

PETERBOROUGH



**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD  
8 OCTOBER 2014**

**The Mayor – Councillor David Over**

**Present:**

Councillors Arculus, Ash, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Davidson, Day, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fletcher, Forbes, F Fox, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Lamb, Martin, Maqbool, Miners, Murphy, Nawaz, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Serluca, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Stokes, Swift, Sylvester, Thacker, Thulbourn and Walsh.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Allen, Fower, Harrington, Iqbal, Lane, Lee, Nadeem and Seaton.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Cereste stated he would not take part in the debate or vote on the motion put forward by Councillor Thulbourn regarding renewable energy projects, as he was a board member of Peterborough Renewable Energy Limited, which had been approached by the local authority to discuss one of the energy projects.

Councillor Holdich stated that he would not take part in the debate or vote on the motion put forward by Councillor Thulbourn regarding renewable energy projects, as his son-in-law was a board member of Peterborough Renewable Energy Limited.

Councillor Serluca stated that regarding the motion put forward by Councillor Ferris on the Green Back Yard, she was a board member of Peterborough Green Back Yard.

Councillor Saltmarsh stated that regarding the motion put forward by Councillor Thulbourn on fixed odds betting, her son was an employee of Corals the bookmakers.

**3. Minutes of the meetings held on 23 July 2014:**

**(a) Extraordinary Full Council Meeting**

The minutes of the Extraordinary Full Council Meeting held on 23 July 2014 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**(b) Full Council Meeting**

The minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on 23 July 2014 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**4. Mayor's Announcements**

Members noted the report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period commencing 21 July 2014 to 5 October 2014.

The Mayor further announced that in 2013, the Council had launched a new reward and recognition scheme for council employees. The purpose of the scheme being to recognise the outstanding and consistent performance of individuals and teams in helping to achieve the Council's priorities or in demonstrating the Council's core values.

A staff panel had spent much time deliberating which of the 21 nominations received should be shortlisted and ultimately awarded with the accolades.

The Mayor introduced the Employee of the Year and the Team of the Year, this being Lisa Alexander and the Youth Offending Service respectively. Lisa had been chosen to receive the Employee of the Year award for increasing the number of young people in the city taking part in the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme. The Youth Offending Team had been chosen to receive the Team of the Year award as they had received a full joint inspection by the HM Inspectorate of Probation, Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission and the HM Police Inspectorate. In total nine inspectors had reviewed the work of the service. The inspection had been scored on a four-star model and the Service had received the maximum four stars in two areas and three stars in three areas.

The Mayor presented Lisa Alexander and the Youth Offending Team with their awards.

The Mayor further advised that the deadline was approaching for nominations for the city's Civic Awards. The closing date was Friday 31 October and the winners would be announced at the Council meeting due to be held on 3 December 2014.

## **5. Leader's Announcements**

Councillor Cereste stated that he had met with Sir Robin Wales, the Mayor of Newham, at the Local Government Association conference in July 2014, with a view to undertaking work around FOBTs (gaming machines) and gaining cross council support in order for local authorities to request that Government give powers to local authorities to make their own decisions on the issue.

Councillor Khan stated that he was concerned that there had been no early warning of the announcement and requested that in future, more notice be given in order to allow Group Leader's to prepare questions.

Councillor Sandford endorsed Councillor Khan's comments.

Councillor Cereste responded and stated that he thought that group leaders had been informed, but apologised if they had not been in this instance and would make sure that advance notice would be given in future.

## **6. Chief Executive's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### **7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

There was one question submitted by a member of the public, this was in relation to:

1. Safe off road horse riding in Werrington and Newborough.

The question and response is attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

## **8. Petitions**

### **(a) Presented by members of the public**

A petition was presented by residents of Helpston, requesting funding for the provision of a play area for under-5s within the village other than that which was provided on the school field, as this was not available for the children to utilise at all times.

### **(b) Presented by Members**

Councillor Shaheed presented a petition requesting the introduction of traffic calming measures in Croyland Road, Walton.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

## **9. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council**

### **(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Petitions Scheme**

Cabinet at its meeting of 28 July 2014, received a report which sought its approval to adopt and recommend to Council the revised petitions scheme and associated levels of signatures to trigger debate at Full Council, Cabinet and Scrutiny and to authorise the Director of Governance to make minor, technical and procedural changes as considered necessary to ensure the Scheme met the standards of best practice in public administration.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within, highlighting the key aspects of the new scheme. All aspects of the scheme had been agreed by the all-party constitution review group bar the numbers of signatures required to trigger a debate at Council or Cabinet. This had been put to Cabinet along with an overview of figures from other Council's, who had moved away from the prescribed scheme, advising of the numbers they had set as their trigger points. In general, it appeared that on average it was 1% of the population for trigger at Full Council, this being 2000 and a proportionate trigger direct to Cabinet or Scrutiny of 500 signatures.

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

Councillor Sandford moved an amendment to the recommendations which lowered the proposed trigger thresholds for debate at Full Council to 500 and the threshold for debate at Cabinet to be 20. In moving his amendment, Councillor Sandford stated that members of the public should be encouraged to participate in the Council's meetings. There was no need for thresholds to be implemented, as the current procedure already allowed for petitions to be reported back to Cabinet, the changes would simple mean that individuals would be able to present their petition at the meeting. Resident's needed to be actively encouraged to participate, and this in turn would create more open and inclusive authority.

Councillor Shaheed seconded the amendment and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- The report contained a number of errors, the reports should be proof read prior to distribution.

Councillor Shaheed exercised his right to speak and in doing so stated that the amendment would allow for smaller groups of individuals to be heard on issues that they felt of significant importance to them.

Councillor Cereste summed up and stated that allowing all petitions to be presented to Cabinet was unreasonable, and could disrupt the work of Cabinet,

Following debate, a vote was taken on the amendment (23 for, 23 against and 0 abstentions). The Mayor exercised his casting his vote against the amendment. The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Members debated the recommendations as moved by Councillor Cereste and in summary raised points including:

- The numbers detailed within the report would prevent abuse of the system and would ensure that matters of significant importance were debated at Council;
- The numbers reflected a strength of feeling on an issue and its significant importance. It was the role of the Ward Councillor to represent those smaller communities;
- The petitions scheme presented was flawed as it had unreasonable thresholds;
- The threshold of 500 signatures for debate at the Full Council had existed for around three years and there only one petition submitted recently for debate. The proposals were trying to restrict the rights of people to have access to participate in proceedings of the council;
- Items of genuine significance at ward level, