

Public Document Pack



PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL SUMMONS TO A MEETING

You are hereby summonsed to attend a meeting of the Peterborough City Council, which will be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Peterborough on


WEDNESDAY 13 APRIL 2011 at 7.00 pm

AGENDA

	Page No.
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Minutes of the Meetings held on 23 February 2011	1 – 20
4. Communications Time	
(i) Mayor's Announcements	21 – 24
(ii) Leader's Announcements	
(iii) Chief Executive's Announcements	
5. Community Involvement Time	
(i) Questions with Notice by Members of the Public	
(ii) Questions with Notice by Members of the Council relating to Ward Matters and to Committee Chairmen	
(iii) Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities;	
(iv) Petitions submitted by Members or Residents.	
6. Executive Business Time	
(i) Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive	
(ii) Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions	25 – 32

7. Council Business Time

(i)	Executive Recommendations:	33
	(a) Long Term Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan	35 – 45
(ii)	Notices of Motion	47 – 48
(iii)	Reports and Recommendations:	
	(a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Proposals Map C	49 – 54
	(b) Programme of Meetings	55 – 60
	(c) Grouping of Borough Fen and Newborough Parish Councils	61 – 63



Chief Executive

5 April 2011
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Alex Daynes on 01733 452447.

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF EXTRA ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD 23 FEBRUARY 2011

The Mayor – Councillor Keith Sharp

Present:

Councillors: Allen, Arculus, Ash, Benton, Burton, Cereste, M Dalton, S Dalton, D Day, S Day, Dobbs, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Fower, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goodwin, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Jamil, Khan, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Lowndes, Miners, Morley, Nash, Nawaz, Newton, North, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Thacker, Todd, Walsh, Wilkinson and Winslade.

The Mayor announced that as there were two meetings to be held that evening, prayers and a minute's silence for Mrs Laura Walsh and Company Sergeant Major Colin Beckett, would be held at the start of the ordinary meeting.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Collins, Elsey, Goldspink, Harrington, Murphy and Over.

2. Declarations of Interest

None received.

3. Proposal to change the name of Electoral Wards

The Mayor announced that there would be a change to the order of the agenda. The name change for Stanground Central would be addressed first.

3. (ii) Stanground Central Ward to Stanground and Fletton East Ward

Councillor Rush addressed Council on behalf of all of the Stanground Central Ward Councillors and stated that there had been extensive consultation undertaken in the Ward and the majority of the responses had been in objection to the proposal. The report was therefore not moved.

3. (i) Fletton Ward to Fletton and Woodston Ward

Councillor Lee moved the recommendations contained within the report and stated that a proposed name change, in order to reflect the make up of the Ward, had been requested by members of the local community in Woodston a number of years ago. A large number of positive responses to the recent consultation had been received in respect of the change to incorporate Woodston and Councillor Lee further stated that two thirds of the meeting would be required to vote in support in order for the recommendation to be passed.

Councillor Serluca seconded the recommendations and stated that in addition to the official consultation exercise, two petitions had been received in support of the name change.

During debate, a concern was raised regarding the overall cost of the consultation exercise, particularly during times of austerity. Councillor Lee responded that there had been postage costs incurred in relation to all replies which had been received back via the post, however the overall costs in relation to the consultation exercise had been minimal as a large portion of the exercise had been undertaken via the Council's website.

Following a vote (42 for, 1 against, 1 abstention), it was **RESOLVED** to:

1. Change the name of Fletton Ward to Fletton & Woodston Ward; and
2. Authorise the Solicitor of the Council to settle any administrative matters in accordance with the report and give Notice to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in relation to the name change of Fletton Ward.

Meeting closed at 6.50 pm

MAYOR

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
23 FEBRUARY 2010

The Mayor – Councillor Keith Sharp

Present:

Councillors: Allen, Arculus, Ash, Benton, Burton, Cereste, M Dalton, S Dalton, S Day, Dobbs, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Fower, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goldspink, Goodwin, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Jamil, Khan, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Lowndes, Miners, Morley, Nash, Nawaz, Newton, North, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Thacker, Todd, Walsh, Wilkinson and Winslade.

One Minute's Silence and Prayers

The Mayor invited the meeting to observe one minute's silence in memory of Mrs Laura Walsh, mother of Councillor Irene Walsh and Company Sergeant Major Colin Beckett.

The one minute's silence was followed by prayers.

News Crew

The Mayor addressed the meeting and stated that there was a local news crew present wishing to film part of the Council meeting. Members agreed to the news crew filming, as required by the Council's Constitution.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Collins, D Day, Elsey, Harrington, Murphy and Over.

2. Declarations of Interest

Members were advised that any submission on their Register of Interest form, which had been distributed to each Councillor prior to the meeting, need not be declared. The forms had been made available due to the Budget, item 7(i)b, being considered and anything declared on individual forms would be taken as having been declared as a personal interest.

It was further advised that whilst all Members had an interest in agenda item 7(iii)a, the Review of the Members' Allowances Scheme, there was a dispensation under paragraph 10 of the Members' Code of Conduct stating that they did not have a prejudicial interest in the item. It was therefore proposed that a personal interest be recorded for all Members of the Council for this item.

Councillor Swift addressed the Solicitor to the Council and questioned whether Councillors would be gagged from speaking on every single item going forward, due to the extent of their declarations?

As a point of information, Councillor Cereste stated that the new Coalition Government were to address this issue.

The Solicitor to the Council responded to Councillor Swift's query and stated that advice had been offered to all Members who had sought it and that the advice given had been of a more permissive nature than conservative. If Members had continuing concerns regarding the advice given to them, then they were to approach the Solicitor to the Council after the

meeting. It was further stated that it was not the case that Members could not speak on any issue.

Councillor Miners declared a personal interest in item 7(i)b due to the nature of his partner's employment, and although he would not be speaking on the item, he would like to exercise his vote.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2010

The minutes of the meetings held on 8 December 2010 were agreed and signed by the Mayor as an accurate record.

4. Communications Time

4(i) Mayor's Announcements

Members noted the report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period 29 November 2010 to 12 February 2011.

The Mayor addressed the meeting and stated that he had one verbal announcement he wished to make and that was to pay tribute to Mr Mike Heath, the Director of City Services who had served Peterborough City Council for the past 14 years. Mr Heath was due to move to the Enterprise Group, which had been set up to look after City Services. Mr Heath's past achievements were acknowledged and he was thanked for all his hard work and effort over the years.

Following the Mayor's address, Group Leaders were invited to say words of thanks to Mr Heath if they so wished.

4(ii) Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

4(iii) Chief Executive's Announcements

The Chief Executive addressed the meeting and expressed further gratitude to Mr Heath on behalf of the Corporate Management Team and Officers of the Council.

A presentation was made to Mr Heath by the Mayor.

5. Community Involvement Time

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

Questions were asked in respect of the following:

- Funding for English as an Additional Language (EAL) children;
- Loss of grant monies and funding;
- Redundancy payments;
- The move of St Teresa's to Bretton; and
- The Professional Development Centre

Details of the above questions and associated responses are set out at **Appendix A**.

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

There were no questions raised.

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) are attached at **Appendix A**.

5(iv) Petitions submitted by Members or Residents

A Petition was received from Mr Martin, a Bretton Parish Councillor and local resident, signed by over 500 local residents. The petition was in opposition to the proposed cuts in the opening hours of Bretton Library by 15.5 hours a week.

Councillor Lowndes submitted a petition from the Princes Street Residents Association, requesting the implementation of a wide 20mph zone in Park Ward, with particular emphasis on the Council to review the situation at Princes Street, Princes Gate and Park Road junction. With the forthcoming opening of Kings School Primary School the increase in traffic would mean that a review of the junction would be necessary.

Mr Banhire submitted a petition on behalf of the ethnic minorities in Peterborough, in particular the African communities, requesting the implementation of an African Community Centre. This type of centre was needed in Peterborough and it would promote social interaction between the African communities and enable the effective sharing of resources and facilities.

Councillor Arculus submitted a petition signed by 351 Netherton residents, opposing the closure of the Spinney Walk public open space by the Longthorpe Primary School

6. Executive Business Time

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

There were no questions raised.

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

Members received and noted a report summarising:

- Decisions from the Cabinet Meetings held 13 December 2010 and continued to 20 December 2010;
- Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the last meeting;
- Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the last meeting; and
- Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 26 November 2010 to 14 February 2011.

The Mayor addressed the meeting and stated that any questions relating to the Budget should be raised during the discussion for item 7(i)b.

Questions were asked about the following:

Neighbourhood Council Review – Initial Report and Recommendations

Councillor Ash queried whether Parish Councils should have been included in the scheme in order to make it more locally focused and if there was no Parish Council within the Ward, should a democratically elected group have been identified to partake rather than selected

unelected members speaking on behalf of the community? Councillor Cereste responded and stated that he agreed that Parish Councils should have more involvement with Neighbourhood Councils and there were proposals coming forward over the forthcoming weeks that would demonstrate commitment to this point. Neighbourhood Council's were an evolving, maturing project within the city and there were things which could be done better and this was the reasoning behind the review.

Councillor Khan queried whether the £25k funding, which had been guaranteed to each Neighbourhood Council, would be available for each to use as they wished? Councillor Cereste responded that £25k had been allocated to each Neighbourhood Council for each to use at they wished.

Councillor Khan further queried why Cabinet had rejected the recommendations to remove the Special Responsibility Allowance for Neighbourhood Council Chairs and that each of the seven Neighbourhood Councils should be responsible for electing their own Chair? Councillor Cereste responded that given the all of the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Council Chairs, including giving up their weekends and evenings, it was unreasonable to state that the allowance should be removed when it was put into the context of comparison to other areas of similar size. With regard to the election of Chairs, it was not in the Council's interest to allow the Neighbourhood Councils to elect their own Chairs, this was a political decision.

Councillor Sandford congratulated the Leader of the Council for endorsing the recommendations of the Scrutiny Group and hence increasing the powers of the Neighbourhood Councils. However, was it not the right of any committee or group to be able to choose its own Chair? Councillor Cereste responded and stated that he had already answered this query in his earlier address to the meeting.

Councillor Fower queried what the level of mainstream revenue disaggregated budgets would be for Neighbourhood Councils. Councillor Cereste responded that he would provide a written response in relation to this point.

Councillor Sanders stated that, on a personal level, he believed Neighbourhood Councils should be abandoned and that any monies allocated to them should be directed to the Parishes, however as the Neighbourhood Councils were not to be disbanded, at the very least the Chairs of the Parish Councils should be given voting rights alongside the City Councillors. Councillor Cereste responded and stated that there would be future proposals coming forward which would lead to the further involvement of Parish Councils.

Write off approval for debts over £10,000 in relation to Non Domestic Rates

Councillor Fower queried what the total sum was that had been written off during the current financial year? Councillor Seaton responded that the write off was just over £720k. This figure went back a number of years and was in relation to companies that were in receivership. There was no possibility of receiving money from the receivership therefore, this would have no impact on the Council's balance sheet.

Grant support to Anglia Ruskin University

Councillor Fower queried what the benefit to the Council would be with regards to the £500k grant provided to Anglia Ruskin. Would the grant be repaid to the Council with interest? Councillor Cereste responded that the grant had been provided to facilitate the refurbishment of the university campus on Oundle Road. The University would not have been in a position to have located the campus on the site if the Council had not assisted with the refurbishment. The university would cater for 1000 students in the city and would provide high quality degrees and high quality levels of training. Therefore the grant was money well spent and would provide for future generations.

Councillor Sanders left the meeting.

7. Council Business Time

7(i) Executive Recommendations

a) Peterborough Core Strategy

Cabinet, at its meeting of 7 February 2011, received the Peterborough Local Development Framework: Peterborough Core Strategy (Version for Adoption) for consideration and was requested to refer it to Full Council to approve.

The Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development, Councillor Hiller, presented the report and moved the recommendation that Council adopt the Peterborough Core Strategy as part of its major policy framework, incorporating the changes as recommended by the Inspector.

During his speech, Councillor Hiller highlighted the following points:

- The document was the single most important statutory planning document;
- The document set out the Council's strategy for the future of the city over the forthcoming 15 years;
- The final document before Council was a testament to the hard work and expertise of many Officers within the Authority, notably Mr Richard Kay, the Policy and Strategy Manager;
- The document had been thoroughly examined by the Independent Planning Inspector, who had concluded that the Council's strategy was a robustly prepared, sound document based on solid evidence;
- All of the Inspectors recommendations were required to be adopted, if not, then the whole process would need to be started over again.

Councillor Hiller further stated that, in his opinion, all of the Inspectors recommendations were sensible and all of those recommendations had subsequently been incorporated into the document.

Councillor Serluca seconded the recommendation and urged all Members to vote in support.

During debate the following points were raised:

- Councillor Khan commented on the ambitious nature of the strategy with regards to regeneration and queried how the neighbourhood management approach to delivering sustainable communities across Peterborough would work if the Neighbourhood Councils could not be guaranteed their £25k?;
- Councillor John Fox stated that 100 dwellings had been identified in the Core Strategy as being allocated for build in or within 800 metres of the Werrington Centre. Where were these dwellings going to be situated, as there was no room available for such a development in this location?;
- Councillor Miners stated that noting the instances of multiple deprivation locally, could the Core Strategy deliver those services and those resources so required in the Peterborough Wards which contained areas of significant deprivation, in order to help towards their removal from national and regional listings?;
- Councillor Ash commented that the emphasis appeared to be on freight warehousing and could more be done to encourage manufacturing industry and a more sustainable working environment, hence meeting the needs of people looking for long term employment?;
- Councillor Goodwin addressed the meeting with regards to the expansion in Eye. She had received an email from a number of local Eye businesses requesting she address the meeting on their behalf in order to convey their opinion that additional dwellings and further employment development would be welcomed in Eye and as a collective

the businesses were disappointed that they had not been consulted on the plans for expansion;

- Councillor Jamil commented that there needed to be more of a balance with regards to the levels of housing earmarked for the city centre. Housing developments also needed to be situated further afield to enable Peterborough to grow properly.

Councillor Cereste responded to points raised during debate and as a point of order stated that in response to Councillor Khan's query regarding the allocation of £25k to the Neighbourhood Councils, this had already been clarified. Councillor Cereste further stated that the document in front of Members was the Core Strategy and not the Land Allocations Document. This additional document would be coming later on in the year and would offer Members the opportunity of allocating specific sites. With regards to the Core Strategy, this document had been arrived at as a result of proper consultation and needs assessments and was based on evidence of the best needs of the city going forward. The city was growing at a tremendous rate and if the situation was not addressed there could be serious repercussions in the future. There had been a significant amount of hard work that had gone into the documents production and it was hoped that Members would show their support for it.

Councillor Walsh addressed the meeting and stated that she was happy with the document in general, however Councillors should be given the opportunity to oppose individual planning applications as and when they came up. Councillors needed to reserve the right to oppose a particular part of the Core Strategy if necessary.

Councillor Hiller summed up and stated that a document such as the one before Members was required and in the Inspectors words, our document was robustly planned and based on solid evidence. Members were reminded that the Inspectors recommendations could not be looked at on an individual basis, all were required to be implemented, if not then the whole process would have to be repeated from the start.

Following a vote (36 in favour, 5 against and 10 abstentions) it was **RESOLVED** to:

Adopt the Peterborough Core Strategy as part of the major policy framework, incorporating the changes as recommended by the Inspector.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

b) Budget 2011-12 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2015-2016

Cabinet, at its meeting of 7 February 2011, received the budget proposals for 2011/12 through to 2015/16 in line with the provisional local government finance settlement and considered any amendments following public consultation feedback and government spending plans.

The final budget document had been put forward to Council following the announcement of the final local government finance settlement and any changes arising from the settlement were incorporated within the final document before Members.

The Cabinet Member for Resources, Councillor Seaton, presented the Budget and moved the recommendations detailed within the Budget Book. During his speech, Councillor Seaton highlighted the following points:

- The Budget had been prepared against the most challenging financial position that councils had experienced for several generations;
- The October spending review had announced that councils would face a reduction in grant of 28% over the next 4 years and Peterborough was no exception to this;
- Before next year, Peterborough's grant would reduce by £15m with an increase to £25m in 4 years time;
- The loss of grant had inevitably meant that difficult choices had had to be made;

- Cabinet had met with Officers in June 2010 when the issues faced had first become clear. Proposals had subsequently been developed that were fair and balanced, and sought to deliver efficiencies in the way Peterborough City Council worked before looking at the important services provided;
- This was not just a budget based on savings alone. Preparation for the future was vital, therefore despite budget pressures, investment had also been proposed;
- Further investment would ensure that the city was in a good position to take advantage when the recession came to an end and investment would also improve the city for current communities and generations to come;
- Investment was vital to ensure the needs of vulnerable people were met including those requiring help in Adult and Children's Social Care, investing in schools and higher education in order to create the capacity needed for a growing city, investing to improve the environment, investing in key growth sites across the city, investing in the city centre and working hard to attract new businesses;
- The investment had been balanced against the grant shortfall due to the significant work carried out to make the organisation as efficient as possible;
- £68m had been delivered in efficiency savings since 2006, gaining national recognition and winning national awards;
- A further delivery of £28m was aimed for next year, whilst ensuring that services were still provided;
- Council tax levels in Peterborough were amongst the lowest in the country, being the 5th lowest out of 56 unitary authorities in the country;
- A council tax freeze was proposed for 2012;
- Peterborough's proposals were amongst the first to be set out in the country. This had allowed for the consultation to be launched on 8th November 2010, a month earlier than usual;
- Particular thanks were extended to the Chief Executive and Rachel Thornton from the Communications Team with regards to the layout of the Budget document;
- The consultation had been a comprehensive process with a web based consultation and a special edition of Your Peterborough magazine. Copies of all of the proposals had also been placed in all libraries and receptions of Council buildings and a number of meetings with partners and stakeholders had been undertaken throughout the city;
- Thanks were extended to all contributors;
- Responses had been made to every element of feedback received;
- Not all proposals had universal support and regard had been given to this prior to the production of the document, however a balance had to be struck in order to meet the required level of savings;
- Where strong and persuasive arguments had been received for changing the proposals, action had been taken;
- Specifically with regards to libraries, further representation had been received since the consultation had ended. Libraries were extremely important to the local community and Peterborough were not closing libraries, unlike other councils;
- Careful consideration would be given to the responses received to the ongoing Vivacity consultation with regards to the reduction in operating hours of the libraries. This would identify the best way forward for these important facilities;
- The proposed Budget struck the right balance in delivering a bigger and better Peterborough by supporting vulnerable people and minimising the impact on services, meeting the financial challenges and placing the Council on a sound financial footing moving forward, recognising the impact the recession was having on our communities and minimising their tax burden and ensuring the proposals reflected the feedback received from communities in recent months.

Councillor Seaton commended the Budget 2011-12 and the Medium Term Financial Plan to 2015-16 to the Council. Councillor Cereste seconded the proposals and reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor announced that the item was open for debate and reminded Members that they would only be permitted one address on the proposals. During debate the following points were raised:

- Councillor Fower stated that due to concerns he had with regards to several significant areas being overlooked, namely the lack of pay cuts taken by Senior Officers, the ongoing publication of the Council's Your Peterborough magazine which was perceived as an ongoing financial burden to the authority, SRAs not being removed, the possible removal of the Mayors car due to it being costly and rather pretentious and the unspecified losses made through the Icelandic Banks, he would not be supporting the Budget;
- Councillor John Fox stated that credit was to be extended to Councillor Seaton for listening to the views of all concerned, however it was the duty of the opposing groups to scrutinise the administration and due to several concerns that he held with the proposals, he would not be supporting the Budget;
- Councillor Swift addressed the meeting and thanked Councillor Seaton and Mr John Harrison, Executive Director Strategic Resources, for the production of such a comprehensive and detailed document. He stated that the document detailed the challenges, risks and uncertainty faced for the forthcoming years with the reorganisation of local government and warned that in a matter of years the Council could face a situation of substantial overspend. He further stated that reliance would have to be placed on outsourcing in order to fulfil commitments and also reliance would have to be placed heavily on the sale of assets. Councillor Swift concluded that, the Budget had not been one of choice due to the reduction in government grant. Local Government was going backwards and not forwards;
- Councillor Fitzgerald stated that cuts were a necessity not a choice, the choices were reflected in what cuts were made. Councillor Seaton and Council Officers were to be commended on the work they had undertaken and for the difficult decisions that had been made;
- Councillor Judy Fox requested clarification on the wheelie bin charges, as revised at Cabinet on 7 February 2011. When wheelie bins were damaged by the refuse collectors would residents receive a new bin and not a recycled bin as a replacement? Had a supplier for the bins been identified already and if so, how much would the bins cost? It was believed that the majority of residents would like to receive a free of charge recycled bin if theirs was stolen rather than paying for a newer replacement;
- Councillor Lee addressed the meeting and stated that high levels of investment in the city were contained within the Budget and whereas other councils were being forced to close their leisure facilities, this was not the case in Peterborough. Facilities such as the museum were quality facilities which had received large investment sums and Peterborough's bereavement services were amongst some of the best in the country and large sums had been invested in these. With regards to Your Peterborough magazine, sponsorship from private sector businesses was sought to keep the magazine running. Flag Fen was to be kept open and kept as an attraction, bringing tourism and investment into the city. The amount of money being invested in the South Bank would lead to culture, leisure, retail and residential development on a derelict run down area of land. The development at Peterborough United Football Ground, specifically in relation to the new stands, would also bring in viable business units. Street lighting was also to be improved across all Wards. Overall, the Budget was an excellent one and there had been tough decisions made, some of which had not been ideal, the Budget was fair and invested in the future of the city. In response to Councillor Judy Fox's query with regards to the bins, Councillor Lee advised that if the bins were damaged then the Council would replace the bin free of charge;
- Councillor Shaheed addressed the meeting and expressed concern at the increase in adult social care charges and the impact these increases would have on individuals. Confirmation of the number of people expected to be affected monetarily by the increase was still awaited. Also, with regards to redundancies, the programme would leave frontline services short of staff and many other members of staff would be left with increased workload. Finally, Councillor Shaheed commented that Peterborough's

Cabinet was one of the largest in the country for a unitary authority and the Liberal Democrats believed a decrease in 3 posts should be implemented, which would save the Council around £50k per annum from the Members allowances budget;

- Councillor Samantha Dalton addressed the meeting and stated that from an environmental aspect, some cuts were good, for example cutting the Council's energy bill would ultimately lead to a reduced carbon footprint. This would be achieved by further investing in street lighting and solar panels on some Council buildings as well as numerous other initiatives. Reductions were needed, as from 2012, a charge of £12 per tonne of carbon emitted was to be introduced and this would cost the taxpayer £380k from year one, moving to £411k per year;
- Councillor Sandford addressed the meeting and acknowledged that there had been more consultation undertaken with the public than during previous years and the document was easier to understand. It was also positive in terms of Area Committees as the Cabinet had accepted a number of proposals put forward by the working group, giving meaningful powers and meaningful amounts of money to these Committees. However, in a number of areas there had been a number of incorrect choices made such as adult social care charges, the cuts in library service, the increase in charges for sports services, the financial impact of larger projects such as the future incinerator and Cathedral Square leading to the Council's borrowing requirement being up to £65m in 2013, concerns around possible future issues arising from the transfer of City Services to Enterprise, the spend on interim managers and consultants, the lack of cuts in Senior Officer pay and the car parking charges, which appeared to be biased towards Councillors. There had been difficult choices faced and there had been a number of areas where the wrong choices had been made. The Budget hit hardest at those people who couldn't afford to pay and failed to make choices which tackled areas of wasteful expenditure and future projects, with the levels of borrowing would put the future financial situation of the Council in jeopardy. It was for these reasons that Councillor Sandford stated both he and his Liberal Democrat colleagues would not be supporting the Budget;
- Councillor Khan stated that the Local Authority had had its hands tied with regards to decisions made within the Budget due to it being led by the Coalition Government and he expressed concerns regarding to the loss of frontline service staff, questioning how services would be maintained in the city going forward. Further concerns were highlighted with regards to Peterborough losing its unitary authority status in the future. For these reasons Councillor Khan stated that he and his colleagues would not be supporting the Budget;
- Councillor Scott addressed the meeting with regards to children's social care and stated that there had been nothing implemented within the Budget that would affect the future safeguarding of children in the city or children in care. This was a positive decision taken by Cabinet. Confidence was high that the savings within Children's Services could be made through innovative ways of delivering and it was hoped that the impact on frontline services would be minimised. A number of areas would need to be looked at and if any Members would like to become part of the reference groups Councillor Scott would be happy to hear from them;
- Councillor Holdich stated that the Budget was a balanced one and tough decisions had been made. There was a lot of investment for young people, £145m over 5 years, going towards investments such as skill centres, the university and schools etc, this was a positive contribution for the future of the city;
- Councillor Ash stated that he did have some concerns, namely with the sale of assets the privatisation of services, due the past failures in this arena and also not obtaining S106 money for services. Councillor Ash further commented that with regards to damaged wheelie bins, if the Council were to replace them it was hoped that the money would be recouped from the company concerned with the damage.

Councillor Cereste addressed the meeting in response to the points raised by Members and the following points were highlighted:

- The Council had to find £50m of cuts out of its budgets;

- With regards to the comments made about cuts in Senior Officers pay, as an administration it was believed the best way to make savings had been to freeze salaries and to remove a post. The salaries would continue to be frozen and this would save a substantial sum over the long term;
- With regards to the Your Peterborough magazine, Councillor Cereste agreed that a different way of delivering the magazine was needed, but in the context of £50m cuts, the monetary value associated with the magazine was low;
- With regards to the rise in adult social care payments, these were means tested and if people could not afford to pay then they would not have to pay;
- With regards to the incinerator, Councillor Cereste stated that a proposal was required in order to run in parallel with other options. If the incinerator was not built then fines would be faced that would take millions out the Budget;
- It was believed that the right choices had been made in a difficult time and Councillor Cereste commended the Budget to the Council

Councillor Seaton summed up and extended thanks to all Party Members for their involvement in the Budget discussion. Overall, objections to the proposals had been nominal and hard work had been undertaken to develop proposals which were fair and balanced and delivered efficiencies in the way that Peterborough City Council worked before looking at the important services provided. Commitment to a vibrant city was still maintained therefore investment was included to stimulate the economy and to create a better place to live. It was considered overall that the Budget proposals struck the right balance and Members were asked to support it.

