

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2020  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR GUL NAWAZ**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andrew Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lane, Lillis, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin and Yurgutene.

**52. Apologies for Absence**

A minute's silence was held in honour of former Mayor of Peterborough John Bartlett, who passed away in January.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Louise Coles, Dowson, Azher Iqbal, Lamb and Jones.

**53. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Murphy declared he was an active supporter of the Palestinian Solidarity Campaign.

There were no other declarations of interest.

**54. Minutes of the Meetings held on 15 January 2020.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2020 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**55. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor congratulated the Electoral Services Team and those who had supported the elections and announced their work had been acknowledged by the Association of Electoral Administrators who had presented them with an award in recognition of their outstanding effort and dedication.

Members were invited to the forthcoming events on behalf of the Mayors Charities:

- Mayors Charity Quiz night 6 March 2020
- Mayors Ball 30 May 2020

Councillor Hiller was invited to address the Council regarding the Civic Awards. He advised Members that in 2014 the Council launched the Civic Awards Scheme, a scheme to recognise residents, groups, organisations and business that had made a difference to the local community. The 2020 winners would be presented with their awards at a ceremony on 3 March 2020 at the Town Hall.

The winners were thanked for their hard work, congratulated and announced as follows:

Community Involvement Civic Awards

Mr Abdul Aziz  
Mr Alastair Kingsley  
Mr Shazad Ali and Mrs Jackie McKenzie  
Miss Catherine Lee  
Chimes Coffee Shop  
Family Voice  
Mr Jason Merrill  
Mr John Hodder  
Mr John Sharman  
Mr Johnny Richardson  
Ms Juliette Welch  
Mr Marcus Horrell  
Mr Neil Boyce  
Ms Nicki Sanders  
Mr Paul Logan  
Mr Richard Astle  
Ms Terri Rowcliffe  
Miss Sheetal Sajan  
Ms Holli Posnett  
Mr James Hayes  
Mr Matthew Coates  
Mr Mohammed Yousaf  
Mr Dennis Stanley  
Mr Ghulam Sarwar  
Mrs Val Mitton

Contribution to Art and Culture Award

Mrs Kate Hall  
Mr Peter Cox  
Mrs Shelah Bringeman

Sports Award

Mr Sajid Majid  
Mr Peter Forest

Young Person Award

Mr Mustafa Hussaini Karim  
Mr Shaan Mahmood  
Miss Nevaeh Chambers

Lifetime Achievement Award

Ms Carol Toppin  
The Late Mr Douglas Henderson  
Ms Lillian Muxlow  
Mr Sydney Smith  
Mr David Ellis

**56. Leader's Announcements**

The Leader addressed the Council and expressed his delight that Peterborough had received Fairtrade City Status and thanked the volunteers and people of Peterborough for their contributions. He explained that the Council had incorporated the Fairtrade goals into their environmental capital ambitions to show commitment and support to

small scale farmers and ensure they earned a decent income. The Leader advised that the motion for Fairtrade was presented to Council April 2007 as stated in the Fairtrade press release.

On behalf of the Council, he expressed condolences to Councillor Azher Iqbal on the passing of his mother and sent good wishes to Councillor Coles, Lamb and Jones who were unwell.

Opposition Leaders endorsed the Leader's comments on Fairtrade Status and added their congratulations and thanks to all those associated with, and who had supported Fairtrade Peterborough. Opposition Leaders asked that residents support Fairtrade Week 24 February to 8 March 2020 which would include a Pancake Race and Fairtrade Stall at the Cathedral and a Fairtrade Exhibition stand in Cathedral Square.

The Mayor announced that, due to the public interest, the Agenda would be re-ordered to allow a full debate on two motions presented by Councillor Walsh on discrimination.

## **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

### **57. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

Questions from members of the public were raised in respect of the following:

1. Public Transport in new housing developments.
2. Trees planted by the Peterborough Development Corporation.
3. Ongoing tree maintenance.

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

### **58. Petitions**

#### **(a) Presented by Members of the Public**

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

#### **(b) Presented by Members**

A petition was presented to Council by Cllr Lillis regarding the installation of a road crossing in Coneygree Road for safety reasons.

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Andy Coles regarding parking issues in Wharf Road and adjoining streets.

### **59. 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**
- d) To the Combined Authority Representatives**

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

1. Self-reporting system for non-working LED streetlights
2. The amount of social housing to be built in next 24 months
3. Prosecutions for fly-tipping
4. Residents settled status
5. Dropped kerbs and pavement parking
6. Payments made to University College Peterborough (UCP) for the Integrated

- Communities Survey
7. Pothole repairs
  8. Fines for dog fouling
  9. Delays in the regeneration programme for Millfield and New England
  10. Changes to the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) following cessation of Kingdon contract
  11. Addition residents parking in Clayton

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

There were no questions (d) to the Combined Authority Representative.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

### **60. 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 meetings of the held on 4 November 2019, 18 November 2019, 20 December 2019 and 13 January 2020.
2. Decisions by individual Cabinet Members between 10 October 2019 and 21 January 2020.

Questions were asked regarding the following and passed to the Leader or appropriate Cabinet Member to answer:

#### Best Start in Life Strategy 2019-2024

Councillor Murphy asked if the closure of the children's centre contributed to the Best Start in Life not working.

Councillor Ayres advised Council that the Cabinet were debating a new comprehensive strategy for the best start in life across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough rather than dealing with the closure of children's centres. The Early Years Social Mobility review in 2018 recommended the development of an early years strategy and identified that, although effective services were delivered across Peterborough and Cambridgeshire, there was a lack of join up and probably elements of duplication and it was agreed that the Directors of Public Health and People and Communities would lead on a transformation programme to include all agencies and organisations involved in the early years services covering pre-birth to children aged five years to ensure they were ready to transition into schools.

#### Report of the Task and Finish Group to Inform the Development of an Air Quality Ambition Statement and Action Plan

Councillor Sandford, as Chair of the Air Quality Working Group asked for confirmation that the Council would implement the recommendations and recognise that the recommendations would also contribute towards tackling Climate Change.

Councillor Holdich confirmed that it would.

#### St Michael's Gate Short Term Lease Renewal

Councillor Hemraj asked when acquisition of St Michael's Gate would occur.

Councillor Allen advised the process was under review.

Councillor Murphy asked if the Council should have supported the tenants and their rights three years ago rather than wait until now.

Councillor Holdich advised that Council was not offered the properties to purchase at the time and were only made aware of the situation when tenants were being evicted. The Council were then able to rent the properties and had since housed over 400 people who would otherwise have been placed in bed and breakfast styled accommodation.

Councillor Allen advised Members that he felt the question was not relevant to the decision.

#### Transfer of Gladstone Park Community Centre

Councillor Jamil sought assurance that the people who currently use the Gladstone Park Community Centre would not be affected by the transfer to Thomas Deacon Academy.

Councillor Hiller advised he would find out.

#### Amendment of Loan Arrangement

Councillor Murphy asked if and when the loan would be repaid and if there were concerns that it would not be.

Councillor Seaton was confident the loan would be repaid.

#### Street Light Dimming

Councillor Sandford asked where the streetlight dimming trials would take place, over what period and how would the results be assessed.

Councillor Hiller advised the trials had already taken place and the difference in light emitted was not noticeable when dimming the lights by 40%. He agreed to provide details of the areas where the reductions were due to be implemented.

### **61. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed Executive Decisions taken since the last meeting including the:

1. Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 23 September 2019 28 October 2019 and 25 November 2019.
2. Combined Authority Board held on 25 September 2019 30 October 2019 and 27 November 2019.
3. Audit and Governance Committee held on 27 September 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following and passed to the Leader or appropriate Combined Authority (CA) representative to answer:

#### Transport Plan

Councillor Sandford reminded Members that the Transport Plan had been debated at Full Council in October and at that time Members were advised that the CA would be approving and responding to the results of the consultation. He asked for details as to what had happened to the Transport Plan.

Councillor Coles advised that the information had not yet been received and this agenda item related to questions asked of the CA Board.

Councillor Murphy advised that key issues remained outstanding, such as franchising. The Transport Plan could be used as part of the Council's plan to reduce emissions and tackle the climate emergency.

#### Climate Emergency

Councillor Ellis queried why the CA had not and said he noted that £125,000 had been allocated to the climate emergency and he was hopeful there would be a specific budget in future.

Councillor Murphy advised he did not know how the £125,000 would be allocated and that it was regrettable that the CA had not declared a climate emergency like most councils as the climate emergency could be influenced by the CA housing programme and transport plans.

Councillor Coles advised Members that the CA Mayor had felt it was for the constituent members of the CA to make that decision on declaring a climate emergency rather than the CA. He offered to make enquiries on how the £125,000 would be allocated and respond at a later date.

Councillor Sandford informed Council that the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) had stated that transport accounted for 25% of global carbon emissions. As the CA was now the transport authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, it seemed incredible that the CA Mayor did not consider that the climate emergency was relevant to the CA. Councillor Coles offered to submit this point to the Mayor.

#### Mayor of the Combined Authority on Bus Trials

Councillor Robinson asked if, following the positive trial at Addenbrooke's Hospital for a reduced bus rate for NHS staff, after which Stagecoach had agreed to conduct trials in other areas, were there any plans to conduct trials in Peterborough as this could impact the parking issues at Peterborough hospital.

Councillor Coles advised he thought the policy was being developed around CAMs and Cambridgeshire first and trials for Peterborough would probably follow later.

Councillor Murphy advised that the scrutiny committee had commented that there had been a consultation, reports and a levy had been placed on Peterborough City Council however there appeared to be no progress towards providing a reliable, affordable, public controlled bus service. He suggested that if people were encouraged to use the bus services it would help to make them safe and reliable. He also thought there had been operational changes Stagecoach, possibly as a result of the thought of franchising and councils providing their own public services.

He advised additional parking was planned for Peterborough Hospital.

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

#### **62. Notices of Motion**

The agenda had been re-ordered and motions 1 and 2 from Councillor Walsh were debated earlier in the meeting.

The following motions had been received in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders:

## 1. Motion from Councillor Walsh

Councillor Walsh moved the motion regarding concerns in the rise of antisemitism in recent years across the UK and recommended that Peterborough City Council adopted The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) the definition of antisemitism in line with other public bodies and local authorities.

Councillor Joseph seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Murphy moved an amendment to the motion as outlined in the Additional Information Pack. He advised that he supported the original motion and that his amended motion concentrated on services the Council provided and issues affecting residents to keep it in line with Council policy and also sought to protect the characteristics of minority groups. He advised that these principles applied to the Israeli/Palestinian situation. He felt that the settlements constructed by Israel in the Occupied West Bank were illegal and annexing them would be in breach of legal order and should not be supported.

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

Members debated both the recommendation and the amendment and in summary the points raised included:

- Members expressed their opposition to all forms of discrimination and had always supported motions surrounding hate, racism, discrimination and prejudice.
- Some Members felt the amendment was covered in the original motion but did provide more clarity to prevent the motion being used to stifle future debate.
- Members felt that this country had freedom of speech and could therefore speak out about specific countries or issues.
- Members wanted the debate to focus on the treatment of Jewish people in this country, not the behaviour of Israel.
- Anti-Semitism was a wider issue than the situation between Islam and Israel.
- Members referred to another local authority who had cancelled a charity event in support of Palestinian children in case they were portrayed as being anti-Semitic.

Councillor Ali exercised his right to speak and advised that he deplored and condemned hatred in any form regardless of faith or origin. He was also concerned some that local events would not be held without the safeguard of the amendment.

Councillor Joseph exercised her right to speak and noted that anti-Semitism had been called history's oldest hatred, as throughout history the Jewish people had been vilified, denied citizenship and forced to live in ghettos and had practised their faith in secret to avoid persecution. It was considered that discrimination was still taking place. The conflict between Palestine and Israel deserved empathy for the Palestinian plight, which was not anti-Semitic. The Council should support policies to promote mutual respect and tolerance.

Councillor Walsh summed up as mover of the original motion and advised Council that the fact they were able to hold the debate illustrated this was a free country where people were free to speak their minds. Councillor Walsh advised that the motion was not directed at any particular nation and it was unnecessary to be concerned about holding future events. If the amended wording was added to the motion, she felt it should also be added to the motion on Islamophobia also although she urged members not to accept the amendment.

A vote was taken on the amendment to Councillor Walsh's motion from Councillor Murphy (26 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

Councillors For: Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggan, Yasin, Yugutene

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nadeem

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on Councillor Walsh's motion as originally moved (unanimous). The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"Peterborough City Council is rightly proud of its efforts to tackle discrimination and hatred in all its forms.

Peterborough City Council expresses concern about the rise in antisemitism in recent years across the UK. As well as physical manifestations through violence and criminal damage, it has also been seen in the use of antisemitic language and characteristics which criticise Israel. It may be legitimate to criticise the policies and practices of Israel, but not if this involves using language and imagery that is antisemitic.

Peterborough City Council therefore resolves to join with the Government, the Crown Prosecution Service, the Police and Judiciary, as well as other Local Authorities, in signing up to the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of antisemitism, which states that:

**"Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, towards Jewish Community institutions and religious facilities."**

The IHRA highlight manifestations as including:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extreme view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanising, demonizing or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective – such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other social institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens as being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.



- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g. by claiming that the existence of the State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g. claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterise Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for the actions of the state of Israel.

Council resolved to:

- 1) Adopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism as the working model for challenging and confronting incidents of this form of racism
- 2) Restate its condemnation of **all** forms of racism and hate in all its manifestations
- 3) Oppose racism and hate against all communities, in keeping with our commitment to eradicate all acts of hatred on grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief and sex or sexual orientation.”

## **2. Motion from Councillor Walsh**

Councillor Walsh moved the motion regarding the adoption of the definition of Islamophobia. Once the government had reached a mutually agreed definition, it should be brought before the Council for ratification.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Murphy moved an amendment to the motion as detailed in the Additional Information Pack. He suggested that Council accept the definition rather than wait for the government response. People working in the Council represented many faiths and community engagement in Peterborough was continuing well. He suggested the definition would send a clear message that the Council was opposing Islamophobia and would develop anti-discriminatory practices and policies as an outcome of this amendment.

Councillor Qayyum seconded the amendment and reserved her right to speak.

Members debated both the recommendation and the amendment and in summary the points raised included:

- Members asked what the outcome would be if this council adopted a definition that was different to the one agreed by the All-Party Parliamentary Group.
- Members expressed that they would accept the outcome of the All-Party Parliamentary Group.
- Members suggested that if this definition was accepted and if the Council wished to modify the definition at a later date, a new motion could be brought before Council for debate.
- Some Members understood the difference between the motion and the amendment was the word “accept” and “acknowledge”. Using the word “accept” showed a stronger standing on the part of the council.
- Some Members had experienced hatred due to their beliefs and felt that Islamophobia was being practiced in this country and in this city.

Councillor Qayyum exercised her right to speak on the amendment. She referred Members to the All-Party Parliamentary Groups (APPG) definition of Islamophobia which had been devised by the Muslim Council of Great Britain. She had herself experienced anger from non-Muslim members of the public in both her personal and

professional life and felt that if the definition of Islamophobia was not accepted, it would appear to dilute the occurrence of the many incidents occurring in Peterborough.

Figures acquired from the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Hate Reporting Crime Cell indicated that in the last five years 35-46 Islamophobic hate crimes had been reported. No consultation had taken place with the Muslim Council for Peterborough by the APPG and therefore Councillor Qayyum was concerned over the authenticity and credibility of endorsing a definition which was important to Muslim residents in the city.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz exercised his right to speak and endorsed his support for the motion.

Councillor Walsh summed up thanking all colleagues for their input. She explained she could not accept the amendment. The previous motion had passed through a process which included ratification by the government, the police, the crown prosecution services, the judiciary and all public bodies and councils and she felt that Council should wait for the same process to be completed before accepting the definition of Islamophobia.

A vote was taken on the amendment to Councillor Walsh's motion from Councillor Murphy (26 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggan, Yasin, Yugutene

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on Councillor Walsh's motion as originally moved (unanimous). The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"Peterborough City Council is rightly proud of its efforts to tackle discrimination and hatred in all its forms.

This council acknowledges the work carried out nationally in 2018 and 2019 by the All-Party Parliamentary Group on British Muslims to create an agreed definition of Islamophobia, and notes that this has not yet been formally adopted by the national Government. The APPG definition is as follows:

*"Islamophobia is rooted in racism and is a type of racism that targets expressions of Muslimness or perceived Muslimness."*

This council also acknowledges the intentions of the Government to appoint independent advisors to lead a review into the definition drafted by the All Party Parliamentary Group, and that Imam Qari Asim MBE, Deputy Chair of the Anti-Muslim Hatred Working Group, is the first such adviser to be appointed. We understand that additional advisers will join the Imam in this important task.

Peterborough City Council will therefore debate a Motion at a future Full Council with a view to adopting the official definition of Islamophobia once it has been adopted by national Government, and will, in the meantime, note the All Party Parliamentary Group definition as set out above. We also support the earliest possible ratification and adoption of the official definition by Government.

Council therefore resolved to:

- 1) Note the All Party Parliamentary Group on British Muslim's definition of Islamophobia as the working definition for challenging and confronting incidents of this form of racism
- 2) Request that the Chief Executive closely monitors the ongoing national review of the APPG definition, in order to ensure a Motion to adopt the new definition is brought to Full Council at the earliest opportunity
- 3) Restate its condemnation of **all** forms of racism and hate in all its manifestations
- 4) Oppose racism and hate against all communities, in keeping with our commitment to eradicate all acts of hatred on grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief and sex or sexual orientation."

### **3. Motion from Councillor Amjad Iqbal**

Councillor Iqbal moved his motion on the abolition of Article 370 and 35A of the Indian Constitution by the Indian Government on 5 August 2019 and the effect this had on the Kashmiri Community of Peterborough.

He informed members that Article 35A gave the Jammu and Kashmir Assembly powers to identify people's permanent residence and allocate the appropriate rights. Article 370 was a legislative power given to the Jammu and Kashmir Assembly to provide autonomy and allowed them to make their own domestic laws. Prior to 5 August 2019, Jammu and Kashmir had its own assembly and flag, the citizens had dual citizenship of both India and Kashmir, and its affairs were dealt with by a national government.

He also advised that after 5 August 2019, residents lost their identity and were classified as Indians. The assembly was demolished, their territory came under the Indian Government, their flag was replaced, and property purchase laws were also changed. Freedom of movement and the use of internet, mobile phones and landlines had been restricted. The Indian Government had unlawfully imposed restrictions which violated the principles of the UN Security Council resolutions.

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

Councillor Seaton moved an amendment and acknowledged the work of Councillors on behalf of British Kashmiris. His amendment called upon the motion to apply to both Members of Parliament who represent this county rather than only one.

He advised Council that Paul Bristow, MP for Peterborough had been appointed Chair with the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Kashmir and chaired a Kashmir Conference on 4 February at the Houses of Parliament.

Councillor Bashir seconded the amendment. She advised Members that 5 February marked the Kashmir Solidarity Day. A People's Motion from the Kashmiri People of Peterborough was presented on 14 August 2019 in Cathedral Square to ask local MPs to raise the issue of the crisis in Jammu and Kashmir to the government and to use their influence to restore basic rights and means of communication. She felt that as a country with over a million citizens of Kashmiri heritage, the British Government should intervene to secure the freedom and democracy of the people of Kashmir as the dispute stemmed from the legacy of the British Empire.

She advised that Councillor Azher Iqbal had intended to bring this motion to Council, however he was unable to attend due berevement. She also advised the motion was not presented to the December meeting due to Purdah and the General Election, nor the January Council meeting as this was restricted to the budget.

Members debated both the recommendation and the amendment and in summary the points raised included:

- Members advised that Paul Bristow MP chaired an International Kashmir Conference on 5 February 2020 advertised on social media and open to all members of the public. It had been attended by journalists, councillors, MPs from all parties, and people from different organisations associated with Kashmir.
- Personal invitations had not been received by councillors to the conference and Members expressed their concern that social media was not the appropriate manner in which to invite attendees to a meeting of important humanitarian relevance. Some Members would have liked an invitation to represent their ward and asked if this could be incorporated in future.
- Councillor Bashir notified Members that an invitation had been sent to all Members to attend the Kashmir Solidarity Gathering however not all councillors were able to attend.
- Some Members felt this type of motion was not a good use of Council time as, while accepting that Peterborough residents were affected, Members could have a greater impact for local residents.
- Members wanted support for the Kashmiri democratic right as agreed in 1948.
- Members advised that the current British prime minister had stated that the issue was between Pakistan and India and therefore for them to resolve. It was unlikely that his own MPs would go against this.
- Independence for Kashmir was beyond the remit of British citizens.
- Local people were not encouraging independence but a move towards freedom of speech through communication and the lifting of the curfew, which in some instances had prevented residents having access to health care.
- Some Members felt that the amendment had been made for the sake of making an amendment as it added no benefit or suggestions and the motion became a political ideal with local PR for one of the two local MPs which had cheapened the motion.
- Members questioned how much time should be spent on matters which did not directly affect the residents of Peterborough when time for Full Council meetings was limited.
- It was noted that there was no mention of the work the North West Cambridgeshire MP had conducted on this matter within the amendment.

Councillor Ali exercised his right to speak and wanted to ensure that Members had not lost sight of the main problem; that the people of Kashmir were suffering and had been for the last 72 years. He acknowledged that it was a political issue and the good work done by MPs to date. He felt it was a legacy the British government had left and needed international intervention to resolve. Many local people from occupied Kashmir were unable to contact their families.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal summed up and stated that in his opinion, the amendment did not add any benefit or value to the motion. The demonstration was organised by the Conservative Muslim Forum who took the initiative and booked the venue, however the event was overtaken by the Friends of Kashmir where it was unanimously agreed that the event would not be held under any political party banner. He clarified that there had not been a People's Motion but a People's Resolution, which requested Councillor Iqbal to present a motion to the Chamber.

A vote was taken on the amendment to Councillor Amjad Iqbal's motion from Councillor Seaton (27 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yugutene

**Councillors Abstaining:** John Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on Councillor Amjad Iqbal's motion as originally moved, subject to the amendment of the motion to call on both of Peterborough's MPs to write to the UK Government (46 voted in favour, 9 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Against:** Nil

**Councillors Abstaining:** Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"On 5th August 2019 the Indian Government, in a surprise move, abolished Article 370 and 35A of the Indian constitution.

The Kashmiri Community of Peterborough express deep concerns about the ongoing reports of human rights violations, and a communication blockade of over eight million people of Jammu and Kashmir since 5 August 2019 resulting in serious risk to life, liberty and security of persons in Kashmir.

The Peterborough Kashmiri community are concerned that the steps taken by the Indian Government are unconstitutional, unlawful and against the agreed principles of the UN Security Council resolutions which safeguard the rights of the people of Kashmir.

Moreover, the way the Indian government has enforced the abolition of the relevant Articles of the constitution is very alarming and concerning to members of divided families living in Peterborough. Since 5<sup>th</sup> August 2019, strict curfew has been imposed, a large population has been reportedly imprisoned in their home with no access to telephone, internet and other media and people were reportedly denied offering the rituals of (Eid al Adha) on the 12th August 2019, which is a violation of basic human rights in addition to the aforementioned acts. The people of Kashmir were reportedly not consulted prior to imposing this change.

Peterborough houses thousands of families, who are hardworking taxpayers of this city, and are directly affected by this through their loved ones living under a curfew situation. We owe it to them to ensure their communication at the very least be reinstated.

