

**MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 26 JULY 2017
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR JOHN FOX

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Fitzgerald, Fower, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, and Whitby

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 7:00pm on 26 July 2017.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sylvester, Ferris, Harper, and Elsey.

28. Questions on Notice

- (a) To the Mayor**
- (a) To the Leader or member of the Cabinet**
- (b) 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. Manor Drive Development;
2. Lessons Learnt from St Michael's Gate;
3. Taxation without Representations;
4. Pavement and Verge Parking;
5. Safety Measures at Gladstone Park Astro Tuff;
6. Parking Enforcement Officer Resources;
7. Dog on Dog Attacks;
8. Activities at St John's Hall;
9. The TACT Partnership;
10. The Status of the Green Backyard;
11. White Goods Shop at Dodson House and Amey Impact;
12. Numbers Housing at St Michael's Gate;
13. Penalties for Breaking Planning Regulations;
14. The Local Transport Plan and Rhubarb Bridge;
15. The North Westgate Development; and
16. Anti-social Behaviour in Millfield Consultation.

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

(c) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives

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

Questions (d) to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Transport and Leadership Powers transferred to the Combined Authority Mayor.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

29. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 - 2020

The Mayor advised that a request had been made to withdraw the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 – 2020 from the agenda on the grounds that further changes to the Partnership's priorities may result from the countywide policy review.

It was agreed to withdraw this item from the agenda, to be considered at a future meeting of Council, once further information was known.

(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Adoption of the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan

Cabinet, at its meeting of 10 July 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to seek approval to recommend that Council adopts (or 'makes' to use the legal jargon) the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan and thereby make it part of the Development Plan for Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that a long time had been spent developing the Neighbourhood Plan, with a significant amount of effort put into the work by the Village Working Group. Consultation had been undertaken with local residents, as well further formal consultation and an independent examination. A referendum was held on 6 July 2017. 166 votes were cast, with 152 votes for approval. Following this overwhelming approval, Council were required to adopt the Plan.

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

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

- The turnout for the referendum had been 47.7%.
- It was noted that Gladstone had commenced a Neighbourhood Plan in 2013 which had not been progressed.
- The Council was urged to work proactively with Parish Council in order to encourage further Neighbourhood Plans.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and explained that this was the first Neighbourhood Plan to come forward following the change to planning laws. Ward Councillors had had little input, with the bulk of the work carried out by local people. Councillor Holdich congratulated residents on their achievement.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing endorsed Councillor Holdich's comments. It was noted that this new form of Neighbourhood Plan was different in nature to those previous, as they culminated in a referendum. Communities groups could also draft a Plan for submission.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council 'made' (which meant to all intents and purposes 'adopted') the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix 1, to thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within Peakirk Parish.

(c) **Audit Committee Recommendation – Updates to the Constitution**

Audit Committee, at its meeting of 26 June 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to obtain the Committee's views on proposed amendments and updates to the Council's constitution, including Regulatory Committee Functions, Standing Orders, and Petitions Scheme.

It was **RESOLVED** (unanimous) that Council agreed to suspend standing order 29.2 for the duration of the item to allow for variation of Council Standing Orders without the item standing adjourned.

Councillor Aitken introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Aitken advised that the key proposed updates to the constitution included clarification around the Appeals and Planning Review Committee speaking scheme, changes to the Planning referral and call-in procedures, a restriction on questions to council that are significantly the same as those asked in the past six months, and a update to the Petition Scheme to cover the procedure for debate at Council. The Committee removed a number of elements to the proposals which were felt to be unnecessary, where existing provision were already sufficient.

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

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

- It was commented that the Audit Committee meeting had been well chaired.
- Confirmation was sought by the Audit Committee that officers would provide assistance in formulating planning reasons for referral or call-in.
- It was further requested that Parish Councillors be provided with the opportunity to attend Planning Committee training alongside Members.

Councillor Over exercised his right to speak and explained that he was pleased to see a focus on the process for petitions to Council. The Audit Committee had chosen to limit the restriction on Planning referrals and call-in's to "planning reasons" and noted that advice from officer would still be available when formulating this reasons. Councillor Over praised the Chairman for a well-run meeting.

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

- 1) Approved the updated Regulatory Committee Functions (Appendix A to the report) subject to the replacement of any reference to “sufficient reasoning” to “reasoning”;
- 2) Approved the updated Council Standing Orders (Appendix B to the report) subject to the removal of “from more than one Political Group”;
- 3) Approved the updated General Standing Orders (Appendix C to the report); and
- 4) Approved the updated Petition Scheme (Appendix D to the report).

(d) Licensing Committee Recommendation – Proposed Taxi Policy

Licensing Committee, at its meeting of 6 July 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to advise Members of the consultation process carried out, to request Members to properly consider the responses received and determine the direction of the policy in consideration of those responses, agree the adoption of the final policy, subject to amendments, and set the implementation date for the policy and conditions to take effect.

Councillor Ayres introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Ayres advised that the proposed Taxi Policy was not a statutory policy, but set out the principles for Taxi Licensing. The proposals had been approved by the Committee in late 2016 for consultation. Following this public consultation, the Committee then considered the responses received. The Committee considered that it was not favourable to extend the life extension for low-emission vehicles to 5 years, as they were currently not widely available, the infrastructure to support such a proposal was not available, and there was uncertainty surrounding the technology. It was also considered that the introduction of ad hoc safety checks, which were currently every three years, was not necessary. It was noted that further safeguarding training was being developed for drivers.

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

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

- The subject of Taxi Licensing was weighty and arduous, and the Licensing Committee has dealt with it well.
- The Police had further safeguarding measures in place, and would notify officers when necessary to ensure the public were not at risk.
- The Policy meant that Peterborough was moving its practices forward in relation to Taxi Licences.

Councillor Allen exercised his right to speak and considered that the proposed policy was of high quality and he felt the Committee had done a good job with their recommendations.

Councillor Ayres summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing thanked Members for their comments and congratulated the cross party committee on its work.

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

- 1) Adopted the draft Taxi Policy, subject to the amendments proposed by the Licensing Committee;
- 2) Agreed the Taxi Policy implementation date to be of immediate effect, subject to:
 - (i) An allowance of 3 months for the amendment of the Off Street Traffic Regulation Order; and
 - (ii) Relevant procurement process for outsourcing driving test;
- 3) Approved the amendment of the Licensing Committee terms of reference to state that:
 - (i) On recommendation by the Licensing Committee all statutory policies within the Licensing Committee's remit must go to Full Council for formal adoption. This includes any modifications, amendments to those policies; and
 - (ii) On recommendation by the Licensing Committee all non-statutory policies must be submitted to either Full Council or Cabinet for formal adoption. Thereafter, any minor amendments or modifications can be adopted by the Licensing Committee.

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

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

1. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 10 July 2017
2. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 5 April 2017 to 30 June 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Implementation of Peterborough Lottery

Councillor Sandford asked what guarantees were available that that Peterborough Lottery would succeed in the face of national competition. Clarification was also sought on the risk to the Council should the scheme fail.

Councillor Seaton advised that the set up cost of the scheme was £6,100, and that this was the level of loss to be incurred if the scheme failed. It was noted that similar local lotteries had been more successful than expected in other areas of the country. Work was being undertaken with local community groups to promote and encourage engagement.

Councillor Fower asked how much money was expected to be made from the scheme.

Councillor Seaton responded that an estimated income of £65,000 a year was expected from 2019. This was discussed at the Cross Party Budget Working which Councillor Fower had been involved with.

Payment Strategy

Councillor Ellis sought reassurance that users of the Cash Offices would be consulted on its proposed closure in person.

Councillor Holdich responded that there was a list of alternative locations that individuals could pay within the report, which was being updated following feedback.

Councillor Seaton advised that online consultation was being undertaken alongside liaison with voluntary sector organisations to reach vulnerable groups. Officers were also present in the Cash Officer to discuss the proposals directly with users.

Budget Monitoring Report Final Outturn 2016/2017

Councillor Ellis asked for clarification around the £1.3 million underspend and asked the Cabinet Member to join him in asking the Government for further funding.

Councillor Seaton responded that savings had been made through Highway efficiencies, reduction in demand for concessionary fare, and financial services assurances. The Council still faced pressure from social care and the cost of housing families. It was advised that efficiencies were not the same as services cuts.

Councillor Murphy commented that this was £1.3 million not spent of services.

Councillor Seaton responded that this represented a 0.6% underspend and suggested that the Council were accurate in their budget setting.

Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 - 2020

Councillor Murphy asked why the priorities identified by the public had not been included in the Partnership Plan.

Councillor Walsh advised that the Plan's priorities focused on high harm risks that the public may not be aware of the. The Plan further set out how the concerns raised by the public would be addressed.

Councillor Sandford questioned how the public could be assured of the Safer Peterborough Partnership's priorities when the Board met in private.

Councillor Walsh responded that the work of the Partnership was transparent and that information was available if requested. The possibility of opening the meeting to the public could be investigated.

Councillor Mahabadi asked whether KPI's would be included within the Plan when it was presented to Council.

Councillor Walsh responded performance indicators were already available, and that this could be provided to Members in the future.

Junction 20 Capacity Improvements (A47/A15 Interchange) – JUN17/CMDN/08

Councillor Murphy asked whether these works were in relation to Rhubarb Bridge.

Councillor Hiller advised that they were not.

Academy Conversion – JUN17/CMDN/09 & Academy Conversion – JUN17/CMDN10

Councillor Mahabadi raised concerns about the funding for SEN child in these academies and sought reassurance that academies would not remain a 'black box'.

Councillor Ayres responded that such matters did not bare any relation to the two decisions made.

Award of Contract for the Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre – JUN17/CMDN/13

Councillor Fower asked for clarification on how the termination of the Amey contract would impact on the Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre contract.

Councillor Holdich advised that he would provide a response in writing.

31. Questions on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives Made Since the Last Meeting

The Mayor introduced the report which detailed Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the Board meeting held 31 May 2017
2. Decisions from the Audit and Governance Committee held 26 June 2017
3. Decisions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held 26 June 2017
4. Decisions from the Board meeting held 28 June 2017

Questions were asked about the following:

Strategic Transport Infrastructure Schemes

Councillor Sandford asked whether the project for the reopening of Wisbech Garden Town Station would be taken forward.

Councillor Holdich responded that this was within the Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and that the Combined Authority were currently considering it.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

32. Notices of Motion

1. Motion from Councillor Ali

The Council recognises the concerns of traders, local community organisations, residents and road users of Lincoln Road, Millfield with regard to traffic congestion

caused by the buses using the bus depot at the end of the day. As bus drivers bring their buses back to the depot at the end of the shift, long tailbacks ensue as buses try to enter the depot. This holds up the flow of the traffic through this already congested area and stops people from entering the area for shopping or eating, thus having an impact on the businesses.

Action needs to be taken to address this issue which has been constantly raised by the traders and others affected within the North, Central and Park Ward area.

The Council resolves to:

- 1. Request the relevant Council Officers to work with the Bus Company to look at staggering the times for Buses coming into the depot to avoid tailbacks in the short term; and*
- 2. Work with the Bus Company to look at the feasibility of relocating the Bus Depot as a solution to this problem for the medium to long term.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Ali advised that the Bus Depot had been at its current location for a very long time. Times had changes and it was no longer appropriate. That part of the city was busy in the evening, and action needed to be taken to address the issue.

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

Councillor Hiller moved an amendment to the recommendations requesting that changes be made to consider traffic in the area in general, not just tailbacks from the Bus Depot. It was noted that business were not affected permanently, but for a short period in the evening. Councillor Hiller was happy to work with the private company to look at a potential relocation, but wished to also consider the broader issues affecting the area.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Over who reserved his right to speak.

Members were invited to comment on the amendment and during debate, and the following key points were raised:

- The area was impacted by double or triple parking on the street.
- A review was needed into Council policy to ensure that this did not continue.

Councillor Over exercised his right to speak and explained that the area suffered a dangerous level of double parking. It was noted that the Bus Depot was run by a private company and that addressing the traffic issues in the area would require consideration additional factors.

Councillor Ali exercised his right of reply as mover of the original motion and stated that he appreciated the comments made by Members and looked forward to a positive resolution. Councillor Ali accepted the amendment to his motion.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

The Council recognises the concerns of traders, local community organisations, residents and road users of Lincoln Road, Millfield with regard to traffic congestion

caused by the buses using the bus depot at the end of the day. Sometimes when As bus drivers bring their buses back to the depot at the end of the shift, long tailbacks can occur ensue as buses try to enter the depot. This holds up the flow of the traffic through this already congested area and stops people from entering the area for shopping or eating, thus having an short term impact on the businesses.

Action needs to be taken to address this issue which has been constantly raised by the traders and others affected within the North, Central and Park Ward area.

The Council resolves to:

- 1) Request the relevant Council Officers continue to work with the Bus Company to try to resolve traffic problems look at staggering the times for Buses coming into the depot to avoid tailbacks in the short term; and*
- 2) Work with the Bus Company to look at the feasibility of relocating the Bus Depot as a solution to this problem for the medium to long term.*

2. Motion from Councillor Ferris

Annual consumption of plastic bottles is set to top half a trillion (500, 000, 000, 000) by 2017. Recognising the damaging impact that plastic waste is having on the Earth's ecosystems, it is imperative that we reduce this through a greater commitment to recycling and reuse.

This Council is asked to introduce a 'refill-reuse' scheme, similar to those already in operation in other cities across Europe. Such a scheme invites local businesses to sign up, allowing people to refill their water bottles on their premises rather than throwing them away after single use. If every Peterborough resident refilled once a week instead of buying a single-use plastic bottle, the city would reduce its waste plastic bottle consumption by approximately 10 million a year.

To take this forward, this Council is asked to:

- 1. Promote a refill-reuse scheme with local businesses, with an aim of recruiting them to become Refill Points;*
- 2. Seek a commercial sponsor to act as a partner in the scheme;*
- 3. Develop a Refill App which shows users which businesses nearby are happy to fill water bottles; and*
- 4. work with other public space operators to contract companies to install drinking water fountains with visible and convenient attachments made to refill bottles in areas of high footfall.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Mahabadi noted that the proposals were closely linked to the Council's priority to become the UK's environment capital. To achieve this priority it was considered important to recognise the use of plastic bottles. Less than 60% of plastic bottles were recycled in the UK. The motion set out a number of innovative ideas, including a refill scheme to make the city greener. It was noted that there were significant economic benefits to the city becoming cleaner. Councillor Mahabadi

accepted the amendment to the motion.

Councillor Ellis seconded the motion and supported the amendment.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Annual consumption of plastic bottles is set to top half a trillion (500, 000, 000, 000) by 2017. Recognising the damaging impact that plastic waste is having on the Earth's ecosystems, we need to continue and further develop our ~~it is imperative that we reduce this through a greater commitment to recycling and reuse.~~

This Council is asked to introduce a 'refill-reuse' scheme, similar to those already in operation in other cities across Europe. Such a scheme invites local businesses to sign up, allowing people to refill their water bottles on their premises rather than throwing them away after single use. ~~If every Peterborough resident refilled once a week instead of buying a single-use plastic bottle, the city would reduce its waste plastic bottle consumption by approximately 10 million a year.~~

~~To take this forward, this Council is asked to:~~

- ~~1) Promote a refill-reuse scheme with local businesses, with an aim of recruiting them to become Refill Points;~~*
- ~~2) Seek a commercial sponsor to act as a partner in the scheme;~~*
- ~~3) Develop a Refill App which shows users which businesses nearby are happy to fill water bottles; and~~*
- ~~4) work with other public space operators to contract companies to install drinking water fountains with visible and convenient attachments made to refill bottles in areas of high footfall.~~*

3. Motion from Councillor Ferris

Council notes the need to promote pedestrian and cycle routes in the city of Peterborough.

This Council believes that pedestrian and cycle facilities in Peterborough can be enhanced and better coordinated particularly in the city centre.

This Council believes that a footbridge and cycle route to Fletton Quays should be constructed.

In moving his motion, Councillor Mahabadi recognised that the issue of a bridge across the River Nene was an emotive topic. It was considered that such a bridge would provide an important link between the Fletton Quays development and the Embankment.

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

Councillor Hiller moved an amendment to the recommendations requesting that the proposals for a footbridge be fed into the cross party budget working group should the

Peterborough University be cited at Fletton Quays. Councillor Hiller noted that the provision of bridge was desirable, but could not be included in previous plans for Fletton Quays due to the lack of commercial viability. As such a bridge would attract a significant cost, the matter should be carefully considered before being factored into the budget.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Serluca who reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Mahabadi accepted the amendment to the motion.

Members were invited to comment on the motion as amended and during debate, and the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised proposals for a bridge were not included in original plans for Fletton Quays.
- It was noted that original proposals did include a bridge, which was still the Council's wish. The plans were amended due to the cost of such a bridge and viability issues.
- The location was ideal for a bridge, given its proximity to the Embankment, Key Theatre, and Football Ground.
- It was considered that there was no point introducing a bridge at the current time until it was determined where the University would be cited. The Council did not want to build a bridge to nowhere.
- The cost of a potential bridge was discussed, up to a level of £3 million. It was estimated that this was cost £300,000 to borrow.
- Such costs would have to be weighed against other Council demands.
- The Transport User Hierarchy was referenced, highlighting that pedestrians and cyclist topped this list. Comment was made that this hierarch often seemed to be ignored.
- It was suggested that even without the University, a bridge at this location should still be considered.
- It was advised that such proposals were included in the original scheme, and that commencement of such was a matter of financing.
- It was considered that plans for a bridge needed to be right, and the priority of funding needed to be appropriate.

Councillor Mahabadi summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing considered that the amendment had been accepted on good faith that the proposals would be pursued.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Council notes the need to continue to promote pedestrian and cycle routes in the city of Peterborough.

This Council believes that pedestrian and cycle facilities in Peterborough can continue to be enhanced and better coordinated particularly in and around the city centre as part of the Council's wider growth and regeneration plans.

Funding for the provision of a foot and cycle bridge This Council believes that a footbridge and cycle route to Fletton Quays from the embankment should be constructed considered as part of the Council's budget setting process, because the potential for a footbridge provision was originally, and still is, an element of this landmark development

and will certainly be a foremost consideration should the City's university be positioned here.

33. Reports to Council

(a) Notification of Changes to the Executive Functions – Officer Delegations

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that authority had been delegated to the Chief Executive to loan officers to other authorities to discharge their functions, and that the threshold for Director ex-gratia payments in respect of complaints had been increased to £1,000.

Councillor Smith seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the changes made by the Leader to the Executive Functions - Officer Delegations.

(b) Consultation on Changes of Governance with Fire

Councillor Bond introduced the report and moved the alternative recommendations set out in the supplementary information pack. Councillor Bond considered that representative model was the more sensible approach, taking into account evidence from the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire Authority. Further collaboration was thought to be a good idea. It was suggested that combining the governance of the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire Authority would have a negative impact on public safety. It was also believed that this would not result in any form of cost saving. It was considered to be important to spread the power of the Police and the Fire Authority of two bodies, as the governance model proposed by the Police and Crime Commissioner would provide the Commissioner with too much influence over the Fire Authority. There was a number of examples of the two bodies communication and working together already, including shared facilities, and a joint education team. It was not felt that changes in the governance approach would improve this. Finally, it was suggested that the creation of a blue light hub would ensure that the emergency services bodies worked more closely together in the future.

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

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

- Councillors Peach, Over, Jamil, and Bond were members of the Fire Authority.
- It was considered that the current governance format was working effectively.
- Public Safety was believed to be key, and required maintaining.
- Comment was made that such proposals were being supported in other parts of the country.
- It was noted that the relationship of the Police to the public was different than that of the Fire Service.
- Concern was raised in relation to one person having power over both the Police and the Fire Services.
- The blue light hub was considered to be a good idea, which could improve communication between services.
- Suggestion was made that the relationship between the Fire Chief and the Fire Authority, and the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Police and Crime Panel were significantly different.

- It was not considered that the recommendation of the Police and Crime Commissioner was in the best interest of the public.
- It was suggested that a large organisation would be too unwieldy and unresponsive to change. Safety should come first.

Councillor Peach exercised his right to speak and explained that that Cambridgeshire County Council had recently agreed the same recommendation. It was hoped that similar cross party support would be shown by the Council this evening. The Fire Authority had equally agreed the same response.

Councillor Bond summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing thanked Members for their support.

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

- 1) Objects to the option as detailed within the Police and Crime Commissioner Business Case option 3 (Governance Model) and supports option 2 (Representative Model);
- 2) Uses the response of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Fire Authority to the consultation either in whole or part to support the preferred option 2;
- 3) States it is the view of the Council that a blue light hub, based on the Fire Service and Ambulance service, is looked at in greater detail, as there is a clear and historical synergy between both of these important public services; and
- 4) Delegates the preparation of a full written response to the Chief Executive, in consultation with Group Leaders, by the closing date of 4 September 2017.

(c) Appointment of the Interim Monitoring Officer

Stephen Gerrard, Interim Director of Law and Governance, left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that the Council had a legal requirement to have a Monitoring Officer in post. Following the secondment of Kim Sawyer, it was proposed that Stephen Gerrard be appointed to the post on an interim basis.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Mr Stephen Gerrard (Interim Director for Law and Governance) as the Interim Monitoring Officer for Peterborough City Council.

(d) Urgent Report – Appointment of the Interim Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer

Stephen Gerrard, Interim Director of Law and Governance, re-joined the meeting.

The Chairman agreed to take this report as an urgent items, due to the statutory requirements of the Council to have a Section 151 Officer in place, and to avoid the need for an extraordinary meeting.

Marion Kelly, Interim Service Director Financial Services, left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that the Council had a legal requirement to have a Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer in post. Following the resignation of John Harrison, it was proposed that Marion Kelly be appointed to the post on an interim basis.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Ms Marion Kelly (Interim Service Director Financial Services) as the Interim Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer for Peterborough City Council.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 9:44pm