

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD IN THE  
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH  
ON  
14 SEPTEMBER 2011**

**Present:** Councillors Todd (Chairman), S Day, G Casey, C Burton, JR Fox, and M Jamil

**Also Present**      Ansar Ali                      Police Authority Representative  
                         Councillor Sandford      Leader of the Liberal Democrat Party  
                         Peter Godley                Youth Council Representative  
                         Niamh Kingsley          Youth Council Representative

**Officers in Attendance:**      Paul Phillipson              Executive Director of Operations  
                         Karen Kibblewhite        Safer Peterborough Manager - Cutting Crime  
                         Katy Softley                Anti Social Behaviour Co-ordinator  
                         Graeme Clark              Project Manager  
                         Andrew Edwards         Head of Growth & Regeneration  
                         Andrew Mackintosh      Director of Communications  
                         Paulina Ford                Senior Governance Officer, Scrutiny  
                         David O'Connor Long    Lawyer

**1. Apologies**

Apologies had been received from Councillor Simons.

**2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations**

Item 7 – Review of Citizen Power Peterborough Programme

As the report had made reference to the Peterborough Environment City Trust Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest in that he was a member of the Board of the Peterborough Environment City Trust.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2011**

The minutes of the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20 July 2011 were approved as an accurate record.

**4. Call In of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions**

There were no requests for Call-in to consider.

**5. Trees in Bridge Street**

The report was presented to the Committee at the request of Councillor Sandford who had raised concerns regarding the proposal to remove approximately one third of the existing trees in Bridge Street. The report explained the reasoning behind the proposal and the outcome of the public consultation on the plans to improve Bridge Street and Long Causeway which had included a question on the removal of the trees in Bridge Street. Councillor Sandford was concerned that the consultation questionnaire had been misleading and had

been bias towards the removal of trees. The Director of Communications and Head of Growth and Regeneration were in attendance to present the report and answer any questions. The Director for Communications advised Members that after consulting with Councillor Sandford he had agreed to reword the question regarding the removal of trees. This would then be opened up for public consultation again allowing the public to have another opportunity to give their views.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members felt that question three in the consultation survey regarding trees had given a misleading statement prior to the optional choices. The statement read:

Q3 Trees - We have been advised by specialists that there are too many trees on both Long Causeway and Bridge Street. If we do not remove some of the trees there is a danger that they all could die, or at least be harmed over time. We are proposing to remove the minimum number, which will also have the benefit of opening up the street scene, allowing in more natural daylight.

- Removal of the minimum number of trees will ensure the long term sustainability of the remainder
  - The opportunity should be taken now to remove all of the trees to reduce maintenance issues in the future.
  - The trees should be left untouched even though there could be issues in the future regarding maintenance
  - I don't have any opinion on this
- Councillor Sandford had read a copy of the Tree Condition Survey and Management Recommendations report used as a base for the proposal for the removal of trees. The report had stated that there was no recommendation for tree removal but had also suggested a need for selective tree removal to ensure longevity of the tree stock. The report had also reported that most of the trees assessed had an estimated remaining contribution of 40 plus years with only three trees of 20 to 40 years and they were in good health.
  - Members wanted to know why one of the options included in the survey was to remove all of the trees. *Members were informed that there had been several enquiries from members of the public asking if there would be an option to remove all of the trees. Officers therefore felt that this option should also be included in the consultation to take into account those views.*
  - Members noted that the response to the survey had been very low with only 100 people responding.
  - How was question three going to be rephrased to ensure a fair and equitable consultation? *The Director for Communications advised that the question would be rephrased as follows:*

*Another chance to have your say on proposals to potentially remove some trees in the area.*

*We have been advised by specialists, The Urban Forestry Organisation Limited, that there are too many trees on Long Causeway and Bridge Street, which has a potential impact on the future health of the trees. We are proposing to remove around a third of these trees in order to prolong the life of the others, open up the street and allow more natural daylight.*

*Do you think we should?*

- *Leave the trees untouched*
  - *Remove around one-third of the trees*
  - *Remove all of the trees*
  - *I don't have any opinion on this*
- Councillor Sanford pointed out that any removal of trees must be inline with the Councils Trees and Woodlands Policy and must have sound arboriculture reasons.
  - Some Members felt that the economical cost of maintaining the trees should also be taken into consideration.
  - Had the businesses along Bridge Street and Long Causeway been approached for their views on the trees? *Members were advised that as part of the consultation there had been a letter drop to all businesses advising them of the consultation and how to access it. Informal discussions had also taken place with businesses along Bridge Street concerning removal of some trees. Businesses had been mainly concerned with the disruption of business if any work were to take place in Bridge Street rather than a strong opinion of retaining the trees.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee recommends that:

1. The Director of Communications rephrases question three of the consultation on Improving Bridge Street and Long Causeway to read:

*We have been advised by specialists, The Urban Forestry Organisation Limited, that there are too many trees on Long Causeway and Bridge Street, which has a potential impact on the future health of the trees. We are proposing to remove around a third of these trees in order to prolong the life of the others, open up the street and allow more natural daylight.*

*Do you think we should?*

- *Leave the trees untouched*
  - *Remove around one-third of the trees*
  - *Remove all of the trees*
  - *I don't have any opinion on this*
2. Question three to be published for a further month to allow the public to have another chance to have their say on proposals to potentially remove some trees in Long Causeway and Bridge Street.
  3. The Director of Communications to report back to the Committee with the results of the additional consultation.