In view of this the Council resolved to call on both of Peterborough's MPs to write to the UK Government:

- 1) To make urgent representations to the Indian Government, through all available routes, to ensure safeguards against human rights abuses are immediately put in place by restoring telecommunications, allowing full access to international humanitarian aid and human rights observers, releasing all political prisoners and finding a bi-lateral resolution taking into account the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir in accordance with the UN charter and resolutions.
- 2) To Insist that all sides permit unimpeded access for international human rights to be monitored throughout Kashmir;
- 3) To seek a permanent resolution to the Kashmir dispute which would bring considerable benefits to the people of Kashmir, enhance the overall peace and security of the region, and bring comfort to many British Kashmiris who have family connections there;
- 4) To seek to protect civilians, promote peace, and work towards a negotiated and democratic solution with the assistance of the United Nations that will allow the people of Kashmir to exercise their right to decide their own future free from coercion and intimidation.

To provide ongoing reassurance to the Peterborian Kashmiri residents that their concerns are being adhered to, Council also resolves to ask the Leader to appoint a Councillor to act as a "Kashmir Champion" for Peterborough to be the first point of communication between the Council, MP and other relevant agencies both in and out of the City."

#### **4. Motion from Councillor Hogg**

Councillor Hogg introduced the motion and explained that the motion was relevant to Fireworks Night and he had originally requested this motion on 25 October 2019 however this was the first opportunity he had been given to present it. It was suggested that the motions and questions system was not working. He was concerned at the length of the firework season and the effect fireworks had on other people, pets, farm livestock and wildlife.

Councillor Ash seconded the motion and reserved their right to speak.

Members debated both the recommendation and the amendment and in summary the points raised included:

- Members stated that following a previous motion on this subject, the Council had written to the Minister at the Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy and whilst the response was understanding, it was felt that the legislation in place at that time struck the right balance between enjoyment by consumers and limiting anti-social use and the Government had no plans to introduce further restrictions.
- Members were also informed that a debate in the House of Commons had not resulted in a change of Government position.
- Any review on firework legislation would be undertaken by the Office of Product Safety and Standards and that body had other priorities.

- It was commented that the Council did not have the authority legally to require public firework displays to advertise.
- There were no manufacturers of fireworks used for public displays in this area.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities offered to meet with Councillor Hogg alongside Regulatory Services officers to discuss the matter further.
- Members said that the motion was not only relevant to Bonfire Night but around other celebrations which could continue for long periods, causing distress to local residents and their pets.
- Some Members wanted to see stronger legislation and fireworks licensed for use at designated times.
- Members explained that there were 51 million pets in the UK and in 2018 the RSPCA had received 411 complaints, 0.003% of dog owners reporting an issue with fireworks. The Horse Society reported that two horses a year died as a result of fireworks with one seriously injured.
- Firework legislation was controlled by government and the RSPCA's proposal was for the Council to approach the government for powers to regulate public displays.
- As the motion contained an element which was said to be outside of the Council's control, Members asked why the motion had been passed for presentation at the meeting.
- The motion had been circulated by the RSPCA to other local authorities and Members questioned why they had done this if the motion was beyond local authority control and requested legal clarification. They were advised that the matter had been dealt with by the Trading Standards Department.
- The Leader intervened and advised the Chamber that the relevant Cabinet Member had researched the information that had been provided and offered an all-party meeting to decide what action the Council could take.
- It was noted that the elderly, children and babies were all affected by fireworks., not only animals.
- Members requested an investigation if it was the case that motion was outside of the Council's remit.
- The Cabinet Member advised Council she had asked if an appropriate amendment could be added to the motion, as she had some sympathies with its sentiments however she had been advised it would not be possible.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved a motion to pass directly to the vote without further discussion which was seconded by Councillor Holdich and the agreed by the Mayor.

Councillor Hogg exercised his right to reply and expressed his disappointment that no-one had thought to propose an amendment to correct the elements on which he may have been mistaken. He felt it was important to encourage displays and move away from fireworks in gardens and in the street.

A vote was taken on Councillor Hogg's motion (25 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 2 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggins, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Day, Howell

## **Councillors Not Voting: Nil**

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Members were advised that the guillotine had now been reached and the meeting would close at 10:15pm. Members were invited members to propose a motion to suspend Standing Order number 14.2 to enable the meeting to be extended.

### **5. Motion from Councillor Qayyum**

Councillor Qayyum moved her amended motion on bullying amongst children and thanked the Cabinet Member for Education for help in preparing the motion. In 2018 research indicated that there had been an increase in referrals to Child and Adolescent Mental Health for children who were self-harming. Safeguarding data showed that 662 school children were suffering from emotional and mental health problems in Peterborough. She advised that the health and wellbeing of children in Peterborough was less than the national average according to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). A Mental Health Lead for one of the practices in Peterborough was leading a campaign to address bullying in schools and spoke to schools about their policies and implementing more rigorous processes. From a health and clinical perspective, the system could no longer cope. The Mental Health & Emotional Wellbeing Service for Children and Young People (CHUMS), a tier below Child and Adolescent Mental Health, was no longer able to take referrals and it was a struggle to refer children who were self-harming. A GPs clinical ability only extended to a certain level and helping such children could be beyond their area of expertise. Healthy, happy children would lead to healthy, happy adults and were the future.

Councillor Ayres seconded the motion and advised Council that she, the Service Director for Education, Councillor Qayyum, and Councillor Joseph had collaborated to produce the motion to reflect the aspirations of both the Education Department and Councillors. Positive mental health ensured children would thrive in their education and when they transitioned into adulthood.

A vote was taken on Councillor Qayyum's motion as altered (unanimous). The motion was therefore **CARRIED** as follows:

~~"My experience as a GP has shown me that~~ The number of young children referred to Child and Adolescent Mental Health services as a result of the repercussions that bullying was having on their emotional wellbeing has risen sharply. ~~As part of my work I have explored the anti-bullying policies in place at our local authority run schools.~~  
Council resolves to recognise:

- That good mental health within young school going aged children both at the primary and secondary age level is an important factor in their development.
- That a mentally healthy child is able to thrive and progress in educational attainment standards thus contributing to the improvement of educational standards (a current need to be met)
- That an addressing of bullying within schools in a constructive and organised fashion promotes communication skills and acceptance of diversity, and truly places Peterborough in a pivotal position to promote those values of cultural acceptance reflective of its diverse population.

Council resolved to propose:

- ~~That the Council requires its maintained schools to review their anti-bullying policies annual and requires logs to be held of all incidents of bullying cases within each school. A child case file should be opened for those who are~~



~~subjected to bullying and a bullying care plan put in place to follow up their progress, including any action to be taken (which should be communicated to families), any contributing social factors, and how these factors can be mitigated or have support provided for. The Local Authority will work with maintained schools to look at systems to support the standardisation of safeguarding reporting. The Service Director for Education will include an update in the relevant report to Scrutiny on progress and implementation. Any proposed approaches will be opened up to academy trusts to engage.~~

- That anti-bullying policies are made available on the Peterborough city council website, similar to the strategy already adopted by Central Bedfordshire Council, and which are deemed to be useful (source: [https://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/info/3/schools\\_and\\_education/532/virtual\\_school/4](https://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/info/3/schools_and_education/532/virtual_school/4)).

## 6. Motion from Councillor Hemraj

Councillor Hemraj moved her motion on Chat Benches, a policy already adopted by several other local authorities. It focused on getting residents talking to each other by putting signage on selected benches to encourage people to stop and chat to combat loneliness.

Councillor Yasin seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Cereste advised the Chamber that he had 15 benches he was willing to donate if someone wanted to collect them.

Members referred to concerns from Public Health on safeguarding and stigma regarding Chat Benches and explained there was a website called [thefriendlybench.co.uk](http://thefriendlybench.co.uk) which was a better way to achieve the same outcome.

A vote was taken on Councillor Hemraj's motion (unanimous). The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"To combat loneliness that can cause a number of health conditions, local authorities across the county have introduced "Chat Benches". It would support the work currently being undertaken to tackle loneliness and would encourage Peterborough residents to communicate more with each other if some existing benches within the Peterborough area were converted into "Chat Benches."

Council resolved:

- To look at designated areas in all Peterborough wards and green spaces where "Chat Benches" could be placed or some existing benches could be converted, by placing a sign on the benches stating, "Happy to Chat Bench. Sit here if you don't mind someone talking to you."
- To encourage Ward Councillors and community groups to get involved in the scheme.
- To approach local businesses to sponsor a "Chat Bench".
- To request that Councillors consider using their Community Leadership Fund to fund a "Chat Bench" in their ward."

## 7. Motion from Councillor John Fox

Councillor Fox moved his motion on reducing homelessness in the veteran community. It was advised that similar motions had proved successful in other locations and would be good for the health and wellbeing of veterans.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary the points raised included:

- Members felt that if veterans needed support and housing, the obligation should be directed to the Ministry of Defence to provide it, given their large budget of £52billion.
- There were many Armed Forces Charities and Members referred to a report in The Times last October stated that the ten largest military charities had combined assets of £1.4billion and reserves of over £275million, which could be used for housing for veterans.
- Members advised that in a recent government consultation paper, it was suggested that there could be some preference for housing of veterans suffering from mental health conditions being incorporated into housing allocations policies.
- Members were concerned that all veterans, regardless of their financial situation or degree of vulnerability would be given preference over every other group in desperate need of social housing of which there was a shortage.
- The Leader advised that the housing policy was currently being reviewed and this motion could be considered as part of that process.

Members were advised by the Legal Officer that the guillotine had been reached and, in accordance with standing orders, there would be no further debate. A vote would be taken on the remaining items on the agenda without further discussion and all motions, amendments and recommendations would be deemed formally moved and seconded. The only motions allowed would be for a matter to be withdrawn, delegated or referred to a relevant body or individual for a decision or report.

A vote was taken on Councillor John Fox's motion (46 voted in favour, 9 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Against:** Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"The campaign to end homelessness in the veteran community was launched last year as it is estimated that 3000-4000 veterans are rough sleeping across the country, making up 2-3% of the veteran population. However, in Peterborough we are seeing a much higher percentage of veterans rough sleeping, with over 10% of those accessing the Garden House services being from a military background.

The Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 introduced a new homelessness advice and information duty, which includes a requirement to provide advice designed to meet the needs of people who are former members of the regular armed services. Some funding was provided to the county to tackle veteran homelessness but this was a small amount and will be used to have a dedicated support officer for the Armed Forces homeless community. This includes those rough sleeping and those who are hidden homeless (using cars and sofa surfing), as well as military families who are being evicted from military accommodation.

However, the only way to properly tackle the situation is to be able to provide more properties. Hostel temporary accommodation is not always suitable for veterans, particularly those with PTSD or other service-related mental health conditions, as the environment they provide is not compatible with the treatment and needs associated with this type of trauma.

Other areas in the country have got dedicated housing for their veterans and they are seeing great successes, including a self-build project in Wiltshire, a Housing First housing estate in Hampshire specifically for the veteran population and more locally Corby Borough Council is in the process of building 18 social rent properties, specifically for the military community. These are just a few of the examples of how lettings policies can be amended to provide housing for our veterans.

Our veterans have given so much, in service of this country, and we should be ensuring that they do not end up at crisis point. There is now a good system through the Armed Forces Covenant Partnership to get support for the individuals that they need and the STOLL (the leading provider of supported housing to veterans) nomination scheme could be applied here in order to support relevant individuals access housing. It would be beneficial for the council to review its Housing Allocations Policy to ensure all possible support is given to support the armed forces community.

Council resolved:

To ask our officers, as part of Peterborough City Council's commitment to the Armed Forces Covenant, to consider proposing amendments to the council's Housing Allocations Policy in order to enable the assignment of a proportion of properties for specific rental to the armed forces community."

## **64. Reports to Council**

### **(a) Draft Schedule of Meetings 2020/21**

A report setting out the proposed draft annual programme of meetings for 2020/2021 was contained within the Agenda.

Members were advised an amendment had been proposed by Councillor Sandford to introduce additional council meetings and the amendment was read out as contained within the Additional Information.

A vote was taken on the amendment to the recommendation from Councillor Sandford (12 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 15 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Haynes, Hogg, Howell, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Case, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh,

Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ali, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on the recommendation as originally moved (45 voted in favour, 10 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Against:** Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lillis, Murphy, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council approved, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2020/21 (attached in the additional information pack).

The Mayor  
6.00pm – 10.22pm  
5 February 2020  
Town Hall  
Bridge Street  
Peterborough

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b>	
<b><u>Questions from members of the public</u></b>	
1.	<p><b>Question from Simon Kail</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</b></p> <p>Hi, Simon Kail, Chair of Peterborough and Fenland Liberal Democrats. My question is, would the Cabinet Member agree that if we are to encourage people to use public transport it is essential that bus services can be easily accessed from new housing developments from when the first houses are built?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>I thank Mr Kail for his question. And whilst the premise of your question is certainly worthwhile and laudable, the reality as you must be aware is not that straight forward.</p> <p>When proposals for any new development come forward officers from both our Planning and Transport Departments work closely with developers to ascertain what level of infrastructure and services, including passenger transport, are required. We are aware that to encourage residents to adopt sustainable modes of transport it would help if each new development were to be served by a regular and frequent bus services from the date of the first occupation which is the thrust of your question. As you might imagine though, this needs to be balanced with other factors, including of course ensuring initially that the necessary physical infrastructure is in place to allow buses to operate and a sufficient level of new houses are actually occupied to make a commercial transport operation viable. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Mr Kail asked a follow up question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hiller for that. As you might have anticipated my particular concern is around the Roman Fields/Paston Reserve development, which has now been occupied for I think over ten years. We are onto the third phase of development and the council are placing people in social housing in the third phase of the development. I understand there is a Section 106 Agreement for £462,000 towards public transport and yet there are as yet no public bus services through the development and it doesn't look like there are going to be any in the immediate future. So, could he confirm if and when a public bus service will be available for the residents of that development please.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the follow up question Mr Kail. I am not aware of when that's likely to happen in the way that you've explained but I can certainly find out for you and I can respond by email. I am more than happy to do that but what you do have to bear in mind is that we need road surfaces, we need roundabouts, we need roads that</p>

provide suitable opportunities for buses to turn and of course bus stops to be installed. That may very well be the case with that particular development, Roman Fields I think you called it, but I am not aware of that. In larger developments however we do use what are known as trigger points which are preconditioned amounts of houses that are built and occupied before a developer is actually required to provide community facilities like schools or community centres or other infrastructure items.

Alongside this there are limits on the level of contribution we are able to secure to support bus services and we have to give careful consideration to balance the need to commence a service with the financial ability to keep that service running. Thank you Mr Mayor.

2. **Question from Charles Fenner**

**For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:**

With the amount of trees damaging paths, drains and properties in the Bretton area, can the Cabinet Member confirm whether, when the Council adopted the roads from the Peterborough Development Corporation, this included accepting liability for inappropriately planted trees that have now self-seeded? What does the Council look to do to rectify this issue, bearing in mind the potential for the Council to be billed for any repair works needed as a result of the close proximity of these trees?

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Mr Fenner. All the areas that we adopted from the Development Corporation containing trees are now our responsibility, the responsibility of Peterborough City Council. All the areas adopted from the Development Corporation, containing trees are now the responsibility of Peterborough City Council. We currently carry out regular checks on our vast tree stocks, and we do have vast tree stocks, and look at the Health and Safety of the tree. In locations where shelterbelts about the properties, we have started a scheme to thin the shelterbelts to give clearance and reduce potential for damage. I would be happy to arrange a walk about with one of our tree officers if you are so inclined Sir.

3. **Question from Charles Fenner**

**For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:**

Last year in the Bretton area a lot of bushes were also overgrown to the point of being dangerous, causing obstructions and potentially harming children. This was of course due to the unusual summer weather we had and growth was abnormally quick. However, the bushes in question have large thorns which are a hazard to children and, once overgrown, could also scratch vehicles in parking bays and making it also very difficult for those of poor sight, mobility and those with prams. These should be cut right back to a point where it would take a while to become overgrown.

Unfortunately, this has not happened. With a small "winter trim" that was all that was given. What measures are the Council putting in place to ensure that the bushes are cut back properly, so as not to cause a hazard or obstruction to those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters, or with prams, or damaging vehicles after a couple of months of being cut?

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Thank you Mr Fenner. Within our contract with Aragon Direct

Services, we pay for an annual cut of all the shrubs on Council land and this is to have them sided back, I'm sure you know what that means, topped to a year's growth and if during the season it is found that a shrub is obstructing the pathway or site lines on a road, this can be reported through Aragon Direct Services or to me if you prefer, and we will arrange to have these checked for any health and safety concerns and cut back accordingly if required. I have asked one of the Grounds Maintenance Supervisors from Aragon Direct Services to check the area you refer to, to make sure there are no current Health and Safety issues. Once again, happy to come out and do a walk about if you think that would be useful. Thank you Mr Mayor.

Page Break

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **Questions on notice to:**

- a. The Mayor
- b. To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
- c. To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

#### **1. Question from Councillor Nick Sandford**

##### **For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:**

When Cabinet authorised the installation of new LED lights across the city, as well as delivering energy savings we were told that the new lights would include a mechanism for reporting themselves if they go wrong and thus enabling speedy repairs.

We were told recently that the programme of installation of the lights is complete, yet I am still coming across instances of new LED lights which have been out of action for considerable periods of time. Does this mean that the new mechanism of self reporting of faults is itself not working for some reason?

##### **Councillor Hiller responded:**

I thank Councillor Sandford for his question. As you quite rightly say, and for the benefit of listeners at home, Councillor Sandford's question was about the reporting system of a new LED lights and if indeed it's faulty. No, it isn't a faulty system, Councillor Sandford. The fault reporting system pertaining to individual lamps works consistently well when power is available. Thank you Mr Mayor.

##### **Councillor Sandford asked a follow up question:**

I have come across a number of streetlights that have been out of action even under this system for a considerable period of time. I point out to him in Ravensthorpe near to the Welland underpass there were two streetlights that I believe have been out of action for a four week period. Now when I came across them I did actually report them but they had previously been out for quite some time. So I go back to the original question, is this system actually functioning because when we were sold the benefits of putting in these LED lights at considerable cost, we were told this was going to be one of the major benefits.

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Sandford for the follow up question. When you use phrases like when we were sold the benefits, I mean you as a Liberal Democrat surely must appreciate that a 70% power usage reduction for one of the biggest polluters of carbon dioxide in this city you must surely appreciate the benefits of the system we've installed. So the benefits I fell speak for themselves. However you did ask specifically about the fault system.

The way that it typically works is that when the system identifies a faulty lamp, it communicates to what's known a base station. The fault is highlighted and a maintenance ticket is raised to rectify the problem. In some cases however, possibly the ones you've said you've noticed, when a site inspection is undertaken, an underground service cable fault may be identified as the root cause. In which case you're talking about up to four weeks, in which case it can be a number a number of weeks to repair if indeed the fault is with UK Power Networks infrastructure whereby this Council is beholden to the service levels arrangements of that organisation. If there is a utilities company power supply issue to a street-light then as you might imagine, it is actually unable to communicate via the base station to our software in the office. It's a bit like boiling a, trying to boil a perfectly serviceable working kettle but without it actually being plugged in. And that's a good analogy I think. In this situation we rely on reports from our own officers, ward councillors of course and members of the public who report potential issues that we are not actually aware about in the scenario that I've described. I hope that helps, thank you Mr Mayor.

2. **Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

**For Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation:**

How much social housing are we looking to deliver in the next 24 months?

**Councillor Allen responded:**

I am pleased to note that like myself he is keen to get on top of the housing needs that we have in this city.

In 2019/2020 we're on target to deliver 343 affordable homes. 209 of which are affordable rented properties. This is a significant improvement on the 146 affordable homes delivered during the year 2018/19.

We continue to work with affordable housing providers to maintain this level of delivery over the forthcoming two years and as it stands there are 502 affordable homes scheduled for delivery in the next 24 months. 270 in 2020/21 and 232 in 2021/22. Thank you.

**Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a follow up question:**

Thank you Councillor Allen for your extensive response with the numbers. In relation to housing and the Northminster development could you kindly clarify what mixed residential use is likely to look like.

**Councillor Allen responded:**

Be assured about our desire to get the mix right but at this stage I can't tell you what the mix is, I can give you some further good news though. Of the numbers I gave you earlier, 122 affordable rented properties are scheduled for delivery in the next 2 years by Medesham Homes, the partnership that we have with Cross Keys Homes. We are on it and we are working towards the outcomes that we all want to provide for housing for the residents of this city.



3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor James Lillis</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:</b></p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how many successful prosecutions for fly tipping offences in Peterborough were there in 2019?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Thank you Councillor Lillis.</p> <p>Fly-tipping blights our communities as I'm sure you will agree. It makes our city look and feel unsafe, and has a wide reaching economic, social and environmental impacts. Aside from that it is also illegal. During 2019, the council prepared 14 cases to prosecute fly tippers in Peterborough, from which we managed to get six convictions. Three further cases are ongoing. In addition, our officers can and do, issue fixed penalty notices for fly-tipping of up to £300 and last year, 195 such notices were actually issued.</p> <p>To be fair I think we need to have conversations with the judiciary to see if we can get them to be just a little bit firmer with these people who ruin our city.</p> <p>More serious punishments, such as imprisonment, substantial fines of up to £50,000, orders to pay costs, and depriving rights to a vehicle used to commit fly-tipping, are levied by the courts, and our officers will always try to obtain the evidence required to bring serious or public cases before the judges. Cases in court generally rely on witness statements, and the behaviours of many fly-tippers often means nobody has witnessed the act. There is also rarely any substantial evidence of the identity of the offender left in a fly-tip.</p> <p>However, despite this, we are grateful for the powers given to us by government to clamp down on this visible and highly impactful offence, and for that support of our MP who has pledged to give his full support to tackling this problem. The council will always seek to take action against those that are responsible for dumping waste using certainly our enforcement powers and any others powers we have available to us.</p> <p>The council has recently invested in up-to-date overt and covert enforcement cameras, which will be positioned at hot-spots in special locations to gather evidence for enforcement and prevention purposes. Fly-tippers in Peterborough should be aware that we are taking a zero-tolerance approach to this most abhorrent of offensive and to put it in perspective it is expensive, time consuming and it ruins the world we live in.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Christian Hogg</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities:</b></p> <p>The UK Government is moving forward with planning the country's exit from the European Union (<i>EU</i>) to be completed on 31st December 2020.</p> <p>In Peterborough, there are around 30,000 residents who have come from the EU, EEA or Switzerland, who will need to apply for settled status before 30 June 2021, or 31 December 2020 if the UK leaves the EU without a deal.</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member, please inform council as to what action Peterborough City Council is taking to inform and support our residents in obtaining</p>

settled status so that their future in this city is secured?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. It's very important that UK nationals living and working in Peterborough are aware of what they need to do to secure settled status. and this has been the council's primary focus relating to Brexit for some time. Many of our EU residents play a vital role in the economic viability of our city as well as providing much needed expertise in public service roles and we highly value them.

We have worked very closely with the Home Office to promote the EU Settlement Scheme, which we have done in the following ways:

- Our web site contains all relevant information about how to apply for settled status, and we have been active on social media to spread the word.
- Our libraries offer an assisted digital service to support people to complete their applications.
- Our Registration Office offers a validation service to ensure applications are submitted with the correct evidence.
- We have commissioned a local voluntary organisation to engage directly with EU residents, and to support them with their applications.
- We are working closely with PARCA (*Peterborough Asylum & Refugee Community Association*) and GLADCA (*Gladstone District Community Association*), two Peterborough-based organisations funded by the Home Office, to promote the scheme.
- We have held targeted workshops for community leaders and EU citizens, including sessions at City Hospital, the Polish Community Saturday School, and at the Queen Katherine Academy and
- We are ensuring our own EU staff are aware of the scheme, and what they need to do to secure settled status

Any Member who wishes to promote the scheme is welcome to contact me so that I can refer them to the appropriate officer. Thank you Mr Mayor.

5. **Question from Councillor Chris Ash**

**For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities:**

Throughout the city, vehicles are being parked within the curtilage of a property without the benefit of a proper vehicle crossing point (a.k.a dropped kerb) from the highway. Very often this causes damage to the footpath and mud and debris picked up from the vehicle leaves a slippery surface on the footpath making this dangerous for all users and especially anyone who is not so good on their feet.

It is also a matter of annoyance to those that have gone through and paid for the proper process to have a vehicle crossing point.

Is any action being taken, and if so what action against those who drive across the footpath or for that matter leave vehicles parked on the foot path causing an obstruction and danger to those legitimately using the footpath.

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I must admit that we did struggle to understand exactly what it was that Councillor Ash was concerned about but we have worked hard with officers and I think I've come up with a comprehensive answer for him but that is up to him to decide.

So, vehicles crossing the highway, via a full height kerb, is an offence under the Highways Act 1980 and although technically this gives the Local Authority the power to enforce this, practically this requires extensive witness evidencing of the offence taking place which is clearly rarely feasible. Highways will still inspect and ensure highway safety is maintained where reasonably practicable, when informed of such cases and encourage property owners including housing associations where breach of property tenancy agreements may be compromised to have approved dropped vehicle crossings installed wherever possible. In addition, it's worth noting powers to tackle pavement obstruction were not handed to local authorities under legislation, which decriminalised parking enforcement across England. Pavement obstruction remains a criminal offence for which the police hold enforcement powers, and therefore instances of pavement obstruction should be reported to them directly. Whilst paving on pavements is not expressly forbidden, local authorities can prohibit it in specific locations where deemed appropriate, via the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order and corresponding signage being erected. The council operate a verge and pavement parking policy to control how and when such schemes are implemented, and full details of this process are available to view on the council's website. In addition, when Highways carry out larger footway resurfacing programmes, we offer residents of the road being worked on, the opportunity to have a dropped vehicle crossing installed at a reduced rate.

So I hope that goes a good way towards answering the question, thank you.

**Councillor Ash asked a follow up question:**

Yes, thank you. First of all apologies if my question wasn't clear. What I really needed to know was, while Councillor Walsh gave us the fact information, what I really wanted to know was that when these complaints are made are actions taken and does the council work with the police to make sure enough space is left when people do park on the footpaths between that and say garden walls. And the other thing really I wanted to know was do officers actually make notes when they are out and about or simply rely on and act upon, I hope, information from the public?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

I'll do my best to answer that also Councillor Ash. First of all I do agree that highway safety is very important and will be maintained when locations are notified to us or when identified by officers through their routine safety inspections. So, there are those. Both our Highways Enforcement Teams will continue to work with the police when their intervention and powers are required. So, for example in severe cases of persistent obstruction of footways, when there is no other traffic order in place. However, parking is a very low police priority as we can all imagine and hence any offence of obstruction would need to be significant and would depend on other priorities they are dealing with at the time. That is the reality we have to live with. Thank you.

6. **Question from Councillor Terri Haynes**

**For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities:**

Peterborough is one of five cities taking part in the governments "Integrated Communities" scheme and in August residents across various parts of the city took part in focus groups and we were told that the reports would be produced by University College Peterborough (UCP), who lead the focus groups, within weeks. Five months later and yet another deadline has been set for the report to be completed by the end of January. Can the relevant Cabinet Member explain the delay, how much UCP have been paid for carrying out this portion of the work, confirm

when the report will be completed (if the most recent deadline was not met) and that this lengthy wait has not had any negative impact on our participation or lead to any setbacks on other stages of the scheme.

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. We are delighted to be working with UCP on this important research, which, as you will appreciate, is complex and wide-ranging. UCP have been provided with £15,000 to complete the work referred to in the question, funded entirely from the government funding that Peterborough has received. Ten focus groups were established last Summer, examining their own and others' perceptions of integration in Peterborough in five different categories. The contract with UCP required them to present the initial findings of the research at a workshop in September, which was achieved. These initial findings were also shared by Dr Tim Hall at the Peterborough Together Partnership meeting in October 2019. Dr Hall has reported to the Partnership his intention to publish his full report in the coming days. I can absolutely reassure Councillor Haynes that the timeline worked to has not led to any negative consequences, nor will it affect other stages of the programme. Thank you Mr Mayor.

7. **Question from Councillor Andrew Bond**

**For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:**

What is the average length of time it takes between a pothole being reported to it being fixed in Peterborough?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

Yes Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Bond for his question which as you quite rightly say relates to pothole fixing time between report and repair In Peterborough, like any other highways authority in the UK, there isn't actually a stock answer I'm afraid. It rather depends on the severity of the pothole and its location. Did you have one particular pothole in mind Councillor Bond?

**Councillor Bond responded:**

I didn't have any particular but I mean I can stand up here for 20 minutes and point out more potholes that need repairing across the city. However it was just something I could perhaps tell residents when they get very frustrated about the lack of action on potholes sometimes. To say, well it should be fixed within this date and if not let me know and I'll see what I can do about it.

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

I'm not sure there was a question there Mr Mayor other than just Councillor Bond's frustration in walking 20 minutes and finding potholes. I would remind Councillor Bond that if he goes to Leicester, Nottingham or Oxford or Cambridge, he would find considerably more potholes than we have around our fair city. As I touched upon before Mr Mayor, the time taken to repair a pothole varies depending on its size and the category of road that it's on and Councillor Bond wasn't specific.

For each road in our city is classified using a number of different factors, primarily on how busy it is.in terms of average traffic volume. This directly informs the response time which varies from 2 hours to actually to 28 days. For example, if a pothole is reported as being a "danger to life and limb" and requires an emergency response, then on a major arterial road the remedial time would normally be within two hours. That said, I would encourage the reporting of all potholes as soon as practically possible to the highway service and this has recently been made a lot easier Mr

Mayor, and it's interesting I hope to other Members, the more efficient use of the App Report. Peterborough which uses Fix My Street, I have actually used it myself, anonymously for a recent surface fault in my village and I was very pleased indeed with both the efficiency of the repair and the progress reporting before and after the effect. I might just add Mr Mayor if you will allow me, that under this Administration I am pleased to say that our Peterborough Highways Services has been consistently voted by the general public, the general public Mr Mayor as the best performing highways service in the East of England, let that just sink in, and consistently within the UK. I have finished now Mr Mayor so you have no need to worry.

8. **Question from Councillor Nick Sandford**

**For Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation:**

Would the relevant Cabinet Member join with me in recognising the amazing success in recent years of the Peterborough Sports Football Club, who have won three promotions in the last four seasons and are now once again in contention for promotion from the Southern League Premier division. If they do win promotion this year to the National League, they will be only two further promotions away from achieving Football League status.

What can the Council do to support and publicise the work of successful local sports clubs such as Peterborough Sports?

**Councillor Allen responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor, I'm delighted to respond to the question from Councillor Sandford. First, let me echo your comments in recognition of the fantastic achievements Councillor Sandford of Peterborough Sports FC. As with so many sports clubs and groups in our city, Peterborough Sports have demonstrated just what can be achieved through hard work, determination and a strong team approach.

The council, along with our partners at Vivacity, will support and promote all sports within the city, and will help celebrate the success of all clubs no matter what level is achieved. The Council approved its Active Lifestyles Strategy in March last year, which runs until 2020. The strategy sets out a range of ways in which sports and other active lifestyle opportunities will be developed and promoted across Peterborough in order that activity is the heart of everything we do.

