

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 25 JANUARY 2017
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS

Present:

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

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lamb, Dowson, Ayres, Azher Iqbal, Over, and Lillis.

2. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on:

(a) 17 November 2016 – Extraordinary Meeting

The minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 17 November 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(b) 14 December 2016 – Special Meeting

The minutes of the special meeting held on 14 December 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(c) 14 December 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2016 were approved as a true and accurate record.

A question was raised as to whether the Councillors' names could be attributed to particular comments within the minutes. The Legal Officer advised that this was not general practice, but would look into the matter.

COMMUNICATIONS

4. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor advised the Council of a number of upcoming mayoral events, including:

- The Holocaust Memorial Day Service at 11:00am on 26 January, including a procession from the Town Hall and service in St John's Church;
- The Katherine of Aragon Service at 10:00am on 27 January, with a procession from the museum to a service in the Cathedral; and
- The Mayor's Charity Valentine Dinner and Dance at 7:00pm on 11 February in the reception room.

The Mayor confirmed that the procession for the Holocaust Memorial Day would begin from the Town Hall at 11:15am.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

6. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

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

1. Air quality and the pursuance of electric buses;
2. Future plans for land to the east of the Hamptons.

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

7. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members.

8. 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

The Legal Officer advised that the order in which questions were asked was determined by ballot.

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

1. The Prevention and Enforcement Team and the incorporation of Planning Enforcement;
2. The Paston/Norwood reserve;
3. The Council's Biodiversity Strategy and the use of pesticides;
4. The development of the Alma Road Medical Centre site;
5. The availability of 'Safer Parking Banners' for local schools;
6. The installation of CCTV cameras in Central Park;
7. Burnt out and abandoned vehicles within the city;
8. Manor Drive and the Local Transport Plan;
9. Stef and Philips and the transfer of properties;
10. Norwood School fence and gate; and
11. Social housing and affordable homes in relation to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

9. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Council Tax Support Scheme 2017/18

Cabinet, at its meeting of 16 January 2017, received a report which set out proposals on the Council Tax Support Scheme in Peterborough for the financial year 2017/18. There was a statutory requirement for the council to set a localised council tax support scheme by 31 January 2017 and formed part of the formal budget process under the Budget and Policy framework.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendation. It was advised that in April 2013 the provision of support for Council Tax payments was localised, to be reviewed annually. The Council had maintained the local scheme at a reduction of 30% for the past four years. The only changes proposed within the 2017/18 scheme were technical, in order to align the scheme with the new housing benefit rules. Council were advised that the link to the online consultation had not worked correctly, however, that did not invalidate the proposals. Low level consultation responses had been received in previous years. No comments had been received from Scrutiny or the Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme Board. The Council was also signed up to the Citizen's Advice Bureau's Council Tax Arrears Good Practice Protocol and Discretionary Hardship Policy.

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

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

- The 'sharp increase' in households being issued with court summons and what this figure was year on year.
- Whether any further comments had been received since the consideration of the proposals by Cabinet.
- Questions were raised as to why consultation responses to the Council were generally so low.
- As the purpose of seeking a contribution for Council Tax by those on the scheme was to encourage employment, it was questioned whether there had

been any realisation of this.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and noted that unemployment in the Peterborough area had decreased.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the motion and advised that low responses to consultations were a concern, however, that the Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme Board and the Citizen's Advice Bureau had been specifically approached for their comments. Councillor Seaton advised that a court summons would be issued only if necessary and that such situations would be dealt with with great care. It was noted that when the scheme was first introduced, 11,500 individuals were signed up. Currently this was 9,000. A decrease in 2,000 was considered a positive step.

A vote was taken (35 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 18 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed a Local Council Tax Support scheme for Peterborough that contained the following local components:

- a) No change to the existing scheme reduction of 30% for all eligible working age claimants; and
- b) Aligned the Council Tax Support Scheme to Housing Benefit rules making it less complicated for claimants.

10. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

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

1. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held 16 January 2017.
2. Call In by Scrutiny Committee or Commission.
3. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call In provisions
4. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 6 December 2016 and 17 January 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Council Taxbase, Business Rates, and Collection Fund Declaration 2017/18

Councillor Ellis asked what action was being taken against the business rates deficit of £2,228,000.

Councillor Seaton advised that the deficit figure was due, in the main, to appeals of business rate valuation. The Council had no power to alter the outcome of appeals.

Real Time Passenger Information

Councillor Fower queried whether the £55,000 was solely in relation to Peterborough City Council, or shared across the authorities within the Partnering Agreement.

Councillor Hiller confirmed that the £55,000 were savings accrued by the Council, up

to this figure.

Councillor Ellis requested an update on the roll out of the scheme across the city.

Councillor Hiller advised that the scheme would be rolled out over five years and that he would keep Councillor Ellis informed of its progress.

Peterborough City Council Construction Framework

Councillor Ferris questioned whether a sustainable procurement procedure had been utilised to secure the Construction Framework, taking into account compliance with international principles.

Councillor Seaton confirmed that he would provide the assessment matrix used within the procurement process. The companies included within the framework were mainly local firms.

Councillor Ali asked what opportunity would be provided to local business under the framework.

Councillor Holdich advised that a large majority of the firms under the framework were local.

Request for Public Consultation for Public Space Protection Orders

Councillor Shearman questioned whether selling Big Issue would be considered begging and whether charity 'Chuggers' were to be considered as anti-social?

Councillor Holdich advised that as long as Big Issue sellers were within their nominated pitches with the relevant identification, they would not be affected by the Public Space Protection Orders proposed. It was Councillor Holdich's intention to try to restrict the presence of charity 'Chuggers' on the street.

Councillor Fower raised a question in relation whether, under the proposed Public Space Protection Orders, blankets, bags, and belongings of individuals would be removed from the street due to health and safety risks.

Councillor Walsh considered that if a situation arose that presented a public safety risk, then that must be dealt with. It was not considered, however, that the private belongings would be removed without need. If Councillor Fower had any specific instances he would like to report, Councillor Walsh would ensure that these were investigated.

Councillor Fower further questioned why 56% of reported fly tipping cases were not investigated.

Councillor Elsey advised that cases where there was not any significant evidence that would allow the perpetrators to be identified would not be investigated, as there was virtually no possibility of success.

Provision of Non Social Care Temporary Agency Workers

Councillor Murphy sought clarification on what the changes were to the contract for the provision of non-social care temporary agency workers and whether any of the temporary agency workers in question were ever Council employees.

Councillor Seaton confirmed that he would provide Councillor Murphy a response to his questions in writing.

Councillor Davidson questioned why the Council were able to spend £4 million on the contract, while decreasing support at Clare Lodge and increasing Council Tax.

Councillor Seaton advised that the £4 million was not related to Clare Lodge or Council Tax and that temporary non care workers were a necessary requirement.

Councillor Shearman sought clarification on whether the £1 million a year was based on the number of employees

Councillor Holdich confirmed that this was calculated using the average number of temporary agency workers utilised, based on past experience.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

11. Notices of Motion

1. Motion from Councillor Sandford

This Council believes that the need to tackle climate change through reducing carbon emissions and the worsening situation with regard to air quality necessitate a large scale shift in the UK to use of energy from renewable sources, such as wind, solar, wave and tidal power.

Council notes that:

- 1. Other countries such as China, USA and India are investing massively in renewable energy: for example China proposes to invest an additional £200 billion in renewables by 2020;*
- 2. Peterborough has a good record on promoting solar energy but we have seen little investment in wind energy;*
- 3. The Peterborough Core strategy policy CS11 gave strong support to expansion of renewable energy but this is weakened in Policy LP31 of the draft new Peterborough Local Plan and in particular the new policy allocates no sites as suitable for construction of wind turbines; and*
- 4. Despite Peterborough promoting itself as "Environment Capital", the Council's Peterborough Energy Scheme supplies electricity which is only 33% from renewable sources, with the remainder coming from fossil fuels and nuclear energy.*

Council calls on the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet to:

