



Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet held at the Bourges/Viersen Room - Town Hall  
on 6 July 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Councillors M Cereste (Chairman), S Scott, D Lamb, P Hiller, P Croft, G Elsey, D Seaton and F Benton

**1. Apologies for Absence**

An apology was received from Councillor Lee.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations.

**3. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting - 30 March 2009**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2009 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Leader.

**4. Cabinet Member Updates**

**5. MONITORING ITEMS**

**5.1 Performance Monitoring Report - Year 2008-2009**

Cabinet received a report which provided an overview of the council's performance between April 2008 and March against the targets and indicators in the Local Area Agreement. In summary:

- For a small number of indicators there is still no way to measure progress
- At the end of the year there were 8 indicators where performance could not be measured
- Strong and improving performance was better at the end of the year than the beginning
- There were more amber indicators at the end of the year, but this has improved from a peak during Quarter 2
- The number of red indicators has remained the same as at the start of the year

During 2008/2009 there has been significant improvement in the way the organisation and its partners measure, monitor and manage performance. The performance management process now provides a framework to identify progress and delivery risks and supports improvements by providing extra help to solve problem areas.

Members expressed concern at those indicators against which progress could not be measured. Officers shared their frustration and advised that government had not yet provided metrics and that they were awaiting guidance.

There were a number of areas that were classed as "at risk" and members suggested that the scrutiny process should be employed to look further into these areas of concern.

#### **CABINET RESOLVED TO:**

Note the 2008/9 performance against the Local Area Agreement priorities and ask that the relevant Scrutiny Committees consider reviewing those areas whose performance was classed "at risk".

#### **REASONS**

Failure to monitor performance would mean that Cabinet would not be able to ensure that the council achieves its intended outcomes.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

None required; the report was presented for monitoring purposes.

### **5.2 Budget Monitoring Final Outturn 2008/2009**

Cabinet considered the Budget Monitoring Report – Final Outturn 2008/2009 which summarised the financial results for revenue and capital to the end of March 2009 and contained performance information on the treasury management activities, payment of creditors in services and collection performance for debtors, local taxation and benefit overpayments.

Cabinet was advised that the report, which had been incorporated into the Audit Committee report relating to the Statement of Accounts 2008/2009, had been considered by the Audit Committee at its meeting of 29 June 2009.

#### **CABINET RESOLVED TO:**

1. Note the final outturn position for 2008/09 on the Council's revenue and capital budget.
2. Note the performance on treasury management activities, payment of creditors in services and collection performance for debtors, local taxation and benefit overpayments.

#### **REASONS**

The monitoring report for the 2008/09 financial year is part of the process for producing the Statement of Accounts.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

None required; the report was presented for monitoring purposes.

### **5.3 Outcome of Petitions**

**CABINET RESOLVED** to note the action taken in respect of the following petitions presented to full Council:

#### **PETITION – REMOVAL OF ISLANDS ON WATERLOO ROAD**

This petition was presented to Council on 8 October 2008 by Councillor Kreling and expressed concerns about the installation of traffic islands on Waterloo Road which it was claimed had been done without public consultation or the support of the community. The petitioners requested the removal of the islands.

The Council's Head of Environment, Transport and Engineering has responded as follows:

"I refer to the above and can only apologise for the lack of a formal response to the petition submitted in October 2008. I am responding as an officer of the Council duly delegated to respond on the matter and trust that you will convey the contents of this reply to the petitioners.

The build outs within Waterloo Road are developer lead rather than any schemes PCC have required or implemented. Planning permission was granted, I believe in 2003, for the residential development now named Century Square. During that application, it was evident that the existing vehicle to vehicle visibility splays at the point of the new access on to Waterloo Road were unacceptable to the Local highway Authority (LHA). As such, the applicant put forward a proposal to provide a build out at the entrance to the development off Waterloo Road, to enable adequate vehicle to vehicle visibility to be achieved. This was unacceptable to the LHA, as a stand alone build out was considered fundamentally unsafe. The applicant was advised that a scheme of build outs (formalising the existing parking and creating a form of traffic calming by the narrowing of the available carriageway width) would be required, including a Stage 1 Safety Audit. This was presented as part of the application and after some revisions, was found acceptable to the LHA, subject to detailed design and a Stage 2 Safety Audit (to be submitted under the Section 278 application).

During that planning application, residents of Waterloo Road would have been consulted and would have been given the opportunity to make comments to the Planning Department.

Once the Section 278 application was received and being dealt with, the developer's construction company (SDC) and agent/consultant were both informed that it would be in their best interest to consult with the residents of Waterloo Road, or at minimum, keep them up to date. I understand from SDC that they have posted regular newsletters to the residents of Waterloo Road, although it should be noted that this is not a statutory requirement upon PCC or the developer. PCC do recommend this in order that good relationships are gained and maintained throughout the development.

Whilst I sympathise with residents, the design of the scheme did take into account those that have off-street parking and those that do not. As mentioned above, the time to raise concerns would have been at the planning stage and if the resident had purchased the property post planning permission, then the onus would be on their solicitor dealing with the purchase to provide the purchaser with full details of the planning permission.

It is the view of the LHA that the build outs should not be removed as they are required in order to ultimately provide safe vehicle to vehicle visibility from the new residential development on to Waterloo Road."

#### **PETITION - PARKING OF VEHICLES FROM EUROCARS IN FAIRFIELD ROAD AND GLEBE ROAD**

This petition was presented to Council on 8 October 2008 by Councillor Lee and concerned issues regarding the parking of vehicles from Eurocars in nearby residential streets.

The Council's Head of Environment, Transport and Engineering has responded as follows:

"I refer to the above and can only apologise for the lack of a formal response to the petition submitted in October 2008. I am responding as an officer of the Council duly delegated to respond on the matter and trust that you will convey the contents of this reply to the petitioners.

I have spoken to colleagues in planning enforcement, who have confirmed that the business is operating in accordance with its long standing planning permission. Unfortunately at the time the planning permission was granted, there were no conditions placed on the provision of parking, either within their site or in the surrounding streets. Consequently, planning enforcement has very little power to tackle the situation regarding the operation of the business.

The parking issues along Glebe Road have been ongoing and well documented for a number of years. The issues have ranged from parking for workers at the former Elliott factory, the parking associated with Peterborough United Football Club on match days and also more recently with the Eurocar business and the parking of their rental vehicles.

The Council has previously consulted with the residents of both Glebe Road and Fairfield Road proposing such measures as residential parking. On both occasions there was an overwhelming majority of residents who did not wish to have their parking restricted in this way, and the proposals were subsequently withdrawn.

The FA Cup replay against West Bromwich Albion had a considerable impact on both parking and traffic flows in the area, which may have resulted in some residents changing their views on some form of restricted parking. As Peterborough United Football Club continues to be successful, the parking problems in the surrounding streets have worsened on match days and thus impacting on emergency service access to the football ground.

I am therefore exploring potential measures with the Football Club Safety Group with a view to tackling the parking issues and how they affect emergency access arrangements. Clearly any measures introduced must also consider the needs of the residents on match days; otherwise there will be no support for the proposals at a local level. I am also mindful that any parking restrictions introduced will result in the displacement of parked vehicles to neighbouring streets resulting in the generation of a similar problem in previously unaffected streets. At this stage I am unable to confirm when the proposals would be consulted upon but trust that residents will appreciate the chance to influence their local community."

## **PETITION – ERECTION OF A YOUTH SHELTER AT FULBRIDGE RECREATION GROUND**

This petition was presented to Council on 8 April 2009 by Councillor Sharp and was in opposition to a proposed youth shelter on Fulbridge recreation ground.

The Council's Head of Neighbourhoods has responded as follows:

"The suggestion to install a youth shelter at this recreation ground came as a result of a group of young people securing youth bank money to improve the facilities at the pavilion and recreation ground. A multi agency working group consisting of:

- Greater Dogsthorpe Partnership
- Peterborough City Council Young People's Service
- North Ward Councillors
- Fulbridge Resident Association
- Peterborough City Council Recreation Services
- Resident representative

was formed to support the young people through the completion of their project and, from the outset, key services were consulted and a comprehensive engagement plan was put into place. This approach was designed to ensure that the local young people and residents felt fully informed and involved in the development procedures.

It is accepted that there can be a negative perception around youth shelters amongst residents, however research shows that if installed in the correct position they are often successful at reducing anti-social behaviour and fear of crime. Cambridgeshire Constabulary comment: "... have taken account of the proposal to install a youth shelter in the area of the multi-use games area and fully support this provision for the young people in the area. I am hopeful that such a provision is likely to reduce the problems which some young people are causing".

The engagement plan was designed to give local people as much information as possible about the misconceptions regarding youth shelters to ease any concerns there may be. Young people involved in the project, supported by local officers, spoke to the majority of residents face to face about the development plans for the park. In summary the results from the community engagement were positive, with a total of 81.4% feeling positive about the installation of a youth shelter at Fulbridge Recreation Ground.

Given the majority of residents are in favour of the youth shelter, the project team would therefore like to proceed with the installation of the shelter but will continue to closely monitor its use."

## **REASONS**

Standing Orders require that Council receive a report about the action taken on petitions. As the petitions presented in this report have been dealt with by Cabinet Members or officers it is appropriate for the action to be reported in this way so that it will be presented in the Executive's report to Council.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

None required; the report was presented for monitoring purposes.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting closed at 10.20 am