

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 27 JULY 2022
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DOWSON

Present:

Councillors Ansar Ali, Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Hussain, Iqbal, Knight, Moyo, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Perkins, Qayyum, Ray, Robinson, Rush, Sabir, Sainsbury, Sandford, Seager, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Stevenson, Tyler, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

33. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jamil, Councillor Dennis Jones, Councillor Alison Jones, Councillor Rangzeb, Councillor Bi, Councillor Imtiaz Ali, Councillor Shaheed, and Councillor Lane.

34. Declarations of Interest

Agenda Item 10(d) Licensing Committee Recommendation – Proposed Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy

Councillor Sabir declared that he held a taxi licensing within Huntingdon District Council, however this would affect his ability to take part in debate.

35. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 June 2022

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 June 2022 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

36. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Members of a number of events attended by himself, the Mayoress, the Deputy Mayor, and the Deputy Mayoress had attended since the previous meeting.

Further announcements were also made in relation to Members' attendance at a special Peterborough Sports Football Club reception, celebrating the club's recent success.

Members' attention was drawn to information provided to them in relation to the Council's Promise to its Children in Care and Care Leavers.

37. Leader's Announcements

The Leader made a number of announcements on the following areas:

- 2022 Annual Peterborough City Council Excellence Awards.
- The Business Rates team selected as finalists for 'most improved Team of the Year in the Institute of Revenues, Rates and Valuation Performance Awards 2022'.
- Children at St Augustine's Primary School won a local eco competition as part of the PECT Eco-Awards.
- Great support to be provided to tackle drug addiction due to extra government funding of £2.3 million.
- 27,652 supermarket vouchers had been order for the summer holidays, providing eligible children with £45 for support with meals.

Group Leaders responded to the Leaders announcements, the key points raised included:

- It was important to recognise the great work done by officers.
- A lot of families relied on the supermarket voucher scheme over the summer and it was good to hear of the number of vouchers ordered.
- Members were keen to see school taking part in more events like the PECT Eco-Awards.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

38. Questions from Members of the Public

Two questions were received from members of the public in respect of the following:

1. Hope Into Actions plans to build three houses.
2. Bats residing in the Bretton Oak Tree

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

39. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by Members of the public at the meeting.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members at the meeting.

40. Petition for Debate – 'Save St George's Community Hydrotherapy Pool'

The Council received a report in relation to a petition, containing 769 signatures, requesting that the Council 'continue with the sale of St George's Community Hydrotherapy Pool [and] not 'mothball' this much-needed service'.

Karen Oldale, the lead petitioner, addressed the Council and, in summary, raised the following points:

- The decision in relation to the hydrotherapy pool was vastly important, with people using the service living throughout Peterborough. Whether the pool was saved or not would genuinely impact residents' futures.
- St George's had been successful and well-used for the past ten years, by residents who were disabled, being rehabilitated and with long-term health conditions.
- For many the pool was the only way to manage their health, wellbeing and pain.
- It was felt that shutting the pool was unnecessary.
- Service users were not asking or expecting the Council to pay for the pool, but to sell the site at a profit to an outside party who could bear the cost of refurbishment.
- The justification provided that the Heltwate School required the site for expansion seemed unreasonable and had simpler alternatives.
- It was suggested that a price could not be put on the loss of people's independence and health and the decision felt short-sighted, discriminatory and cruel.

Councillor Steve Allen, as Cabinet Member, moved a proposal to note the petition and take no further action, and advised that the input of service users was highly valued. The reason for the closure of the site was felt to be clear. Work was being carried out to help identify an alternative location for a hydrotherapy pool in the future. Previously the Regional Pool had been suggested, though this had ended up not being suitable. Consideration was now being given to the Lime Academy pool and an inspection with the user group would be facilitated in due course.

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

Councillor John Fox confirmed that he would not be moving his alternative proposals as set out in the additional information pack.

There being no other proposals, Council debated the proposal and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- It was felt that the closure of the hydrotherapy pool had been an embarrassment to the Council and had let down residents.
- Members would be following developments around Lime Academy carefully.
- Comment was made that the St George's site had had been surviving on goodwill for a number of years, but had now come to the end of its life, so an alternative location must be found with a sustainable business model.
- It was queried why the report to Cabinet went to the July meeting rather than the June meeting.
- Comment was made that the Council was placing money in higher regard than its principles.
- The variety of benefits of hydrotherapy were acknowledged and concern was raised that should the Lime Academy not be suitable a valuable service would be lost.
- It was advised that Cabinet Members had met with the user group to explore options for the future and determine the suitability of potential sites.
- It was suggested that the decision to close St George's was all about money, however comment was made that there were inconsistencies in the costings put forward and that the prices were out of proportion.
- It was commented that St George's had got to the point where the facilities could not be fixed.

- The emotional wellbeing benefits of hydrotherapy were also highlighted as well as the importance of a central location for any such services that were offered.

As seconder of the proposal, Councillor Simons advised that having visited Lime Academy, it was felt to be the most appropriate option to move forward with.

Karen Oldale, as the lead petitioner, once more addressed the Council and, in summary, raised the following points:

- Services users welcomed involvement in the process and wanted to be engaged.
- It was vital to look at a long-term solution.
- Identifying land to be able to support a professionally managed pool as welcomed.
- There was some concerns raised with the use of Lime Academy as an interim solution, particularly with entry and exit, and opening in the evenings.

As mover of the proposal, Councillor Steve Allen summed up by stating that the St George's site was no longer affordable and was needed by the school. Splitting up the site would diminish its price. It was still desired to have a hydrotherapy pool in Peterborough, just not at St George's.

A vote was taken on the Cabinet Member proposal and Council **RESOLVED** (27 voting in favour, 25 voting against, and 0 abstaining from voting) to note the petition 'Save St George's Community Hydrotherapy Pool' and to take no further action.

41. 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 (a)-(d) were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

3. Vinnytsia missile casualties and support
4. GP appointments
5. Felling of the Bretton Oak Tree
6. Availability of wood supply relation to the new wooden market stalls
7. Anti-social behaviour around the city
8. Spend on non-statutory services
9. Stef and Philips' plan for St Michael's Gate.
10. HMOs in Peterborough
11. Livestreaming scrutiny committee meetings
12. HMOs in Peterborough
13. Future Parks Accelerator Programme
14. Temporary Housing following the end of St Michael's Gate contract
15. Lorries parked new residential homes
16. Graffiti in the city centre and safety of residents
17. Net proceeds from sale of Northminster

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

42. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

42(a). Audit Committee Recommendation – Annual Audit Committee Report

The Council received a report from the Audit Committee in relation to the Annual Audit Committee Report.

Councillor Sainsbury moved the recommendation and advised that during the past six months the newly-appointed independent members of the Committee, including an independent Chair, had provide value and constructive feedback. The committee had undertaken a lot of work, but there was still much left to be done. The Annual Report had undergone a small transformation with the intention to engage Members. It was felt imperative that the Audit Committee continued to scrutinise the financial procedures in place at the Council. The Committee were looking forward to further improving their skills through training.

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

Council debated the recommendation and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- The strengthening of the Committee was welcomed and it was hoped the Committee would continue to challenge and scrutinise.
- The Committee seemed to be asking more appropriate questions, particularly as the Committee dealt with a number of highly technical reports.
- It was hoped that the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities would take on board that audit was being taken seriously by the Council.
- It was suggested that previously Members may not have been confident to properly challenge the information presented to them at the Committee, and that having expert independent members had helped with this.

As seconder of the recommendation, Councillor Shaz Nawaz advised that there was now a marked difference in the questions and conversations had at Audit Committee, which seemed to have benefited from having independent members with financial expertise. It was felt that the Committee had improved.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to approve the Annual Audit Committee Report.

42(b). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Budgetary Control Framework

The Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee in relation to the Budgetary Control Framework.

Councillor Sandford, with the agreement of the Chamber, moved and altered version of the recommendation and advised that the Framework was proposed to be updated following feedback from Members, Officers, and the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel. This included a revised timeline, introducing a main budget meeting before 25 February annual. The changes also strengthened the role of the Financial Sustainability Working Group to overseeing the budget and all aspects of the

Improvement Plan. The process for Members to propose an alternative budget or an amendment to the budget had been updated.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the altered recommendation.

A vote was taken on the altered recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Approve the Budget Policy Frame Procedure Rules, as outlined in Appendix A to the report, and
2. To delegate to the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer authority to make minor changes to the procedure rules as necessary.

42(c). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Update to Civic Protocol – Honours Panel

The Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee in relation to the Civic Protocol.

Councillor Sandford moved the recommendation and advised that the proposed updates included moving to more gender-neutral language, changes in job titles, an amendment to the civic procession, the insertion of references to the position of Alderman, changes to arrangements around the Mayor's car in relation to carbon management and discretion about the civic insignia. One further change had been proposed to move responsibility for the business of the Honours Panel to the Constitution and Ethics Committee, as the current iteration of the Panel had no formal status. The Committee also had a direct line of report to Full Council.

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

Council debated the recommendation and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- It was considered that the Honours Panel had operated in an efficient and appropriate manner throughout its duration, with all groups invited to be involved. It was a cross-party body that had all of its decisions ratified by Full Council.
- Disappointment was expressed that nobody had spoken to the current members of the Honours Panel, though the proposals were supported.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Approve the proposed draft amendments to the Civic Protocol.
2. Agree that the Constitution and Ethics Committee's terms of reference be amended to include responsibility for the Honours processes, with delegated responsibility for the administration of the processes to be carried out by Executive and Members Services.

42(d). Licensing Committee Recommendation – Proposed Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy

The Council received a report from the Licensing Committee in relation the proposed

Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy.

Councillor Wiggin moved the recommendation and advised that the current policy had been in place since 2017 and since then a number of changes to legislation and best practice had been established. The declaration of a climate emergency and the aim of achieving net zero carbon was taken into consideration when drafting the policy, which centred around three areas: Department of Transport standards, changes to vehicles standards, supporting a move to low emission vehicles. A move to mandatory CCTV was also considered and it was requested that a consultation be carried out on this area prior to any future implementation.

Councillor Sandra Bond seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to adopt the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy as detailed in 10.10 of the Licensing Committee report and attached at Appendix H to the report.

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

Cllr Fitzgerald introduced the report which outlined the record of Executive decisions made since the last meeting.

Members asked questions on the following Executive Decisions.

Interim Report of the Task and Finish Group to Examine the Issues with Car Cruising in Peterborough

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Steve Allen advised that he would provide information on whether the Police and Crime Commissioner had been contacted in due course.

In response to a question from Councillor Knight, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that he would ask the for an update to be circulated to Members on the progress made on the Task and Finish Group's recommendations.

Agreement to Terminate the Council's Agreement with NPS Peterborough Limited in Relation to Property and Estate

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that NPS did not provide a valuation for Northminster.

Opportunity Peterborough

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the cost of bringing the service in-house had already been budgeted for within the investment and growth workstream.

In response to a question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that officers would provide detail around how much additional growth and investment was expected from bringing the service in-house.

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-2026 Quarter 1 Update

In response to a question from Councillor Hemraj, Councillor Coles advised that the

budget was under constant review and any pay awards would be taken into account.

Implement Recommendations from the Peterborough Parking Strategy

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Cereste advised that the working group formed to consider the Parking Strategy was an officer lead group and that Councillor Steve Allen and himself were involved already.

St George's Hydrotherapy Pool

In response to a question from Councillor Iqbal, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the pool had been closed for two years and was not within the Council's statutory functions.

Councillor Ayres further advised that many special needs children attended the Lime Academy, so would benefit from a hydrotherapy pool placed there.

Contract for cloud-based services hosting the Council's server estate - JUN22/CMDN/11

In response to a question from Councillor Wiggin, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the extension to the existing contract had been overlooked by human error and had been caught quickly.

Bretton Oak Tree – Action To Be Taken

In response to a question from Councillor Sandford, Councillor Simons advised that officers had felt it was the right decision.

Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the overwhelming recommendation for officers and experts was to remove the tree.

In response to a question from Councillor Wiggin, Councillor Simons advised that the contribution of 100 oak trees to mitigate the felling of the Bretton Oak Tree was a significant one.

44. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

The Mayor introduced the report which outlined the record of Combined Authority decisions made since the last meeting.

Members asked questions on the following Combined Authority Decisions.

Active Travel: Peterborough

In response to a question from Councillor Day, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the Council put forward a number of projects to receive draw-down funding. Some of these were not successful, though the Green Wheel had been. Councillor Fitzgerald further queried himself why the Combined Authority had failed to deliver funding for projects within Peterborough generally.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

45. Notices of Motion

45(1) Motion from Councillor Yasin

Councillor Yasin advised the Mayor that she did not wish to move her motion as set out in the additional information pack.

In the absence of a motion to debate, the Mayor moved on to the next item of business.

46. REPORTS TO COUNCIL

46(a) Children and Education Scrutiny Committee – Appointment of Vice-Chair

The Council received a report from in relation to the appointment of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee Vice-Chair.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz moved the recommendation.

Councillor Iqbal seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (25 voting in favour, 0 voting against, and 27 abstaining from voting) to appoint Councillor Sam Hemraj as the Vice-Chair of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee, for the remainder of the 2022/23 municipal year.

46(b) Revised Political Proportionality and Committee Seat Allocation

The Council received a report from in relation to the revised political proportionality and committee seat allocation.

Councillor Day moved the recommendation.

Councillor Knight seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to agree the allocation of seats on committees subject to political balance arrangements (Appendix 1 to the report).

The Mayor
6:00pm – 8:53pm
27 July 2022

**FULL COUNCIL 27 JULY 2022
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 Ed Walker MBE</p> <p>Councillor Coles Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>Thank you members.</p> <p>14 years ago I moved into Peterborough, very early on I was playing in a playground, met someone who had left the prison that morning who was already through a bottle of something very strong. I could find nowhere in this city that would take him. As a church going Christian I did not think this was good enough, why do no churches give the homeless a home?</p> <p>14 years on, there are now 16 houses in this city providing homes for 40 members of this community, referred to us from the local community, that includes, people who have leaving prison, that includes people who have slept on the streets, people who are in addiction, women who have fled violence, refugees who have fled war, people who have fled financial difficulties.</p> <p>We have a plot of land that we would like to contribute to another plot of land owned by the council. We have planning permission, one on the 25th of January this year, 6 months ago. Originally, that plot of land owned by that council was offered to us as a free transfer. In the 6 months since, I have spoken to numerous councillors, I have tried to negotiate with members high up in this council, and what has happened is that we have not got anywhere. We have done 3 independent valuation from RIC Valuers who work for local institutions and they have all returned a value of £0 to £1. The council NPS has valued it at £155,000, they have refused to negotiate with me. Will you be willing to honour your word and transfer the land to us for £0 to £1 as per you originally agreed, and as per 3 independent valuations have said that it is worth?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I'm sorry to hear that Hope into Action and the council are in dispute on this matter.</p> <p>The council will of course do all it can to work with and support organisations providing services for homeless people, but the council is not in a position to give away its land for nothing. The council's s.151 officer has advised this and the external auditor has also said the same.</p>

In the current circumstances we have faced, the council has had to review its previous very generous approach. The council has carried out a recent professional valuation based on its ownership of some three quarters of the whole site and the current unrestricted C3 housing planning permission and this shows that the scheme is viable with a payment for the land.

I know that this matter is still subject to discussion between the officers and Hope into Action and I'm sorry to hear you haven't had anyone to speak to and haven't been able to negotiate, that shouldn't be the case. But I cannot get into details or agree to anything here before conversation between you and council officers have been concluded.

Supplementary question:

Councillors here have said to me privately on the phone that they disagree with that valuation, it is a fairy tale valuation, it is economically illiterate and it reveals a lack of heart and humanitarian approach to the needs of this city.

With all the ability and power in this room, the fact we, after 6 months of negotiations, can't get anywhere on this issue, reveals we don't care either about the housing stock, which we provide 3 architectural assets, we don't care about the housing stock or the homeless of this city. You can put that land up for £155,000 for as long as you want, you will not get any money for it.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I can't really go into any further details about the value of the land, all I can say it is our responsibility to gain best consideration for the property. I understand there is a dispute there but I think we leave that here and then go into negotiations to discuss this further if that suits you.

2. **Question from Amy Price**

Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment

Please can the council, tell me why, following my urgent email to Matthew Gladstone, Wayne Fitzgerald and others, sent on 29th June 2022 at 09:28am, explicitly informing them of the bats which were using the Bretton Oak Tree on Blind Lane to roost, continued to go ahead with the felling of said tree in contravention to the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (Chapter 69) [F763] or recklessly [F764] Subsection 4 (a) and (b); including the Conservation of Wild Creatures and Wild Plants Act, 1975 [F44] (4) subsections (a) (b) and (c)?;

The response I received back from Jim Newton (Director of Planning and Building Control (Interim) Place and Economy, on 29th June 2022 at 14:43, 'after' the Oak was being felled, did not reassure me;

I informed David Watts of David Watts Ecology - who undertook the preliminary Ecology Assessments of the tree, of the bats which were observed the previous night, emerging from - and returning to the Oak, and no Emergence studies had been conducted as part of the decision making process;

Once informed of the Bats presence, David Watts (Ecologist) agreed that it would be unlawful to fell the said tree, knowing bats to be present and this was reflected in my urgent email to the council of that day;

The tree was considered to have low potential for roosting bats but it was highlighted that it was 'feasible that individual cavity roosting bats, utilise the PRF's (Potential Roost Features)' described in the report, (as well as others not detailed) and these bats were actively observed and the council notified, even before the Ecology report was known to me.

A presence/absence survey conducted through an Emergence and Return Study would have enabled the council to identify the bats which had roosted in undetected and concealed cracks and crevices and voids along four specific points in the tree, prior to felling these locations; where the bats were observed;

I wish to make point that 'ALL' Bat species (sp. vespertilionidae) are protected under Schedule 5, Section 9.4 b of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981, and it was unlawful for anyone to disturb any such animal whilst it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection' and there are numerous recorded prosecutions.

The Cabinet Member may have responded:

Can I start by saying that no one in this council takes any pleasure from felling this ancient oak. Many hours have been spent on this very difficult decision.

Can I make it quite clear the felling of the tree was 100% lawful and any suggestion otherwise is incorrect and unhelpful. Numerous surveys were undertaken by experts in this field to determine if bats were present and no evidence was found to suggest otherwise.

You state in your question, bats were observed the previous night emerging from and returning to the oak. Two protestors had at this point climbed the tree and were camping in the tree.

Those two gentlemen at no point mentioned the presence of any bats. Did you manage to get any video evidence?

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 Wiggin (1)

Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communications, Culture and Communities

We were all shocked to see that our twin city of Vinnytsia in Ukraine was targeted by cruise missiles on 14th July, with the death of 23 people and dozens more injured. Please could the cabinet member share our condolences and thoughts for those affected, and provide an update on support given by the council and the City to support our friends in Ukraine?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I thank Councillor Wiggin for bringing this ongoing crisis to focus. We are all shocked and saddened to learn of the devastating attack on Vinnytsia and our thoughts and prayers go out to all people of Ukraine who have been affected by this terrible war.

We have been mindful of the severe impact of the war on the Ukrainian people, and have been working with the Ukrainian Community in Peterborough to coordinate efforts, including fund raising for lorries of essential supplies to go back to several cities in Ukraine. Part of our contribution has been the allocation of staff to support the sorting and packing of supplies, and the coordination of a group of 50 local volunteers.

The council is leading the local Homes for Ukraine scheme, and has so far resettled over 150 people, and expect to continue to provide support over the coming months. Funded by the Government, the council provides £200 for every person arriving in Peterborough and works closely with the Department of Work and Pensions to ensure that Ukrainians can access Universal Credit quickly.

In addition, the council has recently commissioned a local charity called HELP to provide dedicated support to newly arrived Ukrainians. This will enable new arrivals to access information and support to help them benefit from essential public services and to secure school places, and as well as day-day advice and support to ensure Ukrainians feel welcome in our city and can start to rebuild their lives.

Supplementary Question:

	<p>I would just like to thank Councillor Allen on his response, I wanted him to make a firm declaration of our support to all people of Vinnytsia in Ukraine on behalf of all members and he has done exactly that. So, thank you very much.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Barkham</p> <p>Councillor Howard, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health</p> <p>A number of residents in my ward and across the city have expressed concern about not being able to get a face to face appointment with their GP. Others tell me of being made to call at 8am in the morning to get any sort of appointment with their GP and getting stuck for long periods in a queue, waiting for their call to be answered.</p> <p>We all know that GPs and others in the NHS were under great strain during the Covid pandemic but could the cabinet member for health tell me what can be done to ensure that patients at many GP practices can get easier access to their GP?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Barkham for raising this important issue and I do recognise there are challenges that our residents are facing in accessing primary care services. Access to primary care is an NHS responsibility and I have raised the matter with the ICB and they have provided the following response:</p> <p>The local NHS is working hard to ensure patients in need of healthcare support can access them. A number of initiatives are in place including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional appointments in the evenings and weekend provided in Greater Peterborough and Wisbech. This creates between 2,500 to 3,000 extra General Practice appointments per month. • A Health Care Assistant home visiting service is in place for patients who struggle with mobility. • Improvements have been made to GP telephony systems, including introducing automated booking options in some cases. • Over 80,000 additional appointments delivered in General Practice over the Winter thanks to additional funding. • Boroughbury Medical Centre, which is our largest local GP surgery, has invested in cloud-based telephony and recently employed two more receptionists to help better manage their incoming calls. Over the last four weeks they received over 13,500 calls – just under 700 calls per day. <p>And in addition to this I have provided all members with a briefing note to support you in helping and advising your constituents on how best to gain access to primary care.</p>

	<p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Howard for the response, really good, although what you have said does not seem to make much difference as the problem is still here and I still get contacted now letting me know they still cannot make appointments or get through. So, this has been raised through a committee, a health committee, and the response have been quite evasive from the CCG, the noncommittal responses as well, so I would hope that you can work with me and the committee to better this scenario.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Barkham, I am in full agreement and you have my support.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Day</p> <p>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment</p> <p>Why did the council decide to fell Bretton Oak Tree when there was no real evidence (DNA root evidence) to back up claims the tree was the cause of subsidence?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>To be honest I am surprised at this question. Councillor Day, I have worked with you on several issues, and you have very good knowledge of the environment.</p> <p>Did you not read all of the evidence? Did you not seek expert advice? Did you not talk to all officers involved? Did you not do any research?</p> <p>Our tree officers assured me in their expert opinion this decision was correct. The insurance company's structural engineer confirmed the tree was the cause of the subsidence and two independent structural engineers confirmed the tree was causing subsidence.</p> <p>One expert suggested heave, we all know this has been discounted.</p> <p>On top of all this evidence, our S151 officer confirmed to me I had to be fully aware of the financial implications.</p> <p>Your question : why did this council fell this tree without any real evidence?</p> <p>I think you know me well enough to know I would not have signed this decision without concrete evidence this was the only course of action. For you to suggest 'no real evidence' is beyond belief, I honestly thought you were better than that and I'm afraid you do disappoint me.</p>

	<p>The most important thing here is to make sure we put procedures into planning so we are not in the same situation in the future.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>There was not any DNA root evidence and it was said that it was a possible cause but it was not clearly identified as the actual cause of subsidence. What was also clear from those reports, there was an issue with the foundations at the property that were not of the standard that was required and that therefore there was an issue probably really here with planning and the developers that built the property so close to an ancient oak tree.</p> <p>There is a real depth of feeling in the Bretton community about the loss of this tree and in our last climate change and environment group there was some discussions about moving forward to create a cooperative and co-created strategy which includes the tree campaigners to ensure that issues such as the Bretton oak tree are prevented in the future. Can you outline some of that work to Full Council?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>We were involved in a meeting yesterday as you are aware, that was discussed so we are moving that forward. As you are aware there was tree T1 and T2 so it was only them two trees near that property so I don't think you will need some DNA evidence.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox (1)</p> <p>Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communications, Culture and Communities</p> <p>When the idea to build wooden sheds as a substitute for market stalls was promoted by the Deputy Leader, why did the contract not cover the supply of the materials needed to build the market stalls?</p> <p>By including this in the contract this would have meant that if there was any potential for delay in the supply of materials the council would not be liable to spend taxpayers' money, as we are having to do now.</p> <p>As most of us are aware, there has been a problem with the availability of wood nationally for some time. Did the Deputy Leader make any enquiries about this prior to the decision?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Fox for this question about the market stalls.</p> <p>The market kiosks are bespoke units unique to Peterborough. Their presence will add significantly to the look and feel of the city centre, and I strongly believe will help increase footfall and business and retailers. I would emphasise the Kiosk designs were in fact shared with our Communities Scrutiny Committee prior to construction, and received full cross-party support from members, with the committee remarking on the high quality, visually appealing construction they offer.</p>

I am not sure indeed whether you were present on the committee when this was discussed but it certainly went to Scrutiny and was approved.

I will acknowledge, however, due to the high-end product we commissioned, it has not been straightforward to find a contractor that had the technical skills and capacity to produce the kiosks to a timescale that will allow the new market to open as swiftly after Northminster closed as we would have wished.

As with any complex capital project, a contractor is reliant upon the supply chain of goods and materials being provided in a timely manner. The kiosks use a specific kind of wood that is both affordable and structurally sound to support the building. Regrettably, the supplier of the wood could not meet the timescales previously promised and a shortage of materials has been common throughout the building industry over the last few months as the world recovers from the pandemic. It was not possible to substitute the specific wood for another material without compromising the structural integrity, cost and aesthetics.

Whilst the delay is regrettable, the end product is something we can feel proud of. The kiosks are now nearly completed as you will see by walking outside this building and traders will shortly be fitting them out to their own requirements, ready for imminent opening. Alongside the new food hall providing a vibrant city centre market.

Supplementary question:

Actually I don't think the units design has much to do with the inability to factor in material supply. Most people would think this is pretty basic stuff when it comes to contracts. I understand whilst we wait for this wood the traders are being paid thousands of pounds to do absolutely nothing. So how much is this contractual blunder, in my opinion, costing the tax payers of this city each week? And what is the final total?

My question is simple, why did the administration close down the market before there was an alternative ready so it would be a smooth transition from one location to another?

The Cabinet Member responded:

The market had to be closed down to fulfil a contractual obligation to proceed with the Northminster construction site. This was dependant on money from the Combined Authority and meant that diggers had to be on site by a certain date so that's the response in regard to the time scale.

The other point I think was about paying the market traders furlough, common term these days, it's only fair that because we couldn't get the project ready in time for their occupation that we provide them some furlough money. The thousands of pounds you are talking about are an accumulative amount, not per trader, and I think each trader is earning probably about £300 a week. Probably more than it needs to be but fair is fair and we are doing fair by the market traders. They are

	<p>part of our new future for the city centre market and we wanted to keep the good traders on site to proceed with us.</p> <p>Let us all get behind this new market when it opens in a week or so, trade with the market, recognise the value of the food hall and make Peterborough city centre thrive again.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Stevenson (1)</p> <p>Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communications, Culture and Communities</p> <p>Recently, around the city, there has been Anti-social behaviour (ASB) in communities that do not usually experience very much ASB. In some cases, this has been due to an increase in Airbnb-type short lettings on otherwise solely residential streets. ASB has included crime (leading to arrests in the middle of the night) and prostitution, as well as loud and continuous noise, cannabis smoke, parties, etc. To what extent can residents get support from the council's pollution and environmental enforcement teams given many of the problems happen outside office hours and at weekends?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Our enforcement team currently operates 7 days a week between the hours of 8am – 8pm, and where resourcing allows, can be deployed within those times to meet ASB challenges. However, we do recognise that there is a demand outside of these hours, and we are currently reviewing options to improve this capacity.</p> <p>Where community issues become protracted, we work with members of the Safer Peterborough Partnership to direct activity via the City 'Problem Solving Group'. This allows us to request support from all relevant services needed to jointly address community issues. This also provides for a more strategic approach to deal with issues such as drug use, prostitution, and to consider wider preventative initiatives to reduce future crime.</p> <p>Where residents have ASB concerns, they are encouraged to report this either to the council on the antisocialbehaviour@peterborough.gov.uk email address, or indeed report direct to the police on 101 so that patterns and emerging issues can be tracked and responded to.</p> <p>With regards to noise disturbance, our pollution team do not operate 24/7, however, that does not prevent the evidence being gathered which can be used to determine whether a statutory noise nuisance has been caused.</p> <p>Evidence initially can be gathered by those suffering from the disturbance using log sheets provided by the council. Officers will review these log sheets and where necessary supplement them by installing noise monitoring equipment. When a statutory nuisance is evidenced an abatement notice is served, requiring the</p>