Following a vote (36 in favour, 5 against and 10 abstentions) it was **RESOLVED** to adopt:

- a. The changes to the budget proposals arising since Cabinet, as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of the report;
- b. The revenue budget for 2011/12 and the medium term financial plan for 2012/13 to 2015/16, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy, as outlined in pages 41 to 66 of the report;
- c. The capital programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 and related strategies and indicators, including the proposed change to the Council's approach to calculating the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) as outlined in the Treasury Management Strategy;
- d. The council tax freeze for 2011/12 and indicative increases of 2.5% for 2012/13 to 2015/16;
- e. The council tax setting resolution for consideration as set out in Appendix A to the report; and
- f. The reserves position, including the carry forward of the declared surplus in 2011/12 and 2012/13 to contribute towards a sustainable financial position in future years.

The Cambridgeshire Fire Authority met to set their budget and council tax on 17 February, after these Budget papers were released. The council tax resolution was based on the proposals to be considered at that meeting. If different proposals were approved by the Fire Authority, then it would be necessary to submit an addendum to the Council meeting.

7(ii) Notices of Motion

1. Councillor Swift moved the following motion:

That this Council:

Regrets the measures it has to take to impose increased charges on the majority of its services and reduce grants to outside organisations. Whilst recognising that nationally there are serious financial difficulties and that it is the duty of all sections of society to bear an equal share, for Peterborough City Council to try and recoup, within such a short period of time, the loss of substantial Government grants of over £12million pounds to facilitate an amended structure is as a Council, too much to bear.

With affirmation of the above, I move that this Council:

1. Informs Her Majesty's coalition Government that we are outsourcing services to the private sector/Trusts and the question we are asking ourselves is what, if anything, will be left for future Councillors to administer?
2. Calls upon Her Majesty's coalition Government to stage over a longer period of time the funding cuts required nationally to balance the books.
3. Asks Her Majesty's coalition Government to define to Local Authorities, like Peterborough, what the future role of Local Government will be compared to its inception.

The motion was seconded by Councillor John Fox and he reserved his right to speak.

During debate, it was commented that the Council's responsibility to administer local services would not diminish in any way. The key factor would be how the delivery of those services would be identified. Outsourcing the Council's services to private companies with their individual areas of expertise, would, with the support of the Council, enable them to grow. If services were not delivered to a satisfactory degree, then the Council would still have full control to pull those services back and to identify the next steps in order to address the situation.

Following further debate, a vote was taken and the motion was **DEFEATED** (10 in favour, 39 against, 1 abstention).

7(iii) Reports and Recommendations

a) Review of Peterborough City Council's Members' Allowances Scheme – Report of the Independent Members' Allowances Panel

Council received a report outlining the findings of the Independent Members' Allowances Panel.

The Council was required by law to have an Independent Members' Allowances Panel. The Panel had met on 30 September 2010 in order to review the current scheme and to consider specific issues relating to the level of the basic allowance, car parking permits for Members, special responsibility allowance payments for the Leader, Cabinet Advisors, Chairs of Scrutiny Committees/Commissions and Chairs of Neighbourhood Councils.

Councillor Cereste addressed the meeting and moved alternative recommendations to those contained within the report. Councillor Cereste stated that the proposed recommendations reflected a fair and sensible scheme and recognised the commitment of all Councillors.

Councillor Burton seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

During debate, it was commented that unless the recommendations of the Independent Panel were questionable, the recommendations drawn should be those implemented. If not, there was no point in having the Panel in the first instance.

Councillor Cereste responded to the comment raised and stated that if the recommendations proposed by the Independent Members' Allowances Review Panel were approved, then the amount of money paid to Councillors would increase and in this very difficult and austere time, this would not be morally acceptable.

A vote was taken (35 in favour, 10 against, 2 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

Approve the recommendations proposed by Councillor Cereste, those being:

1. A further review of the Basic Allowance take place at the same time the Council considers charging staff for car parking and in the meantime there should be no change in the current basic allowance of £7962.08;
2. The travel allowance of £227.45 within the basic allowance remain unchanged;
3. The telephone allowance of £568.68 within the basic allowance remain unchanged;
4. The scheme of allowances does not continue to be updated for inflation by the use of the Local Government Association's daily rate issued each February and that the Members Independent Remuneration Panel is asked to meet again, to carry out the further review that they suggest and report their findings to the October Council meeting;
5. Certain special responsibility allowances (SRAs) be subject to ongoing review and that no increase be made in the Leader's allowance at this time;
6. The existing arrangements for group leader's allowance is kept and is not paid only to the Leader of the majority group and the main opposition group leader;
7. The Licensing Committee and the Licensing Act 2003 Committee merge into one committee, and pay the Chair of Licensing the amount currently paid to the Chair of the Licensing Act 2003 committee, but discontinue the SRA payment to the Chair of the Licensing Act 2003 Committee;
8. There be no change in the allowance paid to the Chairman and Members of the Standards Committee until the implications of the Localism Bill become clear;
9. The scheme be updated to record the entitlement of certain categories of members to be in receipt of Blackberries, etc;
10. Members continue to be restricted to one SRA; and

The members allowance scheme formally adopt the Councillors car parking scheme with an amendment that the Leader of the Council should not pay a reduced rate, but should pay the same rate as an officer on the same "salary" would pay and on the same basis as below:

Position	Net Amount £
Leader of The Council	400.00
Deputy Leader	151.65
Cabinet Member	139.99
Cabinet Advisors	93.32
Chair of Planning & Environmental Protection Committee	93.32
Chair of Audit Committee	93.32
Chair of Scrutiny Commissions	93.32
Chair of Scrutiny Committee	93.32
Chair of Neighbourhood Councils	93.32
Leader of Opposition Group - (SRA part based on 9 / 17)	71.37
Leader of Opposition Group - (SRA part based on 3 / 17)	54.90
Leader of Opposition Group - (SRA part based on 2 / 17)	52.15
Chair of Licensing Committee	69.99
Member with no SRA	46.66

Meeting closed at 10.30 p.m.

MAYOR

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL MEETING – 23 FEBRUARY 2011

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

AGENDA ITEM 5 - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME**5 (i) Questions with notice by members of the public****1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University from Mr Ed Murphy:**

Last year two authorities, Peterborough and Slough, received additional funding for exceptional circumstances based on English as an Additional Language (**EAL**) children; this was for **new** EAL children. Peterborough received almost £1m. You then top sliced for professional development and access to the DoE recruitment service. 50% (£420k) was distributed to schools based on EAL numbers and 50% based on the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (**AWPU**). This meant that West Town got £20484 for 221 EAL pupils worth £92 per child. A school (like Wittering for example) got £3906 for one EAL pupil. As this money was specifically to deal with the impact of immigration, mobility and EAL children this distribution of funds was unfair and a discriminatory practice.

Does the Cabinet Member regret the Conservative lead government's axing of this grant for Peterborough and can he explain why, when extra money was made available for these children, this Conservative Council choose to discriminate against the very children the Conservative Member of Parliament for Peterborough is now saying the government should help with more cash?

The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University responded:

It is worth reminding ourselves that the Labour Government allowed 3 million migrants into this country leading to 96 different languages being spoken in our schools, causing us to be fairly well down the league tables in terms of results, because they were only in the schools for an average of a couple of years before they took their exams, and they only achieve at 18%. I would like to ask Members, in my reply it talks about the Schools Forum. Now the Schools Forum is a completely independent body made up of all head teachers from across the spectrum in Peterborough, not all head teachers from every school but special schools, secondary schools and primary schools. All there on behalf of their colleagues. So in response, in 2009/10 the local authority did indeed receive an allocation of £978k for its growth in EAL pupil numbers. Following a discussion with Schools Forum on the 24th February 2010 a working group was established (consisting of Schools Forum members) to develop the methodology for distributing this funding to schools. The methodology agreed was to top-slice the grant by £50,000 to target at specific projects. A large proportion of the centrally retained element was used to purchase EMAS UK, translation software, for all schools. The remainder of the grant was distributed to schools; 50% on EAL numbers and 50% on weighted pupil numbers (AWPU). West Town's allocation of £20,484 consisted of £4,040.13 for weighted pupil numbers and £16,444.32 for EAL pupil numbers. Wittering's allocation of £3,906 consisted of £3,832.46 for weighted pupil numbers and £74.41 for EAL pupil numbers.

The justification for distributing 50% of the funding on weighted pupil numbers (AWPU)

	<p>was that EAL pupils within the authority draw down additional resources from other formula factors i.e. deprivation, low prior attainment and pupil turnover. It could be argued that this has resulted in a reduction in AWPU funding over the years as funding has been targeted at these factors. Interestingly if the DFE formula has been used to distribute this funding to schools both Wittering and West Town would not have received any funding as the allocations were based on growth in EAL of more than 2.5%.</p> <p>Although the Exceptional Circumstances Grant (ECG) has now ended the government have mainstreamed the £1.5m received in 2010/11 into Peterborough's DSG allocation for 2011/12. It will therefore become permanent budget. On the 16th February 2011 Schools Forum committed to use this funding to create an EAL factor within the Peterborough's Schools Funding Formula. This factor will result in this funding being allocated to schools based on the number of EAL pupil's it has on roll in January plus an allocation for pupils of Gypsy/Traveller heritage.</p> <p>Mr Ed Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>In the question, I did ask whether you regretted the cut that this Government had made to Peterborough in the exceptional circumstances and also while the debate is going on nationally at the moment; do you think that the current formula which is weighted heavily in free school meals is actually a good idea or do you agree with the Member of Parliament who is arguing that it's not a good idea?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University responded:</p> <p>I think as I said, instead of about £1m we are going to get £1.5m and it's going into our pooled budget so it should be there for ever and a day and on the free school meals; yes I do agree with the MP, its not reasonable to suggest that we should base our migrant numbers on free school meals as a lot of them aren't entitled to free school meals and don't know how to claim it if they were. And they are probably some of the most deprived people in the city, so I think to try and add something to the pupil premium was the right way to go.</p>
2.	<p>Mr Ed Murphy asked the Leader of the Council:</p> <p>What is the total amount of money this Council has lost so far in cuts from the Conservative lead Government's reduced settlement for the forthcoming year; from cuts to and axing of Grants including the Immigration Impact Fund, area grants and other special funds provided under the previous Labour Government?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources responded on behalf of the Leader of the Council:</p> <p>The reduction in formula grant has been outlined in our budget documentation already, and we have shared the full impact of all grant reductions with the public through Scrutiny and through our neighbourhood meetings. Indeed I specifically mentioned it in my speech to Cabinet recommending this budget.</p> <p>However, just to repeat that information, the total grant reduction for 2011/12 is £15m, including nearly £9m of Formula Grant, and nearly £6m of former specific and area based grants.</p> <p>The council expected to receive £337k from the Migration Impact Fund in 2010/11. This was subsequently reduced to £169k as the fund was ceased mid year. The previous government intended to review this grant in 2011/12 to see whether sufficient migrant fees were being received to cover the cost of the grant.</p>

	<p>Mr Ed Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Could I ask you whether these cuts which you've said are £15m plus; when I looked at your papers which I got after I had to submit the question; I calculate at about £26m with no allowance for inflation or other pressure costs; will you be implementing these cuts as vigorously as you implemented the refurbishment of Cathedral Square?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources, on behalf of the Leader of the Council, responded:</p> <p>Probably more vigorously Mr Murphy, the last Labour Government didn't have the courage to set out in detail the cuts they admitted were needed, the current opposition have said that it's a blank sheet of paper, here in Peterborough we have actually provided the detail behind what we are going to do, we've had four months of challenge on that which I think we have all really appreciated the input we've had from the public, unions and staff so I think; more vigorously? I don't think that Cathedral Square has gone quite as we would have liked but we will do it more vigorously.</p>
3.	<p>Mr Peter Ward asked the Cabinet Member for Resources:</p> <p>How much has been paid out in redundancy payments both voluntary and mandatory since the general election, how much is expected to be budgeted to pay for redundancies for the rest of this financial year and what amount is in the budgeted redundancy fund for next financial year?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</p> <p>Redundancy payments to date, since the General Election for Council employed Staff, amounts to £2.3m. The amount we expected to pay for the rest of the financial year is £1.1m.</p> <p>These are of course one off payments and this approach will see the Council release staff costs of £5.8m per year (note that total savings will be lower than this as there will be some costs of departmental restructuring associated with this).</p> <p>As the majority of the Council's staff are employed on national terms and conditions, the Council has to operate within the relevant statutory and national guidance in calculating redundancy payments. The relevant national guidance is contained in "The Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006".</p> <p>The Council has set aside £1.5m as part of its budget plans for redundancy costs for next year. The actual amount of this spent will depend on the proposals that come forward.</p> <p>Mr Peter Ward asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>That's over £5m on redundancy and I hope you give those people being made redundant as much thought as you gave the Senior Officer earlier on this evening, people who are losing their jobs. How much, if any, of these payments go towards non-disclosure clauses? A gagging order, an agreement not to tell the press how much they have got.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</p> <p>I don't think I can tell Mr Ward exactly what the figure is this evening, but I am happy to</p>

	<p>look into that and come back to him. One thing I would say is that it's impossible to make savings without reducing staff numbers. Whilst other Councils have announced very large impacts on their staff, I think here in Peterborough through the efforts of the Trade Unions, Peterborough City Council and employees we have to date managed to avoid 167 compulsory redundancies and we will continue to do all we can to reduce any compulsory redundancies amongst the remaining 74 jobs that are still at risk and this will include consideration of voluntary redundancy applications from staff who are awaiting outcome of their application for the first announcement and also employees who have requested voluntary redundancy following our second announcement. And one final point, yesterday I met three staff who had left the Council and their ages ranged from 18 to 40. The 18 year old had been with us for 6 months, I really regretted the fact that she had to leave us after just 6 months in her first job, but all were in new jobs, so I really wish every employee well, whether it's Mike Heath here or it's anyone who leaves. There are opportunities out there.</p>
--	--

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM No. 4 (i)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT: FOR INFORMATION

- 1.1 This report is a brief summary of the Mayor's activities on the Council's behalf during the last meetings cycle, together with relevant matters for information. (Events marked with * denotes events attended by the Deputy Mayor on the Mayor's behalf).

2. ACTIVITIES AND INFORMATION – From 13 February 2011 to 3 April 2011

2.1 Civic Events

- Attended Citizenship Ceremony on 15 February
- Attended Citizenship Ceremony on 1 March
- Attended Civic Reception at South Holland Centre, Spalding on 3 March*
- Attended Civic Service at the Parish Church of St Andrews on 6 March*
- Attended Annual Civic Service at St. Edmunds Church on 6 March
- Attended Civic Service at St Edmunds Church, Downham Market on 18 March
- Attended Citizenship Ceremony on 29 March

2.2 Visitors to the Mayor's Parlour

- Hosted visit by St. Augustine's School on 15 February
- Hosted visit by Mr Bushaikh on 15 February
- Hosted visit by Gladstone Primary School Youth Council on 17 February
- Hosted visit by Achandy family on 22 February
- Hosted visit by Jamie and Gary Jordan to discuss Fossil Museum on 22 February
- Hosted War Memorial Planning meeting on 24 February
- Hosted meeting with Lt Col Alison Falcon from 158 Regiment on 1 March
- Hosted Charity Committee Meeting on 3 March
- Hosted Vinnitsa planning group meeting on 7 March
- Hosted meeting with Georgette Rouncefield on 9 March
- Hosted Homeless Link Regional Team Meeting on 9 March
- Hosted cheque presentation from Dog Grooming Parlour on 10 March
- Inspection of the Silver Trophies on 15 March
- Hosted visit by Southfields Primary School on 18 March
- Hosted visit by Deaf children from Jack Hunt School on 21 March
- Hosted visit by Thorpe Primary School visiting Mayor's parlour on 23 March

- Hosted visit by Gunthorpe Primary School on 23 March
- Hosted Charity Committee meeting on 24 March
- Hosted launch event of Cranfield University in Peterborough on 25 March
- Hosted visit of Norwood School pupils on 25 March
- Hosted run through of the war memorial presentation 28 March
- Hosted visit from manager of Westgate House on 29 March
- Hosted a meeting to discuss Investors in the Environment on 1 April
- Hosted a meeting with Jonathan Lewis on 1 April
- Hosted afternoon tea for Christine Wilson on 1 April

2.3 Charity Events

- Attended Challenge 66 on 25 March
- Attended a classical charity concert in St John's Church on 30 March*
- Attended Spencer's Charity Ball on 2 April

2.4 Council and Other Events

- Attended Calm a Baby Tour on 15 February
- Attended RAFA exhibition on 16 February
- Attended Gifted and Talented Enterprise launch at Ken Stimpson Community School on 16 February
- Attended Diabetes UK Peterborough AGM on 17 February*
- Attended PCC-Play Shaper event on 18 February*
- Attended opening ceremony for new reception class at John Clare School, Helpston, on 18 February*
- Attended celebration of the patron day for Polish Complementary School on 19 February
- Attended lunchtime recital at Peterborough Cathedral on 19 February
- Attended Fossil Hunting Trip at Ketton Quarry on 21 February
- Visited HMP Peterborough to visit prison director, Mr Nick Leader on 25 February
- Attended Mayor's Civic Dinner & Dance at The Bourne Corn Exchange on 25 February*
- Attended 'Christ on a Bike' at the Solstice on 26 February
- Attended Funeral of Mrs Laura Walsh on 28 February
- Attended Leap Forward Project at Club Dissident on 1 March
- Attended Inter-generational drama group performance at Christ the Carpenter Church on 1 March
- Visited Longthorpe Primary School
- Attended UK YP X Factor event at Town Hall on 2 March
- Attended the purple bus tour on 3 March
- Attended Moving4Ward Event on 3 March
- Attended Show Racism the Red Card workshop on 4 March
- Attended opening of Wisbech Mart Fair on 4 March*
- Attended The Peterborough Ambassadors' Dinner on 4 March
- Attended The Installation of The Right Reverend Stephen David Conway at Ely Cathedral on 5 March
- Attended the Model Club Exhibition on 5 March
- Visited St. Botolph's School on 7 April

- Attended PPS Photographic Exhibition on 7 March
- Visited Phoenix School on 8 March
- Attended International Women's Day on 8 March*
- Attended funeral of WO2 Colin Beckett on 8 March
- Attended opening of The New Clubhouse Facility at Stanground St. John's School on 8 March*
- Visit Deaf Blind Club at Rainbow Court on 8 March
- Attended 115 (Peterborough) Sqn ATC – Annual Awards on 9 March
- Attended AGM of the Outward Bound Association on 9 March*
- Attended 'One Year On' on 10 March
- Attended 'Pledge Against Prejudice' presentation evening on 10 March
- Attended Mayor's Ball on 11 March
- Attended Civic reception for Vinnitsa Delegation on 14 March
- Attended 500 Days to the Olympics Opening Ceremony on 15 March*
- Attended Historical Slide Show on 16 March*
- Attended Change of Command Ceremony at RAF Alconbury on 17 March
- Attended MDHU Sponsored Bike Ride on 17 March
- Attended 'Lucky Sods' production on 17 March
- Attended supper at the Deanery on 17 March
- Attended official opening of Peterborough Lions District Convention on 19 March
- Attended Shire Horse Society Spring Show on 19 March
- Attended Peterborough Lions District Convention, banquet and ball on 19 March
- Attended 'Lucky Sods' production on 19 March
- Attended Bicentennial Eucharist to celebrate the birth of Canon Nathaniel Woodard on 21 March
- Attended MK Dons –v- Peterborough United at Milton Keynes on 21 March
- Visited Dad's Army, Burrell & Ancient House Museum, Thetford on 22 March
- Attended Meet the faiths: Tea and Talk at 6 New England Complex on 22 March
- Attended LEAP programme at Perkins Engines on 23 March
- Attended MND AGM at Hemingford Abbots Village Hall on 23 March *
- Attended Mayor of St Neots end of term meal at Hong Kong Restaurant on 23 March
- Attended St. George's Hydrotherapy Pool, St George's Pool, Dogsthorpe 24 March
- Attended re-opening of Yates , Broadway 24 March
- Attended Britain in the 60's Theme/Beatles Tribute Night at Stukeley Club, RAF Alconbury on 25 March*
- Attended Mayor of Godmanchester's Charity Ball at Wood Green Animal Shelter Refectory on 25 March
- Attended Peterborough Music Festival in Town Hall Reception Room on 26 March
- Attended Jazz breakfast at Peterborough School on 27 March
- Attended Census completion event at the Town hall on 27 March
- Attended Peace Conference at Ibrahimi's Restaurant on 27 March
- Attended City of Peterborough Symphony Concert on 27 March*
- Attended Forster Carer Awards on 29 March
- Attended Team East presentations at Youth Access Point on 28 March

- Attended Peterborough Region College on 29 March
- Attended the Good Life Company on 29 March
- Attended Headway Day Centre in Kings Lynn on 31 March
- Attended production of My Fair Lady at the Key Theatre on 31 March
- Attended Our Histories Exhibition at the Atrium, Peterborough City Hospital on 1 April

3. BACK GROUND DOCUMENTS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT 1985)

None.

4. DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE

Chief Executive.

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM No. 6 (ii)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

**EXECUTIVE REPORT – FOR INFORMATION
RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

1. DECISIONS FROM CABINET MEETING HELD 21 MARCH 2011

NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL REVIEW – PART 2

Cabinet received a report on the outcome the second stage of a review of Neighbourhood Councils which had been undertaken by the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Task and Finish Group. Cabinet was asked to consider the conclusions and agree the recommendations of the second part of this review.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to endorse the recommendations to:

1. Change the name of Neighbourhood Councils to Neighbourhood Committees.
2. Adopt the following as the vision statement for Neighbourhood Committees:

“Neighbourhood Committees will deliver improvements for the local area by identifying, overseeing, monitoring and driving actions to support all issues relevant to the area, including service delivery, service improvements, and area developments”

3. Amend the relevant Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution to reflect these recommendations, and to ensure that Neighbourhood Committees are supported by similar procedures that support other Council committees.
4. Replace the existing terms of reference for Neighbourhood Councils with the following:
 - (i) Neighbourhood Committees are established in Peterborough in accordance with the provisions set out in Local Government Act 2000
 - (ii) Neighbourhood Committees will require the proactive support of all elected Councillors, officers, and partner organisations to ensure their full and positive success

Neighbourhood Committees should:

- (iii) Make decisions within the remit of their terms of reference and their formally delegated responsibilities, or make recommendations to the Executive as appropriate on issues which affect the area
- (iv) Be the committee where members of the Neighbourhood Committee and members of the community can discuss issues of concern or interest, including those that are not the direct responsibility of the Council as well as those that are

- (v) Set the standards for services to meet local needs which are outside the immediate responsibility or budget of the Neighbourhood Committee, and seek agreement for any changes from the Executive
 - (vi) Be the primary focus for public involvement and consultation within the area, working closely with other public, private and voluntary agencies, and advising and/or making recommendations that arise to the Executive as appropriate on issues which affect the area
 - (vii) Develop community action plans, and monitor their implementation, to ensure the promotion of economic, environmental, cultural and social wellbeing of the area, that service delivery improvements are made and that better outcomes are achieved
 - (viii) Carry out any non-Executive functions delegated by the council, and any Executive functions delegated by the Leader, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegations set out in Part 3 sections 1 and 3 of the Constitution
 - (ix) Be directly responsible for any delegated funding identified by the Council and invest that money in ways that support the priorities identified through the community planning process
5. That for the Municipal Year commencing May 2011, replace the existing Delegations to Neighbourhood Councils with those set out below. Keep this under review during that year, with a view to expanding the delegations from the start of the Municipal Year commencing May 2012:
- (i) The Leader retains responsibility for functions delegated and may exercise those functions in person, regardless of further delegation. Further, the Neighbourhood Committees must act with due regard to all other Council policies and procedures
 - (ii) To promote the Council's role as a community leader in its area, giving a meaningful voice to the community and fostering good and productive working relationships with the Council's partner organisations, including Parish Councils, Police, Fire, Probation, criminal justice agencies, health and social care agencies, education agencies, young peoples' services, community associations, residents associations and voluntary sector agencies
 - (iii) To take a leading role in promoting the economic, environmental, cultural and social wellbeing of the area, and develop community action plans to achieve this that improve service delivery and achieve better outcomes
 - (iv) To set the standards for all former City Services operations now contracted to Enterprise to ensure effective delivery of all services, including making decisions on the maximum amount of any delegated budgets allowable within the terms of the contract to be deployed on local priorities (*to be confirmed subject to details of the contract*)
 - (v) To agree the annual programme of works contained within the Highways Capital Programme for 2012/13 onwards
 - (vi) To act as consultees on all major or significant Executive and Council proposals that affect the area, including those affecting both capital and revenue spend
 - (vii) To act as consultees in respect of Major Planning applications relevant to the area, and report views to the relevant Committee

- (viii) To carry out any actions that the Executive authorises in addition to those set out above, until such time as that authorisation is revoked
6. Deliver the recommendations set out in the report from the sub-group of the Neighbourhood Council Task and Finish Group which has focussed on rural/parish issues, specifically:
- (i) create a new committee to replace the Rural North Neighbourhood Council, that comprises rural Ward Councillors and one co-opted representative from each of the 23 rural Parish Councils
 - (ii) appoint a rural Ward Councillor as the Chair of this committee
 - (iii) hold all meetings at a rural location within any of the 23 rural Parish Council areas
 - (iv) decisions relating to non-financial matters or those that are not formally delegated responsibilities will be debated by all members of the committee, with all members having a single vote each
 - (v) matters relating to financial or delegated responsibilities will be decided solely by elected City Councillors
7. Create a single, seamless approach to neighbourhood engagement by creating a structure which enables the following to be delivered in each Neighbourhood Committee area during the same session:
- Ward Forum: a ward-specific informal forum where ward councillors can engage with their constituents and discuss informal issues or issues which may require escalation to the Neighbourhood Committee. During these forums, key officer representation should also be available, including from the Neighbourhood Management team, Trading Standards, Community Safety, Police, and Enterprise
 - Neighbourhood Panel: formally Police-led but now partner-wide meetings during which three local priorities are identified for resolution
 - Neighbourhood Committee: re-launched former Neighbourhood Council meetings, focussing on more strategic or impactful issues affecting the area
- For example, the Ward Forums may run from 6pm until 6.50pm, and the Neighbourhood Committee meeting may run from 7pm until 9.00pm with the first 30 minutes given over to the business of the Neighbourhood Panel
8. Ensure the broader neighbourhood management framework is in place and is able to respond to the opportunities provided in the Localism Bill and other relevant emerging legislation. Further, ensure that monthly Neighbourhood Management Delivery Team meetings are in place for all Neighbourhood Committee areas, that there is full commitment from all councillors, and that the role of community partnership organisations is firmly established.
9. Organise a minimum of two Neighbourhood Committee locality ‘tours’ per annum, during which *ALL* members of the Committee, the nominated CMT member, key PCC officers, key officers from partner organisations, key community leaders/representatives and the local media explore the area in more depth focussing on particular problems, hotspots and successes.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to approve recommendations to:

10. Agree to the creation of a job description for the roles of Chair and Vice Chair of the Area Committee that reflects the changes of emphasis and focus set out in these recommendations, and the role these posts will play in support of the broader neighbourhood management structure.
11. Agree to the creation of a lead officer role within the Neighbourhoods division to co-ordinate and facilitate the entire Neighbourhood Management meeting and engagement structure, including:
 - Developing, co-ordinating and monitoring delivery of action plans at Neighbourhood Committee, Neighbourhood Panel, Ward Forums, and locality tour levels, holding Members, officers and partners to account as necessary
 - Liaising with key PCC departments, notably Democratic Services and Communications, to ensure all required actions are delivered
 - Arranging agenda setting and planning meetings for Neighbourhood Committees in accordance with the Constitution
 - All logistical arrangements for Neighbourhood Committees, Neighbourhood Panels, Ward Forums, Neighbourhood Management Delivery Team meetings and any other related forums, including venues, refreshments, access, transport etc
 - Liaising with Council departments and partners regarding information to be made available at each meeting (e.g. literature or a staffed information stand)
 - Managing the agenda plan for each Neighbourhood Committee containing items for future discussion
 - Developing, managing and co-ordinating a full contacts database of residents, community groups, officers and partners to ensure maximum awareness of all relevant meetings and opportunities for engagement
12. Agree that alongside formal minutes from the Neighbourhood Committee, comprehensive action plans should be created from (i) every Ward Forum and (ii) every Neighbourhood Committee meeting, setting out clearly what actions have been agreed, and naming a lead officer (with the consent of the officer named) and a lead councillor jointly responsible for ensuring the action is achieved.
13. Agree to formalise the seating arrangements at Neighbourhood Committee meetings so that all Members sit at the front of the audience in a horseshoe arrangement, making it clear who has voting rights, how those rights are used, and who is not in attendance
14. Agree to identify a different member of the Corporate Management Team to act as champion and advocate for each of the seven Neighbourhood Committees, and to ensure that the principles of Neighbourhood Committees are given the appropriate status amongst all officers.
15. Agree to develop a single media and communications strategy, supported by an action plan, which proactively promotes Neighbourhood Committees and Ward Forums and their achievements in a timely manner.
 - (a) To help achieve this assign an officer within the Communications team to have responsibility for coordinating publicity and marketing for Neighbourhood Committees and Ward Forums
 - (b) Produce a publicity 'pack' of template materials and formats that promote Area Committees, including 'soft' formats (via the use of the web, social networking etc) and 'hard' formats (posters, leaflets etc)
16. Agree to be creative and flexible with the logistical arrangements for neighbourhood engagement activities set out in recommendation 7, providing they follow the Access to Information rules. For example, vary the start and end times of the meetings to ensure

engagement with different residents, and ensure venues have enough space and capacity to cope with the requirements of both formal and informal forums during the same session

17. Agree that officers should explore transport initiatives as and where appropriate for each of the Neighbourhood Committee meetings to support attendance from residents
18. Agree that the recommendations, when agreed, form part of an overall implementation plan for Neighbourhood Councils alongside the recommendations that emerge from stage one of the review. This implementation plan should be overseen by the cross-party working group formed from the task and finish group, and become a standing item at all Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meetings, with regular updates also provided to Cabinet and Group Representatives
19. Agree to re-brand and have a major re-launch of Neighbourhood Councils as Neighbourhood Committees. This should include raising awareness to all councillors, PCC officers, external partners, and residents to actively promote their purpose including the vision set out in recommendation 2 along with the new delegations and terms of reference

Cabinet further **RESOLVED** to:

1. Not endorse the proposed change of name from Neighbourhood Councils to Area Committees;
2. Ensure that the above recommendations be implemented subject to sufficient resources being available to do so; and
3. Ensure that future reports from Scrutiny review groups making recommendations to Cabinet include any resource and cost implications of those recommendations.

PETERBOROUGH LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN (LIP)*

Cabinet received a report following a change in approach to funding that had been adopted by the Housing and Communities Agency (HCA). The HCA now required local authorities to provide a document that focused on housing growth within the area with supporting evidence. Whilst this was a fluid document the HCA saw this as the key first step in securing funding for projects that provided housing growth.

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

Adopt the Local Investment Plan developed in conjunction with the Homes and Communities Agency, in order that it can be used to help to attract inward investment into Peterborough, primarily for the purposes of encouraging residential regeneration.

2. CALL-IN BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION

Since the last report to Council, the call-in mechanism has not been invoked.

3. SPECIAL URGENCY AND WAIVE OF CALL-IN PROVISIONS

Scrutiny Procedure Rule 14 and Executive Procedure Rule 7 require any instances where the Council's special urgency provisions have been invoked, and/or the call-in mechanism was not applied, to be reported to the next available meeting of the Council, together with reasons for urgency.

Since the last report to Council special urgency provisions have not been invoked.

4. CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

CABINET MEMBER AND DATE OF DECISION	REFERENCE	DECISION TAKEN
Councillor Holdich 15 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/022	Appointment of Authority Governor - Nenegate Primary School – The Cabinet Member appointed Mr Deljit Singh who had been nominated by the Local Authority.
Councillor Holdich 14 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/023	Appointment of Authority Governor - Old Fletton Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Miss Katie Hurst who had been nominated by the local authority.
Councillor Holdich 14 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/024	Appointment of Authority Governor – Braybrook Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Mr Artwell Mpofu who had been nominated by the local authority.
Councillor Holdich 14 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/025	Appointment of Authority Governor - The Duke of Bedford Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Mrs Annette Morgan who was changing from parent to authority governor had been nominated by the governing body.
Councillor Holdich 14 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/026	Appointment of Authority Governor - Parnwell Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Mr Thomas Khumalo who had been nominated by the local authority.
Councillor Hiller 18 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/027	Novation of Contract from ACIS to VIX ACIS for Real Time Passenger Information The Cabinet Member approved a novation of the existing real time passenger information expansion and maintenance contract from Advance Communications and Information Systems (ACIS) Limited to VIX ACIS Limited.
Councillor Hiller 18 February 2011	FEB11/CMDN/028	Transfer of Contract for the Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) System, Cameras and Associated Infrastructure The Cabinet Member approved a novation (transfer) of the existing Automatic Number Plate Recognition System contract from Computer Recognition Systems Limited (CRS) to Vysionics ITS Ltd.

<p>Councillor Holdich</p> <p>3 March 2011</p>	<p>MAR11/CMDN/029</p>	<p>Appointment of Authority Governor - Hampton Hargate Primary School</p> <p>The Cabinet Member appointed Mrs Pamela Stephens who had been nominated by the local authority.</p>
<p>Councillor Seaton</p> <p>28 March 2011</p>	<p>MAR11/CMDN/033</p>	<p>Award of grants to not-for-profit organisations 2011/12</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Resources authorised the award of the following grants to not-for-profit organisations for the period 1st April 2011 to 30th September 2011:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age Concern (Advice and Information) £ 9,925 • Age Concern (Befriending) £23,550 • Age Concern (Premises) £ 7,000 • DIAL Peterborough £16,325 • Gladstone Connect £11,135 • Peterborough Mediation £ 9,760 • Peterborough Racial Equality Council £19,810 • Peterborough Women’s Aid £32,380 • Peterborough Women’s Centre £9,000 • Peterborough Workspace £35,000 • Victim Support Cambridgeshire £4,425 • WRVS £11,140 <p>The Cabinet Member awarded the following grants to not-for-profit organisations for the period 1st April 2011 to 31st March 2012:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens Advice Peterborough £117,600 • Community Action Peterborough £2,400 • PCVS (Voluntary Sector support) £35,930 • PCVS (Volunteer Centre) £14,810 • PCVS (Shopmobility) £14,100 • Peterborough Racial Equality Council (Hate Crime post) £20,000 • Peterborough Women’s Aid (DV Service) £5,000 • Senior Citizens’ Forum £500 • Peterborough Cathedral (lighting) £4,000
<p>Councillor Holdich</p> <p>28 March 2011</p>	<p>MAR11/CMDN/034</p>	<p>Bishop Creighton Primary Academy, transfer agreement and lease of premises -</p> <p>The Cabinet Member approved the execution of a commercial transfer agreement and to grant a 125 year lease of the premises known as Bishop Creighton School (excluding the Children’s Centre situated on the site) at a peppercorn rent to the Board of Trustees of the new Bishop Creighton Academy from 1 May 2011.</p>
<p>Councillor Holdich</p>	<p>MAR11/CMDN/035</p>	<p>Appointment of Authority Governor - Welland Primary School</p>

29 March 2011		The Cabinet Member appointed Miss Jennifer Sergeant who had been nominated by the local authority.
Councillor Holdich 29 March 2011	MAR11/CMDN/036	Appointment of Authority Governor - Discovery Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Mrs Laura Catterick who had been nominated by the local authority.
Councillor Holdich 29 March 2011	MAR11/CMDN/037	Appointment of Authority Governor - Leighton Primary School The Cabinet Member appointed Mr Andrew Parry who was changing from community to authority governor had been nominated by the governing body.
Councillor Scott 29 March 2011	MAR11/CMDN/038	Integrated Case Management System for Children's Services The Cabinet Member for Children's Services authorised the award of a 5 year contract to Capita Children Services for the provision of an Integrated Case Management System (ICMS) solution for Children Services from the date of implementing this decision until March 30 th 2016 for the sum of £1,163,974 which includes capital and one off costs as well as annual maintenance and support.
Councillor Seaton 31 March 2011	MAR11/CMDN/039	Delivery of the Council's Capital Receipt Programme through the Sale of Coneygree Lodge, Coneygree Road The Cabinet Member, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, authorised the negotiation and sale of surplus land and buildings at Coneygree Lodge, Coneygree Road, Stanground by private treaty or auction.

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM No. 7 (i)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

EXECUTIVE REPORT – RECOMMENDATIONS

a) LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP)

Cabinet at its meeting of 21 March received a report following a Joint Meeting of the Environment Capital and Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committees and Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities as part of the democratic process leading to the adoption of the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) at Full Council in April 2011.

After consideration of the report, strategy and plan, Cabinet agreed the recommendations in the report as below:

- (i) That Cabinet considers the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) and makes any changes where appropriate; and
- (ii) That Cabinet recommends to Council the adoption of the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016).

A copy of the report to Cabinet is attached at **Appendix 1**. Full copies of the document have been placed in the Members' Group Rooms, Council receptions and Libraries.

<p>IT IS RECOMMENDED that Council adopts the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016).</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 6
21 MARCH 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Councillor Hiller: Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning	
Contact Officer(s):	Paul Phillipson Executive Director Operations Mark Speed Transport Planning Team Manager	Tel. 453455 Tel. 317471

LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S	
FROM: Joint Scrutiny - Environmental Capital, Sustainable Growth and Rural Commission.	Deadline date : 13 April 2011
(i) That Cabinet considers the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) and makes any changes where appropriate	
(ii) That Cabinet recommends to Council the adoption of the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and the Local Transport Plan (2011-2016)	

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is submitted to Cabinet following a Joint Meeting of the Environment Capital and Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committees and Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities.

A full version of the draft Long Term Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan can be viewed via the following link:

<http://ltp3.org.uk/>

Please note that the document has been sent electronically to save paper. However if you require a hard copy please email mark.speed@peterborough.gov.uk.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

- 2.1 This report is being submitted as part of the democratic process leading to the adoption of the Peterborough Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and Local Transport Plan (2011-2016) at Full Council in April 2011.
- 2.2 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No 3.2.1 'To take collective responsibility for the delivery of all Strategic Executive functions within the Council's Major Policy and Budget Framework and lead the Council's overall improvement programmes to deliver excellent services'.

Is this a Major Policy Item/ Statutory Plan?	YES	Cabinet Meeting	21 st March 2011
--	------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

Date for relevant Council meeting	13 April 2011	Date for submission to Government Dept	Department for Transport Following adoption of the LTP
-----------------------------------	---------------	--	--

3. LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

- 3.1 Improving transport for everyone who lives, works or travels in Peterborough is a priority for the City Council. To provide the best possible transport service in and around the city, the Council produce a Local Transport Plan (LTP) every five years which sets out how we will tackle existing and future transport issues.
- 3.2 The LTP supports Peterborough's Core Strategy and City Centre Area Action Plan and sets out how the city's transport system will support the future growth and development of Peterborough.
- 3.3 The LTP therefore sets out what the Council aspires to achieve and the mechanisms that will be considered to help meet those objectives.

The Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS) has been produced to:

- Align with the Core Strategy document which covers the time period up to 2026
- Support the long term growth and employment aspirations
- Give a long term vision for transport so a consistent approach can be adopted for transport through out the Core Strategy
- Support the long term environmental aspirations of the Council to become Home of the Environment Capital

4. CONSULTATION

Long Term Transport Strategy

- 4.1 The LTTS reflects the views of our residents and key stakeholders as far as practical. To achieve this, a number of consultations have been undertaken during its development including:
- A workshop held on the 1st April 2009 with stakeholders to discuss problems, issues and opportunities, together with the objectives of the LTTS
 - Dialogue with the Transport Partnership
 - Ongoing consultation with stakeholders from across Peterborough City Council
 - Workshop held on the 4th March 2010 when the LTTS was discussed
 - Cabinet Policy Forum 24th May 2010
- 4.2 In addition, a wider group of people and organisations and stakeholders have been contacted directly and asked to give us their views in relation to the development of the LTTS and the LTP.
- 4.3 The LTTS document was used as the basis for the consultation process and development of the LTP.

Local Transport Plan

- 4.4 The consultation process for the Peterborough third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) started in the summer of 2010. Overall a very wide range of consultation methods have been used.
- 4.5 In July all councillors were invited to attend a three day consultation 'drop in' event which was held at the Town Hall.

- 4.6 The consultation has been a well publicised event, in August an interview took place with BBC Radio Cambridgeshire and in September a television interview took place with BBC Look East. The consultation was also mentioned numerous times in the local newspaper, The Peterborough Evening Telegraph. **All media coverage was very positive.**
- 4.7 A LTP leaflet was distributed in the Your Peterborough magazine to **all households** within Peterborough informing them of the ideas the council was proposing to include in the LTP. A copy of the leaflet and questionnaire were also made available online.
- 4.8 255 stakeholders and interest groups were written to directly to give them an opportunity to participate in the consultation.
- 4.9 During September, council officers attended Neighbourhood Council meetings (please see following table), where a dedicated session was held to give everyone a chance to discuss the LTP with the officers:

Neighbourhood Council Meetings

Neighbourhood Council	Venue	Date
Dogsthorpe, East and Park Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Millennium Centre, Dickens Street	1 September 2010
Fletton, Stanground and Woodston Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Riverside Pavilion, Candy Street	2 September 2010
Rural North Neighbourhood Council Meeting	John Clare Primary School, Helpston	16 September 2010
Central and North Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Peterborough Sports and Leisure Club, Lincoln Road	21 September 2010
Gunthorpe, Paston, Walton & Werrington Community Committee Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Ken Stimpson Community College, Staniland Way, Werrington	22 September 2010
Orton with Hampton Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Matley Primary School, Orton Brimbles	23 September 2010
Peterborough West Neighbourhood Council Meeting	Jack Hunt School, Ledbury Road, Westwood	29 September 2010

- 4.10 On September 11th and 12th a two day public exhibition was held at the Queensgate Shopping Centre, where officers were available for questions. From October to December officers also attended meetings with various stakeholders and interest groups.
- 4.11 Full Council forms the last part of the process for this document. The consultation process has been robust and has far exceeded the minimum required for this document so no further consultation is recommended.

5. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

- 5.1 That Cabinet will support the submission of these documents to Full Council for consideration and adoption in April 2011.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The statutory requirement of this document requires that it is submitted to Full Council for adoption and therefore the Cabinet is asked to support the submission of this document to Full Council for consideration and adoption in April 2011.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 The only other option considered was that the Council would not write and publish a LTP. This was rejected as the LTP is a statutory document and the Council is required to prepare and publish the plan.

8. IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The document sets out the transport strategy for Peterborough for the next 15 years with a detailed policies and plan for the next 5 years. Some of the key implications are summarised below:

Financial

- 8.2 The document contains an indicative 4 year spending programme for transport funds.

Legal

- 8.3 The document has been checked for legal implications.

Corporate Priorities

- 8.4 The document has been written in line with the corporate priorities. The corporate priorities have been adopted as the priorities for transport in the document.

Environment Capital

- 8.5 The document identifies the achievement of Home of the Environmental Capital as a key aspiration. The document has had a Strategic Environment Assessment and a Habitats Regulation Assessment.

Community Safety

- 8.6 Road safety and reducing the fear of crime are key goals of this document.

Discrimination and Equality

- 8.7 The document has had an Equality Assessment carried out on it. No negative issues were raised as part of this process.

- 8.8 The document has implication city-wide and is a Statutory and Key document for the Council

Cross-Service Implications

- 8.9 Transport impacts on all departments and as such a rigorous consultation process has been undertaken. (See consultation section in this report).

9. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 9.1 The key risks to a bringing forward the transport interventions and achieving the outcomes of the LTTS and LTP are:

Development dependency

- 9.2 The implementations of some transport interventions are reliant on the expected growth on coming forward as set out in the Core Strategy. Some transport schemes reliant on specific developments coming forward. If the development does not come forward then neither will the transport scheme

Landownership

- 9.3 If third party land is required, not in the control of either the highway authority or developer then Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers might be required to acquire the land. However, if a development is wholly dependant on the acquisition of such land then a ransom equal to a third of the value of that development might be payable (whether or not

such a transport scheme would be in the public interest, necessary to enable CPO powers to be used).

Planning Consent

- 9.4 A transport scheme might require planning consent and / or necessary traffic regulation orders.

Priority

- 9.5 A specific transport scheme contained in the plan might be found to be unacceptable, given the balance of other non transport issues.

Funding

- 9.6 Funding might not be available, given other competing transport priorities both locally and nationally.

Smarterchoices

- 9.7 Continuation and success of increasing Smarterchoices is essential to meet the objectives of this plan.

10. ANNEXES

- 10.1 A copy of the notes from the Joint Scrutiny Meeting between the Environmental Capital and Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committees and the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities has been attached to this report at Annex 1.

Consultation with Scrutiny at the Joint Meeting of the Environment Capital and Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committees and Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities held on 28 February 2011

ISSUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE GIVEN AT MEETING
General		
Accessibility of Document	Councillor Sandford raised concerns that the consultation document had been password protected on a website and that hard copies had not been circulated.	The comment on password protecting a consultation document was noted and would not happen in future consultations. However the process had not been a breach in the Access to Information rules as hard copies of the document had been made available at the Town Hall Reception and libraries and would also have been supplied upon request.
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION		
Core Bus Routes – Primary Public Transport Corridors	It was highlighted that the diagram of the Core Bus Routes only showed Stagecoach services and not PCC services.	The diagram only showed the core, strategic routes but the comment would be taken away to see how more information could be added.
CHAPTER TWO – TRANSPORT POLICY & WIDER CONTEXT		
No Comments		
CHAPTER THREE – TRANSPORT ISSUES AND CHALLENGES		
Summary of Discussion at the April Workshop	The last bullet point made reference to bus services being adversely affected as congestion increased, leading to reduced reliability and increased operating costs, which would impact on fares and patronage levels. This was a situation which was already happening e.g. if passengers travelled early in the day the buses tended to travel as they should do, but after 5pm, often two or three buses turned up at the same time. This situation reinforced the need to shift people out of cars.	The bullet points from the workshop highlighted areas which we wanted to deal with. There were a number of issues to deal with as part of bus services including congestion, road works and Stagecoach’s ability to adapt if a number of buses arrived at the same time. There was work we could do but they also had a responsibility.

Use of Fossil Fuels	How would the reliance of fossil fuels be reduced as bio fuels would not be sustainable in the long term?	We were already engaged in a project for plug in points for electric vehicles.
Electric Vehicles	Why were you advocating the use of electric/rechargeable vehicles as a large percentage of them still used fossil fuel for the production of electricity?	Production of electricity was moving on and the Government was looking at the energy production side e.g. use of wind turbines. The Plan was not just about cars and was about getting people in to other modes of transport.
	There was some concern that the Plan had a chapter on electric vehicles when it was not a proven technology. A report in a magazine had recently said that there was no difference between electric vehicles and the most effective combustion engines. The Plan made no reference to trams which were a proven success where they had been installed.	Research that officers had seen was supportive of electric vehicles. LTP3 was a suite of measures which needed to be balanced around sustainability. The LTTS made reference to a light rapid transit system which would include trams but this would be a very expensive option, around £50m-100m, and would require a much larger population than we currently had.
Trams	Did the estimates for a transit system assume the need to lay down additional tracks?	The estimates did include the laying of tracks as we had already had discussions with Nene Valley who had indicated that they would not be interested in developing this.
Freight	How would you be able to ensure that freight stayed on the parkway system?	We would work with the transport companies and also ensure that SatNavs etc were updated regularly. Automatic Plate Recognition could be widened out throughout the network which would lead to greater enforcement.
Magna Park	How would the extra freight from the Magna Park development be handled? It was important that the quality of life for residents in the area was maintained.	We would look at a quality partnership e.g. allocating priority lanes for the vehicles when needed. A transport assessment would need to be done for Magna Park but as a planning application had not yet been submitted this had not yet happened. We would look at the application very carefully.
HGVs	A big problem with HGVs was them laying up at night. Where would they be expected to park as we did not have a HGV park in the City?	We were looking for a secure parking area for them as we currently did not have parking available. A possible option could be using future park and ride sites in the evening and we would make sure that this was included.

Transport Information	There was a lack of transport information available to the public as the Travelchoice Centre in Queensgate only opened between 9am and 12noon.	A staffing restructure was currently underway which would lead to better and more appropriate staffing hours.
Cycling and Walking in Rural Areas	The Plan states that we want to encourage more cycling and walking but in the rural areas this could be very unsafe as a lot of roads did not have footpaths. We needed to make a decision in the future about laying more footpaths as some of the B roads were very dangerous.	
CHAPTER FOUR – TRANSPORT VISION		
Speed Limits outside Rural Schools	Why was it not planned to put 20mph speed limits outside all schools and just rural ones?	The evidence showed that the speed limits could not be enforced properly and that people did not slow down. There was no proven safety record and the recommendation made by the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities was made against officer advice.
CHAPTER FIVE – THE TRANSPORT OPTIONS		
No Comments		
CHAPTER SIX – ASSESSMENT AND APPRAISAL		
Link between Railworld and East Coast Mainline (ECML)	There was already a link between Railworld and the ECML which would be a good way of getting people to the station. It would also be good value for money as the infrastructure was already there.	It would cost a lot of money to link the Nene Valley Railway to the ECML. The land was currently protected so at the moment it fell out of the cost benefit ratio.
CHAPTER SEVEN – LONG TERM TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN		
No Comments		
CHAPTER EIGHT – LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3		
Transport User Hierarchy	The Transport User Hierarchy was noted but it was felt that the projects contained in the Plan did not reflect the Hierarchy as the total for walking and cycling projects for next year only added up to £100k.	The Transport User Hierarchy was a guide and was used to see if we could solve a problem by integrating walking and cycling but not all transport problems could be solved with walking and cycling.

Great Haddon Development	The public transport priority measures for the proposed Great Haddon Development had now been dropped from the planning application.	The Great Haddon application was still being looked at.
CHAPTER NINE – TRANSPORT POLICY AND STRATEGY		
Bus Priority Measures	What were the bus priority measures?	It was about building extra infrastructure, e.g. perhaps giving up a lane on the network for buses to use when needed.
	Some members advised that they would not like to see one of the lanes on Bourges Boulevard given up to buses as it would be a waste of the highway.	This was just one of the options we were looking at. Bourges Boulevard split the City and would be looked at as part of the City Centre Area Action Plan.
School Travel Strategy	How many schools had now completed their school travel plans?	Officers believed it was nearly 100% but would clarify.
Rural Transport Strategy	There was support for moving people in rural areas from their cars but there were also issues around public transport, e.g. in Newborough the last bus out of the village was at 3.15pm. Would officers be looking again at the bus provision in rural areas?	It was dependent on funding and viability. The Call Connect service was proving to be an effective alternative.
Bus Strategy	The LTP2 gave an aspiration for ½ hourly evening bus services but this now appeared to be dropped. Reference to fares had also been dropped. It would be short sighted if the commitment we already had was dropped around evening bus services.	This had been reviewed due to lack of use of buses in the evenings.
	The idea to move the bus station to where the train station was had received negative feedback from Stagecoach as they had stated that most of their passengers actually wanted to go to Queensgate.	We were looking to improve the links between the bus and train stations. This still had to be discussed and we would look at the wording in the document.
Water Bus Strategy	Had water buses been subjected to the same degree of assessment as other schemes?	Water buses had been included as it was believed that some parts of the strategy could be delivered in the next five years. There was a wider Waterways Strategy being developed by the Environment Agency.

	How long had work on provision of a water bus been going on?	The idea had been around for a number of years.
Car Parking Strategy	Previously there had been a clear strategy about parking charges to try and encourage short term parking only.	We were in competition with private providers and pricing required a lot more work.
CHAPTER TEN – MAJOR AND MINOR SCHEMES		
Glington/Junction 23	With a Park and Ride site at Glington indicated in the LTP3 the dualling of the A15 was vital. If we did not address the public transport corridor then there would be no advantage in using park and ride. There needed to be more emphasis on the public transport corridor at the same time as park and ride.	It was all dependent on where the park and ride site was put but officers believed that the Lincoln Road corridor would also need to be looked at.
Lincoln Rod Bus Priority Corridor	The Lincoln Road Bus Priority Corridor had been in LTP2 and had not happened and had now been included in LTP3. There was a concern that policies did not translate into projects.	
Park and Ride	What was the strategy for Park and Ride? The Plan implied an all year service but did not show it. The proposed site near Werrington was close to the Spalding Railway line.	We would be looking to integrate all modes of transport not just the traditional car to bus model. Key areas where we thought we could justify sites had been identified but had not yet gone through detailed analysis.
CHAPTERS ELEVEN – SIXTEEN		
No Comments		
OTHER COMMENTS		
Parking on Grass Verges	Parking on grass verges was a major issue in some areas of the city but the Plan did not address this. An order in Dogsthorpe had proven to be very successful so why was there not a city wide order?	<p>We were well ahead of some cities on verge parking. We were aware that this was an area where residents had concerns but enforcement was difficult. A letter had now been received from the Secretary of State for Transport which should clarify the situation.</p> <p>We were looking to develop a strategy across the whole of the City outside of this process which would include</p>

		looking whether the CCTV system could help with enforcement. A report would be brought to the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee in due course.
	Councillor Sandford advised that the Walton Ward Councillors had used some of their Community Leadership Fund to plant trees to prevent verge parking.	
	There would be strong opposition in the new town developments if no parking on verges was introduced as some areas did not have parking spaces provided. In some of these areas more parking spaces needed to be developed.	There would be full consultation before any scheme was introduced. The process needed to be managed effectively as it was acknowledged that this would be a contentious issue. The Executive Director of Operations would be commissioning a piece of work by the Neighbourhood Managers to see how a scheme could be developed. It was accepted that some areas would be better suited than others.
	The Council often gave planning permission for developments with insufficient parking.	National policy was that there should be 1.5 parking spaces for each household.

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM No. 7 (ii)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

NOTICES OF MOTION

The following notices of motion have been received in accordance with Standing Order 15.2:

1. Motion from Councillor John Fox:

That this Council:

- (i) Recognises the extent of the work being carried out at the hydrotherapy pool, located at St George's Centre, and its benefits to all the communities across Peterborough;
- (ii) Requests that the Leader of the Council considers amending the Community Leadership Fund (CLF) criteria to cover city wide projects, and if agreed:
- (iii) Requests that all Councillors be asked to make a donation of £500 from their annual CLF allocation towards the running costs of the hydrotherapy pool.

2. Motion from Councillor Sandford

That this Council:

- (i) Notes that the last Labour Government closed over 5,000 post offices, including several in the Peterborough area;
- (ii) Welcomes the Coalition's Governments plans for post offices, which involve:
 - Post offices becoming a one-stop shop;
 - Investment of £1.3 billion in the post office network;
 - Post offices opening longer;
 - 80% of bank accounts being accessible in your local post office;
 - Post offices remaining a central point of our community life;
 - Post offices offering information for jobseekers;
 - Post office services being offered at the shop till; and
 - Small, local shops providing some post office services.
- (iii) Will endeavour to put as much business through Peterborough's post office network as possible, i.e. council tax payments and other council services;
- (iv) Instructs the Chief Executive to write to Postal Affairs Minister, Ed Davey MP, giving this Council's full support to the Government's proposals.

3. Motion from Councillor Fower

That this Council:

- (i) Recognises the litter problems created, especially in those areas designated District Centres, where there are a high proportion of takeaway food outlets;
- (ii) Requests that, unless there are pressing logistical reasons not to do so, a standard planning condition for planning applications for such developments will be automatically imposed for provision of a litterbin at the applicant's expense in the vicinity of the development.

4. Motion from Councillor Fower

That this Council:

- (i) Supports moves to change our parliamentary voting system, which will see Peterborough Members of Parliament elected under a fairer system;
- (ii) Calls on the Returning Officer to take steps to promote participation in the Referendum.

5. Motion from Councillor Fower

That this Council:

- (i) Notes that the Government wants to have directly elected police commissioners with the intention also to axe police authorities, and that the LGA is opposing this change;
- (ii) Expresses deep concern that this will lead to the politicisation of Cambridgeshire Police and jeopardise their operational independence. Such a radical change would be a diversion, at an estimated cost of hundreds of thousands of pounds, in precious resources away from front-line policing;
- (iii) Believes accountability of the police in Peterborough would be best served in strengthening the ties, by other means, between our local neighbourhoods and Councillors;
- (iv) Requests that the Leader of the Council write to our local MPs informing them of this motion and asking them to oppose the Government's proposals for elected Police Commissioners.

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM 7 (iii) (a)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY AND PROPOSALS MAP C

Contact Officer(s):	Simon Machen – Head of Planning Transport and Engineering Richard Kay – Policy and Strategy Manager, Chief Executives	Tel. 453 475 863 795
---------------------	--	-------------------------

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S
FROM : Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Council notes the conclusions of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the Council's submitted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document; and 2. That Council approves the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document, incorporating the changes as recommended by the Inspector, for adoption on 19 July 2011 following approval by Cambridgeshire County Council on that date.

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 The Council on 2 December 2009 approved the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) (Proposed Submission Version) including Proposals Map C – Minerals Safeguarding Areas, for public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State for examination on 28 July 2010.
- 1.2 The consultation and public Examination is complete and the independent Inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State has sent his binding report, (15 March 2011), to the Chief Executive setting out his conclusions on the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD including Proposals Map C.
- 1.3 The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has been prepared jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council and covers the geographical area of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON OF REPORT

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the publication of the Inspectors Report and its conclusion which finds the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 'sound'. Summarily it states ... *'the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document provides an appropriate basis for the planning for minerals and waste for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area over the next 15 years.'*
- 2.2 To ensure the 'soundness' of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD, the Inspector recommended that a number of changes be made to meet legal and statutory requirements. Most of the changes (Appendix A of the Inspectors Report) were put forward by the Councils in response to points raised and discussions held at the Examination. He clarified that these changes do not alter the thrust of the overall strategy. The recommendations in the Inspector's Report **are binding on the Councils.**

- 2.3 This report recommends that Council approves the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD including Proposals Map C, incorporating the changes recommended by the Inspectors Report.
- 2.4 As this is a jointly prepared document the effective date of adoption is dependent on the subsequent adoption by Cambridgeshire County Council, this is scheduled for 19 July 2011.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have jointly prepared a new Minerals and Waste Plan under the statutory process prescribed in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 3.2 The Minerals and Waste Plan comprises:
- **Core Strategy** DPD: a document setting out the strategic vision and objectives, including strategic allocations, and a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development
 - Site Specific Proposals DPD (SSP): a document setting out site specific proposals for mineral and waste development and supporting site specific policies
 - **Proposals Map** DPD: Three maps showing the Plans proposals. Map A - Mineral and Transport Zones, and Map B - Waste (cannot be adopted until the SSP is adopted), and Map C - Mineral Safeguarding Areas (which relates to the Core Strategy)
- 3.3 The Inspectors Report of examination is solely concerned with the Core Strategy DPD and Proposals Map C.

4. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY – THE INSPECTORS REPORT AND THE MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FOR ADOPTION

Content of Minerals and Waste Core Strategy

- 4.1 Before coming to the Inspector's findings and recommendations, Council may wish to remind themselves as to the purpose, content and status of the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. If adopted, it will become part of the statutory development plan and, as such, will be part of the Council's major policy framework. It will be one of the documents that will gradually replace the existing Cambridgeshire Aggregates (Minerals) Local Plan (1991) and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (2003), complemented by a suite of other documents (such as the Site Specific Proposals Document) that together comprise the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan.
- 4.2 The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy sets out the vision, objectives and overall strategy for sustainable minerals and waste development across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough up to 2026, together with a number of policies that are core to achieving or delivering that strategy and a suite of development control policies. In simple terms, it ensures that the considerable levels of planned housing and employment growth across the Plan area will be supported in a timely and sustainable manner.
- 4.3 It reflects Peterborough's Core Strategy and others across Cambridgeshire (adopted and emerging); and the Sustainable Community Strategies across the Plan area, with consistency of vision and priorities, demonstrating how certain spatial elements of those strategies can be delivered through effective minerals and waste management development.
- 4.4 The proposed scale, distribution (broad location) and timing of minerals development supports the forecast demand and seeks, where possible, to support and deliver a wide range of environmental enhancement and objectives, such as the delivery of flood management capacity and biodiversity habitat.

- 4.5 The forecast waste generated by existing and future planned development within the Plan area, together with the increasingly stringent government financial and waste management targets, raises major challenges. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy makes provision for sufficient land and capacity, via a range of management techniques, to ensure the opportunity to deliver modern sustainable waste management facilities can be taken.
- 4.6 The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is accompanied by key diagrams for both minerals and waste which show pictorially some of the key elements of each strategy. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy makes three strategic site allocations all of which are located outside of Peterborough (two at Block Fen / Langwood Fen, near Mepal and a third at Addenbrookes Hospital). It is also accompanied by Proposals Map C which depicts the extent of Minerals Safeguarding Areas (Ordnance Survey based) across the Plan area.

The Inspector's Report

- 4.7 An Inspector's Report must state either:
- (i) That the Core Strategy is 'unsound', and that it is impossible for changes to be made to it to make it 'sound'; under this scenario the Council is not permitted to adopt the Core Strategy;
 - (ii) That the Core Strategy is 'sound', provided (in most instances) that certain changes as recommended by the Inspector are made to the Core Strategy before it is adopted.
- 4.8 The Inspector, Mr Jonathon King, found the strategy 'sound' and, in effect, has given permission to the city council to adopt the Core Strategy provided his recommended changes are incorporated into the final adopted version of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Copies of his full report have been placed in the Members' Group Rooms, Council receptions and the libraries. The report can also be viewed via the following link:

<http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=Inspectors%20Report&ID=455&RPID=251839&sch=doc&cat=13032&path=13032>

- 4.9 In summary, the main recommendations and proposed changes of greatest significance to Peterborough are:

Minerals Spatial Strategy – No significant changes proposed by the Inspector's Report.

- For *sand and gravel* – provision will be made for an extraction rate of 0.75 mtpa from the Northern Zone, i.e. Peterborough and north Fenland District, over the plan period;
- For *limestone* – acceptance of a criteria based policy for future extraction to seek the maintenance of a 10 year landbank;
- For *brick clay* – change to supporting text to clarify the need to maintain a stock of permitted reserves which could be as much as 25 years or more; and
- For *sand and gravel and clay borrowpits* – whilst making no change to the borrowpit policies, the Inspector noted that any proposals for the borrowpits to go on to supply the open market should be considered in the context of the revised policy dealing with Additional Mineral Extraction. This now states that mineral working lying beyond the scope of the mineral spatial strategy will only be allowed where it can be demonstrated that there are overriding benefits which justify an exception to policy [e.g. substantial social and environmental benefits].

Other Minerals Issues

- *Mineral Safeguarding Areas* - In considering MSAs the Inspector has amended the policy in the Core Strategy to widen the scope of applications (non minerals development types) on which the Mineral Planning Authority must be consulted. This change is to make the policy more effective. "This would exclude the most minor of applications from the consultation process, but still pick up those with the potential to sterilise. A pragmatic balance has therefore been struck between safeguarding objectives and the unnecessary screening of unmanageable quantities of applications"

(Para 99). Importantly, applications for development on land which is allocated in other adopted local development plan documents are excluded from the consultation process.

Waste Spatial Strategy

The waste management spatial strategy seeks to establish a network of waste recycling and recovery facilities across the Plan area. The Inspector concluded that *'the policies for waste management are justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The strategy as a whole is sound.'* The thrust of the waste management strategy therefore remains unchanged.

- All new strategic development (urban extensions, housing and employment development etc) will make provision for permanent waste management facilities; and for temporary recycling facilities during the construction phases;
- Additional provision is made to address a shortfall in inert landfill and Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste landfill (SNRHW); and
- No provision is made for non-hazardous landfill, with the exception of that required for land stability; to address potential pollution risk to the environment; or to maintain the viability of SNRHW disposal.

The scale of proposed provision (minimum) by 2026 is summarised as:

- 63,000 tonnes per annum of Household Recycling Centre capacity;
- 627,000 tonnes per annum of new recycling capacity (Materials Recycling Facilities / Mixed Recyclables);
- 10,500 tonnes per annum of in-vessel composting capacity;
- 1.86 million tonnes per annum of inert waste recycling capacity;
- 12.09 million cubic metres of inert landfill void space over the Plan period; and
- 14,000 cubic metres per annum of stable non-reactive hazardous waste landfill void space.

Adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy

- 4.10 Council must decide whether to adopt the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, copies of which have been placed in the Members' Group Rooms, Council receptions and libraries. The document can also be viewed via the following link:

<http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=Minerals%20and%20Waste%20Core%20Strategy%20DPD&ID=456&RPID=251840&sch=doc&cat=13032&path=13032>

This version incorporates all of the recommendations made by the Inspector.

Copies of proposal Map C have also been made available in the Members' Group Rooms, Council receptions and libraries. The document can also be viewed via the following link:

<http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/pc/mwsub/cs/mwcsps?tab=files>

and is the fourth document listed, "C06 Proposals Map C Mineral Safeguarding Area".

- 4.11 To be absolutely clear on this matter, Council can only support or reject this version. Further changes are no longer permitted.
- 4.12 If Council agree the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, then the document will be 'adopted' on the 19 July 2011, subject to subsequent approval by Cambridgeshire County Council.
- 4.13 If Council does not agree the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, then, in accordance with the regulations, the Council is not obliged to adopt it. A range of issues arise, potentially complicated / multiplied due to the joint working relationship with another authority i.e. Cambridgeshire County Council. These are many, varied and probable. An example, would be the unprecedented situation of one Council agreeing to adopt whilst the other disagrees. Legal

opinion would have to be sought as to the validity of adopting a document prepared for a wider geographical area than the area of adoption.

- 4.14 However, as a result of a rather unusual quirk in the plan making system, the Council is equally not permitted to 'withdraw' the earlier draft Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (submission version – February 2010). Effectively, under this scenario, the draft Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the Inspector's report go into somewhat of an abyss, neither adopted nor deleted. In reality, the council would in all likelihood commence the preparation of a new Minerals and Waste Core Strategy which, following the same cycle of extensive consultation and Examination, would eventually supersede this unadopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The ability, in the meantime, of the council and developers to use the unadopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, and the Inspector's Report, as evidence to support or object to a proposal is a debateable point, and an issue we would have to investigate should the need arise.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Extensive consultation, over many years, with the public and a wide variety of other stakeholders has taken place. Emerging drafts have also been considered by various Committee, Scrutiny, Cabinet and Council meetings. The Inspector agreed that we had undertaken appropriate consultation.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 As outlined in the report, Council only has two options available to it; either approve the strategy for adoption, or not approve the strategy for adoption. The former is recommended, as it is a statutory duty to prepare a Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and, in adopting it, Peterborough will have a clear and robust policy document setting out its vision, objectives and key planning policies.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 The option of not approving the plan for adoption is not recommended, because in so doing the council:
- would have no clear vision or strategy of how to provide the virgin and secondary aggregates necessary to support and deliver Peterborough's growth agenda;
 - would have no clear vision or strategy for the provision of a range of sustainable waste management infrastructure (for municipal, commercial / industrial, agricultural and waste water waste streams) to support Peterborough's existing and future communities;
 - would have no clear policies to progressively push forward on matters such as the long term restoration and management of quarries and landfill sites, the associated environmental and transport issues; and
 - will be at considerable risk of having to determine minerals and waste planning proposals using outdated strategies and policies; which in turn could lead to poorly planned growth, and insufficient provision of infrastructure due to uncoordinated planning.
- 7.2 In addition, should the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy not be adopted, this would mean that other LDF documents currently under preparation (Site Specific Proposals DPD, The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Supplementary Planning Document [SPD], and the Waste Management Design Guide SPD and The Block Fen / Mepal Fen Masterplan SPD) would unnecessarily be delayed until a revised Minerals and Waste Core Strategy was prepared.

8. IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy will have implications for all sectors of society and all wards and parishes in Peterborough. The process of sustainability appraisal, based on social, economic and environmental criteria, ensures that all potential implications are taken into account in a systematic way.

- 8.2 *FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:* The EU Waste Framework Directive requires all waste planning authorities to have in place waste management plans, and for those plans to contain specific information. The Government has included in Part 2 of the proposed Localism Bill a power to pass on some or all of any fines from the European Court of Justice to any authority which causes the UK to be in breach of its obligations under the Waste Framework Directive.
- 8.3 In comparison with many other Authorities Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council have made good and continued progress on their Minerals and Waste Plan. It is anticipated that subject to the Core Strategy being adopted, and subsequently the Site Specific Proposals Plan being found sound and adopted, that the Council will have a new directive compliant Plan in place by early 2012, and thereby avoid any potential fine.
- 8.4 There are no immediate financial implications flowing from the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The detailed financial implications of the growth agenda that the Strategy supports will be assessed as individual schemes develop, and, where appropriate, these will be incorporated into the Council's Capital and Revenue financial planning processes.
- 8.3 *LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:* On adoption, the Council must consider all relevant planning applications against the policies in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. In addition, all subsequent documents prepared as part of the Local Development Framework (such as the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD) must be in accordance with the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

None

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM 7 (iii) (b)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

Contact Officer:	Helen Edwards, Solicitor to the Council Diane Baker, Head of Governance	Tel: 01733 452539 Tel: 01733 452559
------------------	--	--

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S
FROM : Solicitor to the Council
That Council approves the programme of meetings for 2011/12 and approves, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2012/13 (both attached at Appendix 1).

1. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

- 1.1 This report presents for the consideration of Council the annual programme of meetings for 2011/12 and the draft programme of meetings for 2012/13.

2. PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

- 2.1 Council is asked to approve and note the programme of meeting dates for 2011/12 and to approve the draft dates for 2012/13 (**Appendix 1**). The calendars have been prepared in accordance with the arrangements that have been implemented in previous years.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 There are no financial implications for the recommendation contained in the report.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no legal implications for the recommendation contained in the report.

5. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

Peterborough City Council Constitution.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - programme of meetings for 2011/12 and draft programme of meetings for 2012/13.

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATES
JUNE 2011 - MAY 2012

MEETING	TIME	JUNE	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY
COUNCIL (Wednesday)	7pm		13			12		7		22		18	
Annual Council (Monday)	6.30pm												14
Cabinet (Monday)	10am	13			12		7	12		6	26		
Scrutiny Panels													
Rural Commission (Monday)	7pm	20	18		19		21		16		19		
Health Commission (Tuesday)	7pm	14	19		13		15		17		13		
Sustainable Growth (Tuesday)	7pm	7	12		6		8		10		6		
Creating Opportunities & Tackling Inequalities (Mon)	7pm	13	11		12		14		16		12		
Environment Capital (Thursday)	7pm	9	14		8		3		19		22		
Strong & Supportive Communities (Wednesday)	7pm	15	20		14		9		18		7		
Scrutiny of the Budget	7pm								5				
REGULATORY COMMITTEES													
Audit Committee (Monday)	7pm	6 + 27			5 + 26		7			6	26		
Planning & Env. Protection (PEP) (Tuesday)	1.30pm	7	5		6	11	8	6	10	7	6	10	
PEP <i>provisional dates (Tuesday)</i>		21	26		20	25	22	20	24	21	20	24	
Standards Committee & <i>provisional dates (Wed)</i>	7pm	8	6		7	5	2 & 30		11	8	14	11	
Licensing & Licensing Act 2003 Committee (Thurs)	7pm	23	21		22	20	17	15	19	16	15	19	
Employment Committee (Thursday)	3pm	16			15		24		26		29		
NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS													
Central and North	7pm	16			20			19			5		
Dogsthorpe, East and Park	7pm	1				4			23		28		
Rural North	7pm		7		28			15			1		
Peterborough North Area Committee	7.30pm	22			15				24		20		
Peterborough West	7pm	2			1				12		27		
Fletton, Stanground and Woodston	7pm	28			21			14		29			
Ortons with Hampton	7pm	21			27			13			8		
OTHER BODIES													
Parish Council Liaison (Wednesday)	6.30pm	29				26	30		11				
Police Authority	3pm	29				3		20		10	22		
Combined Fire Authority	Various	23	6		22	13 & 20		1	11 & 26	16	28		
All Party Policy	6pm	30	28		29	27	24		26	23	29		31
Corporate Parenting Group	6.30pm	8	6		7		23		25		21		
Children's Trust Partnership Board	Various	27			29		14						
Safer Peterborough Partnership	3pm - 5pm	29	27	31	28	26	30	21	25	29	28	25	30

DRAFT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATES

JUNE 2012 - MAY 2013

MEETING	TIME	JUNE	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY
COUNCIL (Wednesday)	7pm		11			10		5		20		17	
Annual Council (Monday)	6.30pm												12
Cabinet (Monday)	10am	11			10		5	10		4	25		
Scrutiny Panels													
Rural Commission (Monday)	7pm	18	16		17		19		14		18		
Health Commission (Tuesday)	7pm	12	17		11		13		15		12		
Sustainable Growth (Tuesday)	7pm	5	10		4		6		8		5		
Creating Opportunities & Tackling Inequalities (Mon)	7pm	11	9		10		12		7		11		
Environment Capital (Thursday)	7pm	7	12		6		8		17		21		
Strong & Supportive Communities (Wednesday)	7pm	13	18		12		7		16		6		
Scrutiny of the Budget	7pm								9				
REGULATORY COMMITTEES													
Audit Committee (Monday)	7pm	4 + 25			3 + 24		5			4	25		
Planning & Env. Protection (PEP) (Tuesday)	1.30pm	5	3		4	9	6	4	8	5	5	9	
PEP <i>provisional dates (Tuesday)</i>		19	24		18	23	20	18	22	19	19	23	
Standards Committee & <i>provisional dates (Wed)</i>	7pm	6	4		5	3	7 + 28		9	6	13	10	
Licensing & Licensing Act 2003 Committee (Thurs)	7pm	21	19		20	18	15	13	17	14	14	18	
Employment Committee (Thursday)	3pm	14			13		22		24		28		
NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEES													
Central and North	7pm	4			13			10			4		
Dogsthorpe, East and Park	7pm	14			18			11			5		
Rural North	7pm	19			19			12			7		
Peterborough North Area Committee	7.30pm	20			24			17			19		
Peterborough West	7pm	25			25			18			20		
Fletton, Stanground and Woodston	7pm	26			26			19			21		
Ortons with Hampton	7pm	27			27			20			25		
OTHER BODIES													
Parish Council Liaison (Wednesday)	6.30pm												
Police Authority	3pm												
Combined Fire Authority	Various												
All Party Policy	6pm	28	26		27	25	29		31	28	28		30
Corporate Parenting Group	6.30pm	6	4		5		21		23	20	20		
Children's Trust Partnership Board	Various												
Safer Peterborough Partnership	3pm - 5pm												

DRAFT PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATES

JUNE 2012 - MAY 2013

CONFERENCES	Summer 2012	Summer 2012	Spring 2013	Summer Term 2013
Conservative Party				
English Democrats				
Labour Party Annual Conference				
Liberal Democrats				
Local Government Association				

Bank Holidays 2012 - 2013

- 27 August 2012 - Summer Bank Holiday
- 25 December 2012 - Christmas Day
- 26 December 2012 - Boxing Day
- 1 January 2013 - New Year's Day
- Good Friday
- Easter Monday
- Early May Bank Holiday
- Spring Bank Holiday

NB: dates in italics are additional, provisional dates for any urgent business and may be cancelled

COUNCIL	AGENDA ITEM 7 (iii) (c)
13 APRIL 2011	PUBLIC REPORT

Contact Officer(s):	Sally Crawford, Electoral Services Manager	Tel: 01733 452339
---------------------	--	-------------------

GROUPING OF BOROUGH FEN AND NEWBOROUGH PARISH COUNCILS

RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM: SOLICITOR TO THE COUNCIL
<p>That Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agrees to the grouping of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Councils under the name of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council; 2. Authorises the Solicitor to the Council to draw up an Order to group the parish councils to include the following electoral arrangements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the number of parish councillors should be twelve, eight representing Newborough and four representing Borough Fen; (ii) the current parish councillors elected in 2010 for Newborough and Borough Fen should continue to represent the new parish council, elections will be held at the end of their term of office in 2014.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The report seeks Council's approval to group the parishes of Borough Fen and Newborough and allow a common parish council under the name of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council to be formed, and request the Council to make an Order to bring the parish council into force.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Parish Councils may apply to the principal council for an Order grouping the parish with neighbouring parishes in the same district under a common parish council under s11 of the LGA 1972.
- 2.2 Under the 1972 Act Parishes cannot be grouped without the consent of the meeting of each of the parishes.
- 2.3 A request has been received from Borough Fen and Newborough Parish councils to group for the following reasons:
 - Borough Fen should comprise of 5 parish councillors but has only had 4 for some time;
 - Borough Fen is not functioning effectively as its meetings are rarely quorate and frequently have to be adjourned;
 - The electorate of Borough Fen is 100 which is too small to have its own parish council;
 - Borough Fen and Newborough Parish Councils are in favour of the grouping;

- Newborough and Borough Fen were one parish council until the 1970s and already have many shared interests such as the village hall and the burial ground.

2.4 At a parish meeting in May 2010, residents were informed of the proposals, Notices were displayed on the parish notice boards, on the Website and an article placed in the village magazine.

2.5 A special public meeting was held on 23 November 2010 at which it was unanimously agreed to apply to the Principal Council (Peterborough City Council) for an Order to Group the two parishes.

2.6 The ward councillor, Cllr Harrington, has been consulted and is in favour of the proposal.

2.7 Ian Dewar, Chief Executive Officer of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Association of Local Councils has been consulted, has given advice to both Parish Councils and has recommended the grouping of the parish councils.

3. GROUPING AND ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 At the meeting in November it was agreed that the proposed Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Council should comprise of twelve parish councillors, eight representing Newborough and four representing Borough Fen.

3.2 The currently elected councillors, elected in 2010, will continue to represent the grouped parish council until the end of their current term of office in 2014 when elections will be held.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 There are no alternative options to grouping. Borough Fen is too small to have its own parish council and is not able to function lawfully with its current arrangement.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Parish Councils may apply to the principal council for an Order grouping the parish with neighbouring parishes in the same district under a common parish council under s11 of the LGA 1972. The Order will set out the name of the parish and the electoral arrangements that are to apply.

5.2 Adopting the recommendations

5.2.1 On agreeing to the request of Newborough and Borough Fen Parish Councils, the Council is committed to make an Order to group the parish councils. The Council has to be satisfied therefore that the grouping of the parish councils is the appropriate form of governance for the area.

5.2.2 In deciding whether to group the parishes the Council must consider the recommendations made by each of the parishes in requesting the Council to make an Order to form the new parish council.

5.3 Electoral arrangements

5.3.1 The current parish councillors representing Newborough and Borough Fen, elected in 2010, will continue to represent the grouped parish council until the end of their current term of office in 2014 when elections will be held.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The parish precept has already been set for 2011/2012 for Newborough and Borough Fen. It is intended that the two precepts should run together for 2011/2012 and to review the budget and precept for 2012/2013.

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The recommendations fulfil the Council's statutory responsibilities.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 8.1 Local Government Act 1972

This page is intentionally left blank