyager School.
2. The Council's strategies, interventions and provisions for meeting the needs of children and young people.
3. The replacement of street lamp posts with energy efficient LEP lamps.
4. The mix of cyclists and pedestrians along the Long Causeway / Bridge Street corridor.

The questions and responses are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

10. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Future Delivery of Property Services – Constitution Amendment

Cabinet at its meeting on 21 March 2016, received a report on the future delivery of property services. The purpose of the report was to formally establish a joint venture property services company with NPS Property Consultants Ltd (NPS), following approval of the Phase One Budget Proposals by Council on 17 December 2017.

Cabinet approved the proposal to formally establish the joint venture company, and endorsed the recommendation that Council amend the Constitution 'Appointments to external organisations' to include the joint venture company within the key partnerships category to enable the Leader to make appointments to the governing body.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. It was emphasised that the recommendation before Council related only the amendment of the constitution and that the establishment of the joint venture company had been agreed by Cabinet.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- It was queried where the savings in relation to the joint venture company were coming from;
- Clarification was sought on whether the joint venture company would be able to build houses.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak as seconder of the recommendations and advised that, as the motion was a simple amendment to the constitution, he was happy to support it.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendations and stated that building houses was not the purpose of the joint venture company. The savings arising from the joint venture had been, it was explained, discussed at the budget working group. Reports in relation to the joint venture company would be brought for scrutiny.

A vote was taken (37 for, 0 against, 27 abstention) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed amendments to the Constitution 'Appointments to external organisations' to include the joint venture company within the key partnerships category to enable the Leader to make appointment to the governing body.

11. Questions on the Executive Decisions made since the last meeting

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed executive decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 7 March 2016;
2. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 21 March 2016;
3. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 13 June 2016;
4. Decisions from the Extraordinary Cabinet Meeting held on 27 June 2016;
5. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had been invoked once since the previous meeting;
6. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had been invoked once since the previous meeting; and
7. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 18 March 2016 to 27 June

2016.

Questions were asked about the following:

Council Office Consolidation

Councillor Sandford questioned how much the proposed 'petition' of the Town Hall in order to retain part of it for Council use would cost.

Councillor Seaton advised that he could not recall the precise cost, but that the figures had been duly examined by the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee at its call-in meeting. The exact cost could be circulated in due course. Councillors were urged to focus on the benefits the offices would provide.

Councillor Ash sought clarification on whether any services would remain at the Town Hall for the public. Councillor Seaton advised that the customer service centre would be moved to the Town Hall site.

Councillor Fower raised a query over the logistics of formal meetings being held in the Town Hall, while officers were elsewhere, and whether this would hinder the running meetings. Councillor Seaton advised that the Democratic Services team would remain at the Town Hall and that it was not envisioned that the running of meetings would be negatively impacted.

Councillor Davidson questioned whether, alongside the office consolidation, a more paper free way of working was to be implemented. Councillor Seaton agreed that the Council should be moving towards paperless working as soon as it was able.

Future Delivery of Property Services

Councillor Murphy raised a question in relation to the Cabinet Member Decision Notice, which was published on 8 July 2016 and why the decision was exempt from the call-in process under special urgency procedures.

Councillor Seaton advised that the NPS proposals had been discussed within the Budget, and that this decision needed implementation by 8 July 2016, via the formation of a company. In order to do this, a notice of change was required. This notice of change was not formalised until 8 July 2016. None of that changed the original decision.

Alternative Governance Arrangements - Executive Procedure Rules

Councillor Sandford requested clarification on what the overall cost had been to the Council of investigating Alternative Governance Arrangements, for those proposals to be then thrown out.

Councillor Holdich advised that he was not aware of the amount. The decision on alternative governance was open to debate and it had been agreed to go down a different path, as it was thought to be the most sensible.

MAY16/CMDN/29 – Expansion by One Form of Entry to Jack Hunt Secondary School

Councillor Ash sought assurances that due consideration had been given to the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) aspects of the build and that the works would be properly undertaken.

Councillor Holdich advised that the expansion was being undertaken and funded by the Council. The planning proposals for the expansion would be considered by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee in due course.

Councillor Murphy questioned why the decision had been taken in May, when the new Ward Councillors had not yet been sworn in.

Councillor Holdich advised that the initial timeline had intended for the application to go to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee in June. As a result of the comments of

both old and new Councillors being considered within the application, that decision of the Committee had been delayed.

MAY16/CMDN/31 – Authorisation to Make a Compensation Payment Following Resolution of Stage 3 Complaint

Councillor Shearman sought confirmation that all the appropriate lessons had been learnt following the complaint. Councillor Holdich assured Members that this was the case.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

12. Motions on Notice

1. Motion from Councillor John Fox

Requests that Council look into the history of the doorway in Long Causeway, which I believe is still the same doorway that originally lead into the Army recruiting office for WW1.

Many people from Peterborough and the surrounding areas would have walked through this doorway to enlist to fight in the Great War and sadly many never returned.

Requests that Council liaise with the owners and gives consideration to erecting a plaque and placing some suitable artwork at the site in order to recognise the significance of this feature in the city and to promote its importance to residents and visitors.

In moving his motion, Councillor JR Fox credited a Stanground resident for initially coming up with the proposal in 2011. It was considered a shame that the proposal was not in time to commemorate the centenary of the Battle of the Somme.

Councillor Bull seconded the motion and commended the proposals, believing that the were overdue. It was considered that the occupiers of the property would be willing to work with the Council in relation to the proposals.

Members debated the motion and sought assurance that the proposals would not glorify war.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

2. Motion from Councillor Ed Murphy

Council notes difficulties, obstruction, inconvenience and cases of damage because of vehicles parked on pavements and verges.

Council believes that inconvenience caused to residents and pedestrians and damage being caused to verges can be mitigated by introducing regulations to prohibit parking on pavements and by protecting verges.

Council instructs the administration, or the Corporate Director Growth and Regeneration, to prohibit vehicles parking on pavements, to introduce some designated parking sections and to protect verges throughout the authority's area.

In moving his motion, Councillor Murphy advised that the motion centred around improving the ability of disabled pathway users to properly utilise the city's footpaths. The Government had drawn attention to the availability of these powers. It was not proposed to make any blanket proposals. If the motion was agreed, it would enable to

the Council and the Police to enforce against those drivers parking on pavements more easily.

Councillor Ferris seconded the motion and advised that vehicles parking on pavements inhibited the independence of a lot of residents, including those with impaired sight and wheelchair users. The motion was not considered to be radical, but to represent a common sense approach to a regular problem. It was noted that the transport hierarchy put pedestrians first, which was not currently the case in practice.

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Walsh. Councillor Walsh advised that the problem of parking on pavements was a serious concern. It was believed, however, that consideration needed to be given to the viability and cost factors of the proposal. Work had previously been undertaken around this matter, including the work of Councillor Peach and the Grass Verges Working Group. A measured review of the situation was needed to established how best to use resources to tackle the problem.

Councillor Peach seconded the amendment to the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- It was considered that definitive action was needed to address the problems caused by vehicles obstructing pathways.
- Concern was raised that reconvening the Grass Verges Working Group would detract from the city wide problem.
- Reference was made to previous parking bans in the the Dogsthorpe area, which was never rolled out to other areas.
- It was noted that some streets had a lack of off street parking, which meant that residents had to park on the pathway in order to avoid obstructing the road. As such, it was suggested any blanket ban would be inappropriate.
- Dissatisfaction was expressed at the open ended nature of the amendment. It was believed that a commitment should be made.
- It was noted that there was no 'one size fits all' solution that could be applied to the whole of the city.
- It was suggested that the proposed amendments provided an opportunity for more flexible solutions.
- Comment was made that the previous recommendations of the Grass Verge Working Group were not useful and that any proposals coming from a new group should be progress quickly.

Councillor Peach exercised his right to speak and advised that he agreed with the intent behind the original motion. It was believed, however, that a more considered approach was required to established what action was appropriate on a street by street basis.

Councillor Murphy, as mover of the original motion and advised that the amendment proposed would mean little action was carried out in practice. It was considered that the original motion would allow for individual streets to be examined.

A vote was taken (40 voted in favour, 18 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

Members debated the substantive motion and in summary raised points including:

- Members were trusting that the commitment to the proposals would be maintained.
- It was noted that no particular timescale had been discussed and it was wished that action could be taken as soon as possible.

