

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 4 MARCH 2020
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR GUL NAWAZ

Present:

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

The meeting opened with a minute's silence in honour of the late Pam Winslade, who served on the City Council until 2012.

65. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lamb, Fower and Louise Coles.

66. Declarations of Interest

Members were advised that the Audit Committee had granted a general dispensation, should they have any pecuniary interest, to enable them to debate and vote on the budget item. Members more than two months in arrears with council tax payments were asked to declare such as their right to vote on the budget item would be affected.

There were no declarations of interest at the start of the meeting however Councillor Ash declared that he was a Trustee of The Citizens Advice Bureau when this subject was raised later.

67. Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on 5 February 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

68. Mayor's Announcements

Members were also advised of the forthcoming Mayors Ball to be held on 30 May 2020 for the benefit of Friends of Peterborough Hospital, Little Miracles and Caring Together. Tickets were available from the Civic Office.

The Mayor thanked those Members who were attending their last meeting, including the Leader of the Council, Councillor Holdich OBE, for their hard work and commitment to their communities.

69. Leaders' Announcements

The Leader spoke on his decision to stand down. And advised Council that there had been a member of the Holdich family on the council since 1880 and Councillor Holdich himself had served the council for almost 43 years since 1978, following the footsteps of his father. He had been Leader and held portfolios in education and housing and also served as a parish councillor.

He had been a popular councillor and Members showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

Opposition Leaders bid Councillor Holdich farewell and wished him well in retirement. Councillor Holdich responded and thanked the officers for their support during his time in office.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

70. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

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

1. Idling Engines Education
2. Waste Hierarchy and circular economy
3. Water Preservation plan and carbon emissions associated with water treatment
4. Adoption of the artery road that runs through Orton Northgate – Loch Lomond Way.
5. Support to help Cherry Tree Community Interest Company

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

71. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members.

72. Questions on Notice

a. To the Mayor

b. To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet

c. To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee

d. To the Combined Authority Representatives

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

1. Renewables infrastructure cost
2. Sale of London Road Stadium and open space

3. Commission of services and property purchase compatibility with fair tax declaration.
4. Student Housing
5. Frequency of cutting bushes and hedges
6. Removal of Trees
7. Savings identified by Grant Thornton
8. Climate Emergency Deadline 2030
9. Home Insulation
10. Children in Care in unregistered Accommodation

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

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

1. Local Transport Plan
2. Public transport services - Question withdrawn and therefore not answered

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

Councillor Holdich, with permission of the Mayor, addressed the Council to advise that Councillor Seaton and Councillor Bisby had been called away due to urgent family health matters.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

73. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council - Part One

(a) Cabinet Recommendation - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 Tranche Two

Council received a report for consideration on the on 25 February 2020 on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 to 2022/23 – Tranche Two and the recommendations of the Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committees regarding CO² emissions, increased parking charges, and refuse collection. Further information was provided in the Additional Information which included a revised Appendix A- 2020/21-2022/23 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Detailed Budget Position with regards to the Housing Benefit Grant.

Councillor Fitzgerald introduced the report in place of Councillor Seaton and advised Council he would be reading Councillor Seaton's previously prepared words and moved the recommendation. He outlined briefly why there was still a deficit and advised that this was hampered by specific local issues such as low council tax, low housing bands, high growth, public health underfunding and deprivation issues.

He reminded councillors that there was a balanced budget for 2020 – 2021 with no service cuts and a continued investment in ICT, schools, intelligent transport systems, leisure trust schemes and housing. Agreement was still awaited on the Capital Correction but there was confidence this would be achieved which would enable future transformation reserves to be maintained.

He outlined the awards and achievements of various departments and schemes within Peterborough City Council and praised the considerable expertise which was reflected in the high performance of services and the income this generated.

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

Councillor Amjad Iqbal moved an amendment to the motion. He advised that grants had reduced whilst social care costs had increased and acknowledged that the Council had streamlined services and found new ways of operating whilst continuing to deliver vital services and commended work of officers during the recent period of austerity. He acknowledged the Council's financial position however he felt that were additional objectives to provide more local vibrant communities and meet climate emergency objectives and these ideas would require business cases for formal approval and as such were cost neutral at this stage. He outlined the plans as detailed in the additional information pack including the Investment Fund for Local Business, the purchase of a Technical Building, Housing Revenue Account (HRA), Housing, Digital Delivery, Transport, Climate Emergency and Eco-living.

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

Council debated both the motion and the amendment and Members raised the following key points and comments:

- Members acknowledged there had been an 80% reduction in grants over a five year period which had left the council in a difficult financial situation.
- The budget proposals needed to be considered alongside those made at the meeting in January.
- Some Members felt that the cross-party budget group were only presented with one set of proposals which had previously been agreed by Cabinet and appeared as a fait accompli.
- Members would have like the amendment to have been submitted to the cross-party budget working group to enable full discussion as Members could not be expected to agree to the amendments without knowing the full impact on the proposed budget and further background information.
- Members felt that some parties did not participate in the cross-party working group meetings.
- Some Members felt that there had been free and open discussions at the meetings where Members could make suggestions and praised the Leader for his open-door policy.
- Members advised that all parties had been invited to the budget working group meetings but needed to be present to discuss their suggestions.
- The budget needed to be refocused towards areas of expenditure which would reduce carbon emissions such as more investment in public transport and cycling rather than roads.
- New property developments needed to be linked to public transport routes. Whilst some Members felt these were designed by private developer, others felt the Planning Department would have had influence over the design.
- The Tree and Woodland Strategy was not being followed. Earlier in the meeting the response to a question regarding cutting back existing trees and shrubs suggested an enhanced service could be provided whilst the budget made cuts to the current cycle and Members would like to see more tree planting if the budget would allow.
- Members felt that the budget should readdress the balance in spending between the city centre and outlying areas with more investment in directed towards outlying areas.
- Members felt it was difficult to locate the budget proposals.
- Some members felt the budget was not a balanced budget as it included proceeds from the sale of assets.
- Members felt funds had been mismanaged on Rhubarb Bridge, St Michel's Gate and computer services.
- The amendment included provisions for climate change and some Members expressed a wish to be able to vote on this element of the amendment in isolation.

- The amendment, Item 8c called for the use of consultants to implement the climate emergency proposals (amended) against a background of criticism for the use of consultants.
- Climate Emergency was being addressed in the current budget as illustrated by the conversion of 27,000 street lights to LED and work in schools to educate children on energy efficiency who would pass these practices onto their households.
- Members explained that the costs of refurbishing properties was great and by using modern technology it was possible to build new properties which were zero carbon and including renewables could further increase the carbon efficiencies. Members heard of a company who constructed panels, similar to those used in building refrigerators, for house building in place of the traditional brick and block construction that could be erected to roof level and made watertight in 3 days and insulated to the point where no further heating would be required. Members considered this was the way forward in housebuilding which would meet the requirements for tackling the climate emergency.
- Cabinet Members advised Council that a City Council Carbon Management Plan would work towards achieving the operational carbon zero promise, investigate where current emissions came from, review existing plans to reduce emissions and identify the areas where further reductions could be made.
- Members did ask if the amendment item on climate change could be proposed separately and Members understood it could not.
- Members were advised of measures taken by other local authorities towards the climate emergency, including the a study on the impact of a car free city centre, building energy efficient homes, modifying current council housing to achieve more energy efficiencies, restricting private vehicles within the city centre, the purchase of land for tree planting and the creation of a team lead by a Head of Service of Climate Change and Carbon Reduction.
- Members expressed concern regarding the maintaining pavements and landscaped areas, bulky waste collections and fly-tipping.
- The cuts needed to balance the city centre and urban areas and the neighbourhoods where people live and be the best budget for the people of Peterborough.
- The building of more council houses was considered beneficial however it needed to be done with full knowledge of the costs. Using the figures from the amended budget proposal, the costs of borrowing would be approximately 6% which equated to a cost of about £5.4million.
- Members felt there would be difficulties achieving a build rate of 600 affordable homes per annum.
- Cabinet Members advised that the Cabinet was already looking at setting up an HRA (*The Housing Revenue Account*) and would continue with this work whilst ensuring that decisions made were not detrimental to the relationships already established with housing associations.
- The company, Medesham Homes had already been set up by the council to deliver affordable housing.
- Councillor Cereste provided some background information on the cost of borrowing relevant to the setting up of an Investment Fund for local businesses. The example rates given were the minimum borrowing rate being 3.8%, increasing to 22+% if the loan is not repaid after five years. For loans taken over 25 years the interest charged was approximately 6.9% and over 40 years 5.9%.
- Members calculated that the total capital cost proposed in the amendment came to £126million with a revenue cost each year if the council borrowed at a rate of 3.8%, of £4.8million, which exceeded the cost of bin collections for the whole year. The council could not afford this and core services would be affected. It would not be feasible for local business to secure sufficient return on the borrowing whilst the national economy was growing at around 2%. There were risks associated with recovering the business

loans as 9 out of 10 small business ventures fail, and if loans were secured against assets there was the potential to make 9 out of 10 people homeless if a venture was unsuccessful.

- Members were advised that Aragon Services continued to look at growth opportunities and the council were looking towards bringing more services in-house.
- The amendment was similar to the amended proposals made previously and was based on the principle of spending capital to produce better services and increase income, which was considered by some to be a sound concept, however further background information to the proposals would have been useful as costs for the amended proposals had not been provided.
- The amendment was considered by some Members to be high risk and unachievable.
- Some Members wanted more emphasis should be on digital innovation.
- Some Members felt the amendment should be supported as the whole city needed to look towards the future and pay particular attention to job creation, the digital age, the environment, housing and the climate emergency.
- Members disagreed over whether items in the amendment would generate or lose money for the council.
- Members noticed that some items on the amendment had been carried forward from last years amendment document with little evidence of additional information being provided.
- As the meeting needed to approve a budget for next year, there was insufficient information within the amendment to support it as an alternative budget.
- Some Members were concerned about the increase in Residential Permit Charges which would bring £107,000 to the budget per year and felt that the cost of running the scheme had not increased by this sum making this was therefore a stealth tax to shore up other budget areas.
- With regards to the planning of Manor Drive area, Members asked it to be noted that the planning consent was granted in 2014. In 2016 the boundaries were re-drawn and Manor Drive became part of Gunthorpe ward.
- Members explained that all council software upgraded, together with the web site. The installation of city fibre would ensure Peterborough was one of the first cities to provide fast track digital service to all residents.
- Members explained that there would be a higher demand for power when people had access to access digital services.
- Members expressed concern over the reduced operations of the Citizens Advice Bureau which was now only open by appointment and would be making job cuts which will have an adverse reaction to the council.

The Mayor felt that the matter had been sufficiently debated and invited the seconds to exercise their right to speak.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz exercised his right to speak as seconder of the amendment and referred to various comments previously made saying earlier speeches and calculations contained contradictions. He felt that alternative suggestions proposed at the budget working group had not been considered and that the Labour and Liberal Democrats were no longer part of the budget working group. He felt that the Administration lacked vision and ambition and that there were failings within the programmes for digital transformation, housing and the climate emergency. He explained the ideas within the amendment had been re-presented as they were really good ideas which would help to move the city forward. He felt that small business generally operated within 15% – 20% net margin and would be able to afford interest payments generated by their debt. He thought the loans to small business would help them to achieve higher profit margins which would lead to increased employment, implementing the living wage and additional apprenticeships within the area. Medesham Homes was a good start however it did not go far enough. He felt a house could be built for £150,000 and

suggested there was an established builder amongst the Members who had the expertise to build such houses and suggested working.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak on the original proposal. He informed Council that a profit could not be made on car parking charges. He explained that money had remained within the budget for Youth Services and the libraries although there was no statutory requirement to do so. He repeated that Members could call at his office to discuss any matter. He advised the Members that the council were applying for lottery funding for £1.5million to replant hedgerows across the county. The CA (*Combine Authority*) already had an Investment Fund for Local Business within the Growth Fund which businesses could and had access. A new appointment, a Business Accelerator would be attached to the university, funded by private money. Several sections within the amendment were currently being considered or had been in the past including housing, transport and contracted services, which had become more expensive to run externally and would be bought back in house when the opportunity arose.

As mover of the original motion Councillor Fitzgerald summed up and advised Members he couldn't see any savings within the amendment. He felt there were no guarantees in any proposals. He thought most Members were insufficiently informed on digital communications and were unable to back up their claims on the digital economy within the area. He advised that the council had a Director of Business Improvement already in place to implement item 1 of the amendment. He commented on item 2, Invest in the purchase of a Technical Building Business, and reiterated Councillor Holdich's comments on the appointment of Business Accelerator on the university site, working in conjunction with the private sector on business innovation, job creation and revenue ideas. He felt it would have been useful if information on the viability of an HRA had been investigated and he quoted a housing association as saying it was unrealistic to build 600 houses from a standing start. The council was moving towards digital platforms, partly driven by cost and partly because it was easier. There was already a move towards bringing Aragon Services into as much council business as possible to support services and staff. He felt the amendment was unworkable with insufficient background information and research, it was not an alternative to the budget and was political posturing for the sake of posturing.

At the request of Members the Mayor moved directly to the vote with no further speakers.

A vote was taken on the amendment to the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 Tranche Two recommendation from Councillor Amjad Iqbal (18 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 9 abstained from voting).

Councillors For: Ali, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

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

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

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 Tranche Two recommendation as originally moved (27 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The recommendation was **DEFEATED**.

Group Leaders were invited to join the Chief Executive, the Monitoring Officer and the Resources Acting Corporate Director and the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting reconvened.

Councillor Sandford wished to bring an amendment to the budget proposal and asked to move the suspension of standing order 21.7 (b).

The motion was seconded and a vote was taken to suspend standing order 21.7(b) (26 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

Councillors For: Ash, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Day, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved to suspend standing order 23.2. to allow the budget vote and the amendment proposed by Councillor Amjad Iqbal again.

The motion was seconded and a vote was taken to suspend standing order 23.2 (45 voted in favour, 10 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** and standing order 23.2 was suspended.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal moved his amendment again on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 Tranche Two.

This was seconded by Councillor Jamil.

A second vote was taken on the amendment to the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 recommendation from Councillor Amjad Iqbal (16 voted in favour, 30 voted against, 9 abstained from voting).

Councillors For: Day, Ellis, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

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

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

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A second vote was taken on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020-21 to 2022-23 recommendation as originally moved (29 voted in favour, 17 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

Councillors Against: Ash, Day, Ellis, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Barkham, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

Council **RESOLVED** to approve:

1. The Tranche Two service proposals outlined in Appendix C.
2. The revised capital programme outlined in Section 8 and referencing Appendix H.

3. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020/21 – 2022/23-Tranche Two, as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
- Appendix A – 2020/21-2022/23 MTFS Detailed Budget Position-Tranche Two
 - Appendix B – Budget Proposals Tranche One
 - Appendix C – Tranche Two Budget Proposal Detail
 - Appendix D – Grant Register
 - Appendix E – Council Tax Information
 - Appendix F – Business Rates- Discretionary Retail Relief
 - Appendix G – Fees and Charges
 - Appendix H – Capital Programme Schemes 2020/21- 2022/23
 - Appendix I – Financial Risk Register
 - Appendix J – Carbon Impact Assessments
 - Appendix K – Treasury Management Strategy
 - Appendix L – Capital Strategy
 - Appendix M – Asset Management Plan
 - Appendix N – Investment Acquisition Strategy
4. The use of local discretionary powers to ensure eligible business ratepayers receive retail relief, public houses discount and local newspaper office discount, in accordance with the ministerial statement of 27 January 2020 and the relevant government guidance as set out Appendix F.

74. Reports to Council - Part One

(a) Council Tax Resolution

Council were presented with the report on the Council Tax requirement as part of the formal budget process as set out within the Constitution and in accordance with legislative requirements to set a balanced budget for 2020/21, which proposed a rise in council tax of 3.99%, including a rise in general Council Tax of 1.99% and an Adult Social Care Precept of 2.00%.

Councillor Holdich moved the recommendation.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the Council Tax Resolution recommendation (39 voted in favour, 16 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

Councillors For: Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

Councillors Against: Day, Ellis, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

Council **RESOLVED** to approve the Council Tax Resolution which proposes a Council Tax Increase of 3.99%, which includes the following breakdown:

- A rise in general Council Tax of 1.99%
- An Adult social Care Precept of 2.00%

Members voted on the remaining agenda items without debate as the guillotine had been reached and standing orders had not been suspended to allow an extension to the meeting.

75. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council - Part Two

(a) Cabinet Recommendation - Climate Change - City Council Carbon Management Action Plan 51 - 94

Cabinet at its meeting on 3 February 2020, received a report on the City Council Carbon Management Action Plan and recommended to Council that delegation be given to the Executive Director for Place and Economy to undertake minor amendments to the Council-CMAP before it was published, provided such amendments did not materially amend the policy.

A vote was taken on the Climate Change – City Council Carbon Management Action Plan (46 voted in favour, 9 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

Council **RESOLVED** to:

1. Adopt the Council-CMAP at its meeting of 4 March 2020, subject to the addition of a Parish Council representative on the Climate Change Member Working Group.
2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place and Economy to undertake any presentational, factual or other minor amendments to the Council-CMAP before it is published, provided such amendments do not materially amend the content of the Council-CMAP.

(b) Cabinet Recommendation - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Youth Justice Plan 2019 – 2022

Cabinet at its meeting on 3 February 2020, received a report on the joint Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Youth Justice Plan 2019-22. The plan was in line with Peterborough's Strategic Objectives:

- Improving educational attainment and skills
- Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults
- Keeping all our communities safe, cohesive and healthy
- Achieving the best health and wellbeing for the city

A vote was taken on the Youth Justice Plan 2019 - 2022 (unanimous) and **RESOLVED** to approve the Joint Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Youth Justice Plan.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

77. Notices of Motion

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

1. Motion from Councillor Skibsted

Councillor Skibsted's motion regarding veganism was taken as read.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Skibsted in relation to veganism (23 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 4 abstained from voting).

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

2. Motion from Councillor Sandford

Councillor Sandford's motion regarding the Global Biodiversity Emergency and Climate Emergency was taken as read.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Sandford in relation to declaring a biodiversity emergency (27 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

3. Motion from Councillor Yasin

Councillor Yasin's motion regarding the abuse of children online was taken as read.

A vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Ayres to Councillor Yasin's motion in relation to child sexual exploitation (unanimous) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Yasin as amended by Councillor Ayres in relation to child sexual exploitation (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"Recorded sexual offences against children have reached an all-time high. New figures released by NSPCC found there were 76,294 sexual offences against children in the UK in 2018/2019; a rise of over 60% since 201/15. These offences include rape, grooming and sexual assault.

More than 70% of sexual exploitation took place on the main social media networks such as Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp and Snapchat. The NSPCC also found 20% of the victims were under the age of 12 despite the minimum age of most social media platforms being 13 or 16 for WhatsApp. Online risks also include viewing sexual and violent content.

However, it can be difficult to measure the true scale and nature of all forms of abuse as victims often feel unable to report their experiences and the adults around them are not always able to recognise that abuse is taking place. This is particularly true for the rapidly changing world of online communications.

To prevent online and offline abuse those working with or supporting children and young people need access to timely and effective guidance to aid them in reducing risks, promoting healthy relationships, spotting issues and reporting concerns.

Therefore, this council resolves to:

- Call upon the government to expedite the an Online Harms Bill to impose a statutory duty of care on tech companies to protect their users from harm.
- Call upon both of Peterborough's MPs to ensure the government delivers its commitment to regulate tech companies.
- Support our local schools in their safeguarding efforts by promoting the need for an online safety policy and sharing the latest guidance to Heads and Governing bodies about online safety including the DfE's 'Teaching online safety in school: Guidance supporting schools to teach their pupils how to stay safe online, within new and existing school subjects' 2019.
- ~~Ensure that the safeguarding training offered to the council's youth workers and foster carers covers online safety plus provide signposting to information that they can use to up-skill children and young people on this issue.~~
- Circulate to registered early years settings in Peterborough a link to the latest UKCIS guidance about online safety 'Safeguarding children and protecting professionals in early years settings: online safety considerations for manager' 2019."

4. Motion from Councillor Burbage

Councillor Burbage's motion regarding autism was taken as read. There was an alteration to his motion which could be found in the additional information.

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Burbage in relation to Autism (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

~~Autistic people~~ People with Autism see, hear and feel the world differently to other people. Autism is a spectrum condition and all ~~autistic people~~ people with Autism share certain difficulties, but being autistic will affect them in different ways.

Some ~~autistic people~~ people with Autism also have learning disabilities, mental health issues or other conditions, meaning people need different levels of support. All people on the autism spectrum learn and develop. With the right sort of support, all can be helped to reach their potential and live a fulfilling life of their own choosing.

Our vision is to make Peterborough an autism-friendly city where people with autism have the same opportunities as everyone else.

Council notes:

- Autism is much more common than most people think. There are around 700,000 ~~autistic people~~ people with Autism in the UK - that's more than 1 in 100;
- Whilst many ~~autistic people~~ people with Autism are able to live a full independent life, some find certain situations difficult to cope with;
- Peterborough has a strong track record in supporting children with special educational needs and vulnerable adults and is currently working towards the creation of Autism Strategy to cover all ages across Peterborough and Cambridgeshire.

- Peterborough MP Paul Bristow has become a Vice Chair of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Autism, and has called for Peterborough to become an autism friendly City.

Council resolves:

- To engage with health and social care organisations, education, the police, charities, people with autism and their families and carers, with input from local MPs Paul Bristow and Shailesh Vara, in drafting the Autism Strategy.
- To ensure that the Autism Strategy currently in development is designed to make Peterborough an autism friendly city and improve the lives of those who live in Peterborough who have autism.
- That Council officers identify opportunities for frontline staff and Councillors, who have regular interactions with residents, to receive appropriate training to help residents with autism receive the best service from the Council and their ward Councillors.”

5. Motion from Councillor Robinson

Councillor Robinson’s motion to support the Education (Guidance about costs of school uniform) Bill was taken as read.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Robinson in relation to school uniforms (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

“The cost of school uniform and PE kits can be a huge financial pressure on families and carers. Many Peterborough’s secondary schools currently require pupils to have multiple school-specific items from a single supplier. These can include items such as trousers and blouses with a logo that could otherwise be purchased more cheaply elsewhere.

A statutory policy on uniform costs had been promised by the government in 2015. Now MP Mike Amesbury’s private member’s bill titled ‘Education (Guidance about costs of school uniform) Bill’ seeks to put the Department for Education’s 2013 school uniform guidance on a statutory footing. The guidance instructs schools to “give highest priority to the consideration of cost and value for money for parents” when sourcing uniforms and also discourages exclusive single-supplier contracts. The Children’s Society has reported that the guidance is not currently being followed by all state schools.

The Private Member’s Bill has now passed its initial stage with cross-party support and for it to pass into law would benefit the parents and carers of Peterborough.

The council praises those Primary and Secondary schools in Peterborough who do offer a discount scheme or some free items of uniform to pupils who are in receipt of free school meals. However, with more than 26 000 children estimated to be living in poverty (after housing costs) in the Peterborough local authority area many other families are likely to be struggling with current uniform costs.

This council resolves:

To ask Peterborough’s two MPs to support the Education (Guidance about costs of school uniform) Bill at each stage as it moves through the House of Commons.

To ensure that local school governors, through the council's round of update briefings, are aware of the current Department of Education guidance and keep them up to date with any change in the law relating to school uniforms."

6. Motion from Councillor Hogg

Councillor Hogg's motion regarding the Councillors Community Leadership Fund was taken as read.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Hogg in relation to the Community Leadership Fund (11 voted in favour, 44 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

28. Reports to Council – Part 2

(a) Grouping of St Martin's Without Parish Meeting with Wothorpe Parish Council

Council received a report seeking approval to group the parishes of Wothorpe and St Martin's Without to allow a common parish council called Wothorpe and St Martin's Without Parish Council.

A vote was taken on the grouping of St Martins Without Parish Meeting with Wothorpe Parish Council (unanimous) and Council **RESOLVED** to:

1. Agree to the grouping of St Martin's Without Parish Meeting with Wothorpe Parish Council under the name of Wothorpe and St Martin's Without Parish Council;
2. Authorise the Monitoring Officer to draw up an Order to group the parish meeting with the parish council to include the following electoral arrangements:
 - (a) The number of parish councillors should be six, five representing Wothorpe ward and one representing St Martin's Without ward;
 - (b) The new grouping arrangements are to come into force for the next scheduled Parish Council elections on Thursday, 07 May 2020.

(b) Annual Pay Policy 2020/21

Council received a report seeking approval for the Pay Policy Statement for 2020/21.

A vote was taken on the Pay Policy Statement 2020/21 (unanimous) and Council **RESOLVED** to approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2020/21. The Policy was attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

The Mayor
6.00pm –11:51 pm
4 March 2020
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough

**FULL COUNCIL 4 MARCH 2020
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Dorothy Ball</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>Petrol and diesel engines are a major source of air pollution, an effect that is significantly worse if the engines are idling. They are also a major contributor to greenhouse gases. There are laws about idling engines – what can the Council do to educate about and enforce the turning off of engines of stationary vehicles? Could the Council also use its licencing power for taxis & public transport to speed up the transition to electrification?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, I hope you can hear me.</p> <p>Air quality in Peterborough does not exceed national air quality standards. As a result the council is not under a legal duty to act to improve such. The council does however recognise that air quality improvements are beneficial to our health, and consequently is focusing on available resources and on measures that experts advise are most effective and efficient to improving air quality. The council has no duty to enforce against idling vehicles, and as such staff are not employed to undertake this function.</p> <p>The council will promote its initiatives to improve air quality as well raising public awareness of best practice and is committed to using its licensing policy to transition to the use of electrification and other low carbon and low emission vehicles as soon as is feasibly possible. As you well know, infrastructure is key to enabling this transition, and funding for which you know we have to go to government and we have received funding from government as well and the process is being installed.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Miles Buntin</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>Thank you, good evening everyone. I would like to ask what safeguards are in place to ensure council is following the waste hierarchy, ensuring that only materials truly non-recyclable is sent for incineration? In addition, how are the council incorporating and promoting the circular economy within this process?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor. The Council adheres to the waste hierarchy in all its waste services wherever it's practical.</p> <p>We provide a comprehensive system so that residents can make informed decisions and re-use and recycle as much of their household waste as possible. And I plead to residents, to actually be very conscious about what they put in their recycling as we do have an issue with contaminated waste which then spoils the waste hierarchy and has to go for incineration. So it is something we are doing in education as well.</p> <p>We promote the reduction of waste through ongoing communication campaigns which try and inform residents of the need to reduce the waste they produce by making decisions on items they purchase. Re-use has an important role at the Council's Household Recycling Centre and items such as books, bikes, electrical equipment and many more are separated for re-use.</p> <p>Recycling is very much dependent on the resident using the services we provide and placing the right materials in the right bin. That may change soon so it is going to be even more complicated. In an ideal world only the non-recyclable waste would be processed through the Council's Energy Recovery Facility (ERF).</p> <p>Miles Bunten asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor, I do. Having many XR members and other members of the local public arranging many different community-based projects regarding waste management, it is clear that the council does not have a set policy on resident / community engagement. Different members have been told different things regarding how to manage and process their waste from splitting and sorting the waste on litter picks to what should and should not be included in their home recycling. Can the council not sing from the same hymn sheet and have a clear set of guidelines following waste hierarchy, following best practice and helping to educate rather than confuse their residents.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I think the answer is simple. We need to work together. If the premise of your question is correct, then clearly we need to do a lot more education and we need to work far more closely with community groups. There is no issue with that. We now have a task force, a cross party working group, etc, etc, etc, please contact me or whoever, one of our officers and we'll be happy to look at all those issues. It's in our interest and your interest for us to work together and make it work.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Laura Howes</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>Thank you. Following release of the Carbon Management Action Plan, which was great to see by the way, I would just like to ask is the environmental crisis also means we need to review the way in which we use precious resources such as water, does the council have a plan to engage in looking at water efficiency across its profile, with water preservation in mind, but also with a view to take steps towards carbon neutrality by reducing the carbon emissions associated with the supply of clean water and the treatment of wastewater?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you for your question. I completely agree with you and your sympathies on this and I share the same points and on the agenda tonight, I'm sorry, can't you hear me, I am sorry, I can't look at you whilst talking to you, on the agenda tonight, as Members will no doubt be aware, we are due to discuss the proposed adoption of a new Carbon Management Action Plan for the Council's activities. Section 2.2.3 of this proposed plan details emissions that are currently excluded from the scope, one of course of which is water. Whilst energy used to heat water is included, what is not included is the energy used relating to cold water. Even cold water has an emissions believe it or not and the implications through the treatment and pumping process from source ie a reservoir, to a tap. That is why the Council, should it choose to adopt this plan, commit to investigating and including emissions arising from water use in future versions.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Joanne Piercy</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Would the relevant Cabinet Member please explain why adoption of the artery road that runs through Orton Northgate, which is called Loch Lomond Way and associated spur roads have yet to be adopted by the council given house building on this section of the development was completed in 2017?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank you for the question. Loch Lomond Way as you know is currently private as the developers have yet to enter what we call a S38 legal agreement dedicating the roads as public highway for adoption. The internal section of Loch Lomond Way is landlocked I'm afraid by the first section of Loch Lomond Way and a private section of Dunblane Drive, as such we as the local highways authority are unable to enter a legal agreement for this area.</p> <p>Joanne Piercy asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes I do. Does the Cabinet Member agree that is unacceptable that, due to these delays the adoption of the road and the lack of a confirmed date for the said adoption, that Orton Northgate residents are not only pay full council tax but also have to pay a management agency on top of their council tax and yet they receive a far from complete service. Some residents have been living on this estate for over ten years and cannot get Cityfibre and cars get excessive damage due to the condition of roads. Can he confirm that some action on behalf of the council and it's residents will be committed to, to remedy this situation.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you for the follow up question. Yes I completely agree with you, it is an appalling situation. It is not unique, but I can tell you that the council highways team are currently working with the developer to enter into that legal agreement for the first section of Loch Lomond Way. As I said before, it should be completed by Summer this year and it will allow the local highways authority to progress the remainder of Loch Lomond Way and side roads with the other developers. Yes I do, I completely agree with you, I think it's really not on. You're paying as you say, council tax for a service that you're not getting, I do stress, it's not at the fault of the council, it is the developer's problem.</p>

5.	<p>Question from Imtiaz Ali</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Following the recent listing of the former public house, The Cherry Tree, by Barker Storey Matthews, and the likelihood that this will again be a site that is developed into a monstrosity of flats in a revolting colour, what kind of support (not necessarily monetary) can the Community Interest Company “The Cherry Tree CIC” expect with respect to purchasing, planning applications, and general ongoing support, as an organisation representing hundreds of Woodstoners who seek only to retain the beautiful building that is a part of Peterborough’s history?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Mr Ali for asking the question. I would start by saying that not all flats are horrible colours, some flats really are quite pleasant Mr Ali. Take a trip over the river to Fletton Quays and I think you’ll understand what I mean. The property being registered as an Asset of Community Value, an (ACV) to use the acronym, allows for a community group to express an interest in making a bid to purchase the property, you’ll be aware of that, this is to allow them the opportunity to keep the property in community use. It was in fact only through the intervention of long-standing Conservative Ward Councillor, Andy Coles, that the building was subject to an ACV in the first place. You’ll be aware of this I hope Mr Ali. Because Mr Mayor the application had not been submitted correctly and it was sent to the wrong email address. Had Councillor Coles not been involved in the campaign group, the community would have had no opportunity to submit an application, that’s a very relevant point Mr Mayor.</p> <p>I also recently read about two ladies campaign and the valiant effort they’re making to keep the pub open Mr Mayor and indeed the Leader and I have had dialogue and advised residents involved in a similar case within our own ward a while ago.</p> <p>As the Cherry Tree pub is private property, owned I understand by Milton Estates, Peterborough City Council has no control over the decision by the owner regarding any offer, if indeed any offer is made.</p> <p>The council haven’t yet to date, received any expression of interest from any community group stating that they intend to raise funds with a view to making a bid Mr Mayor. If and when an expression of interest is made, this would extend the six week moratorium period to six months which is inclusive of the initial six weeks to allow the group time to raise the required money in order to make a bid for consideration. I think it’s worth mentioning Mr Mayor that the owners have no obligation to accept the communities offer, the right to bid is not the right to buy. Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Mr Ali.</p> <p>Mr Ali asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes I do Mr Mayor, thank you for that detailed answer, I don’t think it quite answers my question. But my supplementary question is, that in the event that Save the Cherry Tree was unsuccessful, in their bid, can the council at least provide some assurance</p>

that this highly motivated and community centred group will be invited to participate in planning committees representing their neighbourhood in the event the eventual buyer submits a planning application.

Councillor Hiller responded:

It would be a matter of course Mr Ali, I am surprised your Labour colleagues haven't advised you of that. But what I also would say is that the Property Team at the council is available to assist with queries regarding the Asset of Community Value but I must stress, it appears that this is almost being made into a bit of a political ping pong ball, if and when an application comes forward or any application comes forward within the ward, the residents have the right to comment and contribute and any organised group, I am sure the Planning Committee would be welcome to hear what they have to say. Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Mr Ali.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

Questions on notice to:

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

1. **Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

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

How much will the Peterborough Renewables Infrastructure Project cost the council net of external funding?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Thank you Mr Mayor. The project will not involve the Council in any expenditure as it is fully funded from external sources. The Council will receive, I repeat will receive, 100% funding from Innovate UK for salaries and time as well. There will also be work in connection with a Heat Network, which believe it or not I believe is as important as the electrical pipe for a heat network design that will be brought into the project, which is partly funded, that's £107k by BEIS [the Government Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy] and the council funding the other £33k I repeat, only cost to the council is £33k, probably one of the most significant pieces of work the council will ever undertake.

Council Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:

Thank you for that response Councillor Cereste but I am sure that you will appreciate my line of questioning in light of the grand plan. The previous grand plan of building renewable energy plants which cost the council £3million and without being personal or political, in the interest of accountability and transparency I just want reassurance we are not going to have a repeat performance of that particular project.

Councillor Cereste reponded:

Thank you Mr Mayor, I heard that. That was very good, that was very good, very good. The problem with what the question is first of all the numbers are wrong. Secondly the council has recovered all of that money and the interest for the local authority and the local people. In solar energy they have saved, in the various projects that came from that, the council has recovered a lot of that money if not all of it. And the local people have benefitted amazingly from that project and this project itself, now before we go onto this project, since my absolutely wonderful councillor friend over there is having a little go about the old project. Let's be absolutely clear, the previous project that came to council would have generated between £10-20million a year and the reason that it did not go ahead was not because there was any incompetence or the local authority administration did not understand what was going on, it was because every time it came to council it was held up by the opposition requiring more and more completely inappropriate information. That delayed us to the point that where government changed the policy, not this council, it was not this council got it wrong. Government changed the policy. Now if you show me any politician who works in local government

	<p>that's not been caught by the government changing its policy half way through a project, then you show me an angel. So, and the reply is, you've had your answer to the first one, it is £33k.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>The leader has in the past written about the sale of the London Road Stadium to the football club and mentioned that relocating the club and building a new stadium might be of benefit to the City.</p> <p>I am led to believe that a lot of supporters hope that a new stadium will be built on the embankment.</p> <p>I'm sure the Cabinet will agree that open space gives life and breathing space for a vibrant growing City and that it will be of benefit to the City Centre to enhance this much valued riverside location for leisure and relaxation for all.</p> <p>Are we able to have assurances that a new stadium will not be detrimental to existing amenities in the City Centre nor cause harm to the embankment as a public open space or have an adverse effect on the various events held on the embankment?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Ash for his question. I won't be speaking as loudly as Councillor Nawaz. So I hope everybody can hear me clearly if I don't.</p> <p>At present Councillor Ash, there is around 55 acres of open, green space along the Embankment site extending up to the Wirrina Car Park and Bishops Road. For much of the year, a lot of this space is poorly used, with two exceptions being the Peterborough Beer Festival and the Fun Fair.</p> <p>It is accepted that it's be important to retain the essential character of the area as green, open space for residents and visitors to enjoy in particular, the areas closest to the river Nene so that people can enjoy access to recreation and leisure along the riverfront. I am sure we would all agree with that.</p> <p>The first three phases of the University will take up around 13.5 acres of space Councillor Ash, most of which will be on the site of the Wirrina Car Park. Naturally there will be a need for investment in public realm and landscaping around the University Campus to ensure it retains a green, parkland environment.</p> <p>Were a new Football Stadium to be accommodated somewhere on the Embankment site, it is likely to take up around 10 acres. With careful master-planning there is potential to retain about 30 acres of open, green space on the Embankment, to ensuring the parkland character of the area remains intact.</p> <p>I hope this answers you immediate concerns, thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Ash asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes just a quick one, thanks for that. That does quite a way to reassuring me that most of the space will be preserved for its existing use. But just going on from what you've</p>

	<p>told us, is what sort of plans are there if any to actually enhance the area to make it a bit more attractive.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I would say Councillor Ash what more of enhancements can you need for a verdant riverside embankment with fabulous views over the latest development on the other side of the river. I think any master plan design that will link the various areas of green space through connecting pedestrian and cycle routes supplementing by careful investment in tree planting and the public realm can only be a good thing, There'll also be a need to retain a central area of course Councillor Ash, for festivals and events like the Great Eastern Run, the Perkins Great Eastern Run and of course potentially an opportunity for the football stadium were it indeed to be built on the embankment to host such events. It will of course be the responsibility of the planning committee to consider in the round any proposals that come forward for a new stadium, if indeed they do come forward, whether on the Embankment or indeed at another location. Thank you Councillor Ash for your follow up question and thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>For Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance:</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Finance tell me if the commissioning of services and purchase of property from organisations such as Stef & Phillips and Magic properties (who have one company making big loans to the other, which is known as a trigger to check for tax avoidance measures) are compatible with our fair tax declaration and fair tax mark.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Murphy for your question. What I can tell you is that our Fair Tax Declaration and Fair Tax Mark will apply to any service procurement which is why, as we advised Audit Committee, we are undertaking an ongoing review. I'm sure Councillor Murphy does not want me to pre-judge that review. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy had a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes I do and thank you for letting us know that the review still hasn't happened. We signed up to the Fair Tax Mark a while ago. I would urge this council to get on and check our compliance. You've not answered whether Steff and Philips failed to comply or not, we'll wait and see on that one. When were the earliest communications and contact that you had with directors of Stef and Philips or Magic Homes or any of their employees?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I'm not sure what that question relates to. It is a very strange comment. What it might help, Councillor Murphy with is if I tell him that checks for property transactions include tests for money laundering, possible tax evasion and links to drugs so they actually go far further than the Fair Tax Mark and those tests are approved by the Fair Tax Group. Now, you're asking the question when did we get in touch with Stef and Philips, you said we've not actually done the review yet, that's why I said it's ongoing Councillor Murphy. I am happy to come back to you and tell you whether there has been engagement on that particular issue with..... Councillor</p>

	<p>Murphy, don't keep making faces and mouthing things at me, please, I don't think that is particularly fair. So I will check and again don't keep doing it , I don't need it, please, so what I will do is ask our Director of Finance just to let you have an update on that review and how far we have got into it, whether we have got to that particular transaction yet I don't know. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin</p> <p>For Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority</p> <p>While the proposals for the building of the university are welcomed, it is concerning that there is no planned student housing to be built in phase 1. What assessments have been made on the future impact on the housing market in Peterborough, particularly the rental sector, due to the increase in population to be caused by the university opening?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>Mr Mayor, grateful for the question. Officers gave me about a 3 foolscap sheets of reply to this but my reply, because I've been involved in it is, it is not proposed to build student accommodation on the Embankment but I am talking to developers who wish to provide student accommodation and when we know who is going to be the education provider we will discuss with them their requirements of such accommodation. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Wiggin asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, no just wanted to say thank you to Councillor Holdich for that answer and I look forward to hearing from him or his colleagues, depending on when these negotiations take place and what the outcome will be. It is a concern having lived in student towns, the effects student accommodation can have if not managed properly and I wanted to make sure Councillor Holdich and the Administration were managing this properly. Also I'd like to take this opportunity to share the news of colleagues earlier with best wishes to Councillor Holdich and also Councillor Seaton and other Councillors retiring from the Chamber. Thank you.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Ellis</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>Given that we have taken in the landscaping contract, albeit to a devolved City Council Company, Aragon Services, does the Contract allow the Council to vary the terms, frequencies and standard of cutting back bushes and hedges in Peterborough?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Ellis. We currently cut shrub's once per year and we do have some locations where allow them, the word I've got here is naturalise, that probably means go wild so they've got flowers and that sort of stuff, where they, in the end, do not cause any obstruction. With the current contract, we can work with Aragon Direct Services to vary these frequencies in some locations but any increase above the contractual minimum would be at an additional cost.</p>

	<p>Councillor Ellis asked a follow up question:</p> <p>I do, thank you. Thank you Councillor Cereste. The reason why I ask is because some many areas of Peterborough including Bretton overgrown hedges and overgrown bushes are a problem blocking paths, blocking roads, blocking car parking spaces and blocking the line of sight, being a health and safety hazard. So if we can seriously look at perhaps increasing it to two cuts a year. I appreciate we don't want to be doing it during the nesting period but you know lets, the service does have to improve, because this Summer, myself and other councillors in Bretton and elsewhere in Peterborough, are hugely busy you know with the amount of overgrown bushes and hedges. Perhaps looking to the future maybe some sort of citizen's panel which could perhaps help oversee.....</p> <p>The Mayor interjected:</p> <p>Is it a question, Councillor Ellis are you asking a question?</p> <p>Councillor Ellis continued:</p> <p>Can you please confirm you will be considering this?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you, thank you Mr Mayor. I take it that wasn't a question and therefore you are ignoring it Mr Mayor. But just in case you weren't ignoring it and it slipped somebodys mind, if Councillor Ellis wants to contact either me or somebody at Aragon, if there is a health and safety issue with any tree or bush we will deal with it immediately. So you know you need to tell people if you have a problem, thank you very much.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me how many trees in streets, parks, green spaces and housing areas have been removed by Peterborough City Council or Aragon Direct Services in the past 12 months and how many replacement trees have been planted in the same period?</p> <p>By "replacement trees" I mean standard trees, as are usually planted in street or greenspace locations, and not small "whips" used in woodland planting.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you. In the past 12 months, that's February 19 – Feb 2020, the following trees have been felled and planted in streets, parks, green spaces and housing areas:</p> <p>Trees Felled 341 Standard Trees Planted 170 Whips Planted 200</p> <p>So that's the answer to your question Councillor Sandford.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked a follow up question:</p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor. What those figure show is that our current policy is to plant a replacement tree for every tree that is removed. What that shows is that we are not even meeting our current policy and is Councillor Cereste aware that other councils around the country, particularly in the light of the climate emergency, have much more ambitious policies. I heard that Lincolnshire County Council, at their recent budget meeting, decided that for every tree removed in Lincolnshire, they were going to plant four trees. Why can't Peterborough City Council being equally ambitious?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you, thank you Mr Mayor. You could all though then say you're in exactly the same vein and of course I agree with Councillor Sandford, we are probably both trying to achieve the same thing.in different ways. One of course is you've got to find the money, and so the choice is, the choice could simply be, we plant more tress or do we help two or three elderly, infirm people with home help or homecare. Those are the issues to be frank. And secondly, to compare us with another council who wants to build a few tress, why not compare us with Lincoln when it comes to Photovoltaic panels on the roofs where we have many more per capita than they have.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</p> <p>For Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance:</p> <p>What is the exact amount of savings Grant Thornton have identified which will be implemented by the administration?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Yes I would Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor (<i>Shaz</i>) Nawaz for your questions.</p> <p>The overall challenge was to find £33m. £24m was in Tranche 1. How much did Grant Thornton specifically identify? We believe at least £18m but then this was never just about Grant Thornton. Rather it was about providing extra expert capacity to work along all the experts in the Council. Thank you Councillor (<i>Shaz</i>) Nawaz.</p> <p>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a follow up question:</p> <p>I do Mr Mayor. And in view of Councillor Hiller's earlier comments, I think he might have sensitive hearing so to show due regard I hope you and Councillor Seaton won't mind if I lower my tone. Thank you for that response Councillor Seaton. But are you really telling me that our most brilliant and talented officers were not capable of finding the savings that Grant Thornton have found for us?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor (<i>Shaz</i>) Nawaz. What I just said was they provided extra expert capacity to work alongside the experts in the council. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Ellis</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p>

Today, 4th March, is Peterborough City Council Climate Change Day. Will Peterborough City Council meet the Climate Emergency Deadline of 2030?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Thank you again Mr Mayor and Councillor Ellis. You can have a little giggle cos I just bought a bike and I am even going to try and ride it so that's a real so. And as the guy on the radio asked me today, please don't wear Lycra. My response to him was the size of my backside Lycra on a bicycle just wouldn't work. So at least somebody has taken it humorously.

You know, the answer is everybody has got to make changes, we all need to look at what we are doing and how we do it. We can't guarantee that Peterborough, nobody can guarantee that the city of Peterborough will reduce emissions to net zero emissions by 2030, come on, let's all be honest about this. We want to, hopefully we will do it, but I can't give you that guarantee and I don't believe any city could give you that guarantee no matter what they are doing.

What I can say is that we won't do this alone and it requires everyone one of you, to help, get involved, if you've got an idea turn up to the cross-party working group. There are no ideas barred, there is nothing you are going to say that's going to be ridiculed. You will be extremely welcome to participate either ad hoc or otherwise as long as you talk to Charlotte Palmer or one of the other administrators so that we know you are coming but otherwise you will be extremely welcome.

I hope you will join me tonight, in agreeing to take one step closer to achieving this particular ambition by actually voting for the Carbon Management Action Plan that we will present to you later.

Councillor Ellis asked an additional question:

I do, thank you very much, thank you Councillor Cereste. Do you really think that the actions planned on the Carbon Management Plan are going to be enough to go towards reducing our carbon emissions to go towards the targets of 2030? We need to do more, like you said, reduce the use of diesel and petrol vehicles with more use of buses and bicycles, electric cars, great idea, however the cost of them and we need more charging points. Not just working with the city council but we need to work with outside business, we need to work with schools, we need to work with parish councils etc but to do.....

The Mayor interjected and asked Councillor Ellis if there was a question.

Councillor Ellis responded:

Do you agree with me that the actions in the Carbon Management Plan don't go far enough to meet the targets?

Councillor Cereste responded:

No, absolutely not, it does not go far enough and anybody that thinks we are going to achieve it on what we are going to present this evening is an idiot. Of course what we are going to present this evening is one year's work that was only started a few months ago, so that we could actually get onto the road to doing it. So, you know, no, course it's not enough and then next year we will add to it and the year after that we will add to that and we will learn from our mistakes and do things differently and do things better

	<p>and more technology will come in to play, because that's the way of the world goes and let's be perfectly honest, we can want to put as many charging points as we like into our city but you find me the electricity. Find me the connections so we can put the charging points in. We've got four charging points somewhere in one of our properties which we can't put in because there is no power. So, you know, this is not about the council, this is about all of us working together to try and deliver something that will be better for our children and grandchildren. And remember, one little drop, if we do it all together, if it's one little drop each, we will end up with an ocean and that's what we are trying to do. Thank you.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment:</p> <p>A recent Friends of the Earth report showed that 51% of homes in Peterborough are well insulated. Can I ask the relevant cabinet member what action is being taken to help the other 49% to insulate their homes to meet this standard?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. My head's beginning to spin. The Council has been part of the Local Energy Advice Partnership called (LEAP) since January 2017 and was the pilot authority for the scheme. It is now delivered across 120 Local Authorities in the country. The scheme, run in conjunction with, I think it's called Agility Eco, is funded through the Warm Homes Discount Industry Initiative obligations on energy companies and therefore delivered at no cost to residents or the Council. Home energy assessments are carried out in resident's homes and onward referrals are automatically made when insufficient loft or cavity wall insulation is identified. Free loft and cavity wall insulation is sourced for the residents under the Energy Company Obligation (ECO) Scheme.</p> <p>From April 2017 to March 2019, 1014 referrals were made to LEAP, resulting in 731 Home Energy Visits. The energy advice given, of course if taken by the residents equated to £125,000 in lifetime bill savings. 5,965 easy measures, such as LED lighting, radiator reflectors, draught proofing, cylinder jackets etc were installed and that amounts to £470,788 of lifetime bill savings, whoever worked that out is a genius. The LEAP service also has an IncomeMax service, and we all need more information on that, and this identifies benefits, giving debt advice and assistance with bill management. 179 cases had new income identified equating to £537,000. Tariff switching amounted to £21,302 in savings and the total activity equated to £1,166,527 of savings and new income.</p> <p>So far this year 758 referrals have been made to the scheme and in addition PCC has linked the wider ECO Flexible Criteria to the LEAP scheme in order to ensure assistance on all energy efficient measures is given to those residents with health conditions, on low income and having other vulnerability. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Wiggin asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes thank you Mr Mayor. I thank Councillor Cereste for his comprehensive answer and I'm sad he was cut off in full flow because I'm sure he would have presented us with even more statistics of how help is being given to Peterborough residents. My concern is, that given that half of Peterborough households, by the rating, have an energy performance certificate lower than C, so that's how I came to the figure that's in the report I quoted, figures in the low hundreds or just over a thousand aren't going to be</p>

