

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 8 MARCH 2017  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS**

**Present:**

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

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lamb, Azher Iqbal, Shearman, Clark, and Jamil.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

A minute's silence was held in memory of the late David Thorpe, former Councillor and Mayor of Peterborough City Council.

**3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 25 January 2017**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**4. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor advised that he had a number of announcements to make.

*Civic Awards*

The Mayor advised that it was the third year of the Civic Award scheme, these being awards which recognised residents, groups, organisations and businesses that had made a difference in their local community. The following nominees had been selected to receive a Civic Award:

Community Involvement Civic Award:

- Mr Frank Martin
- Mr Geoff Smith
- Mr Andy Simmonds
- Mr Stuart Simmonds
- Mr John Sharman
- Mrs Jennifer Farnham
- Mrs Patricia Goulty
- Mr Tom Rodulson
- Mrs Margaret Palmer (Cllr Barnack Parish Council)
- Mrs Frieda Gosling (Cllr Ufford Parish Council)
- Mr Bill Green
- Miss Nikki Griffiths
- Mrs Joan Pickett (Cllr Ailsworth Parish Council)

Sports Civic Award:

- Miss Nikki Griffiths
- Mr Richard Leech

Environment Civic Award:

- Mr Bill Green

Business Civic Award:

- Mr Lee Clarke

The Lifetime Achievement Award:

- Mrs Joan Pickett
- Mr David Lowndes
- Mr Peter Lumley
- Mrs Carolyn Lumley
- Mr Brian Pearce
- Lt (scc) Colin Marshall Royal Naval Reserve Rtd.

The winners were to be presented with their awards at a ceremony due to be held on Tuesday, 18 April 2017, at the Town Hall. Further details of the awards would be announced at the ceremony and would be available to view on the Council's website.

*Investors in the Environment Awards*

The Mayor advised that the Council had been awarded a Green level accreditation at the Investors in the Environment Awards. These awards were designed to recognise organisations who were demonstrating a significant commitment to the environment.

**5. Leader's Announcements**

The Leader advised that central government had announced that additional funding

would be available for Adult Social Care. However, no further information had been provided on how this would be distributed. As such, there would be no impact on the budget.

Group Leaders responded to this announcement and raised the following points:

- The announcement from the government was welcomed.
- There was little in the way on detail, and that no further action could practically be taken until this information was forthcoming.

## **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. Drink Spiking; and
2. Eye Village proposals in the Local Plan.

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. Reserving land for transport interchange hubs;
2. The Section 151 Officer;
3. Broadband connections in the city;
4. The Use of St Michael's Gate accommodation;
5. The central reservation of Bourges Boulevard;
6. The roll out of the Prevention and Enforcement Service; and
7. Advertising for cultural events.

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 – Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2017/18 – 2026/27**

Cabinet, at its meeting of 27 February 2017, received a report as part of the Council's formal budget process, as set out within the constitution, and as per legislative requirements to set a balanced budget for 2017/18. The report enabled Cabinet to consider the feedback from the consultation undertaken to date with Scrutiny, residents, partner organisations, businesses and other interested parties, in order to make a recommendation to Council on 8 March 2017.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Thanks were passed on to officers in the finance and communications teams, to Members of the Scrutiny Committees, the Cross Party Budget Working Group, and to those who had responded to the consultation. The MTFS updated the financial picture of the Council and outlined how challenges would be tackled, as well as including the feedback received. It was noted that to delay the approval of the budget until after the central government budget had been announced was not appropriate, as statutory deadlines were in place for this agreement. Peterborough was subject to one of the lowest Council Tax rates in the country. This was due to effective managing of the budget, and it was noted that a balanced budget required monitoring. Central government was called upon to understand the needs of the local authorities, and that further provision needed to be made available for adult social care. It was also highlighted that culture and leisure provision was just as important, as this attracted new business to the area and helping to regenerate the city. The development of the digital front door was a key part of the proposals, and an example of Peterborough leading the way. Other key schemes within the proposals included the continuation of the Councils energy tariff, investment in Operation Can Do, and the development of Fletton Quays and North Westgate.

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

Councillor Ellis moved a motion to suspend Council Standing Order 22.1, "A motion or amendment to rescind a decision made at a meeting of Council within the past six months cannot be moved unless the notice of motion is signed by at least five members." In moving his motion, Councillor Ellis encouraged Members to allow for an opportunity to get the Council's priorities right. It was considered that the decision to increase Members' Allowances was wrong, and that this money should be diverted to where it was truly needed.

Councillor Murphy seconded the motion and advised that the motion was simple. The Council had previously agreed to spend £175,000 on themselves, when this could have been spent supporting the homeless. It was noted that the budget would probably receive unanimous support without the inclusion of the Members' Allowances Scheme.

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

- It was questioned why this motion was not moved during the first phase of the

budget process.

- Suggestion was made that decisions on Members' Allowances should not be made by Members themselves, but through an independent panel, similar to the process for Members of Parliament.
- It was suggested that, based on information from the minutes of a Labour Group meeting, some members of the Group did not support the proposal to reverse the increase in Members Allowances.
- Concern was raised that the minutes of the Labour Group meeting were private. They had been circulated to Members in error, and a request had been made to Members to ignore the email.
- It was noted that Members could return their allowances if they wished.
- The Council was advised that the motion had not been proposed until now in order to wait for the full picture of the budget to be published.
- Comment was made that some Members had felt uncomfortable voting in favour of increasing Members' Allowances in October, in light of the low increase in staff wages. Suggestion was made that an increase in line with pay increase would have been more appropriate.

Councillor Ellis summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the £175,000 increase in Members' Allowances should be invested back in the Peterborough communities, and to help support the Adult Social Care crisis.

A vote was taken (16 voted in favour, 30 voted against, 9 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

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

- The affordable homes provision had dropped by 2/3rds and concern was expressed about this and the £2 million overspend on temporary accommodation.
- It was suggested that the level of borrowing undertaken by the Council was at a dangerous level.
- A number of the items within the budget papers were, it was considered, lacking in specific detail.
- The work of the Cross Party Budget Working Group was welcomed.
- The issue of grass cutting was highlighted as an example of when the Council priorities had been ignored, and had resulted in the reversal of the decision at a later date. It was suggested that the Council was not thinking about the long term implications of decisions.
- Questions were asked in relation to the withdrawal from the Amey contract and what the implications of this were.
- Concern was raised in relation to the Peterborough Lottery proposals, and whether this would promote gambling. It was noted that this would raise money for good causes and the Council if the scheme went well.
- Suggestions were made that the presentation of the proposals could be undertaken in an easier to follow manner.
- The suggested lack of engagement on the proposals was criticised.
- It was raised that the effectiveness of the Budget Working Group was limited, as members of the Group were unable to share the matters discussed at the meetings with the rest of their Group.
- The public experience, it was claimed, was not one of 'no cuts'.
- It was considered that the Council had not sufficiently planned for matters that

were known in advance. For example, Health Inequalities.

- It was questioned what would happen if the 2017/2018 budget failed to deliver required savings and how this would impact on the 2018/2019 budget gap.
- Attention was drawn to proposals including Can Do investment, fly tipping, street cleaning, the digital front door, a parking review, affordable housing, and Fletton Quays.
- Comment was made that money had been allocated to inappropriate priorities, including ICT.
- It was considered that the number of online responses to the consultation, at 41, was low. Questions were raised as to the percentage of Council staff who had responded.
- It was questioned why £300k was allocated to Athene communications when the Council had an in-house communications team at its disposal.
- It was clarified that negotiations with Amey had resulted in mutual consent to terminate the contract.
- Pension and Salary Schemes were discussed, and it was queried why the Council still supported the final Salary Scheme.
- Concern was raised in relation to proposals surrounding the university, and where precisely the students would live.
- Comment was made that the Council should be proud the city and the recent improvements made to it.
- The Council, it was suggested, had an enviable record in the manner of which it had made its savings. This had not been through cuts, but through alternative methods of delivery.
- It was advised that the Council did not have any input into the level of Business Rates imposed on businesses in the area.
- The Council had taken a 'business-like' approach to capital borrowing.
- Comment was made that the Budget Working Group were able to discuss issues with their Group, however, were not permitted to disclose information to outsiders.
- It was noted that no significant alternative proposals had been put forward to the budget as presented.
- It was suggested that, although Peterborough did have one of the lowest levels of Council Tax in the country, this had some detrimental impact on other areas.

Councillor Cereste exercised his right to speak and commented that it would be fantastic to regenerate Millfield. Suggestions like this, however, needed to also identify where the funding would come from within the budget. It was felt that Peterborough was one of the best places in the country to live, and had successfully delivered a balanced budget for the past 10 years. It was believed to be the investment in the city that was generating further growth and ability to deliver services.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the motion and suggested that if the Council stopping borrowing funds, then the Council would also have to stop delivering projects. It was noted that only the grant equalisation reserve was new, all other reserves had previously been in place. It was advised that the Section 151 officer had to sign off on the budget and, as such, the figures included were not a result of guesswork, but evidence based.

A recorded vote was taken:

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles,

Eley, Fitzgerald, Fuller, JR Fox, JA Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lane, Nadeem, Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Seaton, Serluca, Sims, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, and Whitby

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Ash, Barkham, Bond, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Fower, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, and Sylvester

**Councillors Abstaining:** Sharp

Following the vote (34 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council noted:

1. The advice of the Chief Finance Officer per Schedule A, the continuing uncertainty of national public finances, and the risks surrounding forecasts and budget proposals;
2. The feedback on the budget proposals from residents, staff and community groups detailed in Appendix A;
3. The outcome of the Final Local Government 2017/18 Finance Settlement.
4. The transport levy arrangements with the combined authority included in the budget

That Council approved:

5. The draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18-2026/27 (including Phase two budget proposals), as set out in the attached Schedules which comprised:
  - a. Report of the Chief Finance Officer,
  - b. Forecast Revenue Outturn 2016/17,
  - c. Budget Proposals, Key Figures & Cash Limits (including fees & charges proposals),
  - d. Treasury Strategy, Prudential Code & Minimum Revenue Provision,
  - e. Asset Investment Strategy, Acquisition Strategy, Capital Programme & Disposals 2017/18 – 2026/27,
  - f. Asset Management Plan, and
6. A Social Care precept of 3% for 2017/18 and 3% in 2018/19, as well as the Council tax increase of 2% for 2017/18 and future years, already agreed as part of the 2016/17 budget strategy.

## **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 6 February 2017.
2. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held 27 February 2017.
3. Call In by Scrutiny Committee.
4. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call In provisions.
5. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 17 January 2017 to 27 February 2017.

**Questions were asked about the following:**

Modern Day Slavery

Councillor Davidson asked what the obligations of the Council were in relation to the protection of modern day slavery victims.

Councillor Holdich advised that a working group was being formed to draft a policy in relation to Modern Day Slavery, and that Councillor Davidson could input into this group. Further information on this group would be provided to Councillor Davidson following the meeting.

Academy Conversion of Maintained School – JAN17/CMDN/06

Councillor Khan asked whether the academy conversions included the school playing fields.

Councillor Holdich advised that they were.

To Grant a 12 Year Lease to the Green Backyard for the London Road Former Allotment Site – JAN17/CMDN/08

Councillor Fower asked whether there was a reason the lease had been granted for 12 years, specifically. It was also questioned what had changed with the scheme, as the Council had been previously looking to sell the Green Backyard site.

Councillor Walsh advised that she was not aware of the particular reason behind the 12 year lease period, but would provide a further response to Councillor Fower following clarification. The Green Backyard had submitted a business plan to the Council where it had been demonstrated that the site had considerable social value.

Shared Trading Standards Service – FEB17/CMDN/11

Councillor Ash sought assurance that with the move towards more shared services, the Council was not losing its unitary status and merging with Cambridgeshire County Council.

Councillor Holdich advised that in this instance, Peterborough City Council were taking over Cambridgeshire County Council's services, and that Peterborough were still in control.

Acquisition of Freehold Investment Property in Peterborough – JAN17/CMDN/10

Councillor Fower asked why the detail of the decision could not be released to the public.