## **6. Designated Public Places Order (DPPO)**

The report informed the Committee of a proposal to extend the existing city centre Designated Public Places Order (DPPO) into the New England area. The proposal had been at the request of the local Neighbourhood Policing Team Inspector and the Neighbourhood Manager for the areas as well as by a local resident. The DPPO would mean that to consume alcohol in public when asked to stop by a police officer would become an offence. The proposed area was an extension to an existing designated area in the city centre and was bounded by the following roads: St Pauls Road, Fulbridge Road, A47 Soke Parkway, Bourges Boulevard.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- Members were concerned that the boundaries put in place would cause further displacement of anti-social drinking. *Members were informed that a DPPO was a reactive tool and not the only solution. There were a range of other tools in place to tackle anti social drinking. The natural boundary along Bourges Boulevard would help prevent further displacement.*
- Members were concerned at the amount of alcohol licences that were being given out and that there was no joined up strategy to tackle anti social drinking across Peterborough. *Members were informed that the Alcohol Strategy was being reviewed with partners from Health and the Safer Peterborough Partnership. Specific areas looked at had been licensing and street drinking. Part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment had looked at what the issues were across the city and they would be taken into account as part of the review. The outcome of the review would be brought back to the Committee at a future meeting.*
- Why did the DPPO stop at Bourges Boulevard and not extend to the railway tracks as a natural boundary. *The boundary was set on the basis of evidence and on the recommendation of the Neighbourhood Manager and the local Neighbourhood Policing Team Inspector. The boundary would only be extended if evidence was provided to show a further displacement of alcohol related anti social behaviour. The legislation used to put in place a DPPO required evidence based information.*
- A member of the Youth Council commented that young people would probably cross over to the railway tracks to drink to avoid the DPPO area and wanted to know when the DPPO would come into force. *The DPPO would go to Council in November and if agreed would come into force early November. The DPPO was not an outright ban on drinking it was a tool to tackle anti social drinking.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee:

- (i) Endorsed the proposed Designated Public Places Order extending the existing designated area in the city centre which is bounded by St Pauls Road, Fulbridge Road, A47 Soke Parkway, Bourges Boulevard; and
- (ii) Recommended the adoption of the Designated Public Places Order to Full Council.

## **7. Review of Citizen Power Peterborough Programme**

The report informed the Committee of the findings of the formal review of the Citizen Power Peterborough programme. The review had been brought about after the meeting of the Committee on 19 January 2011 at which it had recommended that the Citizens Power Programme be disbanded. Following the recommendation an in depth review of the programme had taken place. The Executive Director presented the report outlining the outcomes of the review to the Committee supplemented by a slide presentation which highlighted the six projects within the programme detailing future planned activities. The six projects within the programme were:

- Project 1: Peterborough Curriculum
- Project 2: Sustainable Citizenship
- Project 3: Recovery Capital
- Project 4: ChangeMakers
- Project 5: Arts & Social Change
- Project 6: Civic Commons

The Committee were asked to:

- a. Identify any additional recommendations or actions to ensure the Citizen Power Programme continued effectively to make a real and lasting difference to Peterborough.
- b. To establish a scrutiny task and finish group to work with officers to ensure that all recommendations and actions from the review were implemented.
- c. To endorse and support the development of an All Party Policy session early in 2012 at where the outcomes from the Single Delivery Plan and relationship to the Citizen's Power Programme would be discussed.

Observations and questions were raised around the following areas:

- The report states that the total investment in the city as a result of the Citizens Power Programme will be £1,170,775. Could the Committee have a breakdown of where this money has and will be spent? *The Executive Director of Operations advised that this could be provided.*
- Was the Council's contribution of £250,000 to the programme a cash contribution and did this include officers salaries. *The £250,000 had been a cash contribution and officer's salaries had not been included in that figure. Officer's time on the programme was part of their core work and had not been considered to be over and above what they normally did.*
- Members had concerns regarding value for money for projects 4 ChangeMakers, 5 Arts & Social Change and 6 Civic Commons. The expenditure against the benefits did not appear to give value for money. *The programme had been difficult to quantify however the fact had been that it had generated a large amount of inward investment into the city which would benefit the city in the long term. Some of the Citizens Power work had been challenging but indications were that it was making a difference.*
- Members congratulated Officers on the quality of the review.
- Members pointed out that when the Citizens Power Programme had first started each member of the Committee had agreed to Champion one of the strands. Since that time there had been little or no contact from officers with the member Champions. This had made it difficult for the Members to engage with the programme and sell it to the public.
- The Recovery Capital project dealt with problems associated with drug and alcohol use. The Council already provide funding to Bridgegate so why could they not fund the work of the Citizens Power Programme. *The funding to Bridgegate from the Council had been to provide specific services. The work that had been done through the Citizens Power Programme was over and above those services therefore additional funding was required.*
- A member of the Youth Council asked if officers were engaging with young people in particular with regard to the Arts. *Officers had engaged with young people and this was continuing to happen. The Executive Director of Operations invited the representatives of the Youth Council to get involved in the programme.*
- Peterborough had a diverse community. How are you engaging and encouraging those young people from the most deprived areas of the city who would not normally get involved in the Arts? It would be useful to see a map of the city indicating where engagement had taken place with young people and what activities they had taken part in. *Members were advised that connecting with diverse communities had been challenging and more work was being done around this.*
- Do you have an exit strategy for the programme and how are you going to maintain sustainability of the programme. *Members were informed that discussions had already taken place about the sustainability of the programme and how the 27,000 Fellows of the Royal Society of the Arts could be used going forward to draw in ongoing interest and funding for the continuation of the programme.*
- Members were concerned that experts were being brought into the city from other cities and that experts within the City were not being used and developed to ensure continuity of the programme. *The Officer advised that people who had been brought in were leading thinkers or experts in their field. This had been about capacity building and they*

*had helped people to understand how they could do things better by looking at best practice from elsewhere.*

- When the funding for the programme stopped how would people continue with the projects. Would advice be given on how to raise money and access funding? *Members were informed that the Arts Council saw Peterborough as a cold spot in terms of Arts engagement and were therefore committed to encouraging growth of the Arts in Peterborough. A strand of work within the Arts and Social Change project was about giving people the skills to access Arts Council funding. The Arts Council had put some money into a grant scheme and people from Peterborough would be encouraged to apply.*
- Was there a vision of how the city would be perceived from an Arts perspective in the future? *One of the statements in the Arts and Social Change project was to have an improved much more visible cultural offering across the city and to build a Creative Hub which would be a unique asset to enable the cultural offering in the city to flourish.*

The Chair thanked the Executive Director of Operations and Project Manager - Citizens Power Programme for giving an informative and excellent presentation.

## **ACTIONS**

1. The Committee requested that the Executive Director of Operations and the Project Manager for the Citizens Power Programme:
  - I. Provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure for the £1,170,775 funding received as a result of the Citizens Power Programme.
  - II. Contact the representatives of the Youth Council to discuss how they could become involved in the Citizens Power Programme.
  - III. Produce a map of the city showing where and how young people were being engaged with the Citizens Power Programme.
2. That members of the Committee continue to be champions of each of the six Citizen's Power strands and that those members who were no longer on the Committee are replaced with current members of the Committee as Champions.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee recommends:

The establishment of a cross-party task and finish group to oversee and monitor the implementation of the recommendations and actions from the Citizens Power review.

### **8. Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group**

The report provided the Committee with an update on the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group. At its meeting on 10 November 2010 the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee agreed to establish a Task and Finish group to conduct a review of Neighbourhood Councils. The review had been completed in March 2011 and one of the recommendations agreed by Cabinet on 21 March 2011 was that the Neighbourhood Committee implementation plan should be overseen by the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review Group. The Review Group met on 31 August 2011 to discuss the purpose of the group going forward, the membership of the group and the terms of reference.

The Committee were asked to agree the new terms of reference and name of the group as the Neighbourhood Committee Implementation Scrutiny Group.

Councillor Burton thanked all the Members and officers who took part in the Neighbourhood Council Scrutiny Review for their contribution and ongoing commitment to the development of Neighbourhood Committees.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee recommends that:

- I. The review group continue under the new name of Neighbourhood Committee Implementation Scrutiny Group
- II. That the new terms of reference be accepted.
- III. That the membership of the group is agreed.

## **9. Forward Plan of Key Decisions**

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Forward Plan, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

### **ACTION AGREED**

The Committee noted the Forward Plan and agreed that there were no items for further consideration.

## **10. Work Programme**

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2011/12 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

### **ACTION AGREED**

To confirm the work programme for 2011/12.

## **11. Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 9 November 2011

*The meeting began at 7.00 and ended at 9.06pm*

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank