

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
22 FEBRUARY 2012**

The Mayor – Councillor Paula Thacker MBE

Present:

Councillors: Arculus, Ash, Benton, Burton, Casey, Cereste, M Dalton, S Dalton, D Day, S Day, Dobbs, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Fower, JA Fox, JR Fox, Goldspink, Goodwin, Harper, Harrington, Hiller, Holdich, Jamil, Khan, Kreling, Lamb, Lane, Lee, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Nadeem, Nash, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Shabbir, Serluca, Shaheed, Shearman, Simons, Stokes, Swift, Thacker, Todd, Walsh and Winslade.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Allen, Sanders and Sharp.

Urgent Item of Business

The Mayor advised all present that an urgent item of business had been permitted for inclusion on the agenda. This item, 'Political Groups 2011-12 and Consequential Amendments to Allocations to Committees', would be taken after item 15(b).

The Mayor further advised that a statement was to be permitted to be made by Councillor Benton.

Councillor Benton addressed Council and stated that with immediate effect, she would become a Member of the Peterborough Independent Forum. This was in response to the recent notification of her de-selection as a Conservative Party Candidate.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Arculus declared a personal interest in item 15(a), in that he was acquainted with the three individuals who were mentioned.

3. Minutes of the meetings held on 7 December 2011

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2011 were agreed and signed by the Mayor as an accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS TIME

4. Mayor's Announcements

Members noted the updated report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period 28 November 2011 to 12 February 2012.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME

7. Questions with Notice by Members of the public

Four questions had been raised by members of the public and were taken as read, these were in relation to:

1. 25% reduction in council tax afforded to people living on their own;
2. The re-instatement of closed play centres;
3. School attainment levels; and
4. The Peterborough City Market.

A summary of the questions and answers raised within agenda item 7 is attached at **Appendix A** to these minutes.

8. Questions with notice by Members of the Council relating to ward matters to Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen

Questions relating to Ward matters were raised in respect of the following:

1. Travellers situated in Dogsthorpe ward; and
2. The cost of a ward name change.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 8 are attached at **Appendix A** to these minutes.

9. Questions with Notice by Members of the Council to representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities

No questions to the representatives of the Police Authority or the Fire Authority were raised.

10. Petitions submitted by Members or Residents

Nicola Day-Dempsey submitted a petition from concerned local residents requesting improvements to the Dogsthorpe Road crossing near Queens Drive Infant School, which had struggled to find and keep a crossing guard in order to help young people and families cross the road safely.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

11. Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive

Councillor Khan queried whether the time limit for the item could be extended. The Monitoring Officer advised that she would look into this request and stated it could be taken as a change to the Constitution.

Questions to the Leader and Members of the Executive were taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Super Output Areas;
2. Cambridgeshire Community Services and the transfer back to Adult Social Care;
3. The recent bus station closure;
4. Road safety issues;

5. Trees in Bridge Street; and
6. Actions being taken in order to tackle homelessness and to assist vulnerable people.

Questions unable to be dealt with at the meeting due to time constraints were in respect of the following:

1. The Police Commissioner election costs;
2. The £10m deficit in the budget;
3. The cost of consultations; and
4. The possibility of SOS bus provision.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 11 are attached at **Appendix B** to these minutes.

12. Questions without Notice on the Record of Executive Decisions

Members received and noted a report summarising:

1. Decisions from the Cabinet Meetings held on 12 December 2011 and 10 February 2012;
2. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the last meeting;
3. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked twice since the previous meeting;
4. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 23 November 2011 to 7 February 2012.

Questions were asked about the following:

Section 75 Agreement with Cambridgeshire Community Services

Councillor Murphy requested clarification as to what notice and negotiation had taken place with the staff affected by the decision and their trade union representatives. Were they in agreement to the decision and what were the pension arrangements to be from the 1 March 2012? Councillor Fitzgerald advised Council that full consultation and staff briefings had been undertaken and with regards to the pensions, they would transfer and there was an agreement that all pensions remaining with the NHS would be subject to continued contributions following the transfer.

Determination of Competition to Establish a New Primary School in Hampton

Councillor Shearman requested clarification as to why the proposal from the diocese of Ely and the Schools Trust, to run the new primary school at Hampton, had been rejected? Councillor Holdich advised that the public had not been impressed with either of the two applicants and the decision cut off point had been near. Both providers were therefore rejected. A provider would however be sought for the school prior to it opening in September 2013.

Solar Photo-Voltaic (PV) Panels Framework Agreement

Councillor Sandford requested clarification as to what the intentions were with regards to the extension of solar power under the framework and whether confidence was high as to whether it could be achieved without imposing an undue burden on the finances of the Council? Councillor Seaton advised that the question was more in relation to how the contract would be used in the future, therefore he was happy to give Councillor Sandford a separate briefing on the works currently being undertaken to role out solar panels.

Councillor Khan requested clarification as to whether there would be any financial

implications upon the Local Authority if orders or individual contracts were cancelled? Councillor Seaton advised that there would not be any financial implications. It was a framework contract and therefore there would be individual business cases coming forward which would be signed off

Appointment of Authority Governor – Highlees Primary School (two separate decisions)

Councillor Shearman requested clarification as to whether there had been three Governor appointments made to Highlees Primary School. Councillor Holdich responded that there were three appointments made, one of them being himself and as the nominated Governor he was not able to take the decision himself, the decision had therefore been taken by the Leader.

Delivery of the Council's Capital Receipts Programme through the sale of Herlington House

Councillor Lane requested clarification as to whether an early receipt of the sum from the sale of Herlington House would have an impact on the financial strategy, when it was scheduled to arrive in two years time and not at present? Councillor Seaton responded that it would not have an impact. Around £36m of assets were being disposed of and the sale of Herlington House was only a small part of this amount. The property had been to auction the previous week and had not been sold. It had also been offered to the Registered Social Landlords in the city but no interest was received.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

13. Committee Recommendations

a) Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document (DPD) and Proposals Map Parts A & B

Cabinet, at its meeting of 12 December 2011, received a report informing it of the publication of the Inspector's Report and its conclusion which found the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD 'sound' and sought Cabinet approval to recommend that Council adopted the DPD at its meeting on 22 February 2012.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning introduced and moved the recommendation that Council adopts the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document, incorporating the changes set out in the Inspector's Report.

In recommending the document, it was highlighted that if the proposals were adopted it would mean that the Council had made provision for both minerals and waste management needs until at least 2026, in a detailed yet flexible plan. If adopted, Peterborough would be one of the first unitary authorities in the country to have both its Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plans adopted, this was a significant achievements.

Councillor Seaton seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

The recommendation was seconded and a vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council adopts the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document, incorporating the changes set out in the Inspector's Report.

b) Peterborough Housing Strategy 2011-2015 and the Peterborough Strategic Tenancy Policy

Cabinet at its meeting of 10 February 2012, considered a report seeking its support for the Peterborough Housing Strategy 2011 to 2015 and the Peterborough Strategic Tenancy Policy and for it to recommend adoption of both documents by Council at its meeting of 22 February 2012.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning introduced and moved the recommendation that Council adopts the Peterborough Housing Strategy and the Peterborough Strategic Tenancy Policy.

In recommending the document, it was highlighted that this was the final version and an important document for the city. It had been the subject of much consultation and set out forty policies which supported growth, meet existing housing need, regenerate existing housing stock and encourage mixed and sustainable communities.

Included within the document was the Peterborough Strategic Tenancy Policy. This document was required to be produced under the terms of the Localism Act. The policy would enable the Council to shape important decisions made by housing association partners, which would affect a number of people living in the city.

Councillor Seaton seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendation and raised points including:

- The good work put into the documents by Officers and Cabinet Members in order to try and tackle the problems faced in Peterborough. The documents could have been more challenging;
- The development taking place in villages where it was not needed, or wanted. There was land to build homes in other parts of the city;
- The private sector being unable to deal with the housing need across the country, and the worsening situation with regards to homelessness;
- The growing numbers of houses in multiple occupation in the city and the lack of larger properties in the city;
- The works being undertaken alongside the water companies to ensure water supplies to all new houses;
- The works being undertaken across housing associations, with the first joint meeting due to take place on 27 February 2012; and
- The number of people who wished to downsize to a smaller property.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning summed up and stated that the strategy and appended policy were robust for the city and he reiterated his recommendation for adoption.

Following debate, a vote was taken (36 in favour, 3 against, 9 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

Council adopts the Peterborough Housing Strategy and the Peterborough Strategic Tenancy Policy.

The meeting was adjourned for a five minute break.

c) Budget 2012/13 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to 2021/22

Cabinet at its meeting of 10 February 2012 received a report presenting budget

proposals for 2012/13 through to 2021/22, in line with the final local government finance settlement for 2012/13 and the possible outcome for future local government funding arrangements for 2013/14 onwards.

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

- A wide consultation had been undertaken, including presentations at the Neighbourhood Committee meetings and the Youth Council, amongst many other groups;
- Where strong arguments had been received to change the proposals, action had been taken;
- The amendment proposed the withdrawal of the increase in residents parking permits in order that a review could be carried out of on street and residents parking arrangements;
- The Budget had been prepared against the backdrop of the most difficult financial position local Councils had found themselves in for many years;
- The Council was about to enter the second year of a four year cycle which would reduce the overall grant from central government by 28%;
- In the next financial year, Peterborough would receive a formula grant reduction of 5.6m, this would mean the Council had had a 15m reduction over two financial years, and overall, all grants received would be 25m lower in four years time;
- Key services were expected to be provided;
- Since 2006 savings totalling more than £100m had been made, with £28m having been delivered in the current financial year;
- A crucial part of delivering savings had been to identify innovative ways of delivering services, including the approach of working with partners;
- Investment had been made into schools, to the sum of £73m, Adult Social Care, to the sum of £10m, Affordable Housing, to the sum of £16m over the next five years and Transport, to the sum of £5m;
- The proposed rise in council tax had been met with some comment from central government, however after consideration, it had been decided that the best way forward would be to decline the government's offer and instead, increase council tax by 2.95% for 2012/13;
- Peterborough was the 5th lowest unitary authority for council tax in the country and with the increase it would still remain one of the lowest;
- To freeze council tax at the current time would mean a hole in the Council's budget in years to come.

