

**PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD**  
**24 FEBRUARY 2010**

**The Mayor – Councillor Irene Walsh**

**Present:**

Councillors: Arculus, Ash, Benton, Cereste, Collins, M Dalton, S Dalton, D Day, S Day, Dobbs, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fower, Fletcher, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goldspink, Goodwin, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Khan, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Lowndes, Miners, Morley, Murphy, Nash, Nawaz, Newton, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Sharp, Swift, Thacker, Trueman, Walsh, Wilkinson and Winslade.

**One Minute's Silence**

The Mayor announced that former Mayor Mary Rainey had recently died and invited the meeting to observe one minute's silence in Mary's memory.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Allen, Burton, C Day, Fazal and Todd.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Members were advised that any submission on their Register of Interest form, which had been distributed to each councillor, need not be declared at the meeting.

Councillor Cereste declared a personal interest in item 7(i)a as Chairman of NHS Peterborough.

Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest that was prejudicial in item 7(i)a concerning the proposed amendments from Councillor Goldspink as he was on the Board of the Peterborough Environment City Trust. He would therefore, leave the chamber for any debate on this part of item 7(i)a.

Councillor Lee declared a personal interest in item 7(i)a as a member of the Police Authority.

Councillor Murphy requested information from the Solicitor to the Council as to why Councillor Cereste did not need to leave the chamber for item 7(i)a on the agenda as he did last year. The Solicitor to the Council, having obtained Councillor Cereste's permission to do so, advised Members that Councillor Cereste's position in the Council this year was one of greater authority and therefore Councillor Cereste was better able to balance the public interest across both organisations.

**3. Minutes of the previous meetings**

The minutes of the meetings held 2 December 2009 and 21 December 2009 were agreed and signed by the Mayor as an accurate record.

## **4. Communications Time**

### **4(i) Mayor's Announcements**

The report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period 20 November 2009 to 20 February 2010 was noted.

### **4(ii) Leader's Announcements**

The Leader reported that following the last full Council meeting, investigations had been made into webcasting Council meetings and this had been shared with group leaders. A full report would be submitted to the next Full Council meeting.

### **4(iii) Chief Executive's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

## **5. Community Involvement Time**

### **5(i) Questions with Notice by Members of the public**

Questions were asked in respect of Children's Centres, public toilet facilities in Alma Road and figures for interpreting services at Thorpe Wood Police Station.

### **5(ii) Questions with notice by Members of the Council relating to ward matters to Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen**

Questions were asked in respect of the sale of land at Dickens Street, parking in Dogsthorpe, traffic management and traffic signalling. Due to time constraints, Councillor Sanders would receive a written response to his question. Councillor Sanders passed on his thanks to Paul Phillipson, Executive Director Operations, for helping to resolve the issues raised in his question concerning traffic management.

### **5(iii) Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities**

There were no questions raised.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda items 5(i) and 5(ii) are attached at **Appendix A**.

### **5(iv) Petitions submitted by Members or Residents**

Petitions were received from Councillor Lee in respect of Improvements at the Dell Playground in Woodston and from Councillor Fower in opposition to the development of allotments at Gunthorpe Recreation Ground.

## **6. Executive Business Time**

### **6(i) Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive**

Questions were asked in respect of the following:

- Snow / ice hazards on pavements – public responsibility/liability issues;
- Progress on implementing Fares Fair programme;
- Role of corporate parents and corporate parenting group;
- Removal of yellow salt bins from sheltered housing complexes.

Councillor Murphy agreed to remove his question as previous responses had already answered his queries.

Councillors Miners and Goldspink agreed to receive written responses to their questions.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 6 (i) is attached at **Appendix B**.

## **6(ii) Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions**

Members received and noted a report summarising:

- Decisions from the Cabinet Meetings held 14 December 2009 and 8 February 2010;
- Use of the council's call-in mechanism, which had been invoked once since the last meeting;
- Waiver of Call-in provision, in respect of the decision to award a loan to Orton Community Transport Association;
- Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 20 November 2009 to 12 February 2010.

### **Questions were asked about the following:**

#### City Council's Biodiversity Strategy: Update of Strategy to Take Account of Legislative Changes

Councillor Sandford queried why the strategy had not been approved as it was already an amended version. Councillor Lee responded that further work was still to be undertaken before a final version could be approved. Councillor Sandford raised the issue that recommendations had previously been approved in a strategy in 2003 and queried why work had not begun on these recommendations already. Councillor Lee responded that previous recommendations were not relevant to the decision to refer the current strategy back to the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee.

#### Peterborough's New Growth Delivery Arrangements

Councillor Fower queried which capital market specialists had been involved in dialogue with the city council. Councillor Cereste responded that this information was not currently available but all avenues were currently being explored to deliver growth. Councillor Fower queried that there seemed to be a reliance on advice from the private sector even in an economic downturn. Councillor Cereste commented that both public and private sector organisations could be used to deliver growth in Peterborough in the difficult economic climate.

#### Refreshing the Local Strategic Plan

Councillor Fower queried which other public services the city council would collaborate with. Councillor Cereste responded that any other organisation that wanted to participate could collaborate with the city council.

#### Older People's Accommodation Strategy Implementation

Councillor Miners queried whether land adjacent to Welland House was being used for the redevelopment and if not, why? Councillor Miners further queried the degree of involvement of Cross Keys Homes in the agreements and developments at The Croft and at the Peverels sites. Councillor Lamb agreed to submit a written response to Councillor Miners detailing the information requested.

#### Bus Service Review

Councillor Sandford requested to know the cost to hold the Cabinet meeting that received the called-in Decision when the only change recommended was to correct a verbal update that was not

originally included in the approved Cabinet Decision. Councillor Sandford requested that Councillor Hiller provide the cost for holding the meeting as if the verbal update had not been omitted from the report in the first instance, the meeting would not have been needed. Councillor Cereste responded that any cost associated with holding the extra Cabinet meeting was not relevant to the decision taken and that Cabinet met to consider a call-in referral from a Scrutiny Committee, not at Councillor Hiller's request.

Councillor Ash queried the rationale for ending the 410 service between Newark and Dogsthorpe as the service was valued by many residents. Councillor Hiller responded that Officers had given assurances that no journey would be unable to be taken following the changes to services.

#### Peterborough Local Development Framework: Peterborough Site Allocations Document (Preferred Options Stage)

Councillor Murphy queried the location of some sites contained in the document as they seemed to be situated on flood plains. Councillor Cereste responded that the document was entering a consultation phase and therefore, proposed sites could be changed.