- 1. Take all necessary steps to ensure that our new Local Plan does contain a strong commitment to expansion of renewable energy in Peterborough and that residents, employers and developers are given positive incentives to install renewable energy capacity in homes and commercial/industrial developments; and*
- 2. Negotiate with Ovo Energy a new tariff under the Peterborough Energy Scheme so that residents signing up to the scheme are given an option to go for 100% renewable energy.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Sandford noted that climate change had featured in the news in recent days. Other parts of the world were beginning to see the significant impact that climate change could cause. The UK had pledged to cut its carbon emissions by 20% by 2050. Councillor Sandford drew attention to the two final paragraphs of his motion. It was considered that the Council's commitment to supporting renewable energy had been significantly diminished in the new draft Local Plan, and failed to allocate any suitable sites for renewable energy. It was further considered that, as Ovo Energy offered a 100% renewable energy tariff, that this should be offered to customers of the Peterborough Energy Scheme.

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

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

- Comment was made that while the motion specifically referred to wind turbines, fewer applications were being made for these, as offshore wind farms became more popular.
- It was further suggested that wind power was unreliable and not efficient.
- Suggestion was made that the motion was meaningless. There was no developer interest in renewable energy sites, as there were no subsidies available. As such, there was not thought to be any point in allocating space for them in the Local Plan.
- It was noted that the energy from the 100% renewable tariff came from the same source as the 33% renewable tariff.
- Comments were made to support the intention behind the motion. It was considered that Peterborough should be at the forefront of including renewable energy sites in its Local Plan.
- It was suggested that the work of the motion was already being undertaken. The Council was close to signing up to the 'UK 100', a commitment to become a 100% carbon free city by 2050.
- It was suggested that small scale renewable energy development could also be looked at within the Local Plan.
- It was considered that if the Council was already undertaking such work, then it was only sensible to agree to the motion.
- Comment was made that tidal, thermal and other types of energy other than wind energy would be a more appropriate focus.

Councillor Fower exercised his right to speak and identified that, with increasing extreme weather, climate change was a serious issue. Peterborough had a good history of promoting renewable energy and had the potential to help find a solution. The motion put forward was to encourage renewable energy within the Local Plan and to provide the choice to customers of the Peterborough Energy Scheme of a

truly green energy tariff.

Councillor Sandford summed up as mover of the motion and welcomed the supportive comments from the Chamber. It was emphasised that the key parts of the motion were the last two paragraphs, and renewable energy in general. If no land was allocated to renewable energy sites within the Local Plan, then there would be no chance to provide any. It was noted that the energy tariff provided by all provided 'the same energy', however, the equivalent level of green energy would be generated for those on a green tariff.

A vote was taken (23 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 2 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

12. Reports to Council

(a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority – Scrutiny Arrangements

Council received a report which requested that the Council appoint two representatives to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that the proposals had been discussed by all the local authorities signed up to the Combined Authority and that proportionality was calculated on a county wide basis.

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

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

- Concern was raised over the how equitable the distribution of seats on the Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee was, as it was noted that authorities with a much smaller population than Peterborough were given the same number of seats.
- It was further noted that mileage costs would be paid to the Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee representatives.

Councillor Holdich summed up as mover of the motion and requested that the Legal Officer confirm the arrangements for political representation.

The Legal Officer advised that the selection for the Combined Authority selection was to be equal across each of the Councils involved and that the proportionality calculations were made by considering the political groups represented across the County.

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

- 1) Appointed two members (one from the Labour Group and one from Conservative Group) to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority; and

- 2) Appointed Councillor Jamil as the Labour Group member and Councillor Over as the Conservative Group member.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 8:55pm

FULL COUNCIL 25 JANUARY 2017

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
6.	<u>Questions from members of the public</u>
1.	<p>Question from Ms Beki Sellick</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Despite Peterborough's environment city commitment, air quality has not improved (nitrogen dioxide levels actually increased in the latest Progress report of 2014, as published on the PCC website) so, given that road traffic is cited as a major source of Peterborough's air pollution, why is PCC not actively pursuing electric buses, which were introduced in London last year and in Nottingham last month?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Pollution levels associated with transport in Peterborough do not exceed National air quality standards or objectives and the Council does a lot of work to try to minimise traffic emissions by installing new infrastructure and running targeted initiatives to promote walking, cycling, public transport and electric vehicles. Buses continue to have a positive impact on the city. Since 2004 the number of passenger journeys has increased by 50% and the council also invests approximately £700k a year subsidising passenger transport services.</p> <p>The Council maintains an excellent relationship with bus operators and we are always keen to explore opportunities for them to continually improve their fleet to electric and other forms of low emission vehicles. Stagecoach in Peterborough have the newest fleets of all the Stagecoach depots in Cambridgeshire. Their single decker fleet was renewed in 2014 and the double decker fleet in 2010 and 2012. Consequently, they have no current plans to upgrade their fleet to electric but we will continue to explore opportunities. I should point out that Nottingham and London have had to invest millions of pounds on electric buses and the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Ms Beki Sellick asked a supplementary question, in summary:</p> <p>Emission levels has increased since the previous report, despite the work being undertaken. This was not adequate. Further work could be carried out to reduce the number of HGV's and buses in the Council's long term plans.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded, in summary:</p> <p>The Council was committed to consider viable and enforceable methods of reducing</p>

	emission levels and would do its very best.
2.	<p>Question from Mr Christopher Wiggin</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Land to the east of the Hamptons is currently reserved for the future building of a railway station. What is the council's plan for this land?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Under the terms of the Section 106 agreement and area of land to the east side of the railway line is reserved for a potential future railway station. The Section 106 agreement requires the safeguarding of a site of sufficient size to accommodate road access, bus turning space, cycle parking and waiting area. However, it does not provide any funding for the station or associated infrastructure. That would be a matter for Network Rail rather than the Council, but it is understood that they do not currently have any plans to provide or fund a station. The land is safeguarded only until the occupation of the 2000th dwelling either within the township centre or on land to the east of the A15.</p> <p>Mr Christopher Wiggin asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Given the extra powers being given to the new combined authority for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire it is likely money could be available for Peterborough that wasn't available before to contribute toward the building of this station. The station has been removed from the second draft of the local plan, will the council join me in making a representation to consultation to the plan to restore this safeguarded land to the plan?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>It is something we can give a great deal of thought to and will certainly discuss with the leader of this council. The land you must be aware is safeguarded for this use until the occupation of dwelling number 2000 either within the township centre or on land to the east of the A15. As far as I am aware Mr Mayor Network Rail don't have any plans to fund or provide a station but I am sure Mr Wiggin himself could make his own enquiries or indeed through his Liberal Democrat Colleagues.</p>

COUNCIL BUSINESS

8. Questions on notice to:

- i) The Mayor
- ii) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
- iii) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

1. Question from Councillor Shearman

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital

The introduction of the Prevention and Enforcement Team is already beginning to bring about welcome and tangible improvements in enforcement matters in Park Ward. However, in a recent issue which involved the police, environmental protection and the planning department, I became aware that Planning Enforcement is not part of the Prevention and Enforcement structure. Would the Cabinet Member please explain why this is so, and whether there are plans to address this anomaly?

Councillor Walsh responded:

Thank you for the question and for recognising the promising start to the work of the Prevention and Enforcement Service. There is still much to do but I am confident the service will continue to go from strength to strength.

Unlike the enforcement functions of the Prevention and Enforcement Service, planning enforcement is actually an integral part of the overall planning service this council is responsible for. The officers within the service are qualified specialist planning officers who are required to consult closely with colleagues in the development management service to determine whether or not to take enforcement action based on a variety of factors.

Like any enforcement action the council takes, planning enforcement has to be proportionate but one of the key differences with planning enforcement is that officers cannot enforce just to make everything the same. In other words, a blanket enforcement approach is not permitted as part of the Planning Enforcement function.

I am assured that officers within the Prevention and Enforcement Service already work closely with our Planning Enforcement officers, and that this relationship will be encouraged and enabled to grow further as the PES becomes ever more established.

Councillor Shearman asked a supplementary question:

Just to thank Councillor Walsh for her answer. I felt I needed to point out what I sensed was an anomaly but I understand the points that you are making. Thank you very much.

