

COUNCIL ADDENDUM	AGENDA ITEM No. 13(b)
6 MARCH 2013	PUBLIC REPORT

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Cllr David Seaton – Cabinet Member for Resources	
Contact Officer(s):	John Harrison, Executive Director - Strategic Resources Steven Pilsworth, Head of Strategic Finance	Tel. 452520 384564

BUDGET 2013/14 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) TO 2022/23

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 The purpose of this addendum to the Full Cabinet report on the Budget 2013/14 and Medium Term Financial Strategy to 2022/23 is to:

- a) Provide an update to Council on further budget consultation responses received since the Full Council papers were released and the closure of the formal budget consultation on 5 March 2013;
- b) Update members on a change to the narrative for the saving proposal relating to sick pay; and
- c) A clarification on the occupancy periods for our council tax discount changes.

2 BUDGET CONSULTATION

2.1 The budget consultation formally closed on Tuesday 5 March 2013 which is after the date Full Council papers were published, in order to give people the maximum time to respond. This paper therefore provides Council with the responses received after the Cabinet meeting on 25 February 2013.

2.2 The budget consultation (excluding the separate library consultation and adult social care consultation) received 61 responses including two petitions with 249 comments made. Areas of the budget consultation receiving six or more comments are:

Budget Area	No. of Comments
Bus subsidies	38
Children Centres / Play Centres	25
Energy and Waste projects	20
Council Finance	14
Capital Programme	16
Neighbourhoods	11
City Centre improvement / Growth	10
Council Tax	9
Street lighting	9
Voluntary Sector Grants	9
Community Leadership Fund	7
Your Peterborough	6
Eligibility Criteria	6

- 2.3 The additional budget responses received since 25 February Cabinet including letters and a response from Unite the Union can be seen in appendix 1. In consideration of all budget responses received during the consultation, there are no further changes recommended to Full Council from Cabinet with the exception of the terms and conditions sick pay saving proposal in the next section.

3 TERMS AND CONDITIONS – SICK PAY

- 3.1 The original proposal on sick pay within the budget consultation updated for Cabinet 25 February was:

We currently pay staff for the first three days of any sickness absence. It is proposed that staff are not paid for the first three days of absence which will result in the saving set out in the table below.

The Council has received feedback on this proposal during the budget consultation events with staff, Trade Unions and Scrutiny. The Council will continue to work with these groups to see if it is possible to implement the scheme as proposed. If this is not possible then alternative options for delivering the saving will need to be developed

- 3.2 The council and Trade Unions have continued discussion on the sick pay saving proposal and in principle have agreed to the following alternative proposal subject to future approval through the relevant committee:

- a) The first three days of any absence being unpaid for an employee with a “high frequency, unrelated medical” pattern and who has been placed on a formal warning for their absence
- b) A new trigger mechanism/monitoring procedure for employees with a “high frequency, unrelated medical” pattern
- c) An agreement to work together to maintain absence levels at less than 3% overall
- d) The introduction of additional medical support, to help employees with underlying medical conditions obtain earlier diagnosis and treatment thereby speeding up return to work
- e) Earlier engagement of trade union representatives in absence cases to support the Attendance Improvement programme

- 3.3 The Trade Unions also recognised that it was necessary to work together to identify other acceptable cost saving opportunities to meet the shortfall in the budget arising from the reduced cost savings around sick pay. There is no change to the budget recommendations put forward in the Council report dated 6 March 2013 entitled ‘Budget 2013/14 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to 2022/23.

4 COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS

- 4.1 The government has made changes to council tax legislation as part of its review of the Local Government Finance Act which means we will be able to change some of our discounts and exemptions. The report to 21 January Cabinet entitled ‘Council Taxbase and Business Rates 2013/14’, paragraph 4.3 included the impact of the council proposing to make changes by removing a number of discounts, the main ones being for empty properties and second homes. This has the effect of increasing the taxbase.

- 4.2 The original regulations on The Council Tax (Exempt Dwellings) Order 1992 (Statutory Instrument SI1992/558) has been updated by revised Regulations (SI2012/2964 and SI2012/2965) issued in 2012 on the treatment of certain council tax discounts.
- 4.3 The budget consultation included proposals for council tax discounts and exemptions and were factored into the adjusted council taxbase accordingly and incorporated into the Council Tax Resolution included in the Full Council report dated 6 March 2013.
- 4.4 The table below was included in the budget consultation document. The only change to the table below shown in italics is reference to the clarification point on reoccupation periods for our council tax discount changes.

Council Tax discount and exemptions	Current discounted rates	Rates from 1 April 2013
CLASS A Empty, unfurnished property undergoing structural repairs	100 per cent for 12 months	0 per cent for 12 months
CLASS C Empty and unfurnished property	100 per cent for 6 months	100 per cent for 1 month <i>For the purpose of determining whether the discount applies, any period of less than 6 weeks within which the dwelling concerned was occupied or furnished shall be disregarded</i>
Discount on a second home	10 per cent unlimited	0 per cent
Additional premium for empty and unfurnished property (empty for at least two years)	Not applicable	50 per cent

Appendix 1 – Budget Consultation responses

Category	Issue	Response
Bus Subsidies	<p>I used a Sunday Bus Service Sunday 25 February 2013 to visit the country out of Peterborough with an extra ticket I paid as my City Weekly Card did not cover the journey. I have incidentally been aware that the Sunday Bus service is subsidised by the City Council and that important decisions will be taken shortly.</p> <p>These country lines are very important to local commuters as well to genuine foreign travellers as I am when visiting the country. It is a real asset for the city as well : people accommodated in Peterborough may, thinks to that line, visit the landmarks out of the city and come back in the evening to their hotel instead of carrying their journey on to an other city like Stamford or Lincoln where they will spent their money instead than in Peterborough.</p> <p>I am sure that a better advertising at the Bus Station and a promotion at the Visit Centre will drive more people and tourists to the Sunday Bus service making it a viable and interesting destination at week end. When the City Buses are very centralised, and leading to some parks,</p> <p>The Sunday Bus Service is one of the only line to go out of the city alouding fellow hikers to walk and ramble in the country.</p> <p>Please keep supporting that line in the interest of your community.</p>	<p>Many of the services that we subsidise are underused and only continue to run because of the funding that we provide. In 2012/13 we spent £1.1million on subsidies for services including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of Stagecoach’s weekend and evening buses • Local Link 401, 404, 406, 407, 408, 410, 411 and 413 • Community Link • Dial-a-Ride <p>We are proposing to review the level of bus subsidies that the council pays for services across the city.</p> <p>Our current contracts for the Local Link services run out at the end of March 2013.</p> <p>An independent assessment has identified that to continue to run the same services as we do currently the cost would increase to over £1.6million.</p> <p>No decision has been taken on what services will be provided and we are carrying out a full review into the bus services we subsidise in order to see how we can best</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p data-bbox="1218 285 1957 395">deliver a service in the future to assist vulnerable people living in the areas that will be affected by these proposed changes.</p> <p data-bbox="1218 443 1984 512">We estimate that this service would have an indicative cost of around £600,000.</p> <p data-bbox="1218 560 1973 703">If these proposals are agreed, 2013/14 would be a transitional year for the service. While we carry out a review we will continue to offer the same service as we do now from April 2013 for approximately 6 months.</p> <p data-bbox="1218 751 1977 1209">Any company can come and supply bus services within Peterborough as long as they abide by the legal requirements for a public transport operator. However, following the deregulation of the bus industry as a result of the Transport Act (1985) councils cannot operate commercial services and compete with the open market. The council provides subsidies for a variety of services, which fill socially necessary gaps in the commercial bus network, where it is not commercially viable for a private sector operator to do so. In other words at present no companies have registered to run services on parts of the routes the Local Link services operate.</p> <p data-bbox="1218 1257 1917 1326">As mentioned no decisions have been made and your comments will become part of the public consultation</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		document that Cabinet will review in order to decide on the final budget for 2013/14.
Bus subsidies	<p>Cuts in evening bus services will have an impact on the 'evening economy' and cuts in other services will impact on retailing and other city centre services throughout the day. At a time when town centres nationwide are struggling to compete with the internet while also facing problems caused by the recession, this seems to be a poor investment decision which will manifest itself in future years in (at the very least) reduced collection of business rates and widespread abandonment of city centre premises. This will more than negate any inward investment benefit to come from planned spending on city centre improvement works.</p> <p>Apart from the economic consequences of these decisions there are significant and immediate social consequences - and, in some cases, negative impacts on the city's reputation and aspirations to be an 'environment capital'.</p>	Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.
Bus subsidies	I note with concern that PCC is proposing to significantly cut funding to local bus services. This, whilst appreciating that budget cuts are necessary, is surely a retrograde step. Travelchoice was set up to encourage a reduction in car use and to promote cycling, walking and use of public transport. It was intended that the City would improve its green credentials to become a true 'environment city'. This	Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>can only be achieved if we have a reliable and efficient system.</p> <p>Currently, Stagecoach and other operators provide a reasonable service though there are certain areas where provision is inadequate and the recent re-routing by Stagecoach has not helped. If the Local Link services provided by Enterprise Peterborough were to be discontinued and curtailed this would aggravate the problem leaving many who rely solely on public transport without adequate provision.</p> <p>No doubt the argument is that certain routes are unprofitable. They are, but the commercial companies have creamed off the financially viable services without funding the lesser used routes as used to be the case when transport was to a degree nationalised. Do we really want to suffer the air pollution problems of a city such as Leicester?</p> <p>Do we wish to confine non-motorists to their homes with reduced opportunity to socialise in the evenings and at weekends? The issue needs CAREFUL consideration and should not be rushed into or imposed by those for whom public transport provision is of little importance.</p>	
Bus subsidies	<p>I urge you to continue to subsidise these routes.</p> <p>I am a keen walker. As such I use this service to go `Bus walking` with a group every Sunday.</p> <p>I use buses as a general rule, thus, walking to & from the stops means I am getting exercise.</p> <p>I am retired. It is a cost effective & convenient way for me to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>get around. I meet & socialise with people on these buses, who in general are a friendly crowd. I know for a fact, that I and many others, especially the elderly, would have our `quality of life` severely affected if the subsidy was withdrawn, this may then mean that this & other bus routes would be withdrawn as nonprofitable. Remember those with pushchairs with young children, & the elderly & infirm, who would most definitely be affected.</p>	<p>No decision has been taken on what services will be provided and we are carrying out a full review into the bus services we subsidise in order to see how we can best deliver a service in the future to assist vulnerable people living in the areas that will be affected by these proposed changes.</p> <p>If these proposals are agreed, 2013/14 would be a transitional year for the service. While we carry out a review we will continue to offer the same service as we do now from April 2013 for approximately 6 months.</p>
Bus subsidies	<p>Knowing full well how limited you are in whatever moves you are able to make, this is simply to express my surprise at how many 'locals' (i.e. non-ramblers) I always find using these services too on our Sunday trudges. Local shops etc. too, on occasion. I have often thought how glad they must be to find us all (we untidy lot) furnishing this justification for maintaining their route for everyone - because without it, some of them doubtless could be scuppered.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>
Bus subsidies	<p>I work a 60 hour week and don't own a car, I rely on buses and bikes. So on Sundays I get to take a nice walk in the countryside around Peterborough using the local link Sunday services which serve the villages! These services are invaluable both for my own well being to de stress after a long week, and for keeping villagers within reach of Peterborough without using their cars.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>
Bus subsidies	<p>The highways budget is being increased to encourage</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>growth yet buses, which are the way many access work, are being cut. With less out of town development buses could also take cars off the road and reduce congestion.</p> <p>Bus services may be preserved at peak times but once a care is needed at other times then it will tend to be used at other times rather than leave it in the garage.</p> <p>There are many two adult households, so that while has the car the other does not, this can either mean that one is housebound or a second car is needed.</p>	<p>previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>
<p>Bus subsidies</p>	<p>I have read the council's budget proposals and am very concerned about the proposed cutting of subsidies to bus services in Peterborough.</p> <p>The evening bus service in Peterborough is already inadequate and it is ridiculous to suggest getting rid of it altogether - this is discrimination against people who either cannot or choose not to drive a car.</p> <p>I would have thought that with the council's claim to be concerned about the environment, it would want to encourage people to be using public transport and increasing, not reducing bus services (for instance, enabling people to get to the Showcase cinema or to Flag Fen). The emphasis on cycling is all well and good - but not everyone feels safe on a bike and some are too physically frail to use one.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>
	<p>Although I live within the Peterborough urban area ,I quite regularly use these services in connection with a walking group. Last Sunday the bus was full ,mainly but not</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>exclusively with walkers,and that is often the case.</p> <p>It enables people like me ,who does not have a car,to enjoy the countryside. Not everyone has a car,be it for reasons of income or, as in my case, very poor eyesight. There is also a very strong environmental case for encouraging the use of public transport over the motor car.</p> <p>Public transport in this area,outside the main towns/cities is generally very poor-as one who has been all over England I would contend its worse here than in most other places.Northants in particular seems badly served. It was one of the counties most ravaged by the Beeching train cuts and now most of the rural buses have gone too.</p> <p>It evidently makes it impossible for people to live in most villages unless they have a car-with all the environmental repercussions it brings.</p>	
	<p>I am a member of the Peterborough Bus Walkers., and I would like to comment/protest about your proposal to remove the service.</p> <p>I am a regular Sunday walker, as I work full-time during the week.</p> <p>Using the 401/404 is very important to me, as it is my only way of getting out to the borders of Peterborough for exercise and interaction with the other walkers.</p> <p>My quality of life would be badly affected if the service is removed, so I an begging that the Council re-consider their proposal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to the proposed reduction in bus subsidies.</p>
General	Following a meeting of Bretton Parish Council it was	

Category	Issue	Response
Finance	<p>resolved that we would like to make representations to Peterborough City Council regarding their budget. The comments we would like to make are as follows:</p> <p>Whilst noting that due to severe austerity measures by the Conservative/Lib Dem Coalition, Government has cut funding to local Authorities including Peterborough City Council. Bretton Parish Council urges Peterborough City Council not to make cuts to front line services, which in Bretton will affect Crofts Corner, cuts to Meals on Wheels services, and subsidised Bus routes including the 406, 404 and 401 services. Additionally, the proposal to cut strategic resources by £200,000.00 will reduce library hours by 8 hours per week to Bretton Library, which will amount to one or two days a week. We ask Peterborough City Council Cabinet to find revised savings elsewhere to avoid cuts to frontline services especially for vulnerable people.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
General Finance	<p>I believe that some of the proposed cuts will seriously damage the lifestyle of Peterborough's most disadvantaged residents.</p> <p>I call upon the City Council to reconsider the proposed cuts in basic services such as children's play centres, bus service subsidies, library opening hours and adult social care.</p> <p>The equivalent savings could be made by reducing the immediate and ongoing costs of vanity projects and other large projects with no short-term benefit to the City. The Council is borrowing hundreds of millions of pounds to pay</p>	Thank you for your comment.

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>for large projects such as a waste incinerator, solar panels on farm land, large scale tree felling, and replacement of city centre street furniture & paving. These involve capital costs as well as costs in servicing the debt.</p> <p>I urge the Council to prioritise services to the public over expensive grandiose projects - and to amend their budget proposals accordingly.</p>	
General Finance	<p>Staff Pensions – The elephant in the room is staff pension costs and the number 1 priority needs to be to reduce them. Stop any new staff joining the scheme and confirm that Enterprise staff aren't being publically funded. There needs to be some gesture from the over-paid executives and having them pay for their own pensions would be a good way. Future appointments should not get these ridiculous pensions.</p> <p>Child transport - Alternatives to separate taxis</p> <p>Translation - Ensure no council scheme encourages migration from non-english speaking countries. Remove foreign language support – expect people to teach themselves English.</p> <p>Litter Costs - Don't allow dogs/cats in any council housing and require covenants in all new developments to reduce future maintenance costs.</p> <p>Free Labour = use more volunteers, low-risk prisoners and community service as labour.</p> <p>Planting - Don't fund any plants on roundabouts. Spend it where it can be enjoyed or to keep visibility clear when</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and suggestions.</p> <p>To comment on a couple of your points:</p> <p>Littering – We transferred our housing stock to Cross Keys Homes in 2004. Only they could comment on pets.</p> <p>Training – We have also scaled back its training budget</p> <p>Stop Secrecy – these items are available on our website. Please visit the page – 'Council payments over £500'</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>joining/leaving parkways.</p> <p>Council Tax - Continue idea of making people pay a little council tax. Will waste council money less if paying for it.</p> <p>heating costs - Reduce temperature in public buildings</p> <p>Training – other councils are slashing training budgets, but Peterborough is introducing schemes! Accept that people can learn themselves, like in the real world.</p> <p>Housing Benefit fraud – Investigate current scams. There's one where people rent from a relative/friend and effectively get a free house bought for them. Needs to consider that people will not have the same surname given the broken modern family.</p> <p>Stop secrecy - Include a description on £500+ spend details to show why the money was spent. This way the public will identify ridiculous spending better than the council can.</p>	
General Finance	<p>I would strongly suggest that improvements in Long Causeway, spending on landscaping (particularly grass cutting and 'tree management') and on communications (particularly publication of Your Peterborough) could be cut and the money thus saved used to support the services I have mentioned above. A modest rise in car park charges could be both financially and environmentally helpful.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
Play centres	<p>The cuts to children's centres and associated services seems to be an error of judgement that will lead to future problems. Some of these proposed cuts will have an impact on future council budgets (through a range of increased requirements from special educational provision through to graffiti removal) and on the budgets of other public services</p>	<p>We are the only authority in the East of England who provides free-of-charge open access play. Given the cuts to our budget from Government we are forced to consider this proposal as part of the budget setting process.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	(eg the NHS and the courts). This is a budget which surely should be protected	<p>However, the play service buildings would remain community assets. We are prepared to work with organisations from within the community who feel that they could use the buildings for play. We have already received expressions of interest from voluntary groups.</p> <p>In addition, there are long established Out of School provisions throughout the city that provide activities and support parents who require childcare.</p>
Play centres	PCC's Play Centre service provides a valuable life line to me as a Foster Carer. I can leave children in my care here knowing all Centres are approved in total safety and without cost. This enables me to Foster children on a permanent basis long-term and not offer my services on a respite weekend basis only. Without these Centres the 3 girls I foster now may be moved on as I work Mon-Fri school hours and have no back-up for school holiday periods other than my statutory annual leave. 5 weeks goes nowhere towards covering the numerous school holidays. It is in these periods that I rely heavily on the Play Centres. Without them I have to rethink my commitment to Fostering.	<p>Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to play centres.</p> <p>A separate response has been sent to this resident.</p>
Play centres	Children's play centres being cut will leave fewer facilities for the young and less opportunities for socialisation. Boredom is cited as a reason for anti-social behaviour so although not a justification it might be expected that more police time will be taken up dealing with such incidents.	Thank you for your comment and please refer to our previous answer with regard to play centres.
Road	Sustrans recognises the huge challenges in producing a	

Category	Issue	Response
investment	<p>balanced budget and improving the City.</p> <p>We welcome the investment in changes to Bourges Boulevard and support investment in walking, cycling and public transport, but would like to see a review of some of the road schemes in the draft budget. We believe that there are other ways of investing in transport that will be cheaper and bring about modal shift. There seems to be an assumption that growth must mean more car traffic and therefore capital is needed to increase road capacity. Growth may well mean more people but does not have to mean more car traffic. Levels of car traffic will depend on modal split, so higher car occupancy and modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport can help eliminate the need for major investment in road capacity. The Council's Long Term Transport Strategy includes ambitions for reducing traffic in the city centre for instance and we would like to see transport investment giving higher priority to walking, cycling and public transport and lower priority to increasing road capacity.</p>	<p>We continue to invest in sustainable modes of transport. We work with the Department of Transport, other government departments and partners (including Sustrans) to promote and encourage a mode shift from the private car to more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The growth of the city however does require some investment in the highway network as outlined in the Long Term Transport Strategy, Local Transport Plan and the Core Strategy. The highway network within Peterborough has to accommodate all forms of transport, (including, walking, cycling, public transport, emergency vehicles, utility vehicles, freight as well as the private car).</p> <p>We have challenging targets for sustainable transport use within Peterborough and these are reflected in infrastructure requirements we have identified. Without these challenging targets for sustainable transport, we would face a larger requirement for more road schemes to increase the capacity of the network and accommodate growth.</p> <p>It is worthwhile stating that a key requirement for sustainable economic growth identified, by businesses, Central and Local Government is investment in transport and infrastructure.</p> <p>The work that we carry out to acquire funding, implement schemes and invest in the highway network reflects the diverse nature of the demands placed upon it.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
<p>Voluntary sector grants</p>	<p>I am Chairman of Orton Wistow Community Association (Registered Charity No. 1027473) and I wish to comment upon the proposal to stop grants to Community Centres (P41/42).</p> <p>Grants to Community Centres have reduced from £1,750 pa to £1,400 pa to £1,250 pa and, two years ago, the grant was savaged to £400 – which was a reduction of 68%, totally disproportionate to the % savings that PCC was trying to effect for that financial year.</p> <p>Our Centre is a vibrant, inclusive facility which is extensively used by – Under 5's (Nursery), Bridge Club, 2 Harmony groups (male & female), Rainbows, Christian Fellowship, Bengali Society, Zumba, Pilates, 2 different children's groups, children's parties, family parties, Xmas/New Year celebrations, Art workshop, Embroiders' Guild, PCC Councillor's surgery, local MP's surgery, polling station (for local elections and Police Commissioners' elections) and a Christmas Fayre is held in December each year.</p> <p>Community issues are discussed at our regular meetings and we are represented at the Napier Place Precinct shop owner meetings.</p> <p>I have a real concern about the future existence of Community Centres in Peterborough if this financial situation, relative to PCC, is to continue. The Centres are managed by volunteers and these continual financial impositions will, I fear, result in many volunteers/Trustees</p>	<p>The current proposals set out the removal of grants to voluntary organisations including community centres and residents' associations funded by Peterborough City Council.</p> <p>Over the course of the last 18 months we have been in discussion with the voluntary sector about future funding agreements in the face of reducing resources available to us.</p> <p>At the same time the Government announced that it is stopping Social Fund payments which were Department for Work and Pensions grants paid directly to members of the public in crisis. These grants were used for urgent and immediate needs including electricity meter cards, food or other day-to-day essentials to prevent poverty and hardship. Instead, the Government now gives a proportion of this money to the council in order for us to support residents affected by the welfare reform changes.</p> <p>Therefore we are considering how we fund the voluntary sector in the future. We are proposing to use this new fund from the Department for Work and Pensions to support voluntary sector organisations and projects which are focussed on helping people with issues surrounding the change to benefits.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>deciding that their lives will be enhanced if they remove themselves from this increasingly pressurised environment with its attendant responsibilities.</p> <p>In summary, there is a fear that removal of the grants will result in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Closure of some Community Centres – representing a real loss to the community. 2. Loss of volunteers/Trustees – it is already difficult to recruit and retain volunteers/Trustees and increasing financial and operational difficulties will inevitably result in the departure of many such valued people and skills. 3. Gradual deterioration in the PCC Community Centre buildings, due to lack of maintenance, resulting in reduction in asset value and, over time, considerable costs of restoration and, probably, an eyesore which will be a blight on the community. 4. A detrimental image to PCC – showing lack of care for its community. 	<p>In addition, council departments will now work directly with their voluntary sector partners, providing them with funding where relevant to deliver services which tackle particular issues in the city.</p> <p>This means that all the grants to voluntary organisations in their current form will end and we propose to adopt this new funding strategy to ensure we are helping those residents in greatest need.</p> <p>A suggestion being put forward is that councillors, through their Community Leadership Fund (CLF), will be able to more appropriately support community centres and residents' associations in the future. So instead of a blanket approach across all community buildings and associations, what is being proposed is a more localised approach which allows councillors to focus their investment on the centres or associations that they feel need their support. Whatever the outcome of the consultation is, we have made a commitment to work with community associations in the city, to make sure that we can find other sources of funding and provide community associations with the right support and right tools.</p> <p>Originally it had been proposed that the CLF fund would be reduced by 30 per cent from 2013/14 and for subsequent</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p>years. However following feedback from members and the Joint Meeting of Scrutiny committees the saving proposal has been revised to reduce the Community Leadership Fund by 30 per cent in 2013/14 only. A review of future years will be undertaken as part of 2014/15 budget setting.</p> <p>Ward councillors will continue to be supported by council officers to help make sure that the remaining CLF supports those projects and groups that are most in need.</p>
Voluntary Sector Grants	<p>My Association occupies a church hall in Mayors Walk, and I understand my earlier email covering my concerns over the lease renewal is now receiving attention from the relevant parties, and we very much welcome that. In response to the reduction of community association funding from £1,750 to £0 over the last few years, I must protest at the level of risk this reduction brings to my association's viability.</p> <p>We fully accept that in this challenging climate of austerity, there is a need to do more with less, I am attempting to develop new revenue streams through the development of a social enterprise, but it is too early to say if this will work, and even if it does, I cannot yet predict the level of income that it will provide over the next three years. Bills for utilities are due to increase by 25% this year and on current hirings we will just about survive, but we will not be able to generate the recommended surplus of 6 months operating costs, or</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments please refer to our previous answer on voluntary sector grants.</p> <p>In addition, the city council would be very happy to work with you as your association explores potential commercial opportunities.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	<p data-bbox="409 284 757 316">£7,500.00 for some years.</p> <p data-bbox="409 352 1182 651">The hall is old, is in desperate need of refurbishment and in particular needs insulation and double glazing. The fabric of the building is tired. We hope that the maintenance contract with Enterprise will address some of the problems, but clearly not all of them, so further funding is needed. All of these pressures mean that the short term viability of the hall is in the balance, and the relatively small investment of the annual grant is a lifeline that will make the difference to our short term position.</p> <p data-bbox="409 691 1189 1126">In summary, our volunteers are keen to develop and improve the hall and are willing to work hard to obtain independent finance, but this loss of the community grant at such a vulnerable time is putting us in a really difficult position and I would urge you to reconsider, as what is a miniscule sum to the council's overall budget is actually of significant benefit to our community efforts. I know it is suggested that Community Associations should apply for CLF money through councillors, and yet that budget was cut to £7,000. With all of the demands on this money from other organisations, I don't think this proposal is sustainable, and particularly as further cuts will no doubt create more need.</p>	
Voluntary Sector Grants	I am taking this opportunity to place my personal feelings at the withdrawal of grants to centres. Many of these are run by volunteers who receive no remuneration for their work whether this is as treasurers, caretakers, booking clerks, secretaries, chair persons, vice chairpersons or	The current proposals set out the removal of grants to voluntary organisations including community centres and residents' associations funded by Peterborough City Council.

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>committee members. Some employ managers, cleaners, caretakers etc., and also provide a most valuable service to the community. These take many forms, pre schools, creches, coffee meetings for elderly, venues for classes, karate, scouts, guides, and the list is endless. On top of this they are run so that the council does not have to pay for utilities and insurance these costs being met by each centre. Even the humble toilet roll has to be paid for. Security and fire systems and also now most of the day to day maintenance is done 'in house'.</p> <p>Should these volunteers decide to pull out of the running of centres, the council would be met with a massive bill to run them by putting in staff to do it. Probably as a base to start from about £20,000 per year per centre in wages etc.</p> <p>Which would be cheaper for the council, that or a small grant, for the lack of a better name, towards the running cost. The present one would only cover our cleaning and wages for one month without utilities etc., so please reconsider as this is a very good 'deal' you get from each centre.</p> <p>I am presently chair of Herlington Community Association which runs the centre there and also holding trustee for other leases and Chair of CAP.</p> <p>I ask that you give serious consideration to this before withdrawing any help for some who really rely on the small amount you presently give.</p>	<p>Over the course of the last 18 months we have been in discussion with the voluntary sector about future funding agreements in the face of reducing resources available to us.</p> <p>At the same time the Government announced that it is stopping Social Fund payments which were Department for Work and Pensions grants paid directly to members of the public in crisis. These grants were used for urgent and immediate needs including electricity meter cards, food or other day-to-day essentials to prevent poverty and hardship. Instead, the Government now gives a proportion of this money to the council in order for us to support residents affected by the welfare reform changes.</p> <p>Therefore we are considering how we fund the voluntary sector in the future. We are proposing to use this new fund from the Department for Work and Pensions to support voluntary sector organisations and projects which are focussed on helping people with issues surrounding the change to benefits.</p> <p>In addition, council departments will now work directly with their voluntary sector partners, providing them with funding where relevant to deliver services which tackle particular issues in the city.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p>This means that all the grants to voluntary organisations in their current form will end and we propose to adopt this new funding strategy to ensure we are helping those residents in greatest need.</p> <p>A suggestion being put forward is that councillors, through their Community Leadership Fund (CLF), will be able to more appropriately support community centres and residents' associations in the future. So instead of a blanket approach across all community buildings and associations, what is being proposed is a more localised approach which allows councillors to focus their investment on the centres or associations that they feel need their support. Whatever the outcome of the consultation is, we have made a commitment to work with community associations in the city, to make sure that we can find other sources of funding and provide community associations with the right support and right tools.</p> <p>Originally it had been proposed that the CLF fund would be reduced by 30 per cent from 2013/14 and for subsequent years. However following feedback from members and the Joint Meeting of Scrutiny committees the saving proposal has been revised to reduce the Community Leadership Fund by 30 per cent in 2013/14 only. A review of future years will be undertaken as part of 2014/15 budget setting.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p>Ward councillors will continue to be supported by council officers to help make sure that the remaining CLF supports those projects and groups that are most in need.</p>
Renewables	<p>These relate to the Solar and Wind proposals that if planning is approved will affect a large number of Peterborough residents, most of who do not live in the urban envelope that outsiders see as Peterborough.</p> <p>P61 and you will have to forgive me as I only used my fingers to add this one up but it would seem there is going to be a Capital Investment by Peterborough of £150,000 over a two year period. Yet the income from the out lay if the figures on P56 are to be true and Income of £30,000 which to me seems a very poor return or perhaps I have missed something in the fine print that you have not produced.</p> <p>So if this is what you are proposing to go forward as a budget can you NOT put this forward as I feel this will mean that I will be out of pocket as a Peterborough Tax Payer.</p> <p>So please explain, but if you cannot give me a satisfactory explanation I propose that you withdraw the proposal for this Solar and Wind generation scheme. Firstly on financial grounds and secondly on the fact if approved it will have a detrimental affect on mine and your local community as the countryside will never return to what it is now a jewel.</p>	<p>The Capital Investment cost to which you refer is actually £149.215 million over two years for a project lasting 25 years. The project income for the first five years of the project is £46.939 million - so considerably more than the figure you mention.</p> <p>The figures to which you refer relate only to the first five years of the project, rather than whole 25 year period. The calculations on which the business plan for the project are based show that the net income (after costs) for the combined wind and solar project is £114 million. This equates to an average income of about £4.5 million each year, which will be used to support Peterborough City Council's frontline services such as care for children, vulnerable people and the elderly.</p> <p>In order to safeguard these services in the face of funding cuts from central government, this income will prove essential. The alternative, in light of significantly reducing funding from central government, is equally significant increases in council tax, which would disproportionately affect the lowest earners in our city.</p> <p>I can understand your concerns regarding the potential</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p>impact of the proposed scheme on wildlife and the countryside. The proposals to use land in the countryside come only after photovoltaic (solar) panels have already been installed on a number of suitable buildings owned by the city council and all council-owned land assessed for suitability – albeit on a very small scale compared to the proposed renewable energy project.</p> <p>As outlined on page 7 of the ‘Environment Impact: Non Technical Summary’ for each proposed site (available on the Peterborough renewable energy project website – www.peterboroughrenewableenergy.org.uk):</p> <p>1.1.3 The proposed development is the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011, which require an EIA to be carried out; and the results to be included in an Environmental Statement (ES) to accompany the planning application.</p> <p>1.1.4 EIA is an assessment process applied to developments that potentially have significant effects on the environment, and a useful introduction is provided by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA): <i>“the EIA process ensures that potential effects on the environment are considered, including natural resources such as water, air and soil; conservation of species and habitats; and community issues such as visual effects and impacts on the population. EIA</i></p>

Category	Issue	Response
		<p><i>provides a mechanism by which the interaction of environmental effects resulting from development can be predicted, allowing them to be avoided or reduced through the development of mitigation measures. As such, it is a critical part of the decision-making process."</i></p> <p>The 'mitigation measures' mentioned here also relate to all aspects of the construction of the proposed solar farm, to ensure that any disruption caused by traffic and construction work is minimised.</p> <p>Please be advised that when the 25 years of the project are up, we anticipate that provision to be made to return the land to current, i.e. agricultural, use – the classification of the land will not change as a result of our proposals.</p>
Library hours	Friends of Werrington Library (FOWL) will be delivering a petition to the City Council calling for the Werrington Library to maintain it's opening hours at the current level of 37.	<p>Please see the separate report on Vivacity's public consultation about the proposed reduction in library hours.</p> <p>Your petition will be passed to Cabinet members.</p>
Library hours	<p>I would rather see hours at the libraries saved than extra editions of Your Peterborough.</p> <p>Libraries could also be a source of information about the changes. They are easily located with in their communities unlike old copies of Your Peterborough.</p> <p>Libraries can also hold the appropriate documents so they can be accessed there and then.</p>	<p>Please see the separate report on Vivacity's public consultation about the proposed reduction in library hours.</p> <p>As you mention many residents still don't have the internet - Your Peterborough allows us to communicate with residents about our services and plans, and although we engage with the media and have social media sites, this is not the case for all residents, particularly older residents.</p>

Category	Issue	Response
	Many are still not on the internet so that public computers help to keep them connected reducing hours limits this access.	By producing a quarterly magazine that is distributed to every household in the city we are ensuring that we can communicate key issues with all residents.
Enterprise	Don't pay them one more penny. Improving efficiency and reducing pension costs is the whole point of having a private company. This looks like "Jobs for the boys" with money going to old friends. .	The overall volume of work has increased for Enterprise Peterborough as the city has grown since the start of the partnership. In particular, provisions for street cleaning, maintaining green spaces and bin collections need to be increased.
Your Peterborough/communications	scrap it	Your Peterborough allows us to communicate with residents about our services and plans, and although we engage with the media and have social media sites, this is not the case for all residents, particularly older residents. By producing a quarterly magazine that is distributed to every household in the city we are ensuring that we can communicate key issues with residents. We are, however, currently investigating future digital releases of Your Peterborough in order to reduce the number of copies that would need to be printed.
Your Peterborough/communications	If you want to save money and help the environment, I would suggest removing the funding for 'Your Peterborough'.	Thank you for your comment. Please see our previous answer on Your Peterborough.

Category	Issue	Response
Riverside Opportunity Area	South Bank - justify how money will be earned back	<p>The South Bank along with other sites, including the Vista housing development and the Community Stadium project at Peterborough United's ground will now make up the Riverside Opportunity Area.</p> <p>The council's vision for Riverside is for the area to become a thriving high quality quarter that reconnects the area with the city centre;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mix of new homes and businesses • Leisure facilities • Tourist attractions • Vibrant and diverse urban neighbourhood • An active quarter during the day and in the evening <p>To make this regeneration project possible the city council is now in the process of appointing a private development partner that would invest in and work with the council on the project.</p> <p>Once a partner has been appointed we will be able to display plans of what the site could look like in the future and to hear your views on Riverside. The regeneration of Riverside will be vital to how the city develops and grows over the coming decades. Construction is hoped to be underway by 2016.</p>
Deputy Chief Executive	Permanent deletion of Deputy Chief Executive's post – don't include as a saving. Misleading.	This is a budgetary document and this is the correct way to permanently delete a post. Previously the post was listed as unfilled.

Category	Issue	Response
Neighbourhood Committees	Scrap, but end culture of secrecy. Provide information and people will spot areas where money is wasted.	<p>Neighbourhood Committees were introduced as a way of engaging with and involving local residents in the council's decision making process. In some parts of the city they worked very well, but in others they have been less successful. We recognise that in areas where there is a parish council, the additional burden of Neighbourhood Committees is unnecessary and can sometimes cause confusion and delay. Therefore we are proposing to end Neighbourhood committee as part of the budget setting process.</p> <p>Instead, we are proposing to work more closely with existing parish councils to ensure they have the full support of the city council when carrying out their wide range of functions and powers.</p>
Environment	Climate change/carbon reduction – too expensive.	Thank you for your comment
Road investment	Bourges Boulevard, Crescent Bridge to Bright Street improvement scheme – no mandate for bridge removal. Remove from budget and do if/when it's actually needed.	This would lead to be better connection between the between the train station and city centre for pedestrians and cyclists, replacing the footbridge with street level crossings and better paths and cycleways.
Road investment	David's Lane/ Staniland Way, Werrington - safety junction improvements need to be funded by Tesco. This item suggests a deal has been done for us to pay for it. Remove from budget.	Thank you for your comment

Category	Issue	Response
Road investment	Hi-tech congestion reducing measures – free alternatives are available or surveys of residents. Just no need to spend this money.	This will help reduce congestion in the city by keeping drivers better informed about hold-ups on the roads and how to avoid them.
Street Lighting	Turn more lights off especially in the early hours when streets are empty.	<p>Peterborough’s parkway street lighting is now 30 to 40 years old and is reaching the end its life. Due to advances in lighting technology recently we are now in a position to efficiently and effectively target this important asset and in so doing taking into account safety, environmental, energy and on-going maintenance considerations.</p> <p>The authority is committed to improve its street lighting stock with the use of the latest technology and is currently in the process of upgrading 6200 units to Light Emitting Diode (LED) within the urban areas. It is just this technology we are looking to use to light the required areas of the parkways combining with systems which allows for the dimming through the early hours when traffic volumes are less if required.</p> <p>Our Cabinet remains firm on its priorities against the funding challenges it faces. Growth, regeneration and economic development of the city incorporates a proposal in the budget setting process, to invest £1 million year on year for five years to address specifically our parkway</p>

Category	Issue	Response
		lighting. This investment, if approved by Full Council, will allow for the removal of the old columns on sections suitable to do so and the installation of new columns and LED lighting at junctions and interchanges, ensuring our network is fit for purpose and sustainable for many more years to come.
Road Improvement	Rhubarb Bridge – no money spent without public support. Bridges are safer. No mandate to do this at all.	The footbridges over the roundabout at the junction of the A15 and A47 (junction 18), often known as Brotherhoods roundabout and Rhubarb Bridge, are at the end of their serviceable life. The older they get the more often they need to be repaired and the more costly it is to carry out the work. Therefore this proposal is to look at alternative ways for pedestrians to get safely across this junction. The initial investment of £160k would pay to investigate and design the new crossing and the £2.5m in 2015/16 would pay for the new scheme to be built. If these works did not go ahead the footbridges would eventually have to close.
Strategic Client Services	Cancel the brown bin collections altogether. Allow residents to keep the bin as a home composter. Or if too scared of the PR from this U-turn start charging people £30-£50 p/a.	We propose to reduce the brown bin collection over winter months when they are less commonly used. However these bins are well used by a large number of residents during the rest of the year.
ICT Services	Use a normal supplier that the private sector would (such	

Category	Issue	Response
	<p>as Dell) to massively reduce the ridiculous costs. Don't purchase any more Apple products.</p>	<p>We purchase phones and other electronic equipment through negotiating large contracts with suppliers, and will always aim to get the most efficient price, which tends to be much lower than the same equipment would cost on the high street.</p> <p>We are also proposing to procure a new supplier to meet our broadband needs which will result in a saving of £100k per year from 2013/14. In addition, we are proposing to reduce the cost of our ICT contract by creating efficiencies through merging services and centralising ICT budgets that will save a further £100k per year from 2013/14.</p>
Roman gallery	<p>Review why this is costing so much. Where did the museum money go? Poor value for money again</p>	<p>We have allocated this money in the budget for 2015/16; however we will be looking for external funding to cover these costs.</p>

Unite the Union Budget response

To whom it may concern,

Please consider the following response from Unite the Union as part of your budget consultation finding.

- **Settlement-** We are disappointed with the Governments settlement to this local authority and believe the coalition government should end these austerity measures and invest in public services and infrastructure to boost the economy. The government should also reduce the deficit by collecting tax from the wealthy & corporations rather than hitting families and communities.
- **Council Tax** – We would urge the authority to raise the local council tax and not take the government 2.95% grant. This is due to the limited shelf life it has, leaving the authority with a deficit in future years. Our principle is small rises in line with inflation are better for the tax payer than dramatic rises in council tax or sudden loss of services.
- **Council tax benefit-** we believe the government's move to tax the poorest in our community is unjust and the council should continue in not taxing those on benefits or low incomes.
- **Investment & savings-** The local authority should look at making better investments in order to raise money for the city. This should include getting a better return or selling the Peterborough Football Stadium. The investment should also include building much needed affordable council housing for social and private letting. Sell assets and equipment that are no longer needed. Save money by taking services such as Administration in house to provide better value & stop Serco from profiting from tax payer money.
- **Neighbourhood Councils & electoral matters-** We agree with scrapping neighbourhood councils. We would urge members to reduce the allowances they receive for additional responsibilities.
- **Your Peterborough-** Scrap your Peterborough magazine idea unless it can be cost neutral. Now is not the time to be producing luxuries in communication. Do more to get everyone online.
- **Employee management-** Streamline the management & functions across the departments, such as commissioning, accounts, etc. Train managers to deal better with employee sickness and performance.
- **Street cleaning-** Create a proud of Peterborough campaign rather than spending extra money for Enterprise to do litter picks they used to do.
- **Play service-** Do not scrap the play service, build it into the much needed Early intervention and prevention in Peterborough. Over the last two years Unite has requested to meet local authority officers and elected members repeatedly regarding this service. Unite is extremely disappointed at the lack of response and willingness to work together on a sustainable solution for this service. The authority could have saved vast sums of money in this area had they consulted with us sooner. As a minimum the service should be maintained through a voluntary sector partnership. Invest in community groups in order that they can

run the building and make more of them to help the community and also sustain the community open access session run by council play services. Charge schools for the session play services deliver to them. Form a Peterborough Play council.

- **Residential units-** Do not privatise Clare Lodge we believe it will continue to make vast amounts of profit for the local authority. We feel the quality of the service will decline and thus council's reputation and the profitability will be compromised if this were outsourced. The liability risk would increase to the council as should the centre fail it will take a lot of time, money and resources to turn around. An example of this is the decline of services provided in Enterprise's provision.
- **Terms & conditions-** Do not change the sickness entitlement but invest in Benedon scheme for staff and work with the trade unions earlier in the process to reduce sickness as discussed on the away day. We are unhappy about a freeze of increments for one year as it takes us out of national T&Cs but should it happen we would insist it reinstated after this time. We are opposed to any move toward performance related pay.

Please acknowledge receipt of this,

U 4 MAR 2013
Financial Services Manager
Peterborough City Council

27 Feb 2013.

Dear Sir,

I write to express my dismay to your future plans to cut subsidy to rural bus services on Sundays especially service 401/404 which serves 16 villages between Peterborough and Stamford. I am 65, retired, ramblers and make use of the 401/404 Sunday bus to get to various start points for our weekly walk. This is the only local rambling group that use the bus, other mainly use cars to get to their start points.

Without this service I would have to use my car to continue walks. Many only have Sunday free to do this enjoyable, healthy and social activity.

I feel the proposed cuts are a backward step in the 21st century to the quality of our lives who enjoy the outdoors. Please save the 401/404 Sunday bus it must be worth it overall.

Yours Sincerely

Fuller

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you in response of the possible withdrawal of the 401/404 bus Sunday and Bank holidays

The journeys are all the villages between Pelsbrough and Stamford.

ie. Coster, Barnton, Wansford, Duddington, Bughley, Bamock etc. The list of villages is endless.

The reason for my journeys are to walk in the surrounding countryside.

My quality of life would be affected as I enjoy the walks and the company that I find here. Also I pick up history & other knowledge seen only when walking, plus the fresh air that is unpolluted.

If there were no buses for me to use I would add to the volume of pollution by using other transport.

Yours sincerely

Mrs. J.M. Bowen.

Community Action Peterborough's Comments on the PCC Budget Proposals 2013/4

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to the budget proposals through the consultation process. Community Action Peterborough would like to comment on the specific proposals on pages 41 and 42 of your document entitled "Medium-term Financial Strategy Proposals Document from Cabinet", dated January 2013. We are very concerned to read all funding to community associations will be withdrawn, and would like to comment on the particular impact your proposals will have on the viability of associations in the future.

There are 54 Community Associations in the Peterborough area, the majority housed in Council owned property. Over the past few years there has been a significant reduction in council grants to Community Associations from £1,750 pa to £700 (with a potential for some centres to apply for an additional £400 for particular projects that required additional grant funding and met PCC criteria for disbursement.) The gradual erosion of the budget allocation produced a reduction from £94,500 to £37,800 of grant funding, which is, in effect, a cut of 60% to Community Associations. The total grant budget you show in the budget for the voluntary sector, community centre and social fund grants is £607,000, or just over 6% of the available funds.

The current proposal is to withdraw all grant funding and to replace it with access to the Community Leadership Fund, reduced to £7,000 per ward & allocated to local organisations through ward councillors.

The overall effect of this decision on Community Centres will be disproportionately damaging, and we strongly urge you to reconsider the proposals as they stand. The reasons why you should reconsider are listed below:

1. Many Community Associations run on shoestring budgets with minimal or no reserves. The user groups tend to be on small or fixed incomes, and many are not able to bear the level of increase in hire fees the loss of the grant will require. Costs for Insurance, utilities and services have risen dramatically over the last three years and there is every indication that such rises will continue. For many associations the grant provided is the difference between balancing the books and having to close due to insufficient funds.
2. Association Committees depend upon unpaid volunteers to commit their time and energy into supporting their local community and to employ staff to administer or clean the buildings. Many committee members do all of that for free and have no paid staff. The pressure these funding changes will bring are clearly going to have a de-motivating affect on volunteers and there is a risk that centres will close where volunteers no longer want the responsibility to manage with less and less support from the local authority.
3. Whilst utility bills can be expected to increase annually, additional costs caused by council withdrawal of services could not have been predicted and had not been factored into budgets. These costs include paying for pest control, PAT testing, PRS/PPL music and waste collection, although there is some variation between centres in what is provided by the council and what is funded by the Association. However, as free services are removed

by the council and replaced with paid-for services, the association budget is hit with a double whammy of grant cuts and fixed cost increases.

4. Community Associations are excellent value for money, with a high social return on investment – studies show that in such voluntary organisations, every pound spent delivers a value of nine times the original investment, i.e. the value of unpaid volunteer time and activity that generates additional income and sponsorship. It seems ridiculous that while paid for services are facing retraction and closure, any replacement or alternative service delivered by local community volunteers will be unable to fill the gap, as they will be engaged on their own survival, trying to locate sufficient funds just to keep going.
5. The CLF is a useful fund both for local improvement works and also for community organisations to obtain funding. In the current financial climate all voluntary groups will have the same pressures, and as a result the demand on the CLF will increase as the only available stream of income for a broader collection of voluntary groups. It makes no sense to reduce the CLF in such a climate, as all it means is that there will be less money for eligible groups without the added pressure of demands from Community Associations. Even if the CLF was maintained at the current level of £10,000 p.a. it is doubtful that will be sufficient to keep voluntary groups adequately supported and it should properly be augmented with £2,000.00 per community centre so the councillors can support all the disparate organisations in their ward fairly.
6. Community Centre buildings require maintenance and items need replacement when they wear out. The grant fund can be put to use to replace items that require replacement and which are not covered by council maintenance contracts. The volunteers are able to mobilise support from local trades people to deliver replacements and repairs at below market rates. This option will disappear with the loss in the grant funds.

In the light of the above reasons we would urge you to reconsider the cut of grant funding to community associations. The proportion allocated to Community Associations is insignificant to the overall council budget, but the damage to the sector will be disproportionately high. Without the grant we can foresee closure of centres, and the political impact of that on local communities should not be underestimated.

We therefore urge the councillors to think again. Community Centres are one of the few sectors that run on tiny budgets, and can assist the council in delivering services in austere times, but without adequate support they will not be able to do so.

Yours Sincerely

Jim Simpson, Chair
Andy Coles, Vice Chair
Shirley Gardner, Secretary
John Mason, Treasurer

Community Action Peterborough

Mr Malcolm Wade



25/02/2013

Ref: NEWS CAMPAIGN Peterborough Telegraph 21/02/2013

City Council needs to cut 17 Million from Budget

Protests to take place in a bid to save play centres from closures, maybe the PCC should reconsider.

Dear Sir

Having read the report in our local News paper it accured to me that a saving of only 17 Million Across a Budget the size that our City's Budget would be, needs a saving of many more Millions than Is suggested and across many more areas, making a saving along the lines suggested needs a bold program of Intensive surgery across all areas of the town hall and right across all protocol's, Town Halls in general are notorious for haemorrhaging money from all areas, and Peterborough's town hall Will be no different, with all the good will in the world city Councillors are not the people to vote on such a Move as to remove items from the environment that could affect our children's very existence, A safety net that at present holds up the very pillars of life around families that depend on Being able to leave there children with people they know and trust, what price do we place on our children's Welfare and well being when we could make savings many other ways many millions of pounds Are lost per year with having to run two town halls much more than 17 Million, I know you could Place a fingers on that cost, many millions have been lost and are still being lost making good Our city centre over the past year or so, the list is endless; please try to find a way to leave Our Play centres out of your face lift, the powers that be will ask for more cut over the next year or so just like Oliver twist, the group I represent in all this has no home to run its affairs from and having Paid the church here in paston over the last year £750 pounds for a hiring of its hall for just 60 hours and to its favour Accent Nene some £240 pounds for hiring of its hall for the 30 hours, our use of both halls just 2 hours per week some £990 pounds trying to give our Members a respite from there four wall week end's with just the T.V and knitting and very little else maybe you could throw us a Line of hope, the face of Peterborough we the People never see but should see and must see, we Will understand we run our Family's with years of making very more cuts than officials in the Town Hall will ever see tell us the truth, let's cut out things that do not matter and save, our Group is Paston and Gunthorpe Pals, we have been running for just over one year now and are self financing With very little interference from outside help, we are a not for profit Group with a five Member Steering committee and room for six more, two of our members could be corporate body's with Links to the town hall we know the way and it's not borrowing, and not Grants.

Yours Respectfully

Malcolm Wade