#### Peterborough City Council Lottery Grants – Transfer to Sports Aid

Cllr Fitzgerald queried whether Peterborough City Council would receive any credit for its contribution of Lottery grant money to Sports Aid. Councillor Lee responded that Lottery grants given to Sports Aid were spent in Peterborough and a press release was sent out but press coverage of this was disappointing and requested the members of the press present to re-run the story to help promote the work of Sports Aid.

#### Orton Community Transport Association – trading as Dial-a-ride – Approval of Loan

Councillor Fower queried the amount of money loaned to the organisation and the reason for this. Councillor Cereste responded that the amount of loan was around £10,000 and this stopped the organisation becoming bankrupt and ensured people working at the organisation remained in employment. Councillor Fower responded that members of the public should have been able to access this information previously.

#### Amendment to Community Leadership Fund (CLF) Procedures

Councillor Fower queried the changes and questioned whether the procedure was becoming less democratic if the Leader can ultimately decide the use of the funds. Councillor Cereste responded that changes increased the democracy and fairness in the process as any both sides of any dispute will be able to be balanced before a final decision was made.

Councillor Goldpsink queried that the 1 March deadline for submission of requests was too far before the financial year's end of 31 March. Councillor Cereste responded that the one month notice before the financial year's end could be looked at again.

Councillor Saltmarsh queried how many Wards had not spent all of their allocation of CLF monies. Councillor Cereste responded that that information was not available to him but could request that it was published.

Councillor Sandford queried that instead of all Ward Councillors agreeing to a scheme, the Leader would be taking power away from the Ward Councillors. Councillor Cereste responded that the Leader of the Council would not need to become involved if the Councillors within a Ward communicated with each other better to resolve the allocation of the funds.

Councillor J R Fox requested that any wards that had not spent their CLF monies by the year's end should be published.

Councillor Sanders queried whether Community Leadership Fund monies would be moved to Neighbourhood Council control. Councillor Cereste responded that there were no plans to do this.

Councillor Trueman queried whether the process could be made easier if Councillors were excluded from it altogether. Councillor Cersete responded that this would not be the case.

**The meeting adjourned from 8.30pm to 8.45pm.**

## **7. Council Business Time**

### **7(i) Executive Recommendations**

#### **a) Medium Term Financial Strategy – Budget 2010/11 and Medium Term Financial Plan to 2014/15, incorporating the Council Tax Resolutions 2010/11, the Asset Management Plan and Capital Strategy**

Council considered the budget for 2010/11 in the context of a 5 year medium term financial plan and corporate plan running to 2014/15 taking into account both its own requirements and those of relevant precepting bodies such as the Police, Fire and Parish Councils where applicable.

The Cabinet Member for Resources presented the budget and moved the recommendations detailed in the Budget Book, together with amendments detailed in Appendices C and D of the Order Paper (attached as **Appendix C** to these minutes). During his speech, the Cabinet Member for Resources highlighted the following points:

- The economic crisis has led to considerable uncertainty in economic matters;
- Central Government had increasing debts to pay off;
- The concessionary bus fares scheme for elderly residents was increasingly popular and funds were needed for this;
- Central Government grant had not increased in line with an increase in population;
- Many operational savings had been made within the Council totalling around £31million;
- The Manor Drive initiative alone has helped save £1million;
- Council Tax remains 10% below the national average and Peterborough remains in the lowest 5 local authorities for Council Tax levels;
- Departmental Delivery Contracts would be focused on to ensure services were being delivered.

The Cabinet Member for Resources commended the budget to the Council. In seconding the proposals, Cllr Cereste reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

(Councillor Sandford leaves the meeting)

The Mayor announced that an amendment had been received from Councillor Goldspink, details of which were outlined in Appendix A(1) of the Order Paper (attached as **Appendix D** to these minutes). Councillor Goldspink presented the amendment which proposed the following:

- A reduction in the efficiency savings proposed for Adult Social Care;
- A removal of the liability for rent and rates for the Women's Resource Centre until 2012;
- A removal of the provision for Water Taxi infrastructure;
- A reduction in expenditure on Council Communications team and in Chairman's and Cabinet allowances;
- Halving the cost of translation services;
- A removal of Wi-Fi provision in the city centre;
- A withdrawal of Peterborough Environment City Trust core funding and operations manager salary support;
- A postponement of the programme of events for Peterborough Area, Environmental Projects and Investment in Heritage by one year;
- A reduction in the grant to Opportunity Peterborough;

- A removal of the increase proposed by Councillor Seaton's amended budget for the implementation of a programme of events for Peterborough area.
- Increases in grants to Community Associations and funds to tackle potholes and cracks in roads;
- A partial restoration of some rural bus services and retention of school meal subsidies;
- A removal of the charge for bulky waste collections;
- A reduction in Council tax from 2.5% to 1.9%.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Murphy who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

A debate followed after which Councillor Murphy highlighted issues including the unstable financial climate, the need to address issues now rather than making too many long term plans and the need to consider the priorities of the residents of the city first. A vote was taken on the amendment. This was DEFEATED by 2 in favour, 41 against and 6 abstentions.

(Councillor Sandford returned to the meeting)

The Mayor announced that a second amendment had been received from Councillor Sandford, details of which were outlined in Appendix B(1) of the Order Paper (attached as **Appendix E** to these minutes). Councillor Sandford presented the amendment which proposed the following:

- A discontinuation of Your Peterborough Magazine;
- A discontinuation of the Community Leadership Fund;
- A reduction in budget for consultants/interim managers by replacement with directly employed posts;
- A removal of provision for water taxis;
- A removal of provision for City Centre Wi-Fi;
- A removal of the provision for revenue costs of Cathedral Square fountains and require Opportunity Peterborough to fund this;
- A reduction in Members' allowances budget by deleting Cabinet Advisor or some Cabinet posts;
- Increased funding for streetlight maintenance and replacement;
- Increase funding for pavements, footpaths and cycle ways;
- Retain funding for litter bins;
- Restore bus service subsidy budget;
- Allow school meals subsidy;
- Increase winter maintenance budget;
- Restore funding for public toilets;
- Increase tree and shrub planting and improvement of urban green space;
- Reduce the savings proposed in Adult Social Care;
- Extend time period for Park and Ride service;
- Increase contribution to PCT to reduce teenage pregnancy rates.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Fower who reserved his right to speak later in the debate.

A debate followed after which Councillor Fower highlighted issues including that many vulnerable people had not been considered in the proposed budget, the Your Peterborough magazine was an unnecessary luxury, Community Leadership Fund money often went unspent and causes such as the St Theresa's Day Centre could be assisted instead of Wi-Fi provision in the city centre. A vote was taken on the amendment. This was DEFEATED by 3 in favour, 36 against and 11 abstentions.

A debate was held on the substantive budget as proposed by the Cabinet Member for Resources and a vote taken.

During the debate above, the Mayor moved a motion that the guillotine be extended beyond 11pm to incorporate the brief adjournment held earlier in the meeting. Councillor Fower seconded the motion which was **AGREED**.

It was **RESOLVED** (35 votes in favour, 5 against and 8 abstentions) to approve:

- The revenue budget 2010/11 and Medium Term Financial Plan for 2011/12 to 2014/15 set in the context of the Sustainable Community Strategy;
- The capital programme for 2010/11 to 2014/15 and related strategies and indicators;
- The council tax increase of 2.5% for 2010/11 and indicative increases of 2.5% in each year until 2014/15;
- The amendments set out at **Appendix C** to these minutes; and
- The council tax resolution set out at **Appendix F** to these minutes including the proposed council tax level for the new Hampton Parish Council.

## **7(ii) Committee Recommendations**

### **a) Publication of Members' Interests and Gifts and Hospitality Registers – Standards Committee recommendation**

Councillor Miners moved the recommendations as set out within the report. Councillor Saltmarsh seconded the motion. A brief debate was held where the Solicitor to the Council confirmed that, in practice, Members would have to request an item be withheld from the website.

The recommendations in the report were **APPROVED**.

## **7(iii) Notices of Motion**

None were received.

## **7(iv) Reports and Recommendations**

### **a) Appointment to Committee**

Councillor Lee moved the recommendation in the report that Councillor Arculus replace Councillor Dobbs on the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee. This was seconded by Councillor David Day.

The recommendation in the report was **APPROVED**.

Mayor  
11.15 p.m.

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RAISED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 5 -COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME

### 5(i) Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

#### 1. **Mr John Shearman asked the Cabinet member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development:**

Some months ago the Council closed the car park in Alma Road and in so doing exacerbated the already dire parking situation in that area. The Council is now proposing to close the public toilets on the same site which, in the view of residents, will encourage the street drinkers who congregate in that area to urinate in public places. Why does the Council not care about the quality of life of the residents in this small part of Peterborough?

#### **Councillor Hiller responded:**

The toilets at Alma Road are regularly abused and provide little facility for any local resident. Needles and other drugs paraphernalia have to be removed on a twice daily basis and the buildings internally have been covered in excrement and other bodily fluids. The persons responsible for this abuse do not respect the segregation and on recent occasions as many as twelve men have had to be removed from the ladies toilets. The recommendation for the closure and other toilets for various reasons has therefore been put to Council as part of the budget process.

#### **Mr John Shearman asked the following supplementary question:**

If the Council accepts that the behaviour of some of the users is a problem why was no response forthcoming from Councillor Peach when I wrote to him on 28 September last year?

#### **Councillor Hiller responded:**

I am not aware of any correspondence with Councillor Peach but this matter could be discussed within the Neighbourhood Council for your area.

#### 2. **Mr Ed Murphy asked the Cabinet member for Children's Services:**

Recently the Children's play facility at South Bretton has been closed and the facilities at Hobson's have been closed for a number of years and never replaced. Under the last Conservative administration it was incorrectly stated via the press that children's play had overspent. The council was however considering the sell off of sites to developers and the closure of play centres. What plans are there to re-open and provide more children's play centres for a growing population with more and more children? Was it a decision of the council, the cabinet member, a consultant or an officer to close the facilities in Bretton and are there any more closures planned by this administration?

#### **Cllr Scott responded:**

There are no plans to close play centres on a permanent basis.

A peripatetic play worker, supported by casual staff has continued to provide a service to children aged 5-13 in the central ward. Recently with extended school funding, additional sporting activities have been organised in the Gladstone Park Recreation Centre.

The decision to close Copeland in South Bretton on a temporary basis was a solution to staffing shortages and was taken by an officer.

This was based on:



- being the least suitable building of all the centres for the activity;
- the centre was located in the least disadvantaged of all the areas;
- another play centre was located a mile away and we have offered transport during the period of the closure.

There are no plans to sell any sites and we are looking at how we can develop the sites to be centres for children and young people aged 0-19.

**Mr Murphy asked the following supplementary question:**

It is fair to believe that a temporary closure would result in a reopening of the centre in the future, can you confirm what transport arrangements would be put in place if it were to remain closed in the view that the Conservative Party propose to reduce the budgets for play centres by 25%?

**Councillor Scott responded:**

I cannot to commit to all play centres remaining open indefinitely in the current financial climate. I can provide a written response to the question about future transport arrangements. I was aware of the officer decision to close the play centre in question.

**3. Mr Ed Murphy asked the Police Authority Representative:**

Following recent controversy over the use of incorrect figures by Conservative politicians, I would like to ask if our Police Authority Member can confirm the figures concerning the number of people being processed at Thorpe Wood Police Station. Recently Mr. Jackson, the incumbent MP, stated that half of those processed at Thorpe Wood required help with translation yet the police have said this is not the case and the figure is much lower. Challenged about using false figures Mr. Jackson now says he researched the period of summer and autumn 2009 and that the figure was 50%. The figures for the last month, January, are public and show Mr. Jackson has been misleading us and parliament when he says half of those processed in Thorpe Wood Police Station are foreign nationals and require help with translation. Can you tell me if you believe his figures which he says are from last summer and autumn are true or false?

And if it transpires they are false what do you think about an MP for Peterborough using misleading information on policing matters?

**Councillor Lee responded:**

It would be inappropriate for me to comment on statements made by the MP for Peterborough, Stewart Jackson, as these can be addressed by the MP himself. The figures for translation services at Thorpe Wood Police Station for January have been given to the requestor previously; of 712 detainees processed, 182 were foreign nationals and 97 of whom needed a translator. The figures for the period covering Summer and Autumn 2009, which was also referred to in the question, are not currently available to the Police Authority. I have been advised that the submission of a Freedom of Information request to Cambridgeshire Constabulary asking for figures for the whole year may ensure an accurate reflection rather than relying on figures based solely on one month.

**Mr Ed Murphy asked the following supplementary question:**

Considering that a Freedom of Information request would take up lots of resources for Cambridgeshire Constabulary, could you in your position as a member of the Police Authority request the information for August and September?

**Councillor Lee responded:**

It was the Labour government that introduced the Freedom of Information legislation and this has already cost many local authorities much time and money.

**5(ii) Questions with Notice by Members relating to Ward matters:**

**1. Councillor Goldspink asked the Cabinet Member for Resources the following question:**

I recently received a draft Cabinet Member Decision Notice on the sale of land at Dickens Street that failed to reflect any of my comments sought as a Ward Member and did not seem to have taken into account the need to retain key land for possible future highways development. Can the Cabinet Member please advise me what the consultation policy is prior to cabinet decisions being made, i.e. should the decision notice fully reflect ward members comments and questions, or is such consultation merely to tick a box?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Ward Councillors are consulted on Executive Decisions that have an effect upon their ward. The consultation is more than a tick box exercise as the inclusion of Ward Councillor comments on the Decision Notice enables the Cabinet Member taking the Decision to be made aware of and consider any issues that ward councillors have relating to the Decision. It would be for the Cabinet Member to weigh up and give necessary consideration to any comments from Ward Councillors before taking an Executive Decision. Councillor Goldspink is aware of the developments around Dickens Street and has accepted the approach.

**Councillor Goldspink asked the following supplementary question:**

Do you think that officers should have consulted with the Management Committee of the Millennium Centre first before further progression with plans?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Having not received the draft Decision Notice yet I cannot comment on the consultations listed in it. This issue was confidential with Councillor Goldspink but Radio Cambridgeshire were able to broadcast details of the Decision and this should not have been shared with the radio station.

**Councillor Goldspink added:**

Radio Cambridgeshire had already received a draft Decision Notice before contacting me and I did not reveal any details that the radio station did not already have.

**2. Councillor Miners asked the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development the following question:**

PEP (Parking Enforcement Programme) implemented within the Old Dogsthorpe area has been a general success. However, there are still many areas within this local community (Eastern Avenue, Central Avenue, Ash Road, Chestnut Avenue etc) where grass verges are being systematically destroyed, mainly as a result of vehicles being driven over them, without dropped kerbing & driveways so that cars/vans can be parked in front garden curtilages (many also without hard standings).

Could the Cabinet Member please clarify current legislation governing these environmental acts of abuse, and whether the City Council (or the Police) requires any new legislation to eradicate these acts of anti-social behaviour?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

With regards to parking on the grass verges within the Old Dogsthorpe area, a specific Traffic Regulation Order was granted through the Department for Transport to enforce verge parking.

In order to allow this Order to be progressed, extensive funding was required to create additional off street parking places in the form of lay-bys. Without such an order, the only verge parking that can be legally enforced is adjacent to waiting restrictions where, under normal circumstances, the order covers the highway to its boundary.

Damage to verges has become a widespread problem and as a result we are looking at other ways to improve the situation. The main issue is that, at present, the Council does not have a policy to back up any actions it may wish to take. I have asked the relevant department to prepare a document for consultation.

There are a number of options that can be included using different parts of the available legislation but these need to be backed up by policy and joint working within the authority. The neighbourhood officers and councils will be important elements of any policy working closely with inspectors from our highways section.

I hope that the new policy will be in place ready to combat the problem before next winter which is the time when the worst damage is done.

**Councillor Miners asked the following supplementary question:**

Many residents have paid money to have kerbs dropped to avoid parking on verges but others haven't. Could evidence be gathered to seek unacceptable behaviour orders or ASBOs if infringements continue?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

I will put this suggestion forward for inclusion in the consultation document.

**3. Councillor Ash asked the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development the following question:**

All will, I'm sure, welcome the new retail facilities at Junction 8 (Eye Road/Paston Parkway) and the jobs they have created. However, can the Cabinet Member tell us why, in spite of;

- a) concerns raised by local ward councillors;
- b) experiences of traffic problems at Maskew Avenue;
- c) representations from local residents groups;

Didn't anybody appear to be ready for the chaos resulting from the opening of the new retail site?

Is he in a position to assure local people that road safety has not been nor will be compromised by the delay in works at this junction?

Can we be confident that once the works are finally completed, traffic flows will be at a reasonable level and that there will be a safe crossing point at this junction?

Can local residents living nearby be assured that they will not, now or in the future, be adversely affected by the works?

Finally is he able to assure local residents that the delays to the contract will not have a detrimental impact on the works in Welland Road, drawn up to mitigate the expected increase in traffic resulting from the new arrangements on the A47 and the knock on effect throughout the Dogsthorpe Ward?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

The first weekend of trading at any new retail outlet is bound to cause some problems. The main issue during the first two days was a fault with the traffic signals and insufficient signage

and management in the car park. A meeting was held between officers of PCC, the Garden Park management and Police, which led to a number of changes being implemented. The following weekend did not create the same issues as a result.

The works at junction 8, adjacent to the above signalised junction, will start in mid March and road safety, both during and on completion of the works, will not be compromised in any way. Controlled crossing points are included in the scheme as are high mast signal heads giving good forward visibility and a new 40mph speed limit around the junction.

Traffic flows are forecast to grow in the city, particularly in view of the growth agenda and I therefore can not guarantee that delays will never occur at these junctions but this should only happen in unusual circumstances, such as the opening of new facilities.

The Welland Road scheme will commence at the same time as the junction 8 works and will be completed around the time of the opening of the new road in the summer.

I have also suggested that, leading up to and during the Junction 8 works, officers engage in fortnightly meetings with ward members and Parish Councillors, to ensure that everyone is kept informed of progress. Having discussed the issues, it has been proposed to close the lights in one direction to enable better traffic flow during the forthcoming Junction 8 works.

**Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:**

Why did the computer model that had been shown to residents not appear to work on this occasion?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

The computer model seen previously was for the forthcoming Junction 8 road works scheme and not the scheme for the Garden Centre development.

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RAISED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 6 – EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

### 6(i) Questions with Notice from Members to the Leader and Members of the Executive

#### 1. Councillor Lane asked the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community development the following question:

Snow and ice is a 'natural hazard', so if anyone slips on it there is no-one to blame. However, as soon as someone grits the pavement it would seem they take responsibility for gritting and could become the target of an injured party who argued the path was not gritted properly. A recent LGA survey has found that 73% of respondents would support legal protection for civic-minded people who did their bit to help out during freezing weather conditions.

Will the Cabinet Member offer this Council's response to public concern on this issue, and:

- show acknowledgement and appreciation towards such civic-minded individuals;
- consider a responsibility for public safety;
- administer a list of trained volunteers, all of whom could be willing at certain times to treat known trouble spots in their community with salt or grit provided by the Council and;
- allow all named volunteers to be given liability cover by the Council's own Public Liability Insurance?

#### **The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development responded:**

I can confirm that if you create a slip hazard on the highway whilst shifting snow you may be liable if anyone is injured as a result.

Although I fully acknowledge and appreciate the will of civic-minded individuals, there is a need to fully appreciate the possible implications and logistics.

The following points are key and need to be carefully considered:

1. The Council's insurance could not be extended to cover any civic-minded person who decides to grit their local area.

2. Our public liability insurance could include trained volunteers who are gritting on our behalf, but only if the following conditions are met:

- they have received formal, adequate training
- they are provided with written guidelines regarding when, where and how to grit
- risk assessments are carried out upon the activity
- they sign a waiver to say they are carrying out this activity at their own risk and cannot hold the Council responsible if they slip on ice themselves
- adequate salt is provided to carry out the gritting, as once people expect gritting to be carried out in a particular area they can rely upon it and any failure on our part to grit subsequently can create a liability
- regular instructions are provided to the volunteers as to when and how much they should grit
- records are retained to show all training, guidelines, risk assessments and instructions to grit as this will form the basis of any defence to claims arising from these activities

In addition the authority might find itself inadvertently entering into an employment relationship with these volunteers if we implement the recommendations above. We can have a clear agreement with them beforehand that no employment relationship is intended but nonetheless once we begin to exercise control over where and when to spread grit, training of and monitoring of volunteers we open ourselves up to a claim of an employment relationship existing.

Taking on board all the aforementioned facts and the risk to the authority I would not advise this is pursued.

**Councillor Lane asked the following supplementary question:**

It seems that regulations make it increasingly difficult to be civic minded. Could a working group be created to investigate the possibility of implementing a scheme, seeking advice from Suffolk County Council which already has one in operation?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

I will request for a working group to be established but note that the obstructions put forward are not Peterborough City Council generated regulations.

**2. Councillor Sandford ask the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development the following question:**

Last summer Full Council unanimously passed a motion in support of the Peterborough Youth Council's "Fares Fair" campaign for cheaper bus fares for young people in Peterborough and asked the cabinet to investigate ways in which this could be progressed. Since then we have received no information on what is happening. Could the Cabinet Member tell us what investigations have been carried out, what are the conclusions and when he will be able to report the findings either to Full Council, the Cabinet or the relevant scrutiny committee?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

From the very early stages the Youth Council was made aware that they would need to do some work to gather data such as how many students would be affected, what their journeys may be and if they already travel by public transport. They haven't done any work on this to my knowledge.

The latest situation is an email from Cathy Summers dated 4 December 2009 providing the data we had gathered on their behalf and offering again to meet with them. Nothing further has been heard from the Youth Council.

I'm unable to give a ball park figure of costs as we don't have any idea of numbers etc until the Youth Council provides this information. In addition, it is not a statutory requirement to provide reduced/free fares for youths. As the concessionary fares costs continue to rise it is difficult to justify doing further work on this at this stage. Equally, as in other areas, it needs the Youth Council to take a proactive approach and undertake some meaningful research.

I'm not aware of any requirement to take a report to Full Council, the Cabinet or the relevant scrutiny committee.

**Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:**

Officers have said that they could not carry out the market research needed as it would cost over £20,000. This is too expensive for children to be able to carry out the work themselves and do you consider it to be unreasonable to ask them to do so?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

The Youth Council is taken seriously by the Council but sometimes communications are an issue. I am not aware of the figure of £20,000 being given and will investigate this with officers.

**3. Councillor Saltmarsh will ask the Cabinet Member for Children's Services:**

Could the Cabinet Member please clarify the role of Members and their responsibilities as Corporate Parents to children in the care of the City Council?

Also, as the meetings of the Corporate Parenting group are not well attended could she advise Members who should be attending these meetings?

**The Cabinet Member for Children's Services may answer:**

Peterborough City Council has a corporate parenting role in relation to children in care and leaving the care of the city council. Members should be aware of the impact of all council decisions on their looked after children. They should be informed about the quality of services their looked after children are receiving.

Members should consider if it would be good enough for their own child and ensure action is taken to address any shortcomings. Services should be scrutinised by the corporate parenting group in relation to the "Every Child Matters" five outcomes, these are:

- Be healthy
- Stay Safe
- Make a positive contribution
- Enjoy and achieve
- Achieve economic wellbeing

Councillors need to be aware of any obstacles preventing children and young people from achieving these outcomes and ensure plans are in place to overcome such obstacles.

The Children in Care Council and the Corporate Parenting Group have been working on the Peterborough Pledge to Children in Care. This will be submitted to Scrutiny, Cabinet and Council in the next few weeks.

Also, a piece of work needs to be carried out by officers with the current corporate parenting group regarding the make up of the group. We need to ensure all councillors are aware of their corporate parenting responsibility and investigate how we can work together as a council to ensure the needs of children in care are met. This may include expanding the corporate parenting group.

**The Deputy Leader provided a point of information:**

The role as corporate parents is taken very seriously by the Council. It has recently been agreed with Officers that all children in care within the Peterborough authority will have free access to leisure and cultural facilities in the city.

**4. Councillor John Fox asked the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development:**

Why were the Yellow salt/grit bins taken away from Sheltered Housing complexes and could we not encourage Registered Social Landlords to replace these much needed facilities?

**The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development may answer:**

Operations Directorate do not control the grit bins within sheltered housing areas. This is the responsibility of the respective housing organisations that manage the complexes, which would

need to carry out a risk assessment as to how best to address any slippery surfaces within their control.

We can give advice on supply and purchase of grit bins and salt if they so wish, however, we cannot insist that they are installed.

5. **Councillor Miners' question about condition of pavements and cycle ways will be answered in a written response.**
6. **Councillor Goldspink's question about the annual budget will be answered in a written response.**
7. **Councillor Sandford asked the Leader:**

According to information obtained in a freedom of information act request by a member of the public and reported in the local press, the Peterborough United Football Ground was valued at between £4 million and £4.7 million in a valuation given to the City Council by surveyors GVA Grimley prior to the Council's recent purchase of the ground. If this is correct, why did the Council pay £8.5 million to purchase the football ground and why was information on the valuation received not given to councillors before they were asked to vote on the issue in December?

**The Leader responded:**

There was a public briefing for all members just before the Council meeting in December at which the valuation was discussed with the officers. However at the briefing they were also advised that the stadium's assets were valued at around a further £5m based upon the future development potential.

As part of my speech I again referred to the valuation placed on the site of between £4 and £4.7m but I also set out the reasons why we were going to buy at a level above this emphasising the benefits, for example the Community Stadium.

So I don't think that you can look at the original valuation in isolation when considering whether the price paid was good value for the Council. As a Council we had much wider considerations to take account of and we listened to our advisors who advised that given the development potential of the site a price of £8m represented value for money.

**Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:**

A Freedom of Information request was submitted to the Council regarding the valuation of the land that was purchased. Why are the details of this request not published on the council website along with other Freedom of Information requests?

**The Leader responded:**

I am not aware why this is not on the website but will ask officers to investigate this.



**COUNCIL MEETING 24 FEBRUARY 2010****Alternative Budget Proposal****Amendment to be moved by Councillor D Seaton**

That the proposed budget as set out in the budget papers be amended as follows:

**(1) Revenue Budget Amendments (note: no change to the overall council tax increase):**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Revenue programme</b>					
<i>Savings:</i>					
Reduce revenue provision for water taxis	20,000	0	0	0	0
Reduced capital financing charges	15,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
	<b>35,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>
<i>Increase in spending:</i>					
Replacement of new bin charge – only from second bin lost /stolen	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Increase implementation of a programme of events for Peterborough area	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
	<b>35,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>

**(2) Capital Budget Amendments:**

	2010-11
	£
<i>OUT (savings)</i>	
Delete provision for water taxis – Funded by borrowing	600,000
	<b>600,000</b>
<i>IN (new spending)</i>	
Provision for water taxis – External third party funding	<b>600,000</b>

**(3) Consequential amendments being made to Capital Strategy, Programme and Disposals (Appendix 3) and Prudential Code, Treasury Management Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy (Appendix 4)**

**COUNCIL MEETING 24 FEBRUARY 2010****Amendment to Council Tax Resolution**

That the proposed resolution as set out in the budget papers be amended as follows:

**(1) Resolution 3(i) Part of the Council's Area:**

Original Table in Budget Papers (page 7)

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Hampton	735.70	858.31	980.93	1,103.54	1,348.78	1,594.01	1,839.24	2,207.09

Amended table

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Hampton	735.69	858.31	980.92	1,103.54	1,348.77	1,594.00	1,839.23	2,207.08

**(2) Resolution 5 Council Tax:**

Original Table in Budget Papers (page 9)

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Hampton	887.32	1,035.20	1,183.09	1,330.97	1,626.75	1,922.52	2,218.29	2,661.95

Amended table

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Hampton	887.31	1,035.20	1,183.08	1,330.97	1,626.74	1,922.51	2,218.28	2,661.94

## COUNCIL MEETING 24 FEBRUARY 2010

## Alternative Budget Proposal

## Amendment to be moved by Councillor S Goldspink

That the proposed budget as set out in the budget papers be amended as follows:

## Revenue Budget Amendments:

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Revenue programme</b>					
<i>OUT (savings)</i>					
Adult Social care - efficiency savings	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Women's resource centre rent and rates - self sufficient after 2 years or close	0	0	100,000	100,000	100,000
Water taxi infrastructure	30,000	0	0	0	0
Reduction in comms dept expenditure	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000
Reduction in Chairman's and cabinet Allowances	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
Halve the cost of translation services	51,000	51,000	51,000	51,000	51,000
Wifi operational costs	105,000	113,000	113,000	120,000	120,000
Withdraw PECT core funding and operations manager salary support	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Programme of events for Peterborough Area - slip by 1 yr	170,000	0	0	0	0
Environmental projects - slip by 1 yr	75,000	0	25,000	0	0
Investment in heritage - slip by 1 year	100,000	0	0	-100,000	0
Reduce grant to Opportunity Peterborough	125,000	125,000	125,000	250,000	250,000
Remove increase proposed by Councillor Seaton's amended budget for the implementation of a programme of events for Peterborough area	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
	<b>1,376,000</b>	<b>1,024,000</b>	<b>1,149,000</b>	<b>1,156,000</b>	<b>1,256,000</b>
<i>IN (new spending)</i>					
Leave school meals subsidy in place	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Don't charge for bulky waste collection	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Partially restore cuts in rural buses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Increase grants to Community Associations	0	0	50,000	75,000	75,000
Tackle potholes and cracks in the roads	615,000	253,850	319,471	291,858	382,004
	<b>1,010,000</b>	<b>648,850</b>	<b>764,471</b>	<b>761,858</b>	<b>852,004</b>
Reduce Council tax increase from 2.5% to 1.9% in 2010-11	366,000	375,150	384,529	394,142	403,996
	<b>1,376,000</b>	<b>1,024,000</b>	<b>1,149,000</b>	<b>1,156,000</b>	<b>1,256,000</b>

**Capital Budget Amendments:**

	<b>2010-11</b>
	<b>£</b>
<i>OUT (savings)</i>	
Neighbourhood Council base funding - slip by 1 year as structures not ready	175,000
Scrap Wifi for City Centre	269,000
	<b>444,000</b>
<i>IN (new spending)</i>	
Provide funds to regenerate older parts of the City - lighting, paving, etc	<b>444,000</b>

**APPENDIX B(1)**  
**REVISED VERSION****COUNCIL MEETING 24 FEBRUARY 2010****Alternative Budget Proposal****Amendment to be moved by Councillor N Sandford**

That the proposed budget as set out in the budget papers be amended as follows:

**(1) Revenue Budget Amendments (note: no change to the overall council tax increase):**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Revenue programme</b>					
<i>Savings:</i>					
Discontinue Your Peterborough Magazine	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Discontinue Community Leadership Fund	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Reduce budgets for consultants/interim managers by replacement with directly employed posts	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Remove revenue provision for water taxis	30,000	0	0	0	0
Remove provision for City Centre Wi-Fi	105,000	113,000	113,000	120,000	120,000
Remove provision for revenue costs of Cathedral Square fountains and require Opportunity Peterborough to fund the ongoing costs of their project	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Reduction in members allowances budget to be funded by deletion of cabinet advisor and/or cabinet posts	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
	<b>815,000</b>	<b>793,000</b>	<b>793,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>
<i>Increase in spending:</i>					
Improved maintenance and replacement of street lights	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Repair of pavements, footways and cycleways	95,000	73,000	73,000	80,000	80,000
Retain funding for litter bins	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Restore bus service subsidy budget	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Retain subsidy for school meals	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Increase winter maintenance budget	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Restore funding for public toilets	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Tree and shrub planting and improvement of urban greenspace	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Reduce savings in adult social care	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Park and Ride (extension to cover more Saturdays)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Additional contribution to PCT targeted at measures to reduce teenage pregnancy	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
	<b>815,000</b>	<b>793,000</b>	<b>793,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>

**(2) Capital Budget Amendments:**

	<b>2010-11</b>
	<b>£</b>
<i>OUT (savings)</i>	
Delete provision for city centre Wifi	269,000
	<b>269,000</b>
<i>IN (new spending)</i>	
Reduce provision for capital receipts from sale of allotment land	<b>269,000</b>

And

Review capital funding for the waste incinerator (energy from waste facility) with a view to replacing it with an MBT Anaerobic digestion facility and present a report to Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee on this subject at the earliest possible opportunity.

## Appendix A - Council Tax Resolution

### COUNCIL TAX 2010/11

Following consideration of the report to this Council on 24 February 2010 and the setting of the Revenue Budget for 2010/11, the Council is requested to pass the resolution below.

#### RESOLVED

1. THAT the Revenue Budget in the sum of £139,009,000 (being £257,122,000 less the Dedicated Schools Grant of £118,113,000) now presented be approved.
  
2. THAT it be noted that at its meeting on 14 December 2009 the Cabinet calculated the following amounts for the year 2010/11 in accordance with regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992: -
  - (a) 55,395 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its council tax base for the year.

#### (b) Part of the Council's Area

Ailsworth	234.51
Bainton	146.55
Barnack	362.67
Borough Fen	38.20
Bretton	3,577.47
Castor	340.74
City (non-parished)	33,934.53
Etton	51.90
Eye	1,434.20
Glington	607.44
Hampton	3,152.07
Helpston	391.08
Marholm	75.52
Maxey	298.71
Newborough	550.91
Northborough	503.63
Orton Longueville	3,439.54
Orton Waterville	3,495.28
Peakirk	176.89
Southorpe	69.88
Sutton	68.95
Thorney	822.60
Thornhaugh	97.74
Ufford	123.95
Wansford	240.86
Wittering	750.99
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>54,986.81</b>
The Council tax base total for areas to which no special items relate	408.36
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55,395.17</b>

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

3. THAT the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/11 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992: -

- (a) £421,599,000 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act. (Gross expenditure including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses)
- (b) (£282,590,000) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3) a) to c) of the Act. (Revenue Income)
- (c) £139,009,000 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 32(4) of the act as its budget requirement for the year. (Peterborough City Council Net Budget Requirement including Parish Precepts)
- (d) £77,948,000 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant increased by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988
- (e) £1,102.28 being the amount at 3(c) above less the amount at 3(d) above, all divided by the amount at 2(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.
- (f) £363,543 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. (Parish Precepts)
- (g) £1,095.71 being the amount at 3(e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(f) above by the amount at 2(a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.



(h) Parts of Council's Area

<b>Parish Of:</b>	<b>Band D</b>
Ailsworth	£1,112.72
Bainton	£1,119.56
Barnack	£1,111.46
Borough Fen	£1,111.10
Bretton	£1,120.01
Castor	£1,120.55
Deeping Gate	£1,095.71
Etton	£1,126.04
Eye	£1,126.31
Glington	£1,108.94
Hampton	£1,103.54
Helpston	£1,116.41
Marholm	£1,096.34
Maxey	£1,098.50
Newborough	£1,129.19
Northborough	£1,117.49
Orton Longueville	£1,103.63
Orton Waterville	£1,099.13
Peakirk	£1,127.30
Southorpe	£1,100.66
St Martins Without	£1,095.71
Sutton	£1,121.18
Thorney	£1,136.57
Thornhaugh	£1,143.05
Ufford	£1,127.93
Upton	£1,095.71
Wansford	£1,130.99
Wittering	£1,148.00
Wothorpe	£1,095.71

Being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 3(g) above the amounts of the special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

3. (i) Part of the Council's Area

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Ailsworth	741.81	865.45	989.08	1,112.72	1,359.99	1,607.26	1,854.53	2,225.44
Bainton	746.37	870.77	995.16	1,119.56	1,368.35	1,617.14	1,865.93	2,239.12
Barnack	740.97	864.47	987.96	1,111.46	1,358.45	1,605.44	1,852.43	2,222.92
Borough Fen	740.73	864.19	987.64	1,111.10	1,358.01	1,604.92	1,851.83	2,222.20
Bretton	746.67	871.12	995.56	1,120.01	1,368.90	1,617.79	1,866.68	2,240.02
Castor	747.03	871.54	996.04	1,120.55	1,369.56	1,618.57	1,867.58	2,241.10
Deeping Gate	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Etton	750.69	875.81	1,000.92	1,126.04	1,376.27	1,626.50	1,876.73	2,252.08
Eye	750.87	876.02	1,001.16	1,126.31	1,376.60	1,626.89	1,877.18	2,252.62
Glington	739.29	862.51	985.72	1,108.94	1,355.37	1,601.80	1,848.23	2,217.88
Hampton	735.70	858.31	980.93	1,103.54	1,348.78	1,594.01	1,839.24	2,207.09
Helpston	744.27	868.32	992.36	1,116.41	1,364.50	1,612.59	1,860.68	2,232.82
Marholm	730.89	852.71	974.52	1,096.34	1,339.97	1,583.60	1,827.23	2,192.68
Maxey	732.33	854.39	976.44	1,098.50	1,342.61	1,586.72	1,830.83	2,197.00
Newborough	752.79	878.26	1,003.72	1,129.19	1,380.12	1,631.05	1,881.98	2,258.38
Northborough	744.99	869.16	993.32	1,117.49	1,365.82	1,614.15	1,862.48	2,234.98
Orton Longueville	735.75	858.38	981.00	1,103.63	1,348.88	1,594.13	1,839.38	2,207.26
Orton Waterville	732.75	854.88	977.00	1,099.13	1,343.38	1,587.63	1,831.88	2,198.26
Peakirk	751.53	876.79	1,002.04	1,127.30	1,377.81	1,628.32	1,878.83	2,254.60
Southorpe	733.77	856.07	978.36	1,100.66	1,345.25	1,589.84	1,834.43	2,201.32
St Martins Without	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Sutton	747.45	872.03	996.60	1,121.18	1,370.33	1,619.48	1,868.63	2,242.36
Thorney	757.71	884.00	1,010.28	1,136.57	1,389.14	1,641.71	1,894.28	2,273.14
Thornhaugh	762.03	889.04	1,016.04	1,143.05	1,397.06	1,651.07	1,905.08	2,286.10
Ufford	751.95	877.28	1,002.60	1,127.93	1,378.58	1,629.23	1,879.88	2,255.86
Upton	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Wansford	753.99	879.66	1,005.32	1,130.99	1,382.32	1,633.65	1,884.98	2,261.98
Wittering	765.33	892.89	1,020.44	1,148.00	1,403.11	1,658.22	1,913.33	2,296.00
Wothorpe	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Total Non-Parished Areas	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 3(g) and 3(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2010/11 the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in the precept issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below :-

	Valuation Bands							
	A £ . p	B £ . p	C £ . p	D £ . p	E £ . p	F £ . p	G £ . p	H £ . p
Cambridgeshire Police Authority	113.04	131.88	150.72	169.56	207.24	244.92	282.60	339.12
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority	38.58	45.01	51.44	57.87	70.73	83.59	96.45	115.74
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>151.62</b>	<b>176.89</b>	<b>202.16</b>	<b>227.43</b>	<b>277.97</b>	<b>328.51</b>	<b>379.05</b>	<b>454.86</b>

5. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(i) and 4 above , the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of council tax for the year 2010/11 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below :-

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Ailsworth	893.43	1,042.34	1,191.24	1,340.15	1,637.96	1,935.77	2,233.58	2,680.30
Bainton	897.99	1,047.66	1,197.32	1,346.99	1,646.32	1,945.65	2,244.98	2,693.98
Barnack	892.59	1,041.36	1,190.12	1,338.89	1,636.42	1,933.95	2,231.48	2,677.78
Borough Fen	892.35	1,041.08	1,189.80	1,338.53	1,635.98	1,933.43	2,230.88	2,677.06
Bretton	898.29	1,048.01	1,197.72	1,347.44	1,646.87	1,946.30	2,245.73	2,694.88
Castor	898.65	1,048.43	1,198.20	1,347.98	1,647.53	1,947.08	2,246.63	2,695.96
Deeping Gate	882.09	1,029.11	1,176.12	1,323.14	1,617.17	1,911.20	2,205.23	2,646.28
Etton	902.31	1,052.70	1,203.08	1,353.47	1,654.24	1,955.01	2,255.78	2,706.94
Eye	902.49	1,052.91	1,203.32	1,353.74	1,654.57	1,955.40	2,256.23	2,707.48
Glington	890.91	1,039.40	1,187.88	1,336.37	1,633.34	1,930.31	2,227.28	2,672.74
Hampton	887.32	1,035.20	1,183.09	1,330.97	1,626.75	1,922.52	2,218.29	2,661.95
Helpston	895.89	1,045.21	1,194.52	1,343.84	1,642.47	1,941.10	2,239.73	2,687.68
Marholm	882.51	1,029.60	1,176.68	1,323.77	1,617.94	1,912.11	2,206.28	2,647.54
Maxey	883.95	1,031.28	1,178.60	1,325.93	1,620.58	1,915.23	2,209.88	2,651.86
Newborough	904.41	1,055.15	1,205.88	1,356.62	1,658.09	1,959.56	2,261.03	2,713.24
Northborough	896.61	1,046.05	1,195.48	1,344.92	1,643.79	1,942.66	2,241.53	2,689.84
Orton Longueville	887.37	1,035.27	1,183.16	1,331.06	1,626.85	1,922.64	2,218.43	2,662.12
Orton Waterville	884.37	1,031.77	1,179.16	1,326.56	1,621.35	1,916.14	2,210.93	2,653.12
Peakirk	903.15	1,053.68	1,204.20	1,354.73	1,655.78	1,956.83	2,257.88	2,709.46
Southorpe	885.39	1,032.96	1,180.52	1,328.09	1,623.22	1,918.35	2,213.48	2,656.18
St Martins Without	882.09	1,029.11	1,176.12	1,323.14	1,617.17	1,911.20	2,205.23	2,646.28
Sutton	899.07	1,048.92	1,198.76	1,348.61	1,648.30	1,947.99	2,247.68	2,697.22
Thorney	909.33	1,060.89	1,212.44	1,364.00	1,667.11	1,970.22	2,273.33	2,728.00
Thornhaugh	913.65	1,065.93	1,218.20	1,370.48	1,675.03	1,979.58	2,284.13	2,740.96
Ufford	903.57	1,054.17	1,204.76	1,355.36	1,656.55	1,957.74	2,258.93	2,710.72
Upton	882.09	1,029.11	1,176.12	1,323.14	1,617.17	1,911.20	2,205.23	2,646.28
Wansford	905.61	1,056.55	1,207.48	1,358.42	1,660.29	1,962.16	2,264.03	2,716.84
Wittering	916.95	1,069.78	1,222.60	1,375.43	1,681.08	1,986.73	2,292.38	2,750.86
Wothorpe	882.09	1,029.11	1,176.12	1,323.14	1,617.17	1,911.20	2,205.23	2,646.28
Total Non-Parished Areas	882.09	1,029.11	1,176.12	1,323.14	1,617.17	1,911.20	2,205.23	2,646.28

**PARISH PRECEPTS 2010/11**

The following precepts have been levied on Peterborough City Council (comparable figures are shown for 2009/10) :-

	2009/10	2010/11	2010/11 Council Tax @ Band D Equivalent
	£	£	£
Ailsworth	6,355	4,004	17.01
Bainton	2,707	3,504	23.85
Barnack	5,792	5,721	15.75
Borough Fen	331	589	15.39
Bretton	88,142	87,145	24.30
Castor	8,477	8,484	24.84
Deeping Gate	-	-	-
Etton	1,608	1,576	30.33
Eye	44,764	43,933	30.60
Glington	5,041	8,068	13.23
Hampton	-	24,788	7.83
Helpston	8,358	8,114	20.70
Marholm	40	50	0.63
Maxey	850	850	2.79
Newborough	4,571	18,464	33.48
Northborough	3,835	10,978	21.78
Orton Longueville	29,101	27,499	7.92
Orton Waterville	12,000	12,000	3.42
Peakirk	4,803	5,596	31.59
Southorpe	398	350	4.95
St Martins Without	-	-	-
Sutton	1,735	1,758	25.47
Thorney	30,644	33,647	40.86
Thornhaugh	4,667	4,633	47.34
Ufford	4,059	3,999	32.22
Upton	-	-	-
Wansford	7,300	8,500	35.28
Wittering	34,752	39,294	52.29
Wothorpe	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>310,330</b>	<b>363,543</b>	