	<p>enough to get this figure a lot higher and won't be able to contribute to Peterborough residents dealing with the climate emergency. What more can we do to encourage take up of these services?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I'll tell you what would be a really good if you all agree with me, I mean, let's face it there's a lot of gobbledegook in my answer and to be frank, some of these organisations I've never heard of, and I didn't have the time to research. So what I would suggest is that we get the officer who did a very good, made a great effort to respond to this question and give me this information, ask him to get the information round to all of you and in a way that we can all understand it, using you know, words and letters that we know what they mean, and you know, it will be an opportunity for all of us, all of us to actually try and inform our electors and residents and we become part of the scheme so at least that probably would be a good start and why don't we take it from there. And if you get any more ideas again, come to the cross party working group or drop us a note or whatever and we will try and incorporate it or use it and make the best of it. Thank you Councillor Wiggin.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>For Councillor Ayres Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Skills and the University</p> <p>"Does Peterborough city council have plans or policies not to use unregulated children's homes, how many children (aged up to 16 and over) are currently in such homes and how many have been placed in such homes for each year since 2015</p> <p>The Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Murphy. For your question. It does mean I can speak tonight instead of Councillor Cereste again. Since of course it's about Education and Children's Services and there is an important difference everyone between unregistered and unregulated accommodation for children and young people. I will cover both types of accommodation in my answer because the two can sometimes be confused.</p> <p>No children or young people of any age are currently placed in unregistered children's homes, and our policy is not to place children or young people in unregistered provision of any kind.</p> <p>There is, however, an acute shortage of placements for children in care, which is a national problem. This means that on very rare occasions, we have had to make short-term crisis arrangements for children aged under 16 where we have not been able to identify a placement, although we haven't done this recently.</p> <p>Officers have only had a very short time to complete the answer to this question Councillor Murphy as you know, which is why I am not able to provide a definitive answer about whether any children or young people have been placed in unregistered provision within the last five years. I can provide the information as a written answer after tonight's meeting, if this would be helpful to you.</p>

	<p>We do have a number of 16 and 17 year olds in unregulated provision. This is provision that is outside of the Ofsted inspection framework and is often known as semi-independent or independent living. Placing young people in unregulated provision, known as locally quality assured and monitored provision, is permissible under the regulations. It is often a good option for older young people who are moving towards independence and for whom a foster placement or children's home is not suitable.</p> <p>In Peterborough, we have a number of providers of this type of accommodation. These providers all have to satisfy our quality assurance requirements, including in respect of staff training, safer recruitment processes and so on. We are also monitored to ensure they are supporting young people to achieve good outcomes. So I thank you again for the question.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a follow up question.</p> <p>Yes I do. First of all thank you very much for what is a very comprehensive reply considering the late notice you got because of a hiccup with the prior notice of that question. You confirmed that there is a problem and that we may have been using not the best. Our policy is to try and use the best, we want to do better, and I think councillors know that within their wards they have accommodation that isn't properly managed. We've had problems with child exploitation in Peterborough etc etc. Do you agree with me, that what's best is direct provision and the use of foster care where ever possible? Can we work as a council to encourage that that is what we go for.</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>I certainly can agree with you Councillor Murphy. Foster careing is obviously the best result for most of our children. We are out advertising even now as we speak on the reports we are asking for foster carers to come forward for our children in care because we know that is going to be the best way to bring them forward in life and to make a good life for them which is everybody in this council desire I am sure.</p>
--	--

<u>Questions on notice to:</u>	
d) The Combined Authority Representatives	
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee Representative</p> <p>Last year a consultation was carried out by the Combined Authority on the draft Local Transport Plan for Cambs and Peterborough. Could our representative tell me what has happened to the plan since then and whether any significant changes have been made to the draft following the consultation, particularly in relation to transport projects proposed for the Peterborough council area?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor, I'd be very happy to. Thank you and I thank Councillor Sandford for the question. The Local Transport Plan or LTP as we know it will be printed and published by the end of the current financial year.</p>

Members will be aware that the LTP is indeed a snapshot in time and therefore as strategies, policies and the overall direction of travel continues to evolve it is imperative that the Plan remains “live” and is therefore updated and revised in a timely manner to reflect the changing environment.

The revised LTP has been produced in partnership with Peterborough City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the Greater Cambridge Partnership, the City and District Councils of Cambridge, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire. Throughout the LTP’s development, ongoing engagement has taken place with central Government, Highways England and Network Rail; as well as neighbouring Transport and Highway Authorities. In addition, to working with public sector partners, the LTP was informed by wider stakeholder consultation, including with transport operators, industry groups; and community organisations.

The public consultation for the LTP ran for 15 weeks, between Monday 17th June and Friday 27th September 2019 last year. The decision was taken to have a 15-week consultation rather than the 12-week statutory requirement as it was scheduled over the Summer months. It was designed to enable the Authority to better understand the views of residents and other key stakeholders on the overarching strategic vision, aims, objectives and the detail contained in the LTP.

The Authority has undertaken an assessment of the public consultation undertaken during the development of the LTP. This review found that the public consultation met the statutory requirements for a strategic document of this type.

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Sandford.

Councillor Sandford asked a follow up question:

Yes Mr Mayor. I didn’t actually hear him say that the Combined Authority had approved the Local Transport Plan but I assume it has done. Is he intending to circulate the final draft of the Local Transport Plan to councillors as it would be of great interest to quite a number of us. And is he aware that two of the major criticisms that were raised during the public consultation were firstly the Local Transport Plan did not address how the Combined Authority was going to tackle the climate emergency and there was also the point that there were a lots of big public transport schemes for Cambridge but not, hardly anything for Peterborough so could he tell us if in the final version of Local Transport Plan those concerns had been addressed.

Councillor Hiller responded:

Yes Mr Mayor I can.