Councillor Walsh responded:

If I may come back on that. It was a perfectly good question and I must say that I had

	<p>to think hard about it and discuss with colleagues. You did set me thinking and I had the same question about regulatory services myself and again the answer is similar, different functions covering different geography etc. Thank you.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Goodwin, Cabinet Member for City Centre Management, Culture and Tourism</p> <p>With significant expansion planned in the coming years at the Paston/Norwood reserve, could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know what cultural, leisure or tourist facilities, local residents can expect to see introduced at the aforementioned location?</p> <p>Councillor Goodwin responded:</p> <p>In response, the council are currently undertaking a review of all leisure facilities including playing pitches and green space located in the city in order to build an evidence base for future development for which Paston and Norwood are included. The recommendations of this review will form part of the council's new active lifestyles strategy in partnership with Sport England and will be managed by a board with representatives from across the city.</p> <p>With regard to culture and tourism, the council's cultural strategy makes provision to expand cultural opportunities. This is through partnerships with Vivacity, Peterborough Presents and Eastern Angles outside the city centre through community provision which also include Paston and Norwood, with activity taking place at Paston Farm and Honeyhill Family Centre.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>According to core strategy policy CS18 and I quote "the council will encourage development of new cultural, leisure and tourist facilities that will meet the needs of the growing population particularly in the proposed new urban extensions of Great Haddon and Paston Reserve and Norwood. My question is can the cabinet member please provide me and my colleagues of some precise examples of what will be introduced to meet the needs of the growing population and the Paston and Norwood reserve.</p> <p>Councillor Goodwin responded:</p> <p>That is what the review is all about and until that extensive review is carried out we won't know exactly what the needs are and what we will be able to provide.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Ferris</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>The Council's Biodiversity Strategy states that "The Council and Amey continue to review the use of pesticides (including fungicides and herbicides) in the Council's land management". Can the Cabinet Member responsible tell me what steps are being taken to reduce the use of pesticides?</p>

	<p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Whilst the Amey contract allows the use of pesticides, its use is minimised and very carefully targeted in line with regulations, the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health. It is currently I am sure you will appreciate uneconomical to carry out hand-weeding of beds.</p> <p>It is also noteworthy that the council has recently entered into licence agreements with conservation organisations to manage several of its nature reserves where no pesticides are used.</p> <p>Councillor Ferris asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>In view of our recent research that has just been published which demonstrated that herbicides such as glyphosate which is most commonly used in the city can cause liver disease at very low doses thousands of times below levels allowed by regulators worldwide and in view of the World Health Organisations own research agency's comment that glyphosate is a possible carcinogen do you not agree with me that we should be trying to phase out glyphosate use around street trees and parks and indeed anywhere where children and people are regularly active?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Yes of course this is concerning as it is concerning that we shouldn't eat burnt toast anymore. It is necessary for us to look at this. I'm very happy to talk to him off line about it and see what we can do. I can't obviously make a commitment here and now.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Ferris</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member responsible tell me when the abandoned former Alma Road Medical Centre site will be developed in accordance with the wishes of the local community, who were consulted and have yet to see any action to give them confidence that the Council is committed to investing in the regeneration of Millfield?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>As Councillor Ferris may be aware, the Council currently has no budget to develop the Alma Road site and as far as I understand there is no single, agreed community view of what use the site could be put to.</p> <p>However Councillor Ferris what I can tell you is this administration has given very careful consideration to the need to invest in both this site and the wider public realm, open space and the community infrastructure of the area as part of our carefully considered emerging phase 2 budget proposals for the financial year 2017/18. You will be pleased to hear that the cross party budget working group has also been involved and our proposals will be published imminently and I am sure that they will address your concerns about this site Councillor Ferris.</p>