Councillor Murphy summed up as mover of the motion and advised that, as amended, there was a danger that nothing would happen. It was hoped that the proposals were put in place and enforced properly.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion (43 voting in favour, 0 voting against, 15 abstaining from voting) and the substantive motion was **CARRIED** with the amendment as follows:

Council notes difficulties, obstruction, inconvenience and cases of damage because of vehicles parked on pavements and verges.

Council believes that inconvenience caused to residents and pedestrians and damage being caused to verges can be mitigated by introducing regulations to prohibit parking on pavements and by protecting verges.

*~~Council instructs~~ **Building on the work already instigated by Councillor Peach, the Council agrees to reconvene the Verge Parking Action Group to review the areas affected by damage from verge parking. The Group will report its findings into the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital scrutiny committee which can recommend to the administration or the Corporate Director Growth and Regeneration, whether to prohibit vehicles parking on pavements, or to introduce some designated parking sections and to protect verges throughout the authority area.***

3. Motion from Councillor Richard Ferris

This Council notes with concern, the recent increase in incidents of racial harassment and abuse, both during the campaign and following the EU Referendum decision, both here in Peterborough and across the country.

We condemn this behaviour as completely unacceptable and contrary to the principles upon which the Council is founded.

We pledge to recommit our efforts to combat prejudice in all its forms, including racism and xenophobia, and call upon this Council to:

- i. Issue a cross party, clear, unequivocal and public statement of support for all communities who call Peterborough their home and for this message to appear prominently on the Council's website;*
- ii. Revise, implement and monitor the effectiveness of the current Safer Peterborough Partnership action plan for tackling hate crime in order to improve support; and*
- iii. Establish a room at Bayard Place, a place of safety, where individuals can report hate crime in confidence and receive any advice and guidance they may need.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Ferris reiterated the sentiments of the motion and thanked Councillor Walsh for her previous statement on the matter. According to figures from the metropolitan police three hate crimes had taken place every hour since the referendum results, an increase of 42% on last year's June figure. The Council needed to work hard to encourage people to come forward and report hate crimes. There was no clear campaign identifiable on the Council website, and it was believed that the Council should sent out a clear message. A physical space was also suggested with a public statement from all parties.

Councillor Ali seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Councillor Walsh had provided a statement already on the Council website, as well as a number of local media outlets.
- It was believed that the police reaction to the increase in hate crime had been swift.
- The Safer Peterborough Partnership were expecting to receive a report following the motion on the resulting actions.
- The current best practice was for individuals wishing to report hate crime to be guided to a suitable room for advice.
- The action from the motion was already being undertaken in the main, however, further support would underpin this.
- The motion was supported and provided an opportunity to highlight the strong links the Council had with communities.
- Abuse in all its forms, including racism, xenophobia, LGBT+ abuse, disability, and misogyny were condemned.
- It was believed to be important to have a clear, positive statement from the Council as a whole.
- It was noted that Peterborough was a success story for multi-culturalism and that all communities should feel safe where they live.
- Reference was made to past attempts by the English Defence League to protest in the city, which was met with a united front. The same should be done now.
- It was suggested that this matter could be scrutinised by the Police Crime Panel.
- The difference between a hate crime and a hate incident was highlighted, and that both could be reported.
- It was suggested that the Council work with local places of worship in order to stamp down on instances of hate.

Councillor Ali exercised his right to speak and stated that it was heartening to hear the responses from fellow Councillors. It was noted that often residents felt unwanted, which was not recorded. Elected Members had a responsibility to address these issues and to ensure residents felt welcomed. Sustained and effective efforts were required

Councillor Ferris summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the motion was not party political. Any statement from the Council would be on a united front and could be distributed out to the communities. Genuine action was needed through the Safer Peterborough Partnership to increase its visibility. All those Members who could attend community events were encouraged to do so.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

13. Reports to Council

(a) Report of the Committee Review Group

Council received a report from the Committee Review Group that sought approval of recommended changes to Regulatory Committees, following a first stage review. Councillor Hiller moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Seaton, who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