Councillor Seaton advised that the Council had made a decision to purchase a site, however the price of this purchase could not be disclosed until the purchase of the site had been completed. This was due to a number of other people or organisations that may also wish to purchase this particular site.



### Sale of Lindens, Lincoln Road – FEB17/CMDN/13

Councillor Davidson asked for clarification on whether the sale of Lindens included the whole site, or just the front. It was believed that the rear of the site already belonged to Cross Keys. Concern was raised that the site may be demolished, and it was suggested that listing should be applied for.

Councillor Holdich advised there was a particular criteria that sites had to meet in order to be considered for listed status. If Lindens met these criteria, then Councillor Holdich would be happy to support such an application. As part of the sale, it was required that the site be kept in public use.

### Enter into a Section 75 agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust – FEB17/CMDN/18

Councillor Murphy requested further detail on what the Section 75 agreement would be used for.

Councillor Holdich advised that the Corporate Director of People and Communities would provide this information.

### Section 256 Agreement CCG – FEB17/CMDN/19

Councillor Murphy asked for further information on the Section 256 Agreement.

Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the detail of the decision was included in the Cabinet Member Decision Notice, which was available online. The Corporate Director of People and Communities would, however, provide further information on this decision.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **11. Notices of Motion**

#### **1. Motion from Councillor Cereste**

*The Motor Neurone Disease Association (MND) was chosen by the Mayor in May as one of his charities for his year in office. The Association is unique in its work, focusing on caring for those with motor neurone disease, researching and campaigning.*

*Following on the vastly successful 'Ice Bucket Challenge' funding has been put in place for the AMBRoSIA project. This project could bring us closer to faster diagnosis, earlier treatment, a better understanding of the types of motor neurone disease, better help for patients according to their needs, new drugs testing relating to the different causes for the disease, and work towards developing preventative treatments.*

*The risk of a person developing motor neurone disease in their lifetime is up to 1 in every 300. In Peterborough, this means that over 635 residents may be diagnosed*

*with the disease during their lives. As such, the work the Association undertakes in Peterborough is invaluable.*

*The value of this work was highlighted earlier this year when Pam Wilkie, previous Cambridgeshire Branch Chairman, was presented with the Annual Volunteer Award from the Peterborough Council for Voluntary Services.*

*The Association has initiated a campaign 'Champion the Charter', which seeks for council's to adopt the Motor Neurone Disease Charter in order to help influence the lives of people living with MND in their communities. Adopting the Charter will help ensure that Peterborough City Council is better informed and understands the needs of people with MND.*

*The Council is therefore called upon to:*

- 1) Acknowledge the work of the Motor Neurone Disease Association and to extend its thanks to the Association for providing support to the Peterborough residents, and their families, affected by the disease; and*
- 2) Adopt the Motor Neurone Disease Charter comprising five points:*
  - The right to an early diagnosis and information;*
  - The right to access quality care and treatments;*
  - The right to be treated as individuals and with dignity and respect;*
  - The right to maximise their quality of life; and*
  - Carers of people with MND have the right to be valued, respected, listened to and well-supported.*

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

## **2. Motion from Councillor Harper**

*That Council acknowledges the significant public concern around dog fouling in various areas of Peterborough which, apart from being an anti-social nuisance, is associated with various health risks (particularly in children) and blights our green open space that the city is so proud of.*

*That Council resolves to:*

- 1) Ensure that the city council demonstrates its commitment to providing safer and cleaner communities by promoting responsible dog ownership to reduce the nuisance and health problems associated with dog fouling through an ongoing education and awareness raising programme.*
- 2) Ensure that, where education is not effective, the city council's Prevention and Enforcement Officers fine and if necessary prosecute owners that fail to clear up after their dog under current legal powers by way of Fixed Penalty Notices under relevant legislation.*
- 3) Investigate the use of Public Space Protection Orders to deal with anti-social behaviour associated with irresponsible dog ownership where there is proven dog fouling issue on green open space land or other dog fouling problem*

areas. The PSPO could provide enforcement officers with the ability to fine a dog owner not in possession of a bag to clear up after their dog, similar to PSPOs being introduced in some other council areas.

- 4) Investigate the placing of additional waste bins (for general and dog waste) at strategic locations to further assist and encourage dog owners to clear up after their pets, and to have somewhere to dispose of the waste easily, safely and promptly.

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

### 3. Motion from Councillor Fower

*Near the end of 2016, there were nearly 500 people on the Council's Housing waiting list, aged between 16-24.*

*81% of these were identified as British, nearly 30% identified themselves as Christian.*

*21% had been on the waiting list between 7 months to a year. 36% had been on the list for over a year.*

*At present the Government intends to withdraw Housing Benefit entitlement for 18-21 year olds from April 2017.*

*Some have argued that the proposed withdrawal of Housing Benefit (or what will be the housing costs element of Universal Credit, by 2017) will only have a limited effect in numerical and expenditure terms on those young people aged 18 to 21 years who are claiming it.*

*However, while the scope for applying the measure may be limited, the impact on the lives of those who will be affected is likely to be profound.*

*Therefore, this Council calls on the leader of the City Council to write a formal letter on behalf of this authority to the Prime Minister and Secretary for State, calling for an end to the Government's policy of removing the entitlement to housing benefit for 18-21 year olds.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Fower suggested that the proposals to withdraw Housing Benefit for young people undermined attempts to fight homelessness. Although the impact would only have limited application, the impact to individuals would be profound and contrary to the intention of the Housing Benefit policy.

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

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

- There was some confusion over the definition of a 'young person' as this varied for different areas.
- It was suggested that exceptions would be made for such a restriction. For example, where young people had a dependent, or if they were unable to live with their parents.
- It has been calculated that only around 60 individuals would be impacted by the

withdrawal of benefit.

- It was suggested that the proposals could, in fact, lead to an increase in costs to the Council in the long term.
- Comment was made that if those affected became homeless as a result, this would result in increased costs.
- It was considered that if young people were old enough to pay taxes, then they should be allowed the support that went along with this.
- It was noted that no decision had been taken on this matter by government, and the proposals may not be implemented.
- Suggestion was made that this would only impact on those young people who could, but choose not to live with their parents.
- Questions were raised as to how the concept of 'choice' would be defined in such scenarios.

Councillor Sharp exercised his right to speak and noted that around 60 people in Peterborough would be at a disadvantage if this withdrawal was enacted. Having taken part in the Rough Sleeping Task and Finish Group, it was suggested that this could lead to the Council facing costs further down the road. This was an opportunity for the Council to express its concern.

Councillor Fower summed up as mover of the motion and expressed disappointment that some Members would not be supporting the motion that was looking to help protect vulnerable people.

A vote was taken (25 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

## **12. Reports to Council**

### **(a) Combined Authority (Mayoral Elections) Order 2017 – Appointment of Returning Officer**

Council received a report which requested the Council to appoint the Returning Officer for the election of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mayor.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Gillian Beasley, Chief Executive, as the Returning Officer (Peterborough City Council) for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mayoral Elections to be held in May 2017.

### **(b) Change of Polling Place for Polling District HAH4**

Council received a report which sought for the designation of a polling place under the Representation of the People Act 1983.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and advised that the Ward Councillors for Hargate Hempsted were happy with the proposals. It was noted that officers had now been asked to review a polling place in Park Ward as well.

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

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

- Support was expressed for this motion, however, it was suggested that the

proposals only addressed part of the problem.

- A question was raised as to whether Polling Places could be shared, or whether this would cause voting confusing.
- It was noted that the electors within Polling District HAH1 still had to travel a significant distance. It was questioned whether this could also be addressed.
- It was advised that this change had resulted from requests from the Polling District residents.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed to designate Orton Hall Hotel as the Polling Place for Polling District HAH4.

**(c) Pay Policy 2017/18**

Council received a report in relation to the Pay Policy 2017/18, approval for which was required by the Localism Act 2011 for each financial year.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed the 2017/18 Pay Policy.

**(d) Draft Programme of Meetings 2017-18**

Council received a report which presented for the consideration of Council the draft annual programme of meetings for 2017/18.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2017/18.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 10:35pm

This page is intentionally left blank