

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 23 JANUARY 2019  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR CHRIS ASH**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Ellis, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azhar Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, , Shaheed, Simons, Stokes, Warren, Walsh, and Whitby.

**56. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Davidson, Dowson, Fuller, Goodwin, Nadeem and Smith.

**57. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interests.

**58. Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 December 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**59. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced that a number of Mayor's Charity events were taking place in the following months including the Holocaust Memorial Day Commemoration which would be held on 24 January 2019 at St John's Church, Cathedral Square.

Other events included the Mayors Charity Caribbean Evening on 9 February 2019 at the Millennium Centre, the Mayors Charity Greyhounds Evening at the Greyhound Stadium on 1 March 2019 and the Mayors Charity Zumbathon at the Eye Community Centre on 2 March 2019.

**60. Leader's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Leader.

**QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

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

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

1. The use of time lapse camera's to prevent fly-tipping.

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

## **62. Petitions**

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

There were no petitions received from the public.

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

A petition was presented to Council containing 3000 signatures requesting the Council to ask Medesham Homes to withdraw its appeal on the plans and proposals for development on Tenter Hill Meadow.

### **(c) Petition for Debate - 'Opposition of proposed development of 100- 123 houses on the former Gloucester Centre site in Orton Longueville'**

A petition had been received by the Council which contained over 500 signatures from people who live, work or study in the city. As such, the petition qualified for debate at a meeting of the Full Council in accordance with the Petitions Scheme set out in the Constitution.

The petition called upon the Council to 'restrict the number of proposed dwellings on this site to a maximum of 50 dwellings and to ensure that the proposed dwellings are in-keeping with the size and style of the current established community'.

The Legal Officer made an announcement to Members advising them of the need to avoid pre-determination of any future planning application.

Councillor Elsey introduced the petition as lead petitioner. He asked Members to help ensure that prospective developments were infrastructure lead, with consideration given to adequate parking, clear access to major roads, school places and the impact on existing communities. The area around the Gloucester Centre was already suffering severe traffic congestion and this proposal would potentially add another 200-300 vehicles, all competing for to access local roads and increasing congestion unless improvements were made to major highways.

Councillor Hiller moved that the petition be noted, as due to legal constraints, and the need to avoid predetermination, it was not possible to take the action requested or refer the petition elsewhere. As it was likely that a planning application would be forthcoming for this site, it was inappropriate for the Council collectively or as members of the relevant committees to express any view on the merits or otherwise on the quantity of housing on this site.

He advised Members that the allocation of the site was determined through the Local Plan process. There had been opportunities for communities and Members to make recommendations throughout the consultation period and the draft Local Plan was now

at an advanced stage. To modify the plan in this final stage would declare the whole plan unsound. Members could make a presentation to the planning authority following submission of a future planning application and this would be considered in the determination of that application.

Councillor Harper seconded the proposal and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the petition and in summary raised the following points:

- Members expressed confusion over what could be done about the petition as to decide not to take action was making a decision.
- Members acknowledged the concern of the local residents.
- It was noted that the petition was presented on an issue that had not been submitted for a planning application.
- The Council needed to consider how it represented the views of the city.
- By presenting this petition for debate at Full Council, it was considered that the developers had been made aware of local opinion and had taken the opportunity to redesign their proposals.
- Some Members felt that only Members on the Planning and Planning Appeals should abstain from discussion on the application.
- Members felt that the processes within the planning department needed to be reviewed together the procedure for dealing with petitions on planning matters.
- It was not considered appropriate to change to Council's planning policies at this meeting and there was no alternative than to agree with the recommendation.

Councillor Harper exercised his right to speak and invited Councillor Eley to represent his ward when the matter was presented to the planning committee.

In summing up Councillor Eley, as lead petitioner, confirmed that he did support the Local Plan but did not approve of a couple of elements and had tried to avoid anyone being predetermined. There had been developments within the city which lacked the appropriate infrastructure and he would like to see this avoided in future. Councillor Eley had been asked by his ward to take this action and he would continue to represent his ward at the appropriate time.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the motion by acknowledging that Councillor Eley was protecting his ward.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the petition "Opposition of proposed development of 100- 123 houses on the former Gloucester Centre site in Orton Longueville", noted the comments raised and took no action for the reasons put forward in the debate.

### **63. Questions on Notice**

#### **(a) To the Mayor**

There were no questions to The Mayor.

#### **(b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet**

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

1. The use of top floor of Central Library

2. The Housing Revenue Account
3. LATCo recycling
4. Abandoned advertising vehicles
5. Traffic provision A15 Guthorpe/Manor Drive
6. Environmental enforcement
7. Empower loan status
8. Effectiveness of Alcohol Action Area
9. Mobile telephone contracts
10. The future of city market
11. Verge parking
12. Progress of Safer off the Streets policy
13. Heltwate Special School and St George's Hydrotherapy Pool relocation project.
14. Street Cleaning in Peterborough and general impact of Amey service transfer.
15. The consequences of Brexit on NHS services
16. The measures taken to reduce the Council's carbon footprint

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

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

There were no questions to the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee.

**(d) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives**

There were no questions to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives.

**64. 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. Extra-ordinary Cabinet meeting held 17 December 2018
2. Cabinet Member decisions between 4 December 2018 and 15 January 2019.

Questions were asked about the following:

Council Tax Support Scheme 2019/20

Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked if the Council, when preparing the online consultation, had considered that some people did not read, write or understand English. He also advised Members that he had discussed the report with the Head of Customer Services as he found the report confusing and thought the public would also have difficulty understanding the report.

Councillor Seaton replied that various groups had been involved in the consultations including Citizens Advice, Kingsgate Church, the Foodbank, Disability Information and Advice Line UK (DIAL), Age UK, The Disability Forum representative, a representative for Care Leavers to cover a broad range of consultees. The Head of Customer Services had spoken to all groups to discuss the changes. Ward Councillors also needed to assume responsibility for their residents.

Councillor Saltmarsh questioned the removal of the current disregard of Child Benefit clause and treating it as income and reducing the capital limit clause from £16,000 to £6,000.

Councillor Seaton responded that this decision referred to a consultation and the final decision on specific elements has not been made.

Councillor Murphy requested that the proposal withdrawn.

Councillor Seaton replied he would be happy to listen to alternative suggestions.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal advised that residents would be impacted twice, by both the cuts in allowances and an increase in council tax bills. He wanted to know how the Council would ensure those impacted would have a voice in the consultation? He asked how much was the Council Tax Hardship Fund and what happened if it was found to be inadequate? What would the effect of these changes be to an existing applicant?

Councillor Seaton advised that Councillors represent the people in their ward and some of the feedback from the consultation would be from Councillors. He did not consider the questions regarding the Hardship Fund were relevant at this stage.

Councillor Sandford asked what Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out on the proposals and if so, what were the findings?

Councillor Seaton did not feel it appropriate to discuss the Equality Impact Assessment in detail. He agreed there would be a negative impact from these changes and that was the reason the consultation was taking place. Councillor Seaton offered to arrange for the Head of Customer Services explain the report in more detail if required.

#### Budget Control Report October 2018

Councillor Amjad Iqbal asked if the underlying reasons for the SERCO overspend were fully understood and how this pressure would be mitigated in the future?

Councillor Seaton explained that a substantial part of the over-spend related to Children's Services. The over-spend was approximately £6.5m which has been reduced to about £3.9m.

Councillor Murphy asked what the overspend figure would be at the end of the financial year and would this be balanced using reserves?

Councillor Seaton stated this was not relevant to the decision in question and the revenue position for the current year was reported to every Cabinet meeting.

#### Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo)

Councillor Hogg asked why the Articles of Associations had been amended to remove some standard items regarding the conflict of interests for directors.

Councillor Cereste advised he was not aware this condition had been removed and if it had, the position would need to be rectified. The existing governance structure within the Council would be adhered to and he would ask the Legal Team to investigate further.

Councillor Saltmarsh asked if any houses had yet been purchased?

Councillor Holdich advised offers had been made on 50 homes and the target of 50 should be achieved, and possibly exceeded by the end of the year. Seven were occupied to date.

Councillor Fower asked if houses would be purchased in other local authority areas and if so how much had been spent to date.

Councillor Holdich advised that no property had been purchased outside the unitary authority and there remained about £4m available to spend.

Councillor Murphy asked about the provision of properties of affordable rents and the use of these funds for such properties as he was aware there had been issued in the Combined Authority with this matter. He also asked if the Council could work with Ermine Street, an organisation already present in Peterborough, to provide properties for homeless people and people on waiting lists.

Councillor Holdich replied that the Combined Authority did have a problem regarding properties of affordable rents however all the schemes that the Combined Authority had started would be funded.

Councillor Sandford asked what properties were being purchased where the cost exceeded £200,000.

Councillor Holdich advised there were none. The council had instructed a professional valuer to value and make bids on relevant properties and no property so far had cost £200,000.

Councillor Barkham asked if the properties purchased would be subject to the Right to Buy Scheme.

Councillor Holdich advised that he didn't think they would, however if that was the case the price would be cost, without discount. If properties were transferred to the Housing Revenue Account, eventually the properties would come under the Right to Buy Scheme. Properties intended for let to homeless persons would be on a licence basis.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked why the maximum purchase price was £500,000.

Councillor Holdich advised it was not the intention to spend this amount on an individual property however it did allow for the purchase of a block of properties or a property for suitable for conversion. The average bid so far was just over £100,000.

#### Approval of funding for the provision of accommodation to reduce homelessness

Councillor Sandford asked why the average spend per property was £152,000.

Councillor Seaton advised this particular grant referred to Bretton Court. The average spend would be approximately £151,000 per property. There was asbestos in the building and considerable work was required to convert the building into flats.

Councillor Murphy asked for confirmation of the definition of affordable homes as he was concerned about the use of funds from Section 106 and Right to Buy Receipts.

Councillor Holdich requested the question be put to him in writing for reply.

Councillor Jamil asked what financial contribution Cross Keys Homes were making to Medesham Homes.

Councillor Hiller, as a director of Medesham Homes agreed to send a response.

Councillor Holdich advised that the detail was available to the public and could be found in the Cabinet records.

#### Delegation of duties from Peterborough City Council to Cambridgeshire County Council

Councillor Fower asked why the period for delegation was five years and requested confirmation that there would be no detrimental impact on service users.

Councillor Holdich advised that the Member responsible, Councillor Smith was not in attendance due to illness and if the question was confirmed by email an answer would be provided in writing.

#### Tyesdale - Approval of Funding for the Provision of Accommodation to Reduce Homelessness

Councillor Ellis asked why the Council were paying Cross Keys Homes the sum of £100,000 to refurbish the 24 units when Cross Keys Homes maintain the housing stock on behalf of the Council and had a surplus of £11m in 2016-2017 and £15m 2017-2018. He asked for assurance that no current tenants would be evicted and that outreach support would be in place for families new to the area.

Councillor Holdich referred to the business case and advised the properties were being renovated to provide accommodation for families as well as single people and the money would be well spent. The existing tenants have now moved out and several had relocated to brand new properties in Midland Road.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked why the Council is paying Cross Keys Homes £100,000 when it is signing a five year lease and Cross Keys Homes will be guaranteed rental income for that five years.

Councillor Holdich advised savings were made when moving people from hotels or hostels and it was better for people to be in permanent homes.

Councillor Murphy asked if the medical centre and schools would be able to accommodate the additional residents and why had single people been moved from Bretton Court to 3 bedroom family homes in Midland Road?

Councillor Holdich responded that those people had previously been in overcrowded situations and the appropriate housing policy had been applied when allocating homes.

Councillor Jamil asked why, as Cross Keys Homes, who were not experiencing the same financial restraints as the Council, was funding made available to them for renovation works.

Councillor Holdich advised that Cross Keys Homes did not need to renovate the properties and could continue to use them in their current condition. The council would be losing money if the contribution had not been made and the £100,000 represented a good investment for the Council.

Councillor Ellis was concerned that residents had been living in properties that required work and asked for assurance that other properties in Peterborough were in an appropriate condition and did not need upgrading. He felt that the properties should have been in a satisfactory condition for people to occupy.

Councillor Holdich advised all Cross Keys accommodation was fit to live in and that the properties were being made into permanent homes to prevent people moving again at a later date. He advised the Council was saving money and had used less funds than budgeted.

Councillor Murphy commented that five years was a long time to be in emergency or temporary accommodation. He asked the Leader to confirm that the housing emergency in Peterborough had been solved.

Councillor Holdich advised he hoped this would be the case. He advised consideration was given to the availability of school places when buying properties.

#### Disposal of part of freehold in West of the City

Councillor Ellis requested confirmation that the Roundhead Pub and car park would be converted to affordable housing. He also wanted to know if support would be available to new residents.

Councillor Seaton stated that the outreach work is not part of this decision, which was to transfer the asset of Bretton Court to Medesham Homes. Any questions regarding outreach and the pub would be answered separately.

Councillor Holdich announced that the planning application for Bretton Court was rejected by Members on the Planning and Environment Protection Committee on the grounds of parking. The addition of the pub would address this matter and it was unlikely that a future planning application would need planning permission as permitted development rights would now apply.

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

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

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee 26 November 2018
2. The Combined Authority Board 28 November 2018
3. Audit and Governance Committee 30 November 2018

#### University of Peterborough – Review and Evaluation for Phase 1 and 2 of the Programme

Councillor Murphy asked why the university item was withdrawn and delayed until 2021.

Councillor Holdich advised this question had been answered previously and approximately £13 million has been set aside. Studies were currently being conducted and once the results were known the matter would be referred back to the Skills Committee followed by the Combined Authority.

Councillor Murphy asked why the report from the scrutiny committee, which recommended making funds available to cover the consultations, had been withdrawn. He also asked why £10 million had been removed from next year's budget for the university.



Councillor Holdich deferred the answer.

#### Members' Allowances Scheme

Councillor Saltmarsh asked if the Combined Authority Board had agreed to be bound by the recommendation of the independent board, even if the recommendation was a decrease in allowances.

Councillor Holdich told the Council that the Combined Authority Members could not legally claim expenses. He stated that this item referred to payments to the Chairman and Business Board.

#### Wisbech to March Rail – Grip 3b Study

Councillor Joseph asked if any similar funding was available for Peterborough and if so, how much.

Councillor Holdich replied £43 million including the road schemes and university. Future schemes are also being considered.

#### Affordable Housing Update

Councillor Murphy asked Councillor Walsh for her opinion on the presentations on the Housing Programme and the position of the Financial Director.

Councillor Walsh told the Council she attended the meeting as a substitute on the day however she left prior to the end to attend another meeting.

Councillor Whitby asked what would be the cost of running the Combined Authority.

Councillor Murphy advised that the Combined Authority Mayor had stated he would have a cost effective authority with most money being spent on delivery. Last year there were 40 employees plus consultants and the estimated costs were £5 million and growing. The total projected expenditure was £816 million with confirmed income of £186 million.

Councillor Holdich declined to comment on the Financial Director's demise but advised there was a 25% reduction in the budget. The Combined Authority had been quite stable but had taken on other responsibilities including the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

#### **66. Notices of Motion**

##### **1. Motion from Councillor - The East West train service (Birmingham to Stansted)**

Councillor Holdich, with the approval of the Chamber, accepted an amendment to his motion from Councillor Murphy. In moving the amended motion Councillor Holdich advised that although there was an hourly service, seat capacity was consistently inadequate. As the franchise is due for renewal in two years he suspects little will be done to rectify this.

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

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Holdich, as amended by Councillor Murphy, (unanimous) and the motion as **CARRIED** as follows:

~~“The East West train service (Birmingham to Stansted) is a vital service for our city, whilst it is a good hourly service it has an appalling lack of capacity users of this will know it does not matter what time of day you use it”~~. For many it is standing room only for most of your journey and the operator knows it because there is always an apology for only having two coaches and this has been the same for years.

Council notes that are various factors involved, for instance:

- there is a shortage of diesel multiple unit rolling stock at present, especially of the Class 170 Bombardier Turbostar trains that currently serve the Birmingham-Leicester-Peterborough-Cambridge-Stansted route;
- More of these trains may become available when new fleets are delivered, for example the Greater Anglia franchise is soon to bring into service a completely new electric-diesel ‘bi-mode’ fleet which will allow some Turbostars to be cascaded to other operators.
- they already run a Birmingham-Leicester stopping service using the same kind of Turbostars that is occasionally extended to Cambridge at peak times but with a bit of creativity and investment might run all day;
- The outcome of Keith Williams' review of the structure of the rail industry is currently taking place and the operator of the next franchise may bid to strengthen the length of the trains on this route and provide a more frequent service;
- there is however also talk of reshaping the franchise so that Birmingham-Stansted might end up as part of TransPennine Express rather than CrossCountry, which could cause further delay to improvements.

This council resolves to ask the rail minister Andrew Jones MP to insist the train operator improves this situation without delay not only for the passenger experience but for the economy of our city on this and for this vital East West connection through our city.

The council asks Mayor Palmer to raise this issue with the rail minister when he meets him next month and to together consider the issues identified in this motion.

Council believes the Mayor should be tasked with seeking things which are achievable quickly and those which are likely to be strengthening the existing services by coupling on some of the former Greater Anglia Turbostars as they become available, and looking creatively at the timetable to extend more of the Birmingham-Leicester services at least as far as Cambridge.”

## **2. Motion from Councillor Holdich – Housing Shortages**

Councillor Holdich, with the approval of the Chamber, moved an altered motion. Councillor Holdich advised that more homes were needed in Peterborough and the Council urged the Government to compel developers to bring their developments forward.

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

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Holdich (unanimous) and the motion as **CARRIED** as follows:

~~It is no secret that there is a shortage of housing not only in our city but nationally. It is no secret that we need more homes, including affordable homes, to be built.~~

This council urges Government to work with the LGA and councils to give councils the power to enable the council to compel developments to be brought forward, either through the council tax process or the planning regime. This would have many advantages, it would bring competition to the market holding down prices, bring forward much needed affordable homes, create jobs, and give a boost to the construction industry.”

### **3. Motion from Councillor Holdich – Permitted Development Policy**

In moving his motion Councillor Holdich advised that the permitted development policy was adequate for a small home extension, but not when converting large office blocks into homes as no consideration was then being given to infrastructure, schools, health or affordable housing.

Councillor Hiller seconded the motion and advised Members that office space had been converted to dwellings across the city without the need for a planning application. This had led to a reduction in available office space and no financial contribution towards infrastructure was being made. It would be difficult to achieve a change in government policy quickly and it would therefore be right to start lobbying now. The implementation of an Article 4 Direction to protect specific offices from conversion was possible, however that would only require a developer to apply for planning consent in the normal way and would not prevent offices being converted into homes. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) did not apply when converting offices to residential use although the Council could consider changing this policy. There was a complicated national policy surrounding net new floor space created and it was unlikely a change of use would be CIL liable even if local policy was changed when there was no net increase in floor space.

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

- Members recommended revisiting the Article 4 Direction.
- Members suggested the Council buy the property and develop themselves which could then include social housing.
- Members felt that some elements of the report were erroneous.
- Members were concerned that the net effect could be that office blocks remain empty as demand for office space is currently low.
- That Article 4 Directions could be served meaning the developer had to apply for planning permission, as had been done in the London Borough of Islington.
- That CIL contributions were not currently permissible under the Council’s CIL charging schedule, however this could be amended. The change would take two years given the consultation process.
- It was suggested that the current scheme allowed office blocks to be converted to housing under in areas unsuitable for housing and the Council had no control over the standard of accommodation provided.
- Members expressed confusion that this motion was against a process that had been referred to earlier in the meeting as a tool to obtain planning permission for Bretton Court.

Councillor Holdich summed up as mover of the motion and suggested Peterborough had overdone the conversion of office units to housing however there was still a shortage of Grade One office space in Peterborough which was needed to attract business. When invoking the Article 4 Directive through the planning system it was not possible to insist upon affordable housing being incorporated. Since 2015, 42,000 housing units had been

converted from office blocks using the Article 4 Directive, with a potential loss of 10,000 affordable homes. In Peterborough this equated to a potential loss of 2,000 homes.

A recorded vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Holdich (41 voted in favour, 7 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Ellis, Eley, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

**Councillors Against:** Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sanford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Howell

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

Permitted development is fine for a small extension to a home but not when it comes to converting office blocks into large residential units with no contribution towards infrastructure such as school places, health, affordable housing, etc. This council urged the Government and the LGA to review this policy in the interest of fairness within the planning system and help with the demands placed on local councils to deliver service to these new communities welcome they may be.

#### **4. Motion from Councillor Warren - Youth counsellors and mental health in schools**

Councillor Warren, with the approval of the Chamber, moved an altered motion. Councillor Warren advised that on a recent visit to a local secondary school he became aware of the social pressures facing young people. Young adults increasingly suffered some form of mental disorder and recent reports from NHS England indicated that one in eight people under the age of 19 suffered a mental disorder in 2017.

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

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

- Members agreed that many schemes mentioned in the Motion were already working well, such as the CHUMS and MOMO.
- That the Foundation Trust is considered to be underfunded.
- Recent statistics revealed that 53,000 children were living in Peterborough, 27% of the population, speaking 153 different languages.
- It was felt that additional funding would need to be generated to fund the proposal and additional resources in mental health would be required.
- The impact of poverty and on-line abuse could be investigated further.
- Comment was made that in some cases it had taken nine months for a child to see a counsellor.
- The resources the Council had available should be targeted at the children, it was suggested.
- Members felt that existing services required publicising as not enough people knew of their existence or how to access them.

Councillor Fitzgerald exercised his right to speak and advised Members that the original motion had been more concise but had been extended on Officers advice to illustrate all services on offer. The Motion was calling on schools to do more with assistance from the Council and partners.

Councillor Warren summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing advised this Motion was predominantly concerned with publicising mental health resources through schools.

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Warren (unanimous) and the motion as **CARRIED** as follows:

Following a recent visit to a local secondary school where I spoke with a number of children about their school environment, I was made aware of some of the social pressures facing young adults particularly from online bullying and the associated pressures found at home and in school.

It seems that young adults are increasingly suffering from some form of mental disorder which if not addressed could lead to real mental illness. Recent NHS figures show one in eight people under age of 19 in England had a disorder in 2017.

Considering this fact, I would like to propose that the council investigate ways as to how it can improve publicising the support on offer in the City from a range of partners which includes: -and explore the possibility of providing youth

- Peterborough City Council promote and publicise the Keep Your Head website.
- Peterborough City Council commissioned service called CHUMS, which provides a variety of support to young people, which can include group work as well as one to one work with young people with more complex difficulties.
- The NHS provides a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, which supports young people who have the most complex mental health issues.
- Centre 33 there to support young people in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough with a wide range of issues including one-to-one confidential counselling to young people aged 13-25 and currently offers counselling in schools in Cambridgeshire.
- Emotional Health & Wellbeing Service provides support to schools across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The service provides advice and guidance for school staff working with children and young people experiencing emotional difficulties and distress.
- Peterborough City Council's children in care have access to an app called MOMO (Mind Of My Own) where they can talk in confidence.

Schools do play an important role in helping young people to develop resilience, and the Personal, Social and Health Education curriculum is a key way in which young people are supported.

I would also request that council speaks to schools asking them to investigate the setting up of mental health workshops in schools specifically aimed at children, so they can talk freely about mental health issues and discuss their concerns and put forward their own ideas to reduce the risk of harm for all vulnerable young people."

## **5. Motion from Councillor Joseph – Representation on the LATCo board**

Councillor Joseph, with the approval of the Chamber, accepted an amendment to his motion from Councillor Sandford. In moving the amended motion Councillor Joseph advised that the Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo) needed to be transparent

and accountable and having representatives from stakeholders on the board would help to achieve this.

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

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

- Members agreed with the objectives of the motion however they felt that having stakeholders sitting on the board may not be the best use of their skills.
- Some Members felt that cross party representation together with staff and customer representation on the board would be advantages.
- Members suggested it may be more appropriate to have an Advisory Board which could include union and staff representatives.
- That it had taken two years to terminate the Amey contract.
- That it was hoped the introduction of LATCo would be an improvement on the current service received from Amey.
- That the LATCo could have considerable environmental implications.
- Members wanted to know if the meetings would be held in public with published minutes.
- Members could use the existing Scrutiny Committees to hold the LATCo to account.
- That board members should know how to run a business and share a strategic vision.
- That there should be a Cabinet Committee to work with the LATCo.
- It was noted that the Council would consider the appointment of directors who were not Councillors to broaden the input of expertise.

Councillor Fower exercised his right to speak and expressed his disappointment that there was opposition to the idea of including union representatives, staff members and cross party presentation on the board. There was concern over how open the LATCo would be.

Councillor Joseph summed up as mover of the motion and thanked everyone for their comments. She explained that people from different backgrounds could bring diversity to the board which would be the best way to achieve an open and accountable organisation.

A recorded vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Joseph, as amended by Councillor Sanford, (19 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Fower, John Fox, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

## 6. Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz – Childhood obesity

In moving his motion Councillor Shaz Nawaz advised that the ill effects of fizzy drinks could lead to diabetes, obesity and heart disease and it was vital that the Council raise the awareness of these effects.

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

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

Childhood obesity was a global concern: Here in the UK, a more sedentary lifestyle combined with a diet high in processed foods and sugary drinks has become the norm for many of our children.

The long-term effects childhood obesity includes an increased risk of life-limiting diseases such as diabetes, heart disease and certain cancers such as breast and colon. Research has shown that obese children are twice as likely to grow into obese adults.

Obesity can reduce life expectancy by 10 years. In fact, it has been said, this generation of parents will be the first to outlive their children.

Is this life limiting future one which we want for our children?

The council recognised that:

- In its role as a corporate parent it has a duty of care to those it represents and part of that role is the protection of children.
- We need to support educational programmes which encourage better diet and healthier lifestyles.
- Encourage healthier eating campaigns in schools and work places.
- Ensure adequate access to literature and support for those wanting to instigate those changes.

The council therefore resolved to:

- Support the national Fizz Free February Campaign in which we will encourage all residents but especially children to give up fizzy drinks for 28 days.
- Have links on our social media platforms where interested parties can get more literature and advice.
- Use social media to get the message across.
- Press release to launch the campaign.

We are all appalled and quite rightly so, when we hear of children going hungry & suffering the effects of malnutrition through lack of food, here in the UK, in the 21st century. Obesity is also often caused by malnutrition processed food high in fat, salt and sugar washed down with sugary drinks. Let's make Fizz Free February an additional step in working towards a solution to this problem.

## 7. Motion from Councillor Hogg – Chairman of Employment Committee

In moving his motion Councillor Hogg advised that there was no mechanism in place to consider the non-attendance of a Committee Chairman over the course of a year.

The proposal was for standing orders to be amended to accommodate this situation and to re-consider the special responsibility allowance.

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

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

- It was advised that the Chairman of the Employment Committee had been absent due to illness in his family and had now resigned from his post. The Councillor in question had donated his allowance to charity.
- It was noted that other Members on the Council had submitted apologies for meetings for consecutive periods.
- Councillor Davidson had had her requirement to attend meetings waived due to family circumstances.
- Councillors do have family commitments which require attention occasionally.
- It was felt that all Councillors not carrying out their role as a Councillor satisfactory should fall within the review.
- Suggestion was made that Group Leaders could format a joint policy on absenteeism for prolonged periods.

Councillor Murphy proposed the Council move to the vote without further discussion and this was agreed unanimously.

Councillor Hogg summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing suggested the motion could have been amended prior to the meeting if Councillors wanted it to cover a wider range of circumstances. He advised that the Constitution and Ethics Committee could build in safeguards where there were legitimate reasons for non-attendance at meetings and he did not want to preclude the findings of the committee.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Hogg (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

Council noted that:

The Chairman of the Employment Committee has given apologies for all three meetings for 2018, and that his last attendance at an Employment Committee was on 31/10/17.

Council further noted that:

The Chairman of the Employment Committee has been paid a Special Responsibility Allowance for this period.

Council resolved to:

Refer this matter to the Constitution and Ethics Committee to consider if Council Standing orders should be amended to remove Chairman of committees due to poor attendance.

Council further resolved to:

Ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to also consider if Council Standing orders should be amended to require the return of Special Responsibility Allowances for the periods of non-attendance, and, if appropriate, refer to the Independent Remuneration Panel for consideration, as per the Council's required process.

## **67. Reports to Council**

### **a) Appointment of Chairman - Employment Committee**



Council received a report to consider the appointment of Councillor Richard Brown to the position of Chairman of the Employment Committee, currently vacant, under Standing Order 6.1.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that Councillor Nadeem had resigned as Chairman of the Employment Committee and, as Group Leader, he proposed Councillor Richard Brown be appointed as Chairman.

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

A vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous) and it was **AGREED** that the Council approved the Council approves the appointment of Councillor Richard Brown as Chairman of the Employment Committee.

**b) Draft Schedule of Meetings 2019/2020**

Council received a report that set out the proposed draft annual programme of meetings for 2019/2020.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendations and advised that each year the schedule must be approved for the following year by Council and included in the agenda. He advised that Group Meetings were held on Monday evenings which coincided with Scrutiny Meetings on three occasions and requested that this be discussed further by Group Leaders.

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

A vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous) and it was **AGREED** that the Council approved, in principle, the updated draft programme of meetings for 2019/20 (attached at Appendix 1 to the update report).

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 11.12pm  
23 January 2019  
Town Hall  
Bridge Street  
Peterborough

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REPORT**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>Questions from members of the public</u></b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Question from Chris Burbage</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member Waste and Street Scene.</p> <p>With the state of fly-tipping in the city of Peterborough and especially in my ward of Bretton could the council look at time lapse camera's in the known areas of regular fly-tipping.</p> <p><b>The Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Mr Burbage. We recently formed a cross party task and finish group to look more closely at the challenge of fly-tipping and of course to make recommendations on how we can improve our response to this issue. A report setting out a number of prevention and enforcement measures was presented to the relevant scrutiny committee on 9th January 2019, and this will be further taken to Cabinet in early February for further decision.</p> <p>The public report has recommended the increased use of surveillance cameras across the city and it is hoped this will increase the likelihood of prosecution and that through robust enforcement we will be able deter others from fly-tipping.</p>

**COUNCIL BUSINESS**

**8. Questions on notice to:**

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

**1. Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

The Cabinet keeps telling us that they are keen to ensure that the Council derives maximum benefit from all the assets that it owns. In view of this, could the relevant Cabinet Member tell us why the top floor of the Central Library in Broadway has remained empty and unused for years? Whilst the Library is managed by Vivacity, the building is owned by the City Council and so why has it been left empty and delivering no benefit whatsoever to Peterborough people for so long?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. So this is the suggestion that the top floor of the central library is empty and not being used. I must admit I was there a couple of weeks ago and it looked pretty well used to me, it was far from empty, Councillor Sandford so I am not sure where the source is.

The space was converted some time ago to create safe, accessible and neutral spaces to hold child protection conferences and reviews for children in care. 80% of its use falls within that category. The remaining time the space is used in a number of different ways, including partnership meetings and workshops, teacher training, and school governor training - supporting our priority for the best educational outcomes for our young people.

The centre actually - that floor actually - operates at close to full capacity; I did check and the average number of room bookings for the last three or four months was about over 300.

**2. Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development

The Labour Group has tabled motions and questions on social housing on a number of occasions. More specifically we have asked that a Housing Revenue Account (HRA) be reintroduced subject to approval from the Secretary of State. May I please have an update as to exactly where we are in terms of furthering this objective?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

Yes, Mr Mayor and, of course, I thank Councillor Nawaz for the question.

	<p>At Full Council, on 25th July last year, it was agreed that the focus for delivering social housing should continue to be through Medesham Homes rather than seeking to return to providing council housing in the traditional sense, Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Since this resolution the borrowing cap on the Housing Revenue Account, the subject of Councillor Nawaz's question, has been lifted, therefore Council officers have, of course, been reviewing the benefits, risks and costs of the reintroduction of an HRA Housing Revenue Account.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with officers from Hartlepool Borough Council, which became the first Council to reintroduce a separate Housing Revenue Account. Hartlepool has done this primarily to allow the Council to purchase housing in inner city neighbourhoods where regeneration is planned. Peterborough City Council officers are now preparing a business case setting out options for reintroducing an HRA in Peterborough for consideration by Cabinet before the end of the current financial year.</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, I hope that answers your question, Councillor Nawaz.</p> <p><b>Councillor Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you very much, Mr Mayor, and thank you very much, Councillor Hiller, for your detailed response. From your understanding and knowledge when do you think the business case will be ready to review?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>As I suggested in my initial answer, Mr Mayor, it is for consideration by Cabinet before the end of the current financial year. As a business man and an accountant you will know full well when the end of the current financial year is, I am sure. Obviously, Mr Mayor, the concept of an HRA has been envisaged as an element of this authority's prudent financial management of the Council's budgets so I take the opportunity to thank Councillor Nawaz for agreeing with and supporting what it is we are doing as a Conservative run local authority. He will undoubtedly be aware there is an exception, expectation, sorry, that the HRA should be self-financing and be a separate account within the general fund of a local authority and I am sure he will also agree there would be little value gained if all we did was to replicate the services of our very capable registered social landlords in Peterborough. I am sure Councillor Nawaz would like to see the disadvantages, would certainly see the disadvantages, in a bidding war for housing sites inflating values and making the affordable housing provision in our city even more challenging. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene please outline what rate of recycling will be achieved by the new LATCo, Peterborough Ltd?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, thank you, Councillor Hogg. I don't have a crystal ball but I will do my best to respond the question, Mr Mayor. We currently have KPI's in place with Amey to look at recycling and, of course, we are aware that the rate is not as high as what we would aspire to. As such, one of the major drives for the Local Authority Trading Company, the LATCo, will be to increase recycling rates. Once established and the outcomes of the latest government consultation on waste and recycling is</p>

	<p>realised we can look at a policy and how we can deal with waste moving forwards to ensure the percentage of recycling increases. In the short term the Local Authority Trading Company will look at how it can maximise its current resources and see if there are any quick wins such as second recycling bins, etc. Look at this space for an announcement, Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Whitby</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Two years ago I brought to the attention of the Group Leaders a problem with a couple of advertising vans which had appeared, dumped, in various places around the city. I warned at the time that failure to take strong action to stop this was needed otherwise other unscrupulous companies would begin to do the same. Dumping of these vans for extended periods creates an unsightly addition to the verges around the city, obstructs the view of drivers, damages the verges and stops our workers from cutting the grass amongst other issues.</p> <p>Sadly my prediction of further vehicles being dumped as fixed advertising hoardings has proven to be true and I have seen personally, six vehicles in various places for some four companies.</p> <p>Can I ask what measures are being taken to take these vehicles off of our verges and move the advertising to where it should be, planned, legal advertising hoardings?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, Mr Mayor, thank you.</p> <p>First of all I'd like to reassure Members that officers from various departments have been working together to identify different options available to remove vehicles being used for the purpose of advertising. However, our powers are somewhat limited in cases where vehicles are legitimately owned by a registered keeper and are taxed and insured.</p> <p>Our Highways Team do have powers to remove obstructions (including vehicles) from the highway under the Highways Act. If the vehicle is assessed as causing a safety issue it can be removed directly, otherwise it requires an application to be made to the magistrate's court, which takes time and incurs costs for the Council.</p> <p>An alternative option is to use our new verge parking scheme, adopted last year by our PES team. Officers have been activating the scheme at locations where the vehicles have been parked. Although the scheme doesn't allow for their removal, owners can be issued with penalty charge notices. To date officers have activated the scheme at 17 locations where advertising vehicles have been parked and issued 49 penalty charge notices. Of these, 33 have been paid and the remainder are being pursued via our recovery processes. For the vast majority of cases, this action has resulted in the prompt removal of the vehicles ticketed, with only a few cases being escalated to more protracted legal proceedings under the highways legislation.</p> <p>For legally registered vehicles, officers will continue to use this scheme to take enforcement action as it is proving very successful in the majority of cases.</p> <p>So the question posed by Councillor Whitby was about 'dumped vehicles'. It should be noted that the majority of advertising vehicles are not 'dumped' but are roadworthy,</p>

	<p>taxed vehicles with registered keepers. Where vehicles are clearly abandoned with no registered keeper, we have powers of removal in accordance with section 2 of the Refuse Disposal Amenity Act 1978, as amended by the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005. In these circumstances, PES Officers will post a notice for removal on the vehicle which must be complied with within 7 days and failure to comply will result in recovery and, if not claimed, the vehicle will be disposed of. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>What is the possibility of plans for traffic provisions on the roundabout located on the A15 junction with Gunthorpe Road and Manor Drive?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Bond for his question.</p> <p>It is a junction I use very, very frequently, so I completely understand his sentiment. What I would say is our highway network is a real asset to our city as I am sure most of us here are aware and we are always looking to bid for funding to make improvements, and I am sure you'll be aware, Councillor Bond, that this particular roundabout was identified in our fourth Local Transport Plan as a future scheme. Transport powers, as I am sure you will be equally aware, have now moved to the Combined Authority and we have submitted this scheme, along with a number of others in Peterborough, for future funding consideration. So, yes, Councillor Bond, there is a possibility. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Whilst I welcome the environmental enforcement measures now in force in the City Centre area please can the Cabinet Member advise me when the proposed plan for a city wide parking and environmental crime enforcement team will be operating in other areas of the city?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Our parking and environmental crime teams are already operating across the city, with the exception of Kingdom Services who have until now been operating on a trial basis in our 2 Public Space Protection areas i.e. that's the city centre and Millfield. The trial has now concluded, and as of January 2019 we awarded a fixed contract to Kingdom Services. This will allow us to deploy them outside of the trial boundaries into other areas of the city.</p> <p>It may be useful to note that the creation of PSPOs is not essential to the deployment of Kingdom enforcement officers. PSPOs are a useful tool for us to enforce issues that do not form part of our statutory powers, for example spitting and other anti-social behaviour. However, we do have existing powers against offences such as littering that can be granted to Kingdom staff without the need for a new PSPO.</p>

	<p>We will be using these statutory powers to expand delivery now that the trial has concluded, and plan for full roll out to take place in April 2019, this year that is... After this date, deployment of Kingdom and our other enforcement resources will be made based on assessment of need and demand.</p> <p>In areas where extra powers may be needed, we will continue to seek PSPOs to enhance our ability to address non-statutory issues that affect our communities. For example, we are launching a third PSPO in the Woodston area this month to tackle the anti-social challenges that have been raised, and we will continue to do this in any areas that necessitate a more bespoke approach to enforcement.</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Saltmarsh asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Surely you'd agree though that it is very frustrating to residents when they know there is parking enforcement policy in force as in Dogsthorpe Ward as to why there is no enforcement action being taken there.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Well, the question is do I understand it's frustrating. Well, yes I do but I think I have explained what the plan is so if you could kindly relay that to your residents then that maybe of some comfort to them. Thank you.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>The £23m loan to Empower remains unpaid and is understandably causing taxpayers a considerable amount of concern. May I, on their behalf, request a detailed update please?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Nawaz for the question and the opportunity to reassure Members and most importantly tax payers. I think I did answer questions on this at December Full Council but I perhaps could have been more erudite in my answers.</p> <p>The loan facility was granted four years ago to Empower when rigorous criteria was set and satisfied including an assessment of assets against the loan facility. The social enterprise company has been operating solvently and has delivered nearly 8,000 solar installations on housing association properties including over 400 in Peterborough. I think it is worth just mentioning to Members that from this investment the Council has made a return of nearly £2m to support vital services for residents and we continue to receive a six figure monthly income.</p> <p>I can reassure Members and tax payers that the Council's loan to Empower is fully secured over the solar rooftop assets and those assets are now fully operational and receiving the feed in tariff indexed each year by RPI to the year 2037. The re-finance process has been undertaken by Empower with the aim of repaying the Council's loan and preserving the community assets incorporated into the schemes design. To provide the latest position, a term sheet has been received by Empower from Triodos</p>

Bank and Thrive Renewables, and this refinance proposal is now being reviewed in the light of alternative sources of finance available in the long term renewables financing market. Approval for the extension of the loan was given until the end of March subject to monthly authorisation, so enabling progress to be monitored closely and I actually have weekly meetings with the Director of Finance and this is on our agenda as one of about 30 different things we talk about every week. Thank you Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you very much Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Seaton for your detailed explanation.

You talk about a rigorous criteria and it gives me slight cause for concern that the criteria was not rigorous enough. But of course we can't see the future and like you did me I think the council meeting before last and hindsight is a wonderful thing. See that where we are, can you provide me with a clear guarantee that the loan will be repaid and if it's not repaid how are we going to deal with the consequences in current times of austerity?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I'll just say again. I'll reassure Members and tax payers that the Council's loan to Empower is fully secured over the assets. Now Councillor Nawaz said can I give him a crystal clear guarantee. Well I've been in politics long enough that I'm not going to give you a crystal clear guarantee about anything including that the Council budget will be balanced until we actually get there Councillor Nawaz and I'm sure you'll bear with me on that.

I can give you a guarantee as strong as anything but to stake my mortgage on it I think I'd be careful about that. Things happen you know. I know you publically said you talked about rigorous criteria well that was four years ago and no-one called in the decision so I think people were happy across the chamber that the criteria four years ago was rigorous. I know you said publically you don't understand the rate of return, it's commercially confidential I am happy to share that with you if you want to discuss it as long as it does remain confidential. I know you said publically we lack the expertise to bring the scheme in-house well I think that is possible an option for the future that we could look at. But actually what I am seeing at the moment from the discussions with Empower and the third parties we are talking to there are a lot of people interested in these sorts of assets and will take it on. Thank you Mr Mayor.

**8. Question from Councillor Joseph**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

In 2017 Peterborough was declared a Local Alcohol Action Area by the Home Office 2017.

These are areas in which local agencies, including licensing authorities, health bodies and the police will come together with businesses and other organisations to address problems being caused by alcohol in their area. Work in the local alcohol action areas will be focused on the key aims of reducing alcohol-related crime and disorder and reducing the negative health impacts caused by alcohol. Underpinning both of these will be the goal of promoting diverse and vibrant night-time economies.



In the light of this does the Cabinet Member think procedures for the granting of alcohol licenses are stringent enough?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. The Local Alcohol Action Area adopted in 2017 was not intended to address the granting of licenses themselves, but to address alcohol related crime and disorder and negative health impacts. In this regard the scheme has proved successful, bringing together agencies to focus on preventative measures that reduce violence in the night time economy.

Examples include working with existing licensees to look at how they promote alcohol or designing out areas that increase the likelihood of violence. E.g. redesigning smoking areas where persons are held in confined areas. In respect of the granting of licenses I do believe our procedures are stringent and that we have an effective and robust partnership that works together to help inform the Licensing Committee's decision making.

This is operating as Government intended. The legislation contains sufficient provisions to ensure that licences are only granted to businesses meeting the requirements of the Act, as well as measures to enable breaches of licence conditions to be addressed, this being by a licence review if necessary.

Furthermore, where evidence is available, we are using extra powers to help the Licensing Committee reach decisions. E.g. in the Lincoln Road area we have introduced a cumulative impact policy which allows for new applications to be refused or amended solely on the volume of licensees already operating in this area. Thank you.

**Councillor Joseph asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Walsh for your answer. You mention the CanDo area which as you have rightly stated is subject to a cumulative impact policy. It also has a Public Space Protection Order in place alongside the LAAA. However we continue to see licenses being granted in this area.

With inadequate resources to ensure that the policies are enforced is it not time perhaps we looked at other ways of addressing this issue, one of which might be to insist that any license applicant wanting to have a license in a cumulative impact area perhaps has five years unblemished years as a license holder in the UK and whether we have the authority to put those policies in place. Thank you.

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you. I think you are touching on the processes now of our Licensing Committee and I think that is something that you really do need to bring forward to them and the relevant Officers of course for them to look at, consider. That isn't something I could answer tonight, we are talking legalities. Thank you.

**Councillor Hiller:**

Thank you, Mr Mayor. I rise on a statement of accuracy rule 20.15. I waited out of courtesy for Councillor Walsh to answer the supplementary question. I have sat on the Licensing committee for many years, Mr Mayor, and what I would say is that the Cumulative Impact Policy in itself doesn't prevent a license being granted. We had a review, not a review, an application last week, the Deputy Mayor was sitting in the

	<p>licensing panel as well as myself, and Councillor Ayres was the Chair. If the programme that's put forward by the applicant is robust enough a licence can be granted.</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>When was the last time the Council's Mobile Telephone provision contract reviewed, and what frequency would this normally be carried out?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Yes so this is about the Council's mobile telephone contract which current contract was let in September 2015 for 3 years. So we actually reviewed it in September last year and we would have gone out to tender again but we were aware that Cambridgeshire are also going out to tender so we have joined the two tenders together.</p> <p>I believe it's the end of this month that those tenders are due to be received so we should be able to get a saving on the joint contract and that will be reviewed over the next month or two. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hogg asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Just to get some clarification on that. So you are saying that the contract was reviewed last year. I believe the contract is with Orange which stopped doing new business in 2010. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor. No. It is with EE.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bashir</b></p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader</p> <p>People from many communities value our City Market. There have recently been concerns expressed from both traders and members of the public regarding the lack of footfall and business downturn, particularly when the Stagecoach Bus service was redirected during the roadworks on Westgate.</p> <p>Can reassurances be provided that the Market has a long term future, and enjoys the full support of the City Council?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Bashir. I could actually answer yes as a short answer to the question but I will elaborate. The question is timely. There is currently a great deal of national interest in the viability of traditional markets. I can assure you and the chamber that Peterborough city market is and will continue to be an important part of our city centre life. It has had the full support of the City Council and a long term future.</p> <p>It is true however to say that the road works during the late Summer and Autumn of 2018 which resulted in bus diversions by Stagecoach, did have an effect on footfall</p>

attending the market. Things have now returned to normal with the completion of the public ground work and bus routes have been reintroduced.

Any current downturn in trade and footfall is regrettable of course but being felt across the high street retail sector as a whole.

A number of initiatives have been introduced to support the market and these include:, and I'll go down a list if you don't mind:

- We are increasing the number events.
- We are expanding the social media marketing opportunities and engaging with 'bloggers' further video coverage.
- We are offering the market site and services as a base for community events.
- We are undertaking essential works to improve the market and capital and revenue bids are being submitted to address related issues.
- Additional promotions are being put in place to increase trader numbers and improve the market offer.
- We are looking into other activities such as regular auctions and craft marketing partnerships.
- Advertisements are in place on advertising billboards in the city.
- And promotion for the market is displayed on screens at the Peterborough train station.
- We are developing the Food Court offer and I am delighted to say we now have traders offering Caribbean, Thai, Nigerian and Indian food along with pizza and pasta and also a bakery and cake shop.
- And to ensure we don't just put things in place we let people know what is there to visit and enjoy. There has been a complete refresh of the market traders' website.

So be assured of our continued support for the assets and the aspiration to see the location become our very own Peterborough Market.

**Councillor Bashir asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Allen for your detailed answer. Members of the public have expressed that the market should return to Cathedral Square. Is that a possibility?

**Councillor Allen responded:**

Thank you for the question, the supplementary question Councillor Bashir. I think the nostalgic sepia images of Peterborough Market Place from back in time are of course somewhat persuasive. Although perhaps appealing, the reality would present a logistical challenge to operate on a regular basis. The setting up, dismantling and removal of storage of the market stalls would be labour intensive and costly. Additionally many of the stalls are effectively now lock up units, where in many cases traders store stock or machinery in connection with their business. For these businesses the prospect of moving in and out of stalls would be impractical. Cathedral Square is a popular and versatile public space. Great for events and festivals and of course also as a location for craft markets, continental markets and farmers markets together with the important seasonal use for our light switch on. And I add the option of a Christmas

	<p>Market which is currently being progressed. I think rather than focus on a move I believe every effort needs to be put in place to promote our current city market in it's present location. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Joseph</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Issues around verge parking are common – what reassurance can you give to residents that the council is taking a proactive approach to address this issue?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, Mr Mayor, thank you. The Council receives numerous complaints relating to verge parking each year and the impact this has on communities and individuals is well documented. Due to these concerns the new Verge Parking Scheme was introduced and came into effect in June 2018.</p> <p>Three resident-backed schemes have been implemented, another will be completed soon, and two are currently open for consultation with local residents. There have also been a number of schemes activated directly by officers such as in locations used by advertisement vehicles or vehicles for sale, which we discussed earlier in the question from Councillor Whitby. Vehicles parked at locations where the scheme has been activated are liable for a Penalty Charge Notice which is enforced by (<i>Prevention and Enforcement Services</i>) PES Officers.</p> <p>Councillors and residents can request and support the introduction of the scheme in their local area. Full details can be found on the Council's website or, alternatively, Residents or Members can contact the Prevention and Enforcement Services who will be able to assist.</p> <p><b>Councillor Joseph asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Walsh. Many of the residents obviously object to the verge parking because of the damage that it causes to the actual verges themselves and causes them to become unsightly. I have been given figures by Officers, retrospective figures as apparently we don't repair the verges any more, that an average of a two by ten foot verge repair costs between £150.00 and £400.00 plus the traffic management costs. Would it not be a better idea perhaps to look at repairing the verges and installing protective matting which, will following the initial outlay would allow us to have verges that were aesthetically pleasing, would have a more positive impact on the environment and vastly reduce the costs of repairs and traffic costs going forward.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, thank you, Mr Mayor. Yes it does sound like a very good idea at first, but the point is that we will repair the verges and then they will get damaged again, so what we need is a sustainable solution and I think the only sustainable solution is to prohibit vehicles parking on the verges so they are not damaged. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
	<p><b>NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WERE ASKED DUE TO THE TIME LIMIT BEING REACHED</b></p>

12.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Coles</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>I was pleased to visit Garden House recently, where I met staff and volunteers who provide support during the daytime for Peterborough’s homeless people. I was also able to speak with some of the guests who are receiving help. I was very impressed to see the mix of services that Safer off the Streets is providing, not just the night shelter scheme in the city, but also daytime support. Could you tell me how the “Safer Off The Streets” partnership is developing in terms of identifying the City’s rough sleeper community and how the Council is working within the partnership?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh may have responded:</b></p> <p>Much has been achieved in the three months since the launch of Safer off the Streets. The Council is a key partner in the partnership which comprises a wide range of other organisations from across the public, voluntary and faith sectors, each of whom are committed to supporting the project’s aims. The partnership came about as a result of the rough sleeper action plan, developed by the highly effective cross party task and finish group last year.</p> <p>Over the coming months work will intensify with the aid of the financial support we have received from the Government’s rough sleeping initiative, and this will enable the resource in the council’s rough sleeper outreach team to be doubled.</p> <p>The Council’s Outreach Team work closely with the Garden House and have outreach officers based out of the building so that rough sleepers are able to access all required support in a neutral location as well as providing outreach to those who are not yet ready to engage.</p>
13.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Martin</b></p> <p>Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>There was a proposal for Heltwate Special School and St George’s Hydrotherapy Pool to re-locate to a site in East Ward off Newark Road. I understand that, following the collapse of Carillion, the planning application has been withdrawn. Can the appropriate Cabinet Member please tell me if the project has been cancelled?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres may have responded:</b></p> <p>The planning application was withdrawn after the financial demise of Carillion in January 2018. However, the decision was also taken that the scheme to build a special new school with a hydrotherapy pool on the site at Newark Road was not best value. Alternative options are being considered for capital investment into the existing Heltwate School to ensure greater suitability of existing accommodation and to create additional spaces. We have also secured additional outdoor space for the school. Additionally, St Georges was reopened following extensive refurbishment in September 2018 as a split site for Sixth Form Pupils from Heltwate and this will be used for the foreseeable future. Any development at Heltwate would be undertaken in conjunction with additional reconfiguration at Marshfield Schools to ensure we can meet all the needs of pupils with SEND (<i>Special Educational Needs and Disability</i>) across Peterborough in the future.</p>
14.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p>

	<p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>I'm aware that a number of roads in the city have not been swept for significant periods of time. With Amey now leaving can the Cabinet Member provide residents and residents groups with reassurance and information about how these services, including emptying bins and cleaning streets, will be delivered across the authority.</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</b></p> <p>All PCC (<i>Peterborough City Council</i>) owned areas of land are visited and cleansed on a cyclical basis this includes both manual litter picking and mechanical road sweeping where possible. With the introduction of the Local Authority Trading Company all services and specifications will initially be a like for like service, we will then look to make improvements through efficiencies and different ways of working moving forwards.</p>
15.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member for Health tell us what discussions he has had with health service partner organisations regarding the possibility of a no deal Brexit and what preparations are being made to avoid potentially catastrophic consequences for NHS services and patient care in Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald may have responded:</b></p> <p>NHS contingency planning for a no deal Brexit is taking place at national level, including measures to ensure supply of medicines and medical devices. The Department of Health and Social Care has issued Operational Guidance on actions that all local providers and commissioners of health and social care services should take to prepare for, and manage, the risks of a no-deal exit scenario. Local oversight is provided by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Health Resilience Partnership, which includes all local NHS Trusts and commissioners and is co-chaired by an NHS England Director and our Director of Public Health.</p> <p>Yesterday, our Service Director for Communities and Safety, who is leading Brexit preparations for the City Council, attended the Local Health Resilience Partnership to ensure that our Brexit contingency plans are aligned, particularly with regard to adult social care. In addition, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (LRF) is currently overseeing multi-agency contingency planning for a 'no deal' Brexit, and the NHS is represented and fully involved. As Cabinet Member I am kept apprised through feedback from senior officers, and directly through attending relevant NHS Partnership Boards. Our planning is not just for 'no deal', but for a number of potential Brexit scenarios.</p>
16.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>The recent IPCC (<i>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</i>) report showed that unless urgent measures are taken, the Earth could be only a few years away from</p>

	<p>significant and irreversible climate change. So what new measures has the council taken to reduce its carbon footprint over the last twelve months?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>Council agreed in April 2017 an Environment Action Plan which outlines targets, across ten different themes, that the Council is committed to delivering, between now and 2020.</p> <p>Under the ‘zero carbon energy’ theme the Council committed to a number of targets designed to reduce our carbon footprint including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishing a CO<sub>2</sub> baseline for Fletton Quays with a view to reducing emissions while taking due account of the city’s growth aspirations. This work is currently underway. Per member of staff, Sand Martin House should be considerably more energy efficient than previously occupied buildings;</li> <li>2. Maintaining our ‘Green’ rating with Investors in the Environment. I am pleased to confirm this is on track, For Members who may not be aware of this initiative it is a national scheme operated by Peterborough Environment City Trust and is designed to help organisations save money and reduce their impact on the environment.</li> <li>3. Upgrade 17,000 street lights to energy efficient LEDs. This project is nearing completion and will make a significant contribution to the level of energy required to illuminate the city’s streets.</li> </ol>
17.	<p><b>Ward Specific Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please inform me as to which roads and footpaths in the Gunthorpe ward are scheduled for resurfacing work between now and the end of the financial year, and also for the 2019/2020 financial year?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>There are works planned to be undertaken on the footway near Werrington Brook, these works are planned to be undertaken during February (weather allowing). There are no carriageway works planned.</p> <p>Over the financial year of 2019/20 there are no works planned on the carriageways. There are planned works on the footways along Donaldson Drive and this will be over a couple of years due to the length of the road.</p>
18.	<p><b>Ward Specific Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member let me know what work the City Council have undertaken with schools in the Gunthorpe Ward, to help encourage and increase the number of children cycling to and from school, and what plans they have in the coming years to ensure growth in regards to this important aspect?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres may have responded:</b></p>

	<p>The Council provides Bikeability training, which is the new cycle proficiency training, to a number of primary schools in Peterborough. Training has recently taken place in Norwood and Gunthorpe Primary Schools which gives our youngsters the ability and confidence to cycle. We also run the Bike-It initiative with a number of schools in Peterborough which aims to encourage active travel. Schools are able to compete in various competitions and promotional events throughout the year.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with and deliver active travel initiatives to schools across the whole of Peterborough to encourage sustainable travel.</p>
19.	<p><b>Ward Specific Question from Councillor Whitby</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>We have had two major crashes recently in the early morning on Fletton Avenue. It appears that speed was an issue with both of these incidents and this part of Fletton Avenue seems to suffer more than most from speeding vehicles.</p> <p>Can I ask the Cabinet Member what specific measures are being considered to deal with this problem, as it is only a matter of time before one of these accidents involves a fatality?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>In 2018 there were three collisions resulting in injury and two collisions resulting in vehicle damage only, however officers have not yet received the verified reports, and thus are not aware of the underlying causes or contributory factors. Once these are received officers shall review whether any future interventions are required. A scheme is planned at the junction of Fletton High Street and Whittlesey Road to improve the pedestrian crossing facilities.</p>
20.	<p><b>Ward Specific Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Numerous reports of stray horses were confirmed in the Gunthorpe Ward in 2018.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member consider introducing a cattle guard at all foot bridges, particularly the footbridge Paston to Gunthorpe Ridings, for pedestrians to pass but not cattle/livestock?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>This is not a proposal we are able to consider. Whilst we appreciate that cattle grids are useful in the correct setting they are not considered to be suitable in the locations referred to. These locations are used regularly by cyclists and pedestrians including those with mobility issues.</p>
21.	<p><b>Ward Specific Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p>



To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development

Can the Cabinet Member please consider the structural damage to a lamppost on Gunthorpe Road in front of Happy House Pre-school for replacement? It is a constant reminder of the fatal incident which led to the structural damage in 2017.

Will the relevant department deal with this as a matter of priority?

**Councillor Hiller may have responded:**

We would like to thank you for bringing this to our attention and we can confirm that arrangements are being put in place to deal with this situation at the earliest opportunity.

**8. Questions on notice to:**

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

There were no questions in this category.



This page is intentionally left blank