The work to deliver the strategy is being driven forward by a partnership group drawn from a range of organisations in the city who are involved in sports and other related fields, and progress will be presented to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee early in the next municipal year. Thank you.

**Councillor Sandford asked a follow up question:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I would like to thank Councillor Allen for that answer. I think quite often we come to this council and complain about things but I think it is important we do recognise it's achievements. If Peterborough Sports gets promoted at the end of the season they will have gone up four times out of five seasons which is quite remarkable. When I was recently at the ground, I came across a former mayor of Peterborough, Keith Sharpe, who is actually working as a volunteer for the club so he's obviously also recognising their achievements.

**Councillor Allen responded:**

I didn't actually hear a question, I did hear perhaps Councillor Sandford confirming what I said about our support for sport and active lifestyles in the city but what I would

	<p>do is to urge any Member to have a look at the strategy, and if you have ideas for ways in which we can continue to promote the amazing achievements of local groups, I'd be pleased to hear them. Infact here we have the new proposals for the Active Lifestyles going forward. These will be presented as I said in the next municipal year and I would hope that Councillors can submit their thoughts on how we are taking this forward. Thank you.</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Councillor James Lillis</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities:</b>          Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how many fines were issues for dog fouling in Peterborough during in 2019?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b>          Yes, thank you Mr Mayor.          Dog Fouling is an offence that is notoriously difficult to enforce as you can imagine, so if an officer is present then the owners are compliant. If an officer is not there, the person isn't being watched, then this is when the offence happens. This difficulty is reflected in the fact that in 2019, four fixed penalty notices were issued for the offence. Officers have though issued a number of formal warning letters to dog owners where separate intelligence suggests they are not cleaning up after their pet.</p> <p>Our approach has, instead, focussed on promoting responsible dog ownership accompanied by educational patrols and visits to known hot spots by our dog warden. Where there is a repeated problem, the dog warden will also review signage and dog waste bins, as well as arranging for temporary dog fouling signs to be marked on the pavements.</p> <p>So if Members are concerned about a particular location where dog fouling is a menace, they are urged to contact our Prevention and Enforcement Services so that matters can be looked into.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority:</b>          £7.5m regeneration funding was agreed at full council on 8 March 2017 for Millfield and New England. Three years on, what is the underlying reason for the delay?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b>          Yes Mr Mayor. Thank you Shaz for your question.          In the Council 17/18 budget an investment of £7.5million in capital funding was allocated to support investment in physical regeneration across the Can-Do area of the city. The funding was allocated into three different investment strands, namely the public realm, community facilities and areas of open space. To date, £663,000 has been spent or allocated on a range of projects including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a new urban park at Dyson Close</li> <li>• Work to identify and design public realm improvement schemes for the Lincoln Road corridor</li> <li>• Installation of an outdoor 'green gym' which is used very frequently.</li> <li>• Installation of new play equipment in three parks</li> <li>• Planting of more than 30 tress in locations where trees had previously been removed</li> <li>• A project run by Gladstone Connect to revitalise public spaces</li> </ul>

- Major capital works at the Gladstone Park Community Centre in advance of it transferring to the Thomas Deacon Trust

In addition to that, a range of discussions continue to be held relating to some of the key issues and sites within the area, including the New England complex, the Stagecoach bus station, and the land at the Alma Road/Lincoln Road junction. Alongside a review of the capital programme, the Cabinet will shortly be asked to consider the future investment plans for this area. Thank you Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Shaz Nawz had a follow up question:**

Thank you very much Councillor Holdich for your response. I think it wouldn't be unreasonable or unfair to say that the people of Can-Do feel that this Administration has neglected that particular area and £7.5million Councillor Holdich was promised best part of three years ago as you alluded to you in your initial response and seeing as it was under your leadership that funding or investment was promised, what do you intend to do in the next couple of months to insure and assure the people of that Can-Do area that they will received that £7.5million funding?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

I'm glad he said that Mr Mayor because we've been having a little bit of a ding-dong on the thing about this. If that was in my patch I'd be ashamed of myself because I'd have made sure that more money of that investment was spent or at least we'd got a plan to spend it. When I put that to Councillor Nawaz he said well what can my ward councillors do and I said to him well if you should not be leader if you don't know what that's about. We are actually spending money in there. When the cabinet programme comes up because if he'd kept himself under the rainbow this wouldn't have come out to be discussed. And it was in there because I think it's two point some odd million for three years. It's now been and looked and I looked at it and I think if we've got to move the bus depot which will make a huge difference to that area, we can regenerate the whole area. Why wouldn't you plant trees and do seats or whatever you want to do in that patch when you going to completely gut the area when the bus area leaves. And the bus does need to leave because if we are going to have electric buses or cheap, easier to run buses then we need to get it out there and that will make hell of a difference to that and I wouldn't want to spend or earmark money to spend knowing they'd be pulled up again in 12 months time. Thank you Mr Mayor.

11. **Question from Councillor Christian Hogg**

**For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities:**

Can the relevant Cabinet Member please inform council on the plan for the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) now that Kingdom is no longer contracted to the council, will this service remain as it is or will there be an increase in its capacity?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. The Prevention and Enforcement Service is being remodelled with the aim of improving our ability to meet Peterborough-wide demand. Kingdom Environmental Services were focused purely on the Public Space Protection areas in the city centre, Millfield, and Woodston. The newly restructured PES will bring a team of envirocrime officers in-house to perform this function, as well as being able to be deployed across Peterborough according to demand.

We are also refreshing how other resources are allocated in the PES with the aim of supporting our Think Communities approach. A team of four Community Safety Officers who will be allocated a geographical area and will be the named individuals

who work with communities and partners to respond to issues. They will be supported by a citywide Problem-Solving Officer who will work as an expert to guide the team in more complex issues such as Anti-Social Behaviour cases requiring a legislative response. A team of six Envirocrime Officers will perform the functions previously delivered by Kingdom, but will be more flexible in their deployment to serve areas of highest demand. A team of 13 Parking Officers, an increase on the current number, will improve our ability to serve parking demands across Peterborough. And finally, a dedicated City Centre Operations Team will pool resourcing from across the council to ensure we have all the right staff in one place to deal with issues in our commercial centre, including rough sleeping.

The new model is being phased in from February 2020, that is as we speak and will be fully operational by April 2020.

**Councillor Hogg asked a follow up question:**

I do and thank you very much again for a comprehensive answer Councillor Walsh. I just wanted to double check that the Kingdom relationship is now completely over, specifically the one with Local Authority Support Limited which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kingdom. Is that the case?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Our relationship is at an end, thank you.

12. **WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Skibsted**

**For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:**

I have been approached by many residents in my ward about the critical state of parking. There is insufficient space for the amount of cars, and no plan to improve this problem for the many residents in Orton Longueville ward. Specifically, I have been asked by residents in Clayton if waste land and a small wall, now unused for any purpose, could be cleared to make way for some extra spaces. This has been done in the first block in Clayton but not the other three. The situation is now quite desperate where often residents have nowhere to park and emergency services cannot access houses.

Are the council willing to remove some of the unused areas of wasteland etc to alleviate this issue, and if not, what will they do about this worsening crisis in all areas of the ward?

**Councillor Hiller's response was included in the Questions Report as follows:**

Parking is an issue across the city where levels of car ownership continue to increase and whilst the Council appreciates that this may be a difficult issue for people to deal with on a day to day basis it is not in a position to undertake work to introduce new parking provision. We would advise that if a Councillor, or a resident, would like to explore the feasibility of changing the use of a particular area of land then they should contact the Council who will first undertake a land ownership check. More often than not the land is not currently in the ownership of the Highways Team or even the Council. Depending on the results of this proposals could then be developed to look at new provision but this would come at a cost that must be met before any work can progress.



**Questions on notice to:**

d. The Combined Authority Representatives

1.	None received.
----	----------------