	<p>offender to stop the breach. Failure to comply with a notice can result in the seizure of equipment and/or the matter being put before the courts.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I was just wondering perhaps if this is something we can discuss offline but my question is do you think it is possible we might reach out to Airbnb owners to solve the shortages of housing for homeless families? If we have got a situation where we've got Airbnb's causing ASB and we have got a need for housing and we've got a need to let out their houses, perhaps we can put these together in some way.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Airbnb properties if misused can be a real torment to nearby neighbours. If we can explore possibilities to put them to a good practical use for homelessness, I think that's a great idea and I will certainly take that forward to my housing colleagues.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (1)</p> <p>Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please confirm how much money we spent last year on non-statutory services and how much we have allocated for the current fiscal year?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>It's a simple question but I'm sorry I'm going to have to let you down, I can't give you a simple answer and I can't give you specific numbers. I have to give you a complex answer because it is not possible to draw a hard line between statutory and non-statutory spending. The councils activities cover statutory services that we are required by law to provide. Non-statutory services that we provide at the benefit of our residence, and activities that we do to run the council efficiently but are not required in law. On top of that, we have staff whose duties are split between statutory and non-statutory functions so it is extremely difficult to calculate how much of their time is spent on statutory as opposed to non-statutory activity. We run statutory services supported by non-statutory functions that make the service to our residence a high quality, even gold standard service. What this means is that concentrating on just the non-statutory spend may mean you overlook potential savings that money is delivering to the statutory spend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large proportion of services are categorised as statutory. From memory there is something like well over 170 different duties that come from a raft of different pieces of legislation. However, decisions are able to be taken based on the level of need or risk these services present ie in some cases the council may provide services over and above the base statutory requirement due to the impact on longer term savings or because it has greater impact and return for our residents. • One interesting example of this is in our early intervention and prevention type services. They could be classed as outside statutory services. However, these are the services that in the long term prevent people from

	<p>going into more expensive long-term care (usually in adult social care or children social care) and thereby saved us a great deal of money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some services not categorised as statutory like finance, but staff working in finance have some statutory duties, for example, completing the statement of accounts which need to be fulfilled. Support services generally, like finance, ICT, legal, human resources, and transactional service may not fit the statutory services analysis directly, but are required to ensure all council services are able to function efficiently and effectively. <p>So I apologise for not giving a simple and clear number on this occasion but that explains how difficult it is to separate non-statutory, statutory, and required spending.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I did Mr. Mayor, but because I don't have a number I think my supplementary question won't be appropriate but I do have another one you will be pleased to hear.</p> <p>Being in finance, Councillor Coles, I'm sure you will appreciate, it's very important that we are able to breakdown different areas of costs and look at those implications. Would you be willing to go back and do some further work to try and breakdown statutory and non-statutory costs as far as possible, so we can have a bit more detail behind the numbers and perhaps then you and I can have a further conversation?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I am very happy to do so and I'm sure it will be part of our work to make sure that you understand, because I know in the case that you want to have an alternative budget you will want to know where we can sort out these numbers. I would just caution you it's going to be difficult to do that in some areas because they are so interrelated between statutory and non-statutory, particularly in terms of staff salaries and what they are doing.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Hemraj (1)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>With the council not renewing the housing contact with Stepf and Phillips. at St Michaels Gate, do we as a council know what Stepf and Phillips plan to do with the 72 units/homes?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Ultimately, of course, it will be for Stef & Philips or the individual owners of the properties at St Michaels Gate to decide how these properties are used after an agreement comes to an end. There is a risk that the properties will be used by other councils for their homeless households, a fact we knew when we took the properties on and which did play a part in our decision making back then. However,</p>

	<p>if the properties are used in this way, we will attempt to work with Stef and Philips to minimise the impact on our local services.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Imtiaz Ali</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>Following on from a motion brought to full council on investigating additional powers to curtail the explosion of HMOs in Peterborough, can I ask what the progress on this has been so far, will it be rolled out for specific wards or is it to be city-wide, and are we likely to get an Article 4 Direction implemented in Peterborough before the end of 2022?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Work has been undertaken to assess the issues, their scale, and how these are distributed across the city, and as part of the work to consider the potential justification for an Article 4 Direction. However, that work now needs to be broadened in scope to include further discussion with, and the data analysis from, representatives of all relevant departments, and relevant interest groups including landlords, as well as tenants, residents, and others.</p> <p>However, in broader terms I am supporting officers to develop a more diverse range of tools, alongside the work on the Article 4 Direction, this will ensure that HMO and poor quality private rented housing is better regulated and controlled in our city. This is likely to include a review of our licensing options, landlord accreditation schemes, use of existing civil penalties, and a charging structure where enforcement action is necessary.</p> <p>Officers will of course bring proposals forward through the scrutiny process, and implementation will be before the end of the financial year wherever it possibly can be.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford (1)</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Giving members of the public easy access to council meetings online is an important part of openness and accountability. Please could the leader of the council tell me why meetings of Full Council, the Cabinet and Planning Committee are currently being live streamed but most scrutiny committees are not? In the past we have live streamed all public meetings so why has this practice been discontinued?</p>

The Leader responded:

Thank you, Councillor Sandford, for your question.

Back in October 2021, you might recall live streaming of meetings was discussed at Group Leaders meeting, which you would have been at. As stated at that meeting, I was happy for all meetings to be live streamed if there was no additional cost to the council, we did agree to immediately live stream any meetings that were deemed to be of a high public interest, which we continue to do.

Officers were then tasked with looking at costings for live streaming all meetings and options to purchase equipment to hold hybrid meetings.

Officers have confirmed that to live stream a meeting costs £150 a meeting, which is what we currently pay for Planning and Cabinet.

As there as 16 Scrutiny meetings and 2 joint meetings left in this municipal year, the additional cost, as now, would be £2,700 plus VAT but probably it would likely be higher than that if we adopted that from a full year.

I am also aware that the independent Chair of Audit has asked for the Audit Committee meetings to be live streamed due to the high-profile nature which has an additional cost of £750 plus VAT for those meetings, which has been agreed.

Officers, at my recommendation, purchased 4 meeting 'owls', for those that have experienced them so far, and I believe most recently there has been further equipment added to aid the facilitation of meetings using that technology. They are in the Town Hall, 2 are in the Conservative Group room and 2 are available, well they are all available for anywhere, to be perfectly honest, for whoever wants to request them.

The beadles have been fully trained how to set up and use this equipment. Therefore, I had liaised with Rachel in Democratic Services about what we can do to enhance that. So, we have been investigating if we can use the 'owls' to live stream on YouTube or Facebook or any other format which of course would incur no additional costs to the council. I think we are more or less there with that, so just like any other meeting to Beadles, the legal officer or the Democratic Service Officer can just press live stream.

I know your fan club will grow enormously because I know you appeal as chair has widened since you have been back at the seat. So, people are now waiting in anticipation for you to come onto the screen.

In the meantime, we will continue to stream any meetings that officers or members feel are of a high public interest but as I say I will come back and confirm but I think it is almost certain. I will say 99.9% which gives me 0.1% wiggle room if it doesn't happen. But I think actually since our discussion in 2021, obviously the world has changed and the use of technology has now become more important in terms of accessibility for people not necessarily in the room. I don't think it's a great stretch to be able to send that signal to one of our, whether it's YouTube or one of the other platforms.

	<p>I hope that helps, but I am fully behind you. I support the notion of more Nick Sandford.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>It's not about me, it's about openness and transparency. I do welcome the reassurance that the leaders actually offered because I do think that this is an important aspect of openness and transparency.</p> <p>Would he accept also that it isn't fair to put on officers the responsibility of having to make a judgement as to whether a meeting is important or unimportant, because that is a subjective view? Would he undertake to try and resolve this as quickly as he can and try to report back to councillors on his findings?</p> <p>The Leader responded:</p> <p>I do agree, I wouldn't necessarily say there is a burden on officers, you know the level of interest whether it is yourself or the Leader's or general consensus amongst councillors would determine the level of interest or something that is important. I just think that it's down to members to express to officers whether they feel something should be streamed.</p> <p>As I have said, I don't think we are there in terms of anymore, I think we have moved on, and I think we will have the system available. At the moment, I believe at the moment for example, Pippa presses the button to stream Cabinet meetings, or she did do but now we seem to have additional people. But the officers are well versed in doing that or indeed recording meetings such as planning or anything else that is regulatory.</p> <p>Yes, Councillor Sandford, I will share the limelight with Councillor Nawaz as well, so rest assured we are all on the same page.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>Please could the cabinet member provide an update on the introduction of an Article 4 direction on HMOs in Peterborough, including a timescale as to when we should expect this to be implemented?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Wiggin, I think I have already answered this.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Cereste for his previous answer to a very similar question. I just wanted to ask how confident Councillor Cereste is at delivering his election promise to the people of Hampton Vale that there will be an Article 4 within that council ward?</p>

	<p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Wiggin, I don't normally say things I don't think I can do.</p>
11.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford (2)</p> <p>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment</p> <p>Could the relevant cabinet member please tell me what positive outcomes for Peterborough have been achieved as a result of the funding received by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council under the Future Parks Accelerator programme?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>The Future Parks Accelerator project is a partnership between all local authorities in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the Local Nature Partnership and Nene Park Trust. The partnership has sought to fund and deliver a range of projects aiming to support the long-term sustainability of all parks and green spaces, and Peterborough has been part of that process.</p> <p>The council has directly benefited from test and learn projects in respect to mapping our open spaces, developing tools to better navigate them, and the development of community-led nature-based projects. The output of these projects will inform the design of the Active Parks Unit – a new service to be delivered across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough that will seek to encourage more community and volunteer involvement and ownership of parks and green spaces.</p> <p>The list of project outcomes is too long to present today but I would encourage you to visit the Future Parks Accelerator website for more detail – you can find it at www.cambsfutureparks.org.uk</p>
12.	<p>Question from Councillor Hemraj (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>What provision has the council put in place to increase the amount of temporary housing now that the contract is ending at St Michaels Gate?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>The contract for housing at St Michael's Gate no longer represents good value for the council, and it is absolutely the right thing to do to exit from it now. We do</p>