The Cabinet Member for Resources commended the Budget to the Council. Councillor Cereste seconded the proposals and reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor announced that an alternative budget proposal had been submitted jointly by the Peterborough Independent Forum, Labour and the Liberal Democrat Groups. Details of the alternative budget were outlined in the Order Paper (attached at Appendix D to these minutes).

Councillor Lane presented the alternative budget, and moved the recommendations, which proposed the following:

- Council tax to be frozen for 2012/13;
- That Council accepts the one year only (2012/13) grant freeze offer from central government; and

- Further savings proposed, to offset in part the loss of council income in 2013/14 and beyond.

During his speech Councillor Lane highlighted that whilst the Conservative amendment to the budget contained a significant reduction in the spend on the Trees and Woodland Strategy, it was felt that this was not a significant enough sum and therefore the plans to make £500k of savings in this area should still stand. Councillor Lane further stated that overall, the alternative budget presented a balanced view and represented the best way forward for the people of Peterborough.

The alternative budget was seconded by Councillor Martin who reserved his right to speak.

A debate on the alternative budget followed and in summary, key points raised in favour included:

- The increase in the tree management budget and the lack of an up to date Tree Strategy or action plan;
- Grant could be obtained from central government in order to cover 80% of woodland management costs;
- The park and ride withdrawal proposals due to supposed lack of usage of the service (there had been a 200% increase in the usage over the Christmas period from last year);
- The Members' allowances proposals, which reduced special responsibility payments;
- Support the Council Tax freeze, which could be offset by rejecting other projects;
- Lack of evidence that the Creative City Programme and its classification as an essential bid, specifically where it stated that Peterborough's level of engagement with the arts needed to be improved;
- The amount of money being spent on the Capital Programme of Works in relation to the amounts of money being spent on safeguarding;
- Local talent could be utilised for the Olympics event and less money should be spent;

Points raised in debate against the alternative budget included:

- The lack of reference to resident's parking in the alternative budget;
- The Trees and Woodland Strategy could not be produced without funding being available.
- Peterborough needed to invest in the incinerator, specifically in relation to incurring charges for landfill;
- Consultants and the specialist skills that they provided was a necessity at times;
- The Olympics event which had been secured for the city and the revenue this would generate;
- The proposals contained within the alternative budget would do nothing in the long term to address the financial situation;
- Although an important part of the city, the duty of care should be for the residents of Peterborough, and less about trees;

During the above debate, the Monitoring Officer advised that an amendment to the original proposals from Councillor Seaton could not be submitted until debate on the alternative budget had finished.

The Section 151 Officer addressed Council and advised that any proposed budget had

to be agreed by Officers to ensure that it was financially sound and viable.

Following debate, Councillor Martin addressed Council and stated that it was not just the opposition groups who were requesting a freeze in the Council Tax, it was the Government also. There were a number of families in Peterborough already struggling to make ends meet and salaries were being frozen.

A vote was taken on the alternative budget (17 in favour, 30 against and 1 abstention) and it was **DEFEATED**.

A debate was held on the original recommendations as proposed by Councillor Seaton. Councillor Cereste stated that the Budget was a continuation of previous budget strategies and accepting the Council Tax freeze grant from Government would not be in the best interests for the citizens of Peterborough.

Following a brief debate, Councillor Seaton summed up and apologised to all those people who had not received a personal reply to consultation responses.

A recorded vote was requested and agreed. Members voted as follows:

Councillors for: Arculus, Burton, Casey, Cereste, M Dalton, S Dalton, D Day, S Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Kreling, Lamb, Lee, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Stokes, Thacker, Todd, Walsh and Winslade.

Councillors against: Ash, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harrington, Jamil, Khan, Lane, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shabbir, Shaheed, Shearman and Swift.

Councillors not voting: Goldspink and Nash.

Following the vote (32 in favour, 17 against and 2 abstentions) it was **RESOLVED** to adopt the recommendations for the budget for 2012/13 and the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) to 2021/22, those recommendations being:

- a. The revenue budget for 2012/13 and the medium term financial strategy to 2021/22, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy;
- b. The capital programme for 2012/13 to 2021/22 and related strategies and indicators;
- c. The council tax increase of 2.95% for 2012/13, indicative increases of 2.95% for 2013/14 to 2016/17 and indicative increases of 2.5% thereafter to 2021/22;
- d. The council tax setting resolution as set out in Appendix A;
- e. The reserves position, including the use of reserves to support the budget position in 2012/13 and the use of the surplus generated in 2013/14 to support the budget position in 2014/15, contributing towards a sustainable financial position in future years.

The Cambridgeshire Fire Authority were to meet to set their budget and council tax on 16 February, after these papers were released. The Council tax resolution was based on the proposals to be considered at that meeting. If different proposals were approved, then it would be necessary to submit an addendum to Council.

The proposed budget as set out in the agenda papers would also incorporate the amendment that was moved with the original recommendations as follows:
Subject to the following amendment as moved by Councillor Seaton, the proposed budget as set out in the agenda papers be amended as follows:

1. The proposal to increase the cost of residents parking permits is withdrawn from the budget in order that a future review can be carried out of our on-street and residents' parking arrangements to ensure we have the right balance in each area. The change is outlined below:

	2012/ 13 £k	2013/ 14 £k	2014 /15 £k	2015 /16 £k	2016/ 17 £k
Original Proposal (page 51 of budget report)	6	15	23	23	23
Increase cost of residents' first parking permit by £5 for 2012/13. Further increases of £5 for first permit in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 will follow. Cost of residents' other annual parking permits to remain unchanged.					
Amendment	-6	-15	-23	-23	-23
Withdraw increase in cost of residents parking permits					
Final budget proposal	0	0	0	0	0

2. The loss of income will be offset by a reduction in funding for the Trees and Woodlands strategy. The change is outlined below:

	2012 /13 £k	2013/ 14 £k	2014 /15 £k	2015 /16 £k	2016/ 17 £k
Original Proposal (page 56 of budget report)	750	750	750	750	750
Trees and Woodlands strategy					
Amendment	-6	-15	-23	-23	-23
Reduce funding to support strategy to offset loss of parking permit income					
Final budget proposal	744	735	727	727	727

This approach means that there is no net impact on the overall budget.

Impact on recommendations (page 1 of budget report)

This amendment does not change the wording of any recommendations, but it does alter the content of the revenue budget to be approved under recommendation a, as well as two elements of the council tax setting resolution under recommendation d:

- a. The revenue budget for 2012/13 and the medium term financial strategy to 2021/22, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy;
- d. The council tax setting resolution as set out in Appendix A

Updates to Council tax setting Resolution (page 6 of budget report)

The amendments will reduce the gross expenditure and income figures in the council tax resolution by £6k for 2012/13. The revised figures are outlined below:

COUNCIL TAX 2012/13

3. THAT the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2012/13 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (as amended): -
 - (a) £405,451,330 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act. (Gross expenditure including repayments of grants to government 31A(6) (a), Parish Precepts and Special Expenses 31A (6) (b))
 - (b) (£341,129,997) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act. (Revenue Income)

The meeting was adjourned for a fifteen minute break.

The urgent item 15(c) was taken next.

URGENT ITEM 15. Reports and Recommendations

(c) Political Groups 2011-12 & Consequential Amendments to Allocations to Committees

Councillor Cereste moved an urgent report, together with a number of additions, requesting Council to consider and agree a number of recommendations, as summarised in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report, in relation to revised political group allocations and committee membership following a change to the political balance of Council. Councillor Cereste recommended that Council:

These recommendations were seconded by Councillor Lee and he reserved his right to speak.

Councillor John Fox moved an amendment to the recommendation from Councillor Cereste in order that Councillor Nash would remain as the Chairman of the Neighbourhood and Area committees for the remainder for the political year. The amendment to the recommendations was to delete the wording of paragraph (e) below:

That Council considers and agrees the following recommendations:

1. Political Group Allocations and Committee Memberships:

- a) Notes the amended Political Group membership for 2011-12 as set out in Appendix 1;
- b) Affirms its approval for the Committee structure set out at paragraph 3.1 of this report;
- c) Agrees the allocation of seats to political groups as set out at paragraph 4.5 of this report;

- d) Agrees the appointments to committees to which the political balance rules apply as set out in paragraph 6 of this report;
- e) ~~Agrees the appointment of Cllr Simons as Chair of Peterborough North Area Committee (Area North & West 2), and as Chair of Peterborough West Neighbourhood Committee (Area North & West 3) in place of Cllr Nash.~~

2. Procedural Matters

- a) Following these changes, affirms its approval for the Leader's Scheme of Delegations as set out in Part 3, section 3 of the Constitution;
- b) Delegates consequential updating of the Constitution arising from this report to the Solicitor to the Council.

This was seconded by Councillor Swift.

Following debate a vote was taken (14 in favour, 30 against and 3 abstentions) and the amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor Sandford stated that each Neighbourhood Committee should be permitted to choose its own Chairman.

Following debate on the original recommendations from Councillor Cereste, Councillor Nash made a statement thanking everyone for their support. A vote was taken (28 for, 18 against, 2 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. Political Group Allocations and Committee Memberships:

- a) Notes the amended Political Group membership for 2011-12 as set out in Appendix 1;
- b) Affirms its approval for the Committee structure set out at paragraph 3.1 of the report;
- c) Agrees the allocation of seats to political groups as set out at paragraph 4.5 of the report;
- d) Agrees the appointments to committees to which the political balance rules apply as set out in paragraph 6 of the report;
- e) Agrees the appointment of Cllr Simons as Chair of Peterborough North Area Committee (Area North & West 2), and as Chair of Peterborough West Neighbourhood Committee (Area North & West 3) in place of Cllr Nash.

2. Procedural Matters

- a) Following these changes, affirms its approval for the Leader's Scheme of Delegations as set out in Part 3, section 3 of the Constitution;
- b) Delegates consequential updating of the Constitution arising from this report to the Solicitor to the Council.

The above recommendations were subject to the following additions as moved by Councillor Cereste:

Following Councillor Benton's move to the PIF Group, the Conservative Group now had 35 members instead of 36 and PIF had 12 instead of 11.

This made a difference to entitlement to seats, and the Conservative Group would lose one more seat in addition to those detailed in the report.

The following recommendations were therefore added to those under recommendation 1 in report:

- f) Councillor Benton is removed as Chair of Employment Committee and that Councillor Fitzgerald is appointed in her place, and that he also replaces her on the Employment Appeals Sub-Committee;
- g) Councillor Benton is removed as Vice Chair of the Licensing Committee and is replaced with Councillor Todd;
- h) That the Conservatives give up a seat on the Licensing Committee, removing Councillor Simons and giving this seat to PIF, with the PIF representative to be notified to the Chief Executive following this meeting;
- i) That Councillor Benton be removed as the Conservative representative from the following Committees, with the replacement Conservative members to be notified to the Chief Executive following this meeting –
 - Creating Opportunities and Tackling Inequalities;
 - The Planning Review Committee; and
 - As substitute on the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee.

14. Notices of Motion

1. Councillor Goldspink moved the following motion:

Given that this Council has invested £250,000 over two years in the Citizen Power Programme, this Council:

1. Calls for a report to be submitted to its next meeting setting out the original objectives of the project and how they were to be measured, together with an evidenced assessment of the success of meeting those objectives, the tangible benefits achieved and their value to the ordinary people of Peterborough.

This motion was seconded by Councillor John Fox.

Following a debate on the motion, Councillor Hiller commented that a full review of the Citizen's Power Programme had been undertaken, with a report submitted to the Strong and Supportive Scrutiny Committee in September 2011 and the report and its recommendations had been agreed in full. A Task and Finish Group had subsequently been established and was due to report back to the Scrutiny Committee in July and November 2012. A formal process was already therefore in place. A vote was taken (17 in favour, 28 against, 3 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

No motion had been put forward to extend the length of the meeting and therefore the guillotine procedure came into effect and the remainder of the items on the agenda were taken to be formally moved and seconded, with no speeches allowed and votes taken in the usual way.

Councillor Murphy wished it to be noted in the minutes that he was not aware that the vote had taken place for Councillor Goldspink's motion. He believed he was voting on an extension to the length of the meeting.

2. Councillor Miners submitted the following motion:

That this Council:

1. Believes that the opportunity given under the Localism Act, to reintroduce the Committee system should be adopted during the next Municipal Year. By reintroducing the Committee system, we will be giving back bench Councillors a more active role in the decision making process of the Council. Thereby going some way to bringing Democracy closer to local people.

A vote was taken (19 in favour, 30 against, 0 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

3. Councillor Sandford submitted the following motion:

That Council:

1. Notes that Peterborough's Third Local Transport Plan agreed by Full Council in 2011 states the following vision for Park and Ride in Peterborough:

Park and Ride transport hubs that will intercept vehicles before they access the city centre and provide opportunities for transfer between transport modes.

In order to realise this vision the city council will concentrate on the following objectives (inter alia):

- To intercept vehicles destined for the city core and city centre and, hence, be an integral part of the car parking supply for the city
- To integrate modes of transport to form comprehensive transport hubs that provide pedestrian and cycle linkages, secure cycle storage, interchange between bus services and electric vehicle recharging facilities and Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) overnight parking
- To provide a cost effective alternative to city centre parking
- To provide appropriate seasonal Park and Ride to facilitate access to the city centre in the Christmas period.

2. Notes that the Peterborough Bus Strategy makes the following commitment to key actions on Park and Ride:

- Review permanent park and ride options such as developer funded or Government Growth Area Funding; and
- Continue to provide a Christmas park and ride service

3. Notes that a Scrutiny Review of Park and Ride recommended that the Council should seek to increase likely patronage by progressively extending the period of operation of the current Christmas park and ride service

4. Therefore regrets the withdrawal of the Christmas Park and ride service proposed by the Cabinet and requests the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee to carry out a review of park and ride options and report back to the July meeting of Full Council with appropriate recommendations.

A vote was taken (14 in favour, 31 against, 2 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

15. Reports and Recommendations

a) Appointment of Deputy Coroner

A report was submitted to Council requesting its approval to appoint Simon Milburn as the Deputy Coroner for Peterborough.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

Appoint Simon Milburn as the Deputy Coroner for Peterborough.

b) Peterborough City Council Pay Policy Statement for 2012/3

A report was submitted as Council was required by the Localism Act 2011 to pass a resolution approving the Pay Policy Statement by no later than 31st March each year, for the following financial year. This report asks council to approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2012/13.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** to:

Adopt the pay policy statement as appended to the report.

Meeting closed at 11.30 p.m.

MAYOR

FULL COUNCIL 22 FEBRUARY 2012

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions have been received under the following categories:

<u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT TIME</u>	
7	<u>Questions with notice by members of the public</u>
1.	<p>Anne Sylvester asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Politicians are planning to remove the 25% reduction in Council Tax afforded to those living on their own.</p> <p>This proposal would adversely affect the living standards of all single council tax payers in Peterborough.</p> <p>Does the Leader of the Council agree with this proposal?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement responded:</p> <p>The single person discount for council tax is granted, as the name suggests, when a house is only occupied by one person.</p> <p>There are no proposals, either nationally or locally, to remove the single person discount.</p> <p>Anne Sylvester asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Due to the serious nature of the proposals, could the Leader please provide me with a full written response?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement may respond:</p> <p>The Council is undertaking a process of checking that people currently claiming single person discount are indeed living alone, and eligible. Where people are not living alone, the benefit will be removed. Where people are eligible, the discount will of course remain in place.</p> <p>A full written response would also be provided by the proper Officer.</p>
2.	<p>Glennis Bentley asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p> <p>According to the Peterborough's Children & Young People Plan 2009 – 2012 "children and young people are at the centre of the work we do and that we deliver services in the</p>

	<p>way they need them”.</p> <p>Key priority 5 states “We want children to enjoy learning through play and informal learning opportunities to live together in cohesive communities”.</p> <p>Given this priority when are the Council going to re instate closed play centres, fully staffed and accessible to all children and young people?</p> <p>Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services responded:</p> <p>Peterborough City Council is currently delivering play services from seven City Council Play Centres (Thistle Drive, The Tunnel, The Spinney, Crofts Corner, Paston Farm Adventure Centre, Charteris Play Centre, Chestnuts Play Centre) and one outreach venue in central ward delivered at the Iqbal Family Centre. Copelands Play Centre is not currently used for the delivery of play but is used by North Bretton Children’s Centre as a satellite centre and it has a wide range of activities taking place there for children and families of the local area.</p> <p>A review of play services is being undertaken and we remain committed to providing play and informal learning opportunities across the city. We need to ensure these are delivered in a cost effective way that maximises the limited resources at our disposal and provides the best possible opportunities for children and families.</p> <p>Glennis Bentley asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>The review that is being undertaken, what part will the families be consulted on and the young people themselves?</p> <p>Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services responded:</p> <p>Once the review was finished within the Council then it would go out to public consultation and the children and families will be consulted. It will be a widespread consultation involving the parents who use play centres.</p> <p>With regards to the timescale for the consultation, I will let Mrs Bentley know.</p>
3.	<p>Nicola Day-Dempsey asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>In Peterborough schools over the past three years, 85% of pupils in English and 83% in Mathematics made the expected progress between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2.</p> <p>However over the same period, only 60% of pupils in English and 52% in Mathematics made the expected progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4.</p> <p>The progress from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2 was above the national average and the progress from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 was well below the national average.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Schools explain why this should be so and what the Local Authority is doing to improve this situation?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University responded:</p> <p>There has been significant targeting of resources into primary schools around tracking the progress of pupils and taking action to address underperformance at an earlier</p>

stage. Secondary schools are now also showing more rigour in this area, and as a result the rate of progress is improving year-on-year (up 8% in English from 2009 – 2011 and up 9% in mathematics over the same period – double the rate of national improvement). Schools are placing more significance on progress measures as the focus on league tables has moved away from straight GCSE results. This will lead to further improvement on progression.

It is more difficult for the Council to intervene across the secondary sector because of the mixed economy of maintained and academy schools. However, we will continue to strive to work with all secondary schools and will undertake similar work to target support and improve both the progress and standards all learners achieve. For example, last month the Authority held a training session for Governors to equip them with the ability to challenge performance within their school governing bodies. It is not for the authority to run the school; it is for the heads and the Governors.

The authority had not been backward in coming forward in taking over schools that were underperforming. In the not too distant past we have taken over John Fisher, and that is much improved, and also the old Orton Longueville school. Since it has been taken over and become an Academy, you can see the results.

There are large challenges amongst our schools, during the last nine months, 581 extra young people arrived in our schools, 570 from distant parts. (Councillor Holdich read a letter) The schools were running Saturday schools and also looking at family learning. Dialogue had also been opened with the exam boards to highlight to them that, although the children spoke English, they did not understand some of the questions in the exam papers.

The Council was putting millions into improving our schools and for instance the new TDA site, building a new school. All Saints is also being rebuilt, Queens Drive extended and we are still looking for more sites in PE1. And we are the first Council in the country who have completed our Building Schools for the Future programme, or will do when they are completed. So you can see that this Council does believe in its young people and the young people of our city are our future and this Conservative controlled Council is putting children's education at the top of its priorities.

Nicola Day-Dempsey asked the following supplementary question:

Would the Cabinet Member agree with me that the main reason for this disparity is that unlike our secondary schools all but one primary school has remained within the control of the Local Authority and for this reason he should be doing everything in his power to dissuade primary schools from applying for academy status, and if they do become academy schools in the end and lose LEA control will we then see a reduction or cut of our primary and secondary consultants and education team at the city council?

Councillor Holdich, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University responded:

I don't think there's any advantage in a primary school becoming an academy personally, but we do have one that has gone and we will monitor its progress. This Authority is one of the few authorities in the country that hasn't cut the funds to its improvement team but our improvement team can only go into schools if we are asked. We do not fail in our duty of taking schools over, if we feel they are failing, but it is a two year process, you can't just walk in. we do encourage the schools to let us in and if you look at the Ofsted reports you will see an increase in the praise for the work being undertaken by the school improvement team.

4.

Di Newman asked the following question:

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement.

The Peterborough City Market has a long history dating back to a 10th Century Market Charter. As the city's largest hub of small independently-owned lock-up businesses, it not only provides everyday commodities, at affordable prices including really fresh food with zero-packaging, but also provides local employment and new business opportunities, reflects the city's multicultural society and supports local farmers and food producers; underpinning local sustainability and enhancing the city's Environment Capital aspirations and credentials. Considering this and the ever mounting impact on the City Market and its traders including:

- a. the hikes in rents, Business Rates; and
- b. parking fees;
- c. removal of its on-site security;
- d. removal of sufficient cleaners and appropriate cleansing policies; and
- e. proposed removal of the Market's manager, and position;

Can the Cabinet Member advise me how much of the £350,000 p.a. (approx: figures as £450,000 just a few years ago!) revenue the city council receives from the City Market traders in respect of annual rents and Business Rates and of the total revenue received by the city council over the past 5 years, including any additional funding, has been set aside in the proposed Budget to re/invest into the City Market for the near future?

Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement responded:

On average the City Market brings in approximately £400k of income, depending on how business is fairing and how many stay in business, which is used to fund the running cost and investment of the market. We spend on the market approximately £370k of this and that doesn't leave much leeway or slack for any unforeseen things which may happen The significant costs are:-

£90k Refuse
£60k Cleaning
£77k Staffing
£53k Rates
£19k Maintenance
£22k Utilities
£17k Security and Insurance
£30k Misc

There is no additional investment within the Medium Term Financial Strategy for the market, although I have a great deal of respect for the traders and I believe the market is an important part of our city and somehow we need to find a way of using it more effectively and giving them a greater opportunity to trade far more successfully.

Di Newman asked the following supplementary question:

Could we ask the Chief Executive to come down and meet with the traders to discuss how and when funds would be implemented? The floors haven't been cleaned for a year so could I have a breakdown of costs that you allegedly spend on the market and also we want a breakdown of the budget to be ploughed into investment or re-investment into the city market for the next five years and how that is going to be implemented and when.

Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement responded:

As mentioned, there is no additional investment within the Medium Term Financial Strategy so there isn't any money planned at the moment to be invested in the market. I am surprised to hear that the floor has not been cleaned for a year when there is 60k being spent on cleaning, if that is the case we need to investigate that, thank you for bringing it to our attention. I will be quite happy to give you a breakdown of what is spent on the market, it's a matter of public record, and I'm sure that both the Chief Executive and I would meet with the market traders to see if there is a way in which we can improve what is going on down there.

8 Questions with notice by Members relating to ward matters To the Cabinet Members and to Committee Chairmen

1. Councillor Miners asked the following question:

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning

"Noting that perhaps the usual time-span for this city council to remove/evict illegal Traveller Encampments, from residential areas, is around 10-14 days, could the Cabinet Member please inform the community of Dogsthorpe Ward why Travellers are still at the Saxby Gardens/Belvoir Way illegal encampment for nearly two months, and still counting?"

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:

I can appreciate Councillor Miners feeling behind this question and I have sympathy with the residents. I personally attended the traveller eviction at Werrington last week and witnessed first hand the aggression some members of this community can dispense and indeed the filth they leave behind. There might well be some traditional gypsies telling fortunes from painted caravans out their somewhere but some of the lawless groups we endure here are far from that picture. The Council has, until recently, successfully used common law procedures to move on unauthorised Traveller encampments on after a period of around 10 days. This is typically up to three times faster than using criminal law proceedings through the court system. In future, the initial welfare assessment that we are legally obliged to carry out with Travellers at new unauthorised encampments will be used to determine, on a case by case basis, whether common or criminal law proceedings need to be instigated.

There are a number of Travellers who have remained at Belvoir Way for some weeks. These Travellers make up a single family unit of parents and children who have in fact been occupying land in Peterborough for several years, indeed the family's children are in permanent education here. One of the children in this family has a very serious health condition, and, I'm told under the professional guidance of NHS colleagues, we are unlawfully unable to move the family on until we can identify suitable land to move them to. We are as a consequence working hard to do so, and are liaising closely with the family and health professionals.

There have been other Travellers that have parked up at the same location from time to time over the last few weeks, and these have not been associated with the family described above. In this case, and in any other location, the council will continue to take tough enforcement and eviction action against unauthorised encampments in Peterborough where it is lawfully able to do so. Members will be aware that we have now set up a cross party group chaired by Councillor John Fox, to recommend a future

	<p>transit site location for the city. Permanent transit sites will, I'm sure Members are aware, enable our police force to act far more swiftly when moving these people on.</p> <p>Councillor Miners asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Is it true that the eviction notices have been served on these individuals in Belvoir Way / Saxby Gardens on 20th February, which will result in the travellers having to vacate the site by the 27th February at the latest?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:</p> <p>I cannot confirm the exact dates, this is the first I have heard about it this evening. I will certainly check and report back to you immediately, but I would say that effective and timely communication to affected ward councillors is paramount. This should happen as a matter of course through our Neighbourhoods Officers and I will certainly ensure that this is addressed. But I will check on those dates.</p>
2.	<p>Councillor Fower asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Can the relevant cabinet member inform me as to how much it would cost the local authority to change the name of the electoral ward South Werrington to South Werrington and North Gunthorpe, how long any action may take and what the cost was of the last electoral ward name change was?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</p> <p>The cost of any change would depend on the number of households within a particular ward at that time. In order to consult with all residents, the Council would need to print the appropriate documentation and fund the cost of outward and return postage. Staff resources would also have to be considered in any such exercise. The last electoral ward name change took approximately four months to conclude; this included a consultation period, engagement with the Neighbourhood Committees and a report to Full Council.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>If at the next Full Council meeting I raised a motion calling for the change in name for this particular ward, which I represent, I wondered if the Cabinet Member would be minded to support this particular motion?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources responded:</p> <p>I think that is entirely for the Neighbourhood Committee to agree amongst themselves, I have no particular view on the name you might want for your particular ward.</p>
9	<p><u>Questions with notice by Members to Council representatives of the Police and Fire Authorities</u></p>
	<p>No questions were received in this section.</p>

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS TIME

11 Questions with Notice to the Leader and Members of the Executive

1. **Councillor Miners asked the following question:**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning.

"When this Local Authority and Central Government talk generally about 'Deprivation Levels' the terminology of 'Super Output Areas' is mentioned. Could the Cabinet Member please inform Council what these 'Super Output Areas' are and how many such areas are within the Ward boundaries of this local authority?"

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:

A 'Super Output Area' is the national term used to describe a small geographically-defined area for the purposes of statistical reporting only. There are two levels of Super Output area:

- Lower SOA which typically comprises an area with around 1,500 residents
- Middle SOA which typically comprises an area with around 7,500 residents

All areas of the UK are represented by a Super Output Area, which enables consistent and comparable statistical reporting relating to issues such as education, employment, health, housing and crime.

Peterborough is made up of 104 Lower Layer Super Output Areas, and 21 Middle Layer Super Output Areas.

More information, including deprivation indices, is available from the Office of National Statistics website at www.ons.gov.uk

Councillor Miners asked the following supplementary question:

I take it that the middle SOA's are the ones suffering the most deprivation and if it is so what extra resources do Peterborough City Council give to these middle SOAs to combat the deprivation?

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:

The answer to the supplementary question I have to suggest may be a complex one and I would be very happy to write an answer to Councillor Miners if that's acceptable to him.

2. **Councillor Murphy asked the following question:**

To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.

Following the Executive Decision taken in December 2011 to determine the front-line health and social care services that would continue to be managed by Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS), could the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care please advise me why certain services, including Occupational Therapy, will now been removed

from the management of CCS and placed under the management of Adult Social Services?

Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care responded:

My Cabinet Decision of 14 February sets out the reasons why I have concluded that it would not be in the best interests of the Council nor the people we represent to transfer the management of a number of our adult social services teams to Cambridgeshire Community Services. I have listened and taken account of professional advice in coming to this view and debated this with my colleagues, both in Cabinet and at a wider level within my group.

The teams concerned are Occupational Therapy, the Transfer of Care (from hospital) Team, intermediate care and reablement teams are critical components of an effective adult social care service and are a vital part of our overall assessment and care management responsibilities to older people and people with disabilities in the city.

In addition, given the substantial budget pressures facing the Council as it takes back its Adult Social Care functions from NHSP, it is critical that the Council exercises full control over the entry points, assessment and care planning processes, so that the services can be delivered within the available resources.

I can though assure members that despite these changes, the Council remains committed to joined up service delivery between City Council and NHS and other staff, wherever that can be shown to benefit our residents, and that services being delivered on the day after the transfer will be the same as those delivered immediately before.

Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:

What is the additional cost of this action to change the decision that had previously been made by this Council, can we indeed change that decision constitutionally, how have the staff been affected and are you aware that there could be casualties as these staff do not want to work for Peterborough City Council as many of them see themselves as health professionals?

Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care responded:

You make an assumption that there is an additional cost, I have no evidence that has been put before me, in effect as I've already alluded to in my reply we are looking to manage our services within budget in the most cost effective way, you also heard me say that I don't believe, and neither do the professionals, that there shouldn't be any difference in service on the Friday when the team are working for the NHS or Cambridgeshire Community Services, that they work for the Council on Monday – why should that be different? The person who pays their salary may be different but they will still be the same people working in the same team and the same team of people, why would that be different? In terms of their particular preference of who they might want to work for, well, they worked for the Council to start with and they maybe healthcare professionals, but they will still be healthcare professionals on the Monday, why would that role change, I don't understand the logic in that argument I'm afraid. If there are any financial implications, I expect them to be positively favoured towards the Council in managing what is a difficult budget in terms of an increasing demand.

3. **Councillor Sandford asked the following question:**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning.

When the Council knew about the drainage problems in the Queensgate bus station early

last year, remedial works were scheduled for the coldest, wettest, most miserable time of the year and subsequently bus passengers were left without any shelter, safety measures, seating, refreshments or adequate signage in the Ackland Street Car Park. Why could the works not have taken place at a more favourable time of year and why did the cabinet member apparently do nothing to sort out the problems experienced by passengers?

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:

The city's bus depot is extremely busy; in many ways of course this is great news that passengers are taking advantage of our multi award winning services and effective routing. Due to the high number of heavy vehicles using the bus station fortnightly checks are undertaken to identify if any trip hazards that may arise. During one such check a large area of dipping was found, so thorough assessment was undertaken which revealed serious work required in area of dipping and other areas including drains and drainage channels. Unfortunately the existing allocated revenue budget could not cover the high cost of such repairs so capital funding therefore needed to be identified.

In addition to identifying the funding it was necessary to pre-order new service boxes which are bespoke and need to be made especially for us. There is a long lead time on this and therefore the works couldn't be carried out in the summer (as these weren't made yet); a decision was also made not to carry out the works pre Christmas so that the pre Christmas trade was not affected. It was not possible to postpone the work any longer as a number of drainage areas were continually failing prior to Christmas and becoming potentially dangerous. The works could not be completed without any disruption or indeed inconvenience whatsoever, however much tax payer's money was thrown at it. In fact the complaints from the travelling public during these essential works were very few, eight in total I am told by our Officers. The press coverage and radio campaigning were both out of proportion for what was in reality for most bus users, able bodied and disabled, the reality. The reports in the local paper have been variously responded to by emailed comments that have been generally supportive of the works, appreciating that once completed the facilities will have improved.

That notwithstanding, I can understand your comments concerning shelter, seating and access but unfortunately there is no space available for the provision of temporary seating and the relatively short duration of the works didn't warrant a huge spend for the temporary facilities in these financially constrained times. My comments to you via email were prompted by a brief exchange I had with our Officers to the effect that they would look very carefully at creating such a provision, unfortunately they couldn't.

I accept that the essential works have been an inconvenience but it simply wasn't possible to carry out this type of work without any disruption at all. It really is important that we properly maintain this key asset in our city so that it is available and serviceable for many years to come.

Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:

The information I have been given is slightly different, I was told that the need for the works was identified, not in the Summer of last year, but in the Spring so could not the works have been carried out in September or October or could they not have been postponed and carried out in April when the weather would have been much more clement. If we are going to create a sustainable travel town, don't we need to give passengers who actually travel on public transport decent conditions and these were not decent conditions, and if we want people to use public transport wouldn't it be better to encourage some of the Cabinet Members to use public transport rather than giving them subsidised car parking and permits?

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:

I think you have some very valid points, I myself use public transport on occasion, and I'm sure some of my fellow Cabinet Members do likewise, however, the times of our meetings, the urgency of some of the business we have to conduct really determines that most of the time we use personal transport. Regarding the timings of the works, the service boxes which are complex, they are made bespoke; the lead time was such that we couldn't have conducted these works sooner than we did. The reason they were done when they were done is that the safety implications of these works determined that they had to be done before a serious incident occurred so unfortunately they had to be done when they were done, and of course they were finished in both phases ahead of schedule. I think we need to be complementing some of our Officers rather than perhaps being slightly derogatory.

4. **Councillor Ash asked the following question:**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Safety.

Residents continue to raise road safety issues covering many aspects of road use at all levels. I am sure all Members have similar concerns. Can the Cabinet Member give assurances that vulnerable locations are continuously being monitored by the appropriate agencies and Council Committees, and that road junctions, slip roads etc are being designed to ensure that they can be safely negotiated and are not confusing to road users?

Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Safety responded:

Road Safety is a formal priority for the Safer Peterborough Partnership and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.

A dedicated Road Safety team is based within the Neighbourhoods Division, and they constantly monitor road traffic collision data in order that any trends or issues are identified at the earliest possible opportunity. An intensive education programme is also undertaken in schools and colleges across the City to address road safety issues, improve new road users' awareness and skills, and potentially change inappropriate behaviours.

The work of the Road Safety team forms part of a dedicated Road Safety Task and Finish Plan which is reported to the Safer Peterborough Partnership Board on a quarterly basis. The Plan is prioritised in order to maximise the effectiveness of resources and concentrates at present on speed, young drivers and motorcyclists.

Each year an accident cluster site list is produced. The list looks at the past three years of personal injury collisions and ranks sites in order of priority using set methodology. A copy of the list is passed to the Transport and Engineering Department and is used when programming future year's capital works depending on resources available.

Councillor Ash asked the following supplementary question:

A lot of residents are concerned and they are wondering where they can go to find information from, I'm also concerned that various junctions do seem to have problems; they don't seem to be altered. Can you tell me, do you look at and report back regularly to Councillors or Ward Councillors where there are problems? Is there a feedback procedure?

Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Safety responded:

	<p>There is various information published and I can find out what is available for people to be able to access but if there is some particular group of residents or if there is some particular area which you have in mind then could you please let me know, or let your Neighbourhood Manager know and we will concentrate on that particular issue and on that particular location and deal with residents concerns.</p>
5.	<p>Councillor Fower asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Given the fact that the majority of people opposed the removal of trees on Bridge Street, during the City Councils consultation and that over 200 hundred local people and businesses signed up to opposed the removal of the trees as part of a petition run by the Peterborough Liberal Democrats, can the relevant cabinet member inform me why they have chosen to ignore the majority opinion and continue with the removal?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement responded:</p> <p>I disagree that we have ignored the majority of the population. I take trees very seriously, and I am an environmentalist. However in these very difficult times we do have to do what is best for the city, Bridge Street and the public realm and also in this case for the trees as well. The decision was taken on that basis so we didn't ignore your petition but what we did do was made a decision that was based on what the other 170,000 people who live in our city wanted us to do and that is they want us to have a really nice Bridge Street with good healthy trees in it, growing well and producing something that somebody wants to see and sit under.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>People feel that the decision taken by this administration to ignore the views of people who have partook in the Council's own consultation I am wondering whether these people have been notified of this decision now, those that have actually shown opposition to it and whether this administration has been polite enough to actually give them an update and to notify them that they have decided to ignore their views.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement responded:</p> <p>I think there has been enough publicity which makes it absolutely clear what our decision has been and certainly with the help of Councillor Fower, everybody knows what our decision has been and what the future intent of this administration is and I thank him for helping us do that. I would also like to say, whilst his petition was a couple of hundred people and we take it very seriously, I spoke to hundreds of people myself, business, community and local forum, they all want to see a vibrant thriving city centre and I repeat, the interest of the entire community is that we have somewhere where you can enjoy walking, shopping and enjoy the trees that will remain and be able to sit and contemplate if that's all that you want to do, in a nice place to do it, and I think our decision will achieve that.</p>
6.	<p>Councillor Jamil asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning.</p> <p>The Council commits resources to supporting and helping the disadvantaged within Peterborough, particularly those who are homeless and vulnerably housed. This is</p>

welcomed at a time of hardship for many people. Could the Cabinet member give an indication of what actions we are taking to help people progress towards a more stable life?

Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning may responded:

A very good question highlighting an area of the Council's very effective work often overlooked in the media. Stability in our lives is probably something most of us in this chamber take for granted, but when life, for whatever reason deals us a bad hand we can normally rely on the support of family, friends, colleagues and sometimes professionals to advise us or indeed help us through a rough patch. As Councillor Jamil suggests however, there are a number of folk who are not able to do that immediately and the threat of homelessness can, in amongst other calamities be a real one. The new Housing Strategy being recommended for adoption by this Council tonight specifically addresses the myriad issues and complexities this subject incorporates. In Peterborough, we have not seen an increase in the number of households presenting as homeless, despite the opposite national trend. But there is no room for complacency, and our Officers are acutely aware that this statistic could change as the economy becomes even more challenging and personal debt rises.

The primary objective of the Housing service is to prevent homelessness and to support independent living amongst vulnerable groups, and the service works closely with our partner housing associations in the city to allocate suitable properties to people in housing need, to minimise evictions, and to support vulnerable households at the earliest possible opportunity.

In the last year we have also started projects to improve relationships with private city based landlords to ensure that this valuable resource is utilised to its full potential. Members may have read in the local media of our recent successes in our enforcement action against landlords who do not follow the correct legal processes when seeking possession of their properties. This firm action by Council Officers has my complete commitment and I pledge to the members of this Council that our Officers will be even more active in this arena of enforcement and prosecution.

We work very closely with partners in the voluntary and faith sectors to make sure whenever possible that all available resources and options are available for people who may need support: for example, the very effective One Service supporting offenders newly released from prison, whose immediate needs are complex and have to be addressed quickly to help them help themselves and stop reoffending with all the associated issues and costs that action promotes, not least the impact on the law abiding, tax paying residents of this city. Peterborough Streets supports vulnerable homeless people with drug, alcohol and emotional problems; and the Salvation Army supports people who are facing poverty and a wide range of other personal problems.

This week we have received notification from the Department of Communities and Local Government that we are to receive an allocation of additional funding to assist households at risk of mortgage repossession. This funding will enable us to prevent homelessness of those who have experienced recent changes in their income and fallen into mortgage arrears as a result by having the ability to negotiate with lenders and giving breathing space to the hard pressed borrowers.

Councillor Jamil asked the following supplementary question:

At a time when we are talking about funding there are agencies which he refers to that help those vulnerable people, one of them is Citizen's Advice Bureau who have seen their budget cut year on year. Can I get some reassurance from the Cabinet Member that that

	<p>will stop and they will look again to see and support the valuable work that they do?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Housing, Neighbourhoods and Planning responded:</p> <p>You have my assurance that the Citizen's Advice Bureau is a valued service in this city, we are currently having to look at extreme financial constraints and that's the decision we have made for this particular budget, however I can assure you that we are looking very closely at all support services, voluntary sector as well as contributed to sectors, and we do value that particular service.</p>
7.	<p>Councillor Martin would have asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement.</p> <p>Can the Leader advise what will be the extra cost a) for Peterborough and b) across Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City, of postponing the Police Commissioner elections from May to November 2012 and does he support the separate election date?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement sent the following response:</p> <p>The decision to postpone the Police and Crime Commissioner elections was taken by the Electoral Commission, not Peterborough City Council. The Council must follow instruction from the Electoral Commission on this matter. It is impossible to estimate the costs involved as the legislation is yet to be published alongside any financial arrangements involved in these elections. We are unable to provide a response on behalf of other Local Authorities within Cambridgeshire as there are many different demographic factors to consider.</p>
8.	<p>Councillor Murphy would have asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care.</p> <p>Considering the £10m deficit in the Adult Social Care Services budget, would the Cabinet Member please advise me how this level of overspend has occurred and what it has been spent on?</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care sent the following response:</p> <p>All of the budget reports published by Cabinet have included details of the pressures in Adult Social care, and how we intend to deal with them. This includes the Cabinet report released back in January, and you can see the same detail included in your budget book tonight on pages 57 to 63.</p> <p>Nationally, a combination of an increasingly elderly population, and other adults developing more complex needs, is placing significant pressure on adult social care services. Peterborough is no exception to this, and it is clear that in the last year we have experienced significant increases in demand for our services.</p> <p>To give you an example, at the start of the year around 1,500 older people required our support. Within nine months of this financial year, an extra 200 older people needed our support. This pattern is the same across all client groups.</p> <p>The extra money has been spent providing the support that these vulnerable people need.</p>

9.	<p>Councillor Shearman would have asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet member for Resources:</p> <p>How much did the Council spend on public consultations in the year April 2010 - April 2011, in which areas of Council activity and how is the effectiveness of such consultations assessed?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton, Cabinet member for Resources sent the following response:</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to consult, however not all consultations undertaken are statutory. Each consultation is undertaken as efficiently as possible on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The term 'consultation' covers a broad range of public engagement exercises across the Council. This could include consulting on corporate issues via the Citizen's Panel Survey and also consulting on specific service issues such as planning applications, road schemes, licensing issues, school transport and the City Council Budget.</p> <p>Where possible, existing mechanisms are utilised, such as Neighbourhood Committees, in order to gauge resident's views about the services that are provided by the Council.</p> <p>Examples of costs between April 2010 and April 2011 include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around £14k spent within Transport and Engineering Services on public notices regarding traffic regulation orders; • Around £25k per annum spent within the Planning Service on advertising costs in order to comply with statutory consultation on planning applications; and • Around £6,300k spent on the Citizen's Panel Survey undertaken during the summer of 2010. <p>The Council does not keep a corporate register of all costs in relation to consultations. The consultations being undertaken are reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that the Council is utilising the most cost effective approach and to keep a central database would be an unnecessary and costly exercise.</p> <p>However, in the event that further information should be required on a specific consultation, details can be obtained from the relevant department.</p>
10.	<p>Councillor Ash would have asked the following question:</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Safety.</p> <p>Many towns and cities have buses parked at or near to key nightlife areas on a Saturday night that are equipped to provide assistance and advice to anyone that needs it. In October of last year, the SOS Bus Project based in Norwich received a special recognition award for the services it has provided. Has the Cabinet Member considered investigating the provision of a similar service in the City Centre?</p> <p>Walsh, Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion and Safety sent the following response:</p> <p>We are actively considering commissioning a similar scheme through the forum of the Adult Joint Commissioning Group for Drugs and Alcohol. This group reports through the governance of the Safer Peterborough Partnership (our statutory community safety partnership) and first received a presentation on the concept from the Ambulance Service</p>

<p>in 2010. The City has benefited from a Care Tent facility at times of high demand (i.e. Christmas) and the principle of the SOS bus is an extension of what has been a successful deployment of that tactic. A new Safer/Stronger Peterborough budget profile for 2012/13 will afford us the opportunity to once again look at the proposal.</p>

APPENDIX C

COUNCIL MEETING 22 FEBRUARY 2012

(agenda item 13c)

Amendment to be moved by Councillor David Seaton

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

- The proposal to increase the cost of residents parking permits is withdrawn from the budget in order that a future review can be carried out of our on-street and residents' parking arrangements to ensure we have the right balance in each area. The change is outlined below:

	2012/13 £k	2013/14 £k	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k
Original Proposal (page 51 of budget report)	6	15	23	23	23
Increase cost of residents' first parking permit by £5 for 2012/13. Further increases of £5 for first permit in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 will follow. Cost of residents' other annual parking permits to remain unchanged.					
Amendment	-6	-15	-23	-23	-23
Withdraw increase in cost of residents parking permits					
Final budget proposal	0	0	0	0	0

- The loss of income will be offset by a reduction in funding for the Trees and Woodlands strategy. The change is outlined below:

	2012/13 £k	2013/14 £k	2014/15 £k	2015/16 £k	2016/17 £k
Original Proposal (page 56 of budget report)	750	750	750	750	750
Trees and Woodlands strategy					
Amendment	-6	-15	-23	-23	-23
Reduce funding to support strategy to offset loss of parking permit income					
Final budget proposal	744	735	727	727	727

This approach means that there is no net impact on the overall budget.

Impact on recommendations (page 1 of budget report)

This amendment does not change the wording of any recommendations, but it does alter the content of the revenue budget to be approved under recommendation a, as well as two elements of the council tax setting resolution under recommendation d:

- f. The revenue budget for 2012/13 and the medium term financial strategy to 2021/22, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy
- d. The council tax setting resolution as set out in Appendix A

Updates to Council tax setting Resolution (page 6 of budget report)

The amendments will reduce the gross expenditure and income figures in the council tax resolution by £6k for 2012/13. The revised figures are outlined below:

COUNCIL TAX 2012/13

3. THAT the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2012/13 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (as amended): -
- (a) £405,451,330 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act. (Gross expenditure including repayments of grants to government 31A(6) (a), Parish Precepts and Special Expenses 31A (6) (b))
 - (b) (£341,129,997) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act. (Revenue Income)

COUNCIL MEETING 22 FEBRUARY 2012

(Agenda item 13 c)

ALTERNATIVE BUDGET PROPOSAL

Amendment to be moved by Peterborough Independent Forum, Labour and Liberal Democrat Groups as follows:

This is an alternative budget proposal submitted jointly by the Peterborough Independent Forum, Labour and Liberal Democrat Groups.

The motion is that that the proposed budget as set out in the budget papers be amended as follows:

- Council tax is frozen for 2012/13
- The Council accepts the one year only (2012/13) grant freeze offer from central government
- Further savings are proposed to offset in part the loss of council income in 2013/14 and beyond.

The updated recommendations to Council are as follows (with changes highlighted in italics):

RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM : Executive Director - Strategic Resources
That Council is recommended to approve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. The revenue budget for 2012/13 and the medium term financial strategy to 2021/22, set in the context of the sustainable community strategy, <i>including the updates from the alternative budget proposal</i> h. The capital programme for 2012/13 to 2021/22 and related strategies and indicators <i>including the updates from the alternative budget proposal</i> i. The council tax <i>freeze for 2012/13</i>, indicative increases of 2.95% for 2013/14 to 2016/17 and indicative increases of 2.5% thereafter to 2021/22; and j. The council tax setting resolution as set out in <i>the alternative budget proposal</i> k. The reserves position, including the use of reserves to support the budget position in 2012/13 and the use of the surplus generated in 2013/14 to support the budget position in 2014/15, contributing towards a sustainable financial position in future years l. <i>That a special session of Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee is set up to review the Cabinet Member recommendation regarding the Energy from Waste procurement, expected June 2012</i> m. <i>That Cabinet brings forward additional savings proposals within six months of the Council meeting to help meet the additional budget gap from 2014/15</i>

1. Revenue Budget Amendments:

The following revenue budget amendments are proposed:

Description	2012/13 £k	2013/14 £k	2014/15 £k
Accept the council tax grant freeze for 2012/13	1,552	0	0
Reduction in Trees and Woodland strategy funding from £750k to £250k. Funding to be used in year 1 to enable fuller survey of tree stock to be undertaken, completion of the strategy and subsequent production of a fully costed service plan.	500	500	500
Remove the funding to support the Olympic torch procession event to be run by Vivacity (leaving £45k of funding to allow necessary support to main torch event)	48	0	0
Reduce the Diamond Jubilee bid by 50% by attracting sponsorship for the event	15	0	0
Implement changes to Special Responsibility Allowances for Members (schedule attached)	59	59	59
Remove 'headroom' in member allowances budget previously earmarked for inflationary increases	21	21	21
Changes in borrowing costs associated with capital programme proposals (outlined below in section 2)	34	137	235
Total savings/extra income	2,229	717	815
Loss of council tax income from council tax freeze in 2012/13	-1,831	-1,904	-1,980
Reinstate Christmas Park and Ride for one year, with some additional investment to promote the service. Review to then be undertaken to see if service could become self sufficient from 2013/14, otherwise will cease after that.	-40	0	0
Total costs/loss of income	-1,871	-1,904	-1,980
Net Impact on Budget	358	-1,187	-1,165

The full ten year position is included in appendix 2.

2. Capital Budget Amendments:

The following Capital programme amendments are proposed:

Description	2012/13 £k	2013/14 £k	2014/15 £k
Remove the Broadband Infrastructure investment from the capital programme – rely on private sector to deliver	-1,100	-2,000	0
Remove St Peters Arcade scheme	-600		
Additional investment into Bus Shelters – Doubling the sum in current LTP plans	40	40	40
Net Impact on Capital Budget	-1,660	-1,960	40
Revenue saving from capital changes (transferred to revenue amendments above)	34	137	235

The Groups also considered the planned expenditure on the Energy from Waste plant, and whether it was sensible to delay this programme to review options. In the time available the Groups had to have regard to officer advice that a delay at the current stage of the procurement exercise would not be sensible.

However continued scrutiny of the project and approach are essential, and as such it is recommended that a special session of Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee is set up to review the Cabinet Member recommendation regarding the Energy from Waste procurement, expected June 2012.

3. Impact on the Overall Budget:

	2012/13 £k	2013/14 £k	2014/15 £k
Current MTFS 'Bottom line'	-2,700	2,265	-6,551
Use of Reserves	2,700		
Use of Surplus		-2,265	2,265
February Cabinet - Council recommendation	0	0	-4,286
Net impact of alternative budget amendments	358	-1,187	-1,165
Use of Surplus from 2012/13 alternative budget measures to support 2013/14 position	-358	358	
Use part of 2013/14 surplus of £2.265m from original Cabinet proposal to balance 2013/14 position (and reduce use in 2014/15)		829	-829
Surplus (+) / Deficit (-)	0	0	-6,280
Difference to Cabinet recommendation	0	0	-1,994

The impact of the alternative proposals on the overall budget is as follows:

- They deliver a balanced budget for the next two years
- An additional £1.994m of savings will be required in 2014/15 (on top of the requirement in Cabinet proposals to find £4.286m of savings, meaning that £6.280m will need to be found overall)
- Additional on-going savings of around £1.246m will need to be found in 2015-16 rising to £1.732m by 2021/22
- A full 10 year analysis of the impact is included in appendix 2

In order that early planning to deal with the additional savings is undertaken, it is recommended that That Cabinet brings forward additional savings proposals within six months of the Council meeting to help meet the additional budget gap from 2014/15

Appendices:

1. Member allowances proposals
2. 10 year MTFS figures, including difference to Cabinet recommendations
3. Council tax resolution

Changes to Members Allowances

The amendment proposes two savings from the Members Allowances budget. These are outlined below, with full workings shown overleaf:

Implement changes to Special Responsibility Allowances for Members

These proposals are essentially the same as those put forward by the independent panel and rejected by Full Council in December.

There is one change. The original report recommended reducing the Cabinet SRA to 1.5 times Basic Allowance, and reducing the number of Cabinet Members. As the number of Cabinet Members is not something that can be determined by Full Council, the proposal here reduces the SRA to 1.35 times Basic Allowance to achieve the same level of saving.

The total saving from these changes is £59,119.

Remove 'headroom' in member allowances budget previously earmarked for inflationary increases

Inflation was provided in the budget for a possible increase in allowances. Whilst there are some other commitments against this sum, £21,000 can be freed up.

Current Allowances	No.	Amount for Allowance	Total Amount Payable	Details of proposed change to allowances	Amount for Allowance	Total Amount Payable	Saving
Basic Allowance	57	7,165.95	408,459		7,165.95	408,459	
Telephone Allowance	57	568.68	32,415		568.68	32,415	
Subsistence Allowance	57	227.45	12,965		227.45	12,965	
Total Basic Allowance (B/A)	57	7,962.08	453,839	No change to B/A	7,962.08	453,839	
Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA)							
Leader of The Council	1	21,497.85	21,498		21,497.85	21,498	
Deputy Leader	1	16,123.39	16,123	Reduce from 75% to 65% of Leader's SRA (1.95 x basic)	13,973.60	13,974	-2,150
Cabinet	8	14,331.90	114,655	Reduce from 2 x basic to 1.35 x B/A	9,674.03	77,392	-37,263
Cabinet Advisors	1	7,165.95	7,166		7,165.95	7,166	
Chair of Planning & Env Protection Committee	1	7,165.95	7,166		7,165.95	7,166	
Chair of Licensing Act 2009 Committee	1	7,165.95	7,166		7,165.95	7,166	
Chair of Audit Committee	1	7,165.95	7,166		7,165.95	7,166	
Independent Member of Audit Committee	1	784.50	785		784.50	785	
Chair of Employment Committee	1	1,791.49	1,791		1,791.49	1,791	
Chair of Scrutiny Commissions	2	7,165.95	14,332	Reduce to 75% of B/A	5,374.46	10,749	-3,583
Chair of Scrutiny Committee	4	7,165.95	28,664	Reduce to 75% of B/A	5,374.46	21,498	-7,166
Chair of Neighbourhood Councils	3	7,165.95	21,498	Reduce to 25% of B/A, pay to 7 areas	1,791.49	12,540	-8,957
Leader of Opposition Group - Distributed	1	7,165.95	7,166		7,165.95	7,166	0
Chair of Standards Committee	1	1,569.00	1,569		1,569.00	1,569	
Independent Members of Standards Committee	7	784.50	5,492		784.50	5,492	
			262,236			203,117	-59,119
Total Allowances			716,075	Total Allowances		656,956	-59,119
Budget allowance for Employer's NI cost			50,000	No change to budget for NI costs		50,000	
Budget headroom for inflationary increase			41,147	Inflationary freeze - release capacity		20,147	-21,000
Total budget and spend			807,222	Total budget under proposals		727,103	-80,119

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Loss of council tax income from council tax freeze in 2012/13	-1,831	-1,904	-1,980	-2,059	-2,141	-2,216	-2,294	-2,375	-2,458	-2,545
Reinstate Christmas Park and Ride for one year, with some additional investment to promote the service. Review to then be undertaken to see if service could become self sufficient from 2013/14, otherwise will cease after that.	-40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total costs/loss of income	-1,871	-1,904	-1,980	-2,059	-2,141	-2,216	-2,294	-2,375	-2,458	-2,545
Net Impact on Budget	358	-1,187	-1,165	-1,246	-1,328	-1,403	-1,481	-1,562	-1,645	-1,732

Impact on the Overall Budget

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	
Current MTFS 'Bottom line'	-2,700	2,265	-6,551	-12,861	-18,045	-23,767	-25,582	-27,608	-30,134	-32,123
Use of Reserves	2,700									
Use of Surplus		-2,265	2,265							
February Cabinet - Council recommendation	0	0	-4,286	-12,861	-18,045	-23,767	-25,582	-27,608	-30,134	-32,123
Net impact of alternative budget amendments	358	-1,187	-1,165	-1,246	-1,328	-1,403	-1,481	-1,562	-1,645	-1,732
Use of Surplus from 2012/13 alternative budget measures to support 2013/14 position	-358	358								
Use part of 2013/14 surplus of £2.265m from original Cabinet proposal to balance 2013/14 position (and reduce use in 2014/15)		829	-829							
Surplus (+) / Deficit (-)	0	0	-6,280	-14,107	-19,373	-25,170	-27,063	-29,170	-31,779	-33,855
Difference to Cabinet recommendation	0	0	-1,994	-1,246	-1,328	-1,403	-1,481	-1,562	-1,645	-1,732

COUNCIL TAX 2012/13

Following consideration of the report to this Council on 22 February 2012 and the setting of the Revenue Budget for 2012/13, the Council is requested to pass the resolution below to set the council tax requirement.

RESOLVED

1. THAT the Revenue Budget in the sum of £136,573,381 (being £264,275,381 less School Funding of £127,702,000) now presented be approved.
2. THAT it be noted that at its meeting on 12 December 2011 the Cabinet calculated the following amounts for the year 2012/13 in accordance with regulations made under Section 31B(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the Act) (as amended): -

- (a) 56,651 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended), as its council tax base for the year.

(b) Part of the Council's Area

Ailsworth	237.44
Bainton	166.98
Barnack	453.78
Bretton	3,556.59
Castor	370.92
City (non-parished)	34,419.40
Etton	53.16
Eye	1,507.68
Glington	634.98
Hampton	3,534.22
Helpston	379.14
Marholm	76.97
Maxey	306.20
Newborough and Borough Fen	588.61
Northborough	504.87
Orton Longueville	3,444.69
Orton Waterville	3,505.36
Peakirk	175.90
Southorpe	72.29
Sutton	68.95
Thorney	967.05
Thornhaugh	92.22
Ufford	122.58
Wansford	238.01
Wittering	759.57
SUB TOTAL	<u>56,237.57</u>
The Council tax base total for areas to which no special items relate	413.08
TOTAL	<u>56,650.65</u>

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

3. THAT the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2012/13 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992 (as amended): -
- (a) £405,178,381 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act. (Gross expenditure including repayments of grants to government 31A(6) (a), Parish Precepts and Special Expenses 31A (6) (b))
 - (b) (£342,687,997) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act. (Revenue Income)
 - (c) £62,490,384 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A(4) of the act as its council tax requirement for the year.
 - (d) £1,103.08 being the amount at 3(c) above divided by the council tax base at 2(b) above in accordance within section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax requirement for the year.
 - (e) £417,700 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 35 (1) of the Act. (Parish Precepts)
 - (f) £1,095.71 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by the amount at 2(a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council tax requirement for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates

(g) Parts of Council's Area

Parish Of:	Band D
Ailsworth	£1,111.46
Bainton	£1,116.86
Barnack	£1,107.86
Bretton	£1,121.45
Castor	£1,123.79
Deeping Gate	£1,095.71
Etton	£1,128.47
Eye	£1,127.75
Glington	£1,110.74
Hampton	£1,109.75
Helpston	£1,109.39
Marholm	£1,100.39
Maxey	£1,102.46
Newborough and Borough Fen	£1,115.69
Northborough	£1,117.85
Orton Longueville	£1,102.55
Orton Waterville	£1,106.24
Peakirk	£1,124.33
Southorpe	£1,102.28
St Martins Without	£1,095.71
Sutton	£1,135.76
Thorney	£1,131.08
Thornhaugh	£1,146.83
Ufford	£1,128.11
Upton	£1,095.71
Wansford	£1,133.06
Wittering	£1,150.79
Wothorpe	£1,095.71

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

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

	Valuation Bands							
	A £ . p	B £ . p	C £ . p	D £ . p	E £ . p	F £ . p	G £ . p	H £ . p
Ailsworth	740.97	864.47	987.96	1,111.46	1,358.45	1,605.44	1,852.43	2,222.92
Bainton	744.57	868.67	992.76	1,116.86	1,365.05	1,613.24	1,861.43	2,233.72
Barnack	738.57	861.67	984.76	1,107.86	1,354.05	1,600.24	1,846.43	2,215.72
Bretton	747.63	872.24	996.84	1,121.45	1,370.66	1,619.87	1,869.08	2,242.90
Castor	749.19	874.06	998.92	1,123.79	1,373.52	1,623.25	1,872.98	2,247.58
Deeping Gate	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Etton	752.31	877.70	1,003.08	1,128.47	1,379.24	1,630.01	1,880.78	2,256.94
Eye	751.83	877.14	1,002.44	1,127.75	1,378.36	1,628.97	1,879.58	2,255.50
Glington	740.49	863.91	987.32	1,110.74	1,357.57	1,604.40	1,851.23	2,221.48
Hampton	739.83	863.14	986.44	1,109.75	1,356.36	1,602.97	1,849.58	2,219.50
Helpston	739.59	862.86	986.12	1,109.39	1,355.92	1,602.45	1,848.98	2,218.78
Marholm	733.59	855.86	978.12	1,100.39	1,344.92	1,589.45	1,833.98	2,200.78
Maxey	734.97	857.47	979.96	1,102.46	1,347.45	1,592.44	1,837.43	2,204.92
Newborough and Borough Fen	743.79	867.76	991.72	1,115.69	1,363.62	1,611.55	1,859.48	2,231.38
Northborough	745.23	869.44	993.64	1,117.85	1,366.26	1,614.67	1,863.08	2,235.70
Orton Longueville	735.03	857.54	980.04	1,102.55	1,347.56	1,592.57	1,837.58	2,205.10
Orton Waterville	737.49	860.41	983.32	1,106.24	1,352.07	1,597.90	1,843.73	2,212.48
Peakirk	749.55	874.48	999.40	1,124.33	1,374.18	1,624.03	1,873.88	2,248.66
Southorpe	734.85	857.33	979.80	1,102.28	1,347.23	1,592.18	1,837.13	2,204.56
St Martins Without	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Sutton	757.17	883.37	1,009.56	1,135.76	1,388.15	1,640.54	1,892.93	2,271.52
Thorney	754.05	879.73	1,005.40	1,131.08	1,382.43	1,633.78	1,885.13	2,262.16
Thornhaugh	764.55	891.98	1,019.40	1,146.83	1,401.68	1,656.53	1,911.38	2,293.66
Ufford	752.07	877.42	1,002.76	1,128.11	1,378.80	1,629.49	1,880.18	2,256.22
Upton	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Wansford	755.37	881.27	1,007.16	1,133.06	1,384.85	1,636.64	1,888.43	2,266.12
Wittering	767.19	895.06	1,022.92	1,150.79	1,406.52	1,662.25	1,917.98	2,301.58
Wothorpe	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42
Total Non-Parished Areas	730.47	852.22	973.96	1,095.71	1,339.20	1,582.69	1,826.18	2,191.42

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

4. That it be noted that for the year 2012/13 the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in the precept issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below :-

	Valuation Bands							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p	£ . p
Cambridgeshire Police Authority	116.34	135.73	155.12	174.51	213.29	252.07	290.85	349.02
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority	39.54	46.13	52.72	59.31	72.49	85.67	98.85	118.62
TOTAL	155.88	181.86	207.84	233.82	285.78	337.74	389.70	467.64

5. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3 (h) and 4 above , the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of council tax for the year 2012/13 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below :-

	Valuation Bands							
	A £ . p	B £ . p	C £ . p	D £ . p	E £ . p	F £ . p	G £ . p	H £ . p
Ailsworth	896.85	1,046.33	1,195.80	1,345.28	1,644.23	1,943.18	2,242.13	2,690.56
Bainton	900.45	1,050.53	1,200.60	1,350.68	1,650.83	1,950.98	2,251.13	2,701.36
Barnack	894.45	1,043.53	1,192.60	1,341.68	1,639.83	1,937.98	2,236.13	2,683.36
Bretton	903.51	1,054.10	1,204.68	1,355.27	1,656.44	1,957.61	2,258.78	2,710.54
Castor	905.07	1,055.92	1,206.76	1,357.61	1,659.30	1,960.99	2,262.68	2,715.22
Deeping Gate	886.35	1,034.08	1,181.80	1,329.53	1,624.98	1,920.43	2,215.88	2,659.06
Etton	908.19	1,059.56	1,210.92	1,362.29	1,665.02	1,967.75	2,270.48	2,724.58
Eye	907.71	1,059.00	1,210.28	1,361.57	1,664.14	1,966.71	2,269.28	2,723.14
Glinton	896.37	1,045.77	1,195.16	1,344.56	1,643.35	1,942.14	2,240.93	2,689.12
Hampton	895.71	1,045.00	1,194.28	1,343.57	1,642.14	1,940.71	2,239.28	2,687.14
Helpston	895.47	1,044.72	1,193.96	1,343.21	1,641.70	1,940.19	2,238.68	2,686.42
Marholm	889.47	1,037.72	1,185.96	1,334.21	1,630.70	1,927.19	2,223.68	2,668.42
Maxey	890.85	1,039.33	1,187.80	1,336.28	1,633.23	1,930.18	2,227.13	2,672.56
Newborough and Borough Fen	899.67	1,049.62	1,199.56	1,349.51	1,649.40	1,949.29	2,249.18	2,699.02
Northborough	901.11	1,051.30	1,201.48	1,351.67	1,652.04	1,952.41	2,252.78	2,703.34
Orton Longueville	890.91	1,039.40	1,187.88	1,336.37	1,633.34	1,930.31	2,227.28	2,672.74
Orton Waterville	893.37	1,042.27	1,191.16	1,340.06	1,637.85	1,935.64	2,233.43	2,680.12
Peakirk	905.43	1,056.34	1,207.24	1,358.15	1,659.96	1,961.77	2,263.58	2,716.30
Southorpe	890.73	1,039.19	1,187.64	1,336.10	1,633.01	1,929.92	2,226.83	2,672.20
St Martins Without	886.35	1,034.08	1,181.80	1,329.53	1,624.98	1,920.43	2,215.88	2,659.06
Sutton	913.05	1,065.23	1,217.40	1,369.58	1,673.93	1,978.28	2,282.63	2,739.16
Thorney	909.93	1,061.59	1,213.24	1,364.90	1,668.21	1,971.52	2,274.83	2,729.80
Thornhaugh	920.43	1,073.84	1,227.24	1,380.65	1,687.46	1,994.27	2,301.08	2,761.30
Ufford	907.95	1,059.28	1,210.60	1,361.93	1,664.58	1,967.23	2,269.88	2,723.86
Upton	886.35	1,034.08	1,181.80	1,329.53	1,624.98	1,920.43	2,215.88	2,659.06
Wansford	911.25	1,063.13	1,215.00	1,366.88	1,670.63	1,974.38	2,278.13	2,733.76
Wittering	923.07	1,076.92	1,230.76	1,384.61	1,692.30	1,999.99	2,307.68	2,769.22
Wothorpe	886.35	1,034.08	1,181.80	1,329.53	1,624.98	1,920.43	2,215.88	2,659.06
Total Non-Parished Areas	886.35	1,034.08	1,181.80	1,329.53	1,624.98	1,920.43	2,215.88	2,659.06

PARISH PRECEPTS 2012/13

The following parish precepts have been levied on Peterborough City Council (comparable figures are shown for 2011/12) :-

	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2012/13 Council Tax @ Band D Equivalent £
Ailsworth	3,625	3,746	15.75
Bainton	3,538	3,538	21.15
Barnack	5,719	5,544	12.15
Borough Fen	606	-	
Bretton	87,140	91,733	25.74
Castor	8,355	10,444	28.08
Deeping Gate	-	-	-
Etton	1,849	1,744	32.76
Eye	43,222	48,399	32.04
Glington	8,727	9,560	15.03
Hampton	46,973	49,703	14.04
Helpston	8,653	5,211	13.68
Marholm	57	360	4.68
Maxey	1,250	2,070	6.75
Newborough	10,055	-	
Newborough and Borough Fen	-	11,758	19.98
Northborough	9,463	11,186	22.14
Orton Longueville	20,289	23,600	6.84
Orton Waterville	40,000	37,196	10.53
Peakirk	4,450	5,034	28.62
Southorpe	499	479	6.57
St Martins Without	-	-	-
Sutton	2,417	2,764	40.05
Thorney	34,200	34,200	35.37
Thornhaugh	4,738	4,715	51.12
Ufford	3,977	3,977	32.40
Upton	-	-	-
Wansford	8,900	8,900	37.35
Wittering	38,702	41,840	55.08
Wothorpe	-	-	-
Total	397,402	417,700	

With effect from 1 April 2012 by an Order made to Peterborough City Council dated 9 May 2011, Burrough Fen and Newborough parish council's have amalgamated together, known as Newborough and Burrough Fen Parish Council. The Order was made in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972, section 11