Employee Appeals Sub Committee

- Mixed views were expressed on in relation to the Sub Committee proposals. It was though that Council employees should feel they were being heard by an independent Councillor rather than a Council officer and due to this one element some members could not support the motion.
- An alternative view was suggested that employees should be heard by those with legal experience of employment law and would be better served if heard by senior Council officers assisted by legal officers which would offer the best protection for employees, the Council, and Members. Members noted that across all departments there were legal advisors who were called upon to assist both officers and Members if necessary.
- Some employees were intimidated by attending a tribunal which would also be attended by the Member on behalf of the council.
- It was questioned whether the trade union had been consulted of the proposed changes.
- It was questioned whether, as Members are part of the corporate body of the Council, they were actually impartial at hearings. It was suggested that staff would be better off at an independent tribunal, as exists in industry.
- Laws were in place to protect employees from unfair dismissal. It was suggested that it would be better to leave HR officers to rely on these laws and members not get involved.
- There were very few cases where intervention was needed.
- Members were not trained to deal with the often distressing emotional element of appeals.
- It was also noted the difficulty in convening meetings.

Corporate Parenting

- By default all Elected Councillors were corporate parents, a responsibility from which they are unable to resign. This panel had traditionally been made up as a cross party group with Members with specific interests in matters around children.
- Concern was raised that there was no mention within the report of consultation with Foster Carers, Adoption Panel, Youth Council or regular attendees of the Corporate Parenting Group.
- Not all Members were in favour of an allowance for the Chair of the Corporate Parenting Committee, as there were already dedicated professionals in place to support the very small percentage of children who need support. It was advised that there was no budget for this post this year and this would remain until at least April 2017.
- The working group only consisted of two regular attendees of the Corporate Parenting Panel.
- The most recent Ofsted report had been fully investigated by Members with various interests, changes had been implemented. It was therefore suggested that a review of the Corporate Parenting arrangements was not necessary.
- An opposing view was made with the reading of part of the Ofsted report and specific mention was made to the comments that the Corporate Parenting Panel was not developed and needed to be more ambitious, and challenging for young people and there must be a more robust approach. Members felt that as there had been little improvement over the last ten years the proposed changes were deemed necessary in order to achieve an improved Ofsted report in the future.
- The existing Corporate Parenting Panel members were invited to attend future meetings together with foster parents and children whose views needed to be taken on board, and to this end it was suggested that meetings finish no later than 8pm.
- It was considered that both lay people and professionals should be included in Corporate Parenting discussions.

Councillor Seaton exercised his right to speak and advised that this was an important responsibility and it was the Chair of the Employment Committee who attended Court to defend the legal aspects of the decision. Therefore a lot of training and refresher courses were required for very few cases. Any mistakes could be both distressing to all concerned and costly to the Council. Councillor Seaton made reference to the considerable legal experience of an earlier speaker and suggested this should not be ignored.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the motion and advised that recommendation six was the only area he wished to speak upon and he firmly believed employees and the Council were best served by qualified and accountable people. It was considered that comparisons between other departments requiring legal advice was inappropriate as a comparison.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council note the stage 1 report of the Committee Review Group.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council establish the Appeals and Planning Review Committee and agree the terms of reference.

A vote was taken (34 voting in favour, 23 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council establish the Corporate Parenting Committee and agree the terms of reference.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** for the Corporate Parenting Committee and Appeals and Planning Review Committee that the Council:

1. Agree that both committees should each have a membership of 11 and should be subject to the political balance arrangements;
2. Agree the appointments to those committees;
3. Elect Councillor Elsey as Chair and Councillor Holdich as Vice-Chair for the Appeals and Planning Review Committee; and
4. Elect Councillor Bisby as Chair and Councillor Saltmarsh as Vice-Chair for the Corporate Parenting Committee.

A vote was taken (34 voting in favour, 20 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

1. The Employee Appeals Sub-Committee should no longer hear appeals against dismissal by staff below Deputy Chief Officer level, that this function be delegated to Officers and the Employment Committee should be asked to review the employment policy; and
2. The Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary changes to the Constitution and request the Employment Committee to review the employment policy to effect the Council's decision.

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

1. Authorise the Monitoring Officer as Proper Officer to carry out the wishes of the Leaders of the Political Groups in allocating members to these committees, and appoints those Members with effect from the date at which the Proper Officer is advised of the names of such Members;
2. Agreed that the Independent Remunerations Panel should be requested to take account of these changes as part of its review of the Member Allowances Scheme; and

3. Agree that the Committee Review Group report back again to the October on the outcome of the scrutiny committee review.

(b) Constitution – Member Code of Conduct

Council received a report from Chair of the Audit Committee that sought agreement to amend the Council's Member Code of Conduct to one based on the Department for Communities and Local Government model. Councillor Fuller moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Aitken, who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- It was encouraged that all Councillors read the code of conduct and ensure that their behaviour reflected the principals contained within.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council agree to amend its Member Code of Conduct to one based on the Department for Communities and Local Government model as set out in Appendix 1 (Option 3) of Addendum A of the report.

(c) Constitution – Major Policy Framework

Council received a report from the Director of Governance that sought approval of amendments to the Major Policy Framework within the Council's constitution. Councillor Seaton moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Holdich.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council approve amendments to the Major Policy Framework (Part 3 Delegations – Section 1 – Functions Reserved to Council) in Appendix 1.

(d) Annual Report of the Audit Committee

Council received the annual report of the Audit Committee that provided an overview of the work of the Audit Committee in successfully meeting its terms of reference and improving the Council's governance and control environments. Councillor Fuller moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Aitken.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council notes the work carried out by the Audit Committee in improving the governance arrangements across the Council.

(e) Appointment of the Chairman to the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee

Council received a report that sought the appointment of Councillor Allen as Chairman of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2016/17. Councillor Holdich moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Council appoints Councillor Steve Allen as Chairman of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2016/17.

(f) Increase in the Invest to Save Budget

Council received a report from the Corporate Director Resources that sought an

increase of the Council's Invest to Save budget initially by £75m plus an additional £50m when the Empower loan was refinanced and the loan was repaid to the Council. Councillor Seaton moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Holdich, who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Concern was raised that the Council was seen to be providing funding for social housing outside of Peterborough, when there were numerous opportunities for investment within the city.
- It was noted that the profit accrued from this investment would enable further spending in the city and would benefit the residents of Peterborough. As there were limited opportunities for investment in the city, it was thought to be a good idea, as well as ensuring that Peterborough was a good neighbour.
- Further concern was raised in relation to the risks associated with lending.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the motion and advised that that this arrangement would affectively mean that Axiom was borrowing from the Council, and that a substantial some would be returned. It was believed to be an innovative approach. He was happy to discuss with Councillors any individual concerns they had.

A vote was taken (36 voting in favour, 0 voting against, 20 abstaining from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. Approves the increase in the Invest to Save budget; and
2. Subject to approval of item 1, approves the amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy to:
 - a) take account of the increase to the Invest to Save Budget; and
 - b) to add the proposed Housing Joint Venture company to the list of external bodies that the Council is able to lend to.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 11.00pm

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>COUNCIL BUSINESS</u>	
9.	<p><u>Questions on notice to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Mayor b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>It is now almost a year since the City Council agreed to install a digital real time information sign at the bus stop on the no1 route adjacent to Voyager School in Walton. This stop is heavily used by both local residents and school students and has a once every ten minute service throughout the day. Six months ago I was told by officers that they were waiting for an electricity connection to be made available but nothing seems to have happened since then. Please could the relevant cabinet member tell me what is going on and what is causing the further delay?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I actually agree with Councillor Sanford it is disappointing expecting something to happen and it doesn't and I also agree with him that this route is a working example of just how good a timely the bus services around our city are and as a result in his own words heavily used by both residents and students. That said it might be helpful to have a RTPI facility at this particular stop like others in Peterborough and work did actually start with this in mind some months ago. The problem encountered was that the shelter did not meet the specification needed to complete the installation. The shelter infrastructure apparently needs upgrading to accommodate the technology. I am told by our engineers that the work is scheduled to be completed no later than the end of this year when we can more specific I have asked that Councillor Sandford is updated. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I am grateful for Councillor Hiller's considered response to the question. I think there is credibility issue here, I reported to local people through our newsletter precisely what I had been told which is the only problem in getting this working was an electricity connection and Councillor Shaheed I'm sure will back me up on this that we've had a person come to our surgery on three separate occasions to say how much longer is this going to take. Could I just urge Councillor Hiller that I accept fully what he says in this particular case but could he ensure that when we put these questions and report information on to local people that we are actually given accurate information otherwise it does cause a bit of a credibility problem.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I thank Councillor Sandford for that I quite agree with him but it wasn't just the</p>