5.	<p>Question from Councillor Bond</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills, University, and Communications</p> <p>Towards the end of last year I requested 'safer parking banners' for three of the local primary schools, who were seeing significant issues regarding the safety of their children; due to the parking issues our cities schools are facing. My question to the relevant Cabinet Member is; why are there only two of these banners available at any one given time? When this is clearly a city wide issue?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>Thank you for raising the issue of inconsiderate parking outside schools. A 'Safer Parking' campaign is available for schools to deliver, supported by the Prevention and Enforcement Service's Road Safety team.</p> <p>The scheme is designed to assist with stopping drivers parking on 'School Keep Clear' markings and to encourage parents to park safely and sensibly. The campaign is a mixture of enforcement and education and consists of banners being placed outside schools where feasible. Due to the demand of the campaign the Prevention and Enforcement Service is currently in the process of arranging for a further 2 sets of the banners to be printed which will be available for schools use across the city where there is an on-going parking issues.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Shearman</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>For a number of years now, councillors in Park Ward, together with the Friends of Central Park, have been asking for the number CCTV cameras in Central Park to be increased, as well as the lighting close to the cameras to be enhanced in order to make the identification of individuals involved in criminal activities easier. In recent days the Park has suffered again from several incidents of criminal damage, yet the small number of CCTV cameras currently in place in the park is likely to mean the perpetrators will not be apprehended.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member take immediate action over this matter and undertake a review of the current situation in the park, and in that review identify possible sources of funding to finance the installation of more cameras together with the upgrading of the lighting?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Central Park is served by two CCTV cameras which are connected to our remote CCTV control room. However their effectiveness is currently more limited than we would like because the equipment is becoming outdated and is unable to capture clear images in poor lighting conditions. There are also some issues with maintaining clear lines of sight because of the growth of trees and shrubs that sometimes block the cameras' views, especially during Summer.</p> <p>I am though pleased to report that the council is investing significantly in the upgrade of our CCTV system across the whole of Peterborough. We will be making full use of</p>

	<p>our City Fibre Network rather than relying on the current BT fibre optic network, and will be upgrading camera hardware so it better meets the needs of our residents and visitors. This should significantly improve the quality of CCTV services being provided at Central Park.</p> <p>I understand that at a recent meeting with the Friends of Central Park it was agreed to look at the requirement of additional cameras. Once the review has taken place I will be in a position to report further on this. It must be born in mind that to install a CCTV camera the capital cost is approximately £30,000 and annual on costs are in the region of £2,000 so any decision must be taken with this fully in mind.</p> <p>Councillor Shearman asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>But you will notice and I hope I am not patronising you but I did say in my question identify sources of funding, I wasn't saying necessarily sources of funding from within the council's budget. So I wonder whether there are opportunities for Council officers to look outside of the council's budget to find out if there are any national or local organisations that could help with the funding of this.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Yes I can assure Councillor Shearman that council officers are always looking for funding opportunities due to pressures on council budgets. This particular item will be kept in mind during that constant search.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>There have been a number of vehicles burnt out around the city since December 2016 and January 2017, as well as an increase in the amount of abandoned cars, vans and other burnt out debris. What is Safer Peterborough Partnership doing to address this?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>The problem of abandoned and burnt out vehicles, which blight some of our communities, is one which is taken seriously by the council's Safer Peterborough Partnership via its delivery team Prevention and Enforcement Service.</p> <p>Every report of abandoned vehicles on public land is investigated by officers who ultimately impound vehicles which have genuinely been abandoned and remain unclaimed after due notice has been served. Similarly, every report of burnt out vehicles on public land is investigated with evidence gathered from the scene where available, before the vehicles are removed by Amey. Where vehicles are on private land we offer support, guidance and information to land owners to enable them to deal with the problem. An example of this is the effective work being carried out with the private landowners of the land at Oxney Road, affected by a number of burnt out vehicles.</p> <p>Officers also work with communities through targeted education on the environmental impacts of fly tipping, encouraging residents to report abandoned and burnt out</p>

	<p>vehicles so they can be quickly dealt with.</p> <p>It is worth remembering that when vehicles and other debris is set alight it is often an attempt to destroy evidence of criminality and this is more difficult to address. Education alone will not always deter this type of offender, and so prosecution remains the key.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Basically I would like to ask what is this authority doing to remove the burnt out vehicles on private land and I know you have made mention of Oxney Road but in particular there were abandoned burnt out vehicles in Maskew Avenue. Me and my fellow Lib Dem Members viewed this as a quality of life problem. They are unsightly and they symbolise and contribute to signs of disorder and decay for all sorts' physical and behavioural disorder and potentially invite further disorder in crime. Some parts of your response you did cover that but how are we actually dealing with that and addressing that? I'm disappointed that I have made reference to this the end of December and again in January and only the other day I drove round again in these particular areas and these sites are still blighted with evidence of burnt out vehicles and other debris. It's not very good for the environmental aspects of Peterborough. We pride ourselves in being a greener capital yet the surrounding areas would suggest otherwise. Finally then to sum it all up what I am asking is what is the cost to the local authority and by the collection of the scrap material that you do collect is that refunded back into our budget?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>I asked for data and received it on the number of incidents and I would say overall we don't have a huge problem in this city. But if there is any particular site of extreme concern then I would be happy to look into that. So we will talk outside the Chamber.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>When will Manor Drive benefit from the Long Term Transport Plan for Peterborough, and how will it be developed in line with the Local Transport Plan?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Manor Drive has been developed in line with Peterborough's Local Transport Plans and the city's Long Term Transport Strategy. As such the development has benefitted and will continue to benefit from the policies that are set out in these adopted documents. For example:</p> <p>Peterborough has one of the best road network s and demonstrably Mr Mayor and demonstrably one of the fastest commute times in the country. As you are aware Manor Drive has very good access to the parkway and that wider network. There are also plans for major highway improvements, some of which are in the vicinity of Manor Drive. If we are successful in securing funding Manor Drive residents will see further highway benefits through improved journey times, faster connectivity and reduced vehicle emissions as well as the whole of Peterborough, which we all have</p>

to agree I'm sure is a benefit to our wider city economy.

Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:

I'm very mindful of your comments. Subject to the Local Transport Plan which is meant to be covering from 2011 to 2019 for Peterborough it outlines what the city council intends to do over the next five years to improve and enhance the transport structure. Basically from what I can tell to date there are no transport systems in place which provide a positive contribution to meet their social needs. In the frame of the plan which is due to expire in 2019 is there such a facility and transport in place for Manor Drive?

Councillor Hiller responded:

I assume you are still talking about Manor Drive and I'm not sure what you meant by facility. I can tell you that Manor Drive has had speed cushions installed and the road has been narrowed to reduce vehicle speeds.

The development has walking and cycling links to Gunthorpe, Paston and the wider area all of which Mr Mayor are direct examples of how Manor Drive has benefitted from the local transport plans in relation to road safety and sustainable transport. Officers are also in discussions with a bus operator about a possible future bus service once the development has progressed further as I have explained in detail to councillor Davidson I think at a previous full council meeting.

9. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital

When was it representatives from Steff and Philips told council officers or Councillors that other Councils would be interested in using these dwellings, did anybody else tell the Council that this may be the case and why was no verification sought as it seems this was just accepted as fact when it may have been a lie. I also note that the MP and Minister have failed to tell us who the regulator was when these properties ceased to be Housing Association owned or managed following discovery of this fact by Cllr Johnson some months ago. Can the Cabinet Member now tell us if and when and why the regulator agreed to the transfer of these properties to a private organisation as they were originally housing association dwellings?

Councillor Walsh responded:

Stef and Phillips contacted this council in May 2016. They had already made a commitment to the purchase of St Michael's Gate irrespective of whether or not Peterborough City Council entered into an agreement with them. Had we rejected their offer, they had working arrangements with a number of other local authorities in London and the Home Counties who would certainly have had a use for the accommodation.

To validate this, council officers made enquiries with the local authorities they were working with. Barnet Council confirmed that they worked with Stef and Phillips and had placed homeless households in Luton, so would have no reservations about using Peterborough. I am sure that Cllr Murphy is aware of the recent media report

	<p>that Westminster City Council intends to send their homeless households to local authority areas in the Home Counties, and also that they will be using accommodation in Coventry. Peterborough is an attractive option for London boroughs due to our excellent transport links and relative inexpensive housing. Why wouldn't they locate homeless people here?</p> <p>We have made investigations into the historical ownership of St Michael's Gate and found that it has never been owned by this Council. It was owned and managed by an organisation that leased it to the council for use as temporary accommodation in much the same way that Stef and Phillips is doing so now. There is no legal recourse available to this Council to challenge or reverse the sale of the properties to Stef and Phillips. And on the issue of morality it is wrong that some in this chamber continue to give false hope to people who have quite frankly been through enough heartache. However should Cllr Murphy wish to make further investigations, he is of course entitled to do so and I would suggest he contacts the Land Registry in the first instance.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Will you provide me with details of what Barnet said, why haven't you answered the first part of the question and why haven't you answered the second part of the question if and when the regulator knew about this matter? Why have you not found out I don't want you to tell me you'll get back to me. I want an honest answer for once. If the regulator didn't give permission, do you think this may now be a criminal matter?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>I think that Councillor Murphy should stop digging into the past. The council has had no involvement, no ownership and no recourse. If he wishes to pursue enquiries such as that he is perfectly entitled to do so and can do it at minimal expense.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills, University, and Communications</p> <p>It's been 6 years since the Norwood School fence issue was finally settled and initially, things were running smoothly. However, after the initial voluntary key holders were no longer able to continue locking and unlocking the gates at the weekends, the school has done nothing to ensure that the gates, as per the agreement and signage that hangs on the fence, are open to members of public, outside of school hours.</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet member please provide me and residents with a response as to what they can do to make sure that the school does unlock the gates outside of school hours, to benefit local children, enabling them to play safely, make the land accessible to wheelchair users, and encourage the use of this green open space for a range of leisure activities?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>Initially and for the first few years of the use of the field, the school caretaker was opening the school field at around 4.15 after school clubs finished, and then the</p>

	<p>members of the community were locking the gates at dusk to prevent access during dark and prevent unwanted use. This was the agreement for community use.</p> <p>There have been several different community key holders over this period.</p> <p>Unfortunately the community failed in locking the gates in the evening and so the gates remained open all night.</p> <p>As a matter of safeguarding and preventing night time use the school decided to leave the gates locked.</p> <p>This has appeared to have been no problem whatsoever as far as the school is aware no complaints to the school made in the last two of years and therefore the gates have remained locked.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>The equality act does state that changes or adjustments should be made to ensure that people can access various things if they are disabled and a mandate that is true as previously been agreed, that the community can make use of this safe play area outside of school opening hours. Now technically people can pop over, hop over the fence. My question is if someone is a wheelchair user they cannot jump over the fence. So is the leader in agreement with me that the caretaker who locks up at the front each evening should also find time to unlock those two side gates?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>I'm rather tempted to be a bit rude as the local councillor why don't you get off your butt and find somebody in the community that will lock the gates at the appropriate time and go to the school and say can we do this with this person. You can't have that field left open and I suggest to you that it is too rough for people to use with a wheelchair.</p>
11.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please tell me how many of the planned social housing dwellings and affordable homes for Peterborough have been removed following resubmissions or requests to planning committee or officers.</p> <p>Please provide yearly figures from 2010 to the present date.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>The answer to this question is not a quick and easy one. His request would necessitate over seven years' worth of pre-applications, planning applications, re-submissions open book development, viability appraisals, planning committee decisions and delegated officer recommendations being trawled through with only a couple of days to do it to get some idea of what he is looking for. Frankly Mr Mayor I don't consider this is a priority for our already stretched hard working planning</p>

professionals and I have instructed them to look at this request of course but when they have the time to do it. This will be done in due course and once I have the specific number of affordable units I will of course make this number available.

Mr Mayor what I can say is that it has been a long-standing central government policy, reflected in our own adopted planning policies, that where the viability of a development is in question, any sensible and pragmatic Council should look to be flexible whenever possible in applying policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing contributions, which are often the largest single item sought on housing developments.

Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:

Thank you for your response and I accept that it can take some time, maybe the last year or two. Do you think there may be occasions when we've been too flexible and let the developers off building homes for people to rent?

Councillor Hiller responded:

The simple answer to that is not under my watch, no and certainly not since Mr Simon Machen has been Head of Planning Services in this council. What Councillor Murphy has to understand is the council's planning professionals have a comprehensive understanding of viability across the area. Where a robust and well evidenced viability assessment has been provided we have in accordance with policy negotiated on the affordable housing requirements of a scheme. This has been a consistent approach for a number of years, this decision isn't taken lightly and it is only accepted where it is clear the normal policy requirement would prevent the delivery of a development and on occasion decided by our cross party planning committee which of course includes labour members.

This page is intentionally left blank