	<p>recognise the uncertainty this will cause for households living there, and our Housing officers are working closely with them to provide reassurance and alternative accommodation.</p> <p>The council is working with its partners in the social and private rented sector to bring forward the right type of temporary accommodation at the right cost. We have secured the use of Elizabeth Court for a further 5 years and will be working with Cross Keys Homes and other providers to increase capacity further. The council is also undertaking a review of its Housing and Homelessness services to major on the prevention of homelessness so the demand for temporary accommodation is reduced and we do not need to enter costly arrangements to provide temporary accommodation but can focus on providing rapid rehousing interventions.</p>
13.	<p>Question from Councillor Stevenson (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>The nation's long-distance lorry drivers provide a vital service, carrying goods, and in particular food, around the country and to food outlets in our city and elsewhere. Naturally, the contents of the lorries often require refrigeration which must be kept switched on at all times, especially in the recent hot weather. When drivers park up close to residential streets overnight, the noise from the refrigeration units can keep local residents awake, particularly during the summer when people sleep with their bedroom windows open. What can the council do to support lorry drivers in their work and also ensure that the residents of our city are not kept awake all night by refrigerated lorries parked near to their homes?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>Lorry drivers do indeed provide a valuable – indeed, an essential - service. However, the onus is on businesses to make provision for the carriage and storage of their refrigerated goods, including any necessary infrastructure, and support for their lorry drivers.</p> <p>The nearest designated overnight parking for HGVs is at the A1(M) A605 services, which provides showers and toilets.</p> <p>There are a number of points to consider in relation to noise disturbance. If on the road, vehicles may be parked in contravention of parking restrictions, in which case instances can be reported to our parking enforcement service. As parking enforcement does not currently take place overnight, reported incidents would help inform future decisions on enforcement provision. Vehicles may currently be parked legally but the location considered not suitable by residents for use by HGV's, in which case they could ask the council to review current parking provision at that locality.</p>

	<p>In relation to refrigerated vehicles parked at business premises, these can be reported to the council to investigate for any planning consent breaches in the first instance and depending on whether that provides a solution, they could be reported as a possible statutory noise nuisance.</p>
14.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox (2)</p> <p>Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communications, Culture and Communities</p> <p>A retired ex-Police Officer contacted me recently, stating that he does not feel safe in our city centre anymore. A former bobby on the beat protecting others, he now has serious concerns for his own safety from cyclists and e-scooters travelling at great speed, narrowly avoiding pedestrians.</p> <p>He told me he'd contacted the Police who informed him that the City Centre is protected by a Public Space Protection Order and that the City Council are responsible for policing it.</p> <p>As I am sure many of us would agree the Guildhall is a beautiful building and is important to the heritage and city centre of Peterborough, this too needs protecting from vandals more effectively, especially as there appears to be more than one set of CCTV cameras covering this location. On Armed Forces Day I was disgusted by the amount of graffiti on almost every pillar of the Guildhall which had apparently been there for some time without any action taken to clean it off.</p> <p>I now ask the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the well-being of our city centre, and the safety of the people using it, to clarify this and exactly what he proposes to remedy these problems? Visitors to Peterborough shouldn't be afraid for their safety in pedestrian areas and shouldn't have to witness vandals' daubings on our heritage buildings. These issues are escalating - what are you doing now to mitigate them?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>I agree with the comments of Councillor Fox. Residents and visitors should feel safe and be able to enjoy the city centre and all it offers, and I have called upon officers to revisit our capacity to address this challenge. Officers are reviewing resourcing levels in the city centre with the aim of increasing resilience and visibility, and announcements about the actions to be rapidly implemented as part of this review will be made shortly.</p> <p>We are working closely with partners to help with this , and have requested Police assistance to improve their presence in the City Centre via their Neighbourhood teams. Furthermore, we have applied for Home Office 'Safer Streets Funding' which if successful will allow for a dedicated ASB investigation officer for the city</p>

	<p>centre along with 6 temporary CCTV cameras and additional monitoring to target ASB Hotspots.</p> <p>The PSPO can be enforced by both council and police officers. The current order is due to be refreshed next year and we are using this opportunity to review the conditions it stipulates, and to consider what extra powers may be brought to give council and Police more tools to improve the City Centre. Any proposals will be brought before the appropriate scrutiny committee to seek member views and support for this approach.</p>
15.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (2)</p> <p>Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member confirm the net proceeds due to Peterborough City Council from the sale of Northminster?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>The capital receipt was £4.1m, which has been received.</p>

	<p><u>Questions on notice to:</u></p> <p>d. The Combined Authority Representatives</p>
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Representative on the Transport and Infrastructure Committee</p> <p>What assessment has been made of the success of the introduction of the number 29 bus service (linking Hampton, Orton and Bretton) introduced by the combined authority, and what are the plans for the future of this service?</p> <p>The Combined Authority Representative responded:</p> <p>The Combined Authority established the number 29 bus service to connect the Hamptons and Ortons to the hospital as you know. This route is subsidised by the Combined Authority and was established on a trial basis. No decisions have been made about what will happen to the service but I would expect that this will be reviewed at a future meeting of the Combined Authority's Transport & Infrastructure Committee, of which, as you know, I am a Member of that Committee so I will be inputting into that process from a Peterborough perspective.</p> <p>I also want to discuss what their plans are for bus services in Peterborough and what opportunities there are for additional services in our area to support further uptake in bus travel to support our economy, our climate change objectives and our expanding population.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Cereste for his answer again. The 29 bus service has great potential but at the moment it runs at rather limit times and prevents people that might possible be wanting to use the bus service to do so. For example, employees of the hospital being able to get to the start of their shift because the first bus doesn't run until 9 o'clock and if they are there earlier than that, they just can't get the bus. So I know this was raised by Councillor Burbage and others in the Transport Plan joint Scrutiny meeting. I hope Councillor Cereste will join us in pressing for this service to be improved so we can maximise the benefit of it.</p> <p>The Combined Authority Representative responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Wiggin, if you drop me a note I will be happy to look at that and take it with me when I go to the next committee meeting.</p>