	<p>electricity issue that caused the delay and of course as this progresses I will make sure that Councillor Sandford is kept fully briefed.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Nadeem</p> <p>To Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services</p> <p>Analysis of data relating to children and young people in Peterborough reveals that Peterborough is one of the fastest growing cities in the UK with a young and ethnically diverse population. Children and young people under the age of 20 made up 26.5% of the population of Peterborough in 2012 (2.6% more than the national population percentage). In 2013 40.8% of school children were from a minority ethnic background, significantly higher than the national rate of 26.7%. However, the data also shows that these children and young people are in general terms more disadvantaged across a range of socio-economic indicators compared to East Anglia and England as a whole with substantial disparities between wards in the city. There are wards in the centre of Peterborough (including North Ward which I represent) with significant levels of deprivation and long standing problems: poverty, overcrowding, poor health, unemployment, poor housing stock, alcohol, drugs, sexually transmitted infections, teen pregnancies, low birth weights and infant mortality are issues for these areas. The data also shows that outcomes are poor throughout life with events in early life affecting children as they grow into adulthood.</p> <p>Given the above, how effective does the Cabinet Member consider the Councils existing strategies, interventions and provisions are in meeting the needs of children and young people in Peterborough and specifically with regard to my own ward (North Ward) and in improving outcomes for them?</p> <p>Councillor Smith responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Nadeem for your question. Quite a big question for a new Cabinet Member but I will answer it the best I can with the knowledge I have at the moment. We acknowledge that some areas in our city provide us with significant challenges and those challenges impact disproportionately on children and young people. The council has a joined up approach to people and communities which brings communities, children’s services including early help, safeguarding, educating and education together under one director. We have a clear intention to make significant improvements to the issues of poor housing stock and overcrowding and its impact on the city. With our application to the Secretary of State and Department of Communities in Local Government we aim to introduce selective licencing within specific areas of the city which includes North Ward and that decision is expected imminently. Specific work arising from operation Can Do Team and multi-agency support groups and the newly formed Prevention and Enforcement Service is focused upon making a real sustainable generational change. Our community connectors have recently moved to enhance our community cohesion function and will increase our reach into and the understanding of those communities that are most acutely affected. Only by agencies working together with the communities will the communities see a sustainable change. Our draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2016-2019 which recently came to Cabinet includes the focus on inequalities and health between areas and communities within Peterborough. Our people and community strategy is designed to place communities at the heart of what we do thus insuring that the social issues outlined by the Member and affecting young people are tackled. Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Nadeem asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Smith for your comprehensive response. And Mr Mayor my supplementary question is that if the council’s policies in meeting the needs of</p>

	<p>children are so effective how is it we have a school in my ward that Gladstone Primary School, which received a most damning Ofsted Report and whose governing body had to be disbanded in May this year because it was not meeting its legal duty to ensure that pupils are safe. What sort of start in life are children at this school going to have when they receive a substandard education? Is the council not failing these children and their parents? Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Smith responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Nadeem. We take on board everything you say. I am new in post and plan to get under the skin of these issues very quickly. Looking at the Ofsted report to see what we can do and I will assure you I will be doing my best in this post with these issues.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>With the ongoing replacement of street lamp posts with energy efficient LED lamps, would the Cabinet Member please confirm what has happened to the old style lamp posts that have been taken down, who owns these and what are the future plans for them.</p> <p>Some of the posts removed were very old and very ornate, especially those that were taken from the Park Road area. Could these lamps be reused, perhaps in the parks within the City, as they would help to enhance these areas?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I am very happy to respond to Councillor Fox's question Mr Mayor as I was quite interested in these old lamp posts being reused myself in conservation areas especially but unfortunately we have not managed to give any of them a clean bill of health from a structural safety point of view. I am sure Councillor Fox will appreciate whilst it would have perhaps been desirable to have been able to relocate and re-erect the old columns in light of the failed structural tests it would have been impractical and possibly unsafe to highways users.</p> <p>I can't accept liability on behalf of this authority Mr Mayor to make that happen. Mr Mayor these are old cast iron posts and are unlike my friend Councillor Fox are rather showing their age. Did you see what I did there? I'll let the applause die down Mr Mayor. All the old posts are owned by Peterborough City Council and as part of the contract Peterborough Highways Services they are sent for recycling Councillor Fox however I can however reassure him and indeed any other Members that should be interested that should we discover any of these lamp standards actually achieve a relatively positive structural report I have asked that they're stored for a limited period and offered for re-use elsewhere. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor John Fox had no supplementary question.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Shearman</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Is the Cabinet member aware that the mix of cyclists and pedestrians along the Long Causeway/Bridge Street corridor is still a cause for concern?</p> <p>The cycle route along Long Causeway is frequently not recognised by pedestrians</p>

due to poor signage and markings, and cyclists are still using Bridge Street during prohibited hours.

What action can the Council take to ensure these problems are resolved?

Councillor Walsh responded:

I would like to thank Councillor Shearman for his question with regard to the issues he has raised in these locations and I do share his concerns and I think the most effective response would be for me to deal with these two locations separately.

First of all with regard to Bridge Street. During the prohibited hours there has been increased patrol work by the Prevention and Enforcement Service in recent months. However the powers available to deal with cyclists rests at present solely with the police. It is intended that this is one of the powers that will soon be extended to all officers who comprise of a multi-agency Prevention and Enforcement Service. The arrangements for these powers are being progressed under the provision of the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme. We will therefore in future have more capacity to deal with the problem and I can assure Councillor Shearman that this is an issue that will receive the attention it deserves.

Secondly with regard to Long Causeway, this location should be viewed as any normal road and footway location as far as cyclists are concerned i.e. cyclists can use the road. Vehicles are only allowed to use the road under certain conditions with bollards in place to control this. The footpath as is the case elsewhere is for pedestrians only. A great deal of planning and consultation was carried out during the design phase of Long Causeway and due to concerns raised by groups representing disabled users it was decided to make obvious the delineation between the road and the footway by putting in place a dropped curb. So with regard to the signage I have been informed that there is no special signage suitable or available for this location. However I would like to assure Councillor Shearman that the Prevention and Enforcement Service will patrol this area also and deal with any offences appropriately. Thank you Mr Mayor.

Councillor Shearman asked the following supplementary question:

Thank you Councillor Walsh for your very helpful and comprehensive answer. Members will remember that the previous council leader having sat outside in a street café saw someone almost being knocked over or was knocked over and he tried to take action and assured us, and this is not a criticism of you Councillor Cereste, tried to get action taken but that wasn't possible and I guess the officers who prevented him from getting what he wanted to do done are the same officers who have come up with this answer here. But I am glad that Councillor Walsh that that action is going to be taken in Bridge Street. In terms of Long Causeway this issue was raised by a couple of residents who had seen families just wandering across off the footpath with a child and a resident actually knocked a child over because the child was wandering across. It is not clear to a lot of people. I was almost with my partner almost knocked over by a cyclist as I walked out of the Halifax Building Society. That cyclist was on the footpath so I really think more appropriate to the actual concerns would have been helpful and I recognise Councillor Walsh that you didn't write that answer that was written for you. Thank you very much.

Councillor Walsh responded:

Thank you Councillor Shearman. Yes I did write it myself actually I did not follow the script. I studied this very hard actually in order to give the most comprehensive and clear explanation to the situation. The danger is caused by people who are not following the rules. Now you may say they don't know the rules and you may say that

on Bridge Street as well. I think they do know the rules, they just simply break them. What I am saying is that soon we are going to have more manpower to deal with the problem.

At the moment it is only the police that have the powers. Shortly that will change and we will have more from this Prevention Enforcement Team, people who will be able to deal with it and so this issue should become better over time. That is the plan anyway. Other than that aside as I say there is not a sign in existence that deals specifically with that location. We can look into something, I am certainly prepared to do that but, you know, I tried in an honest way to give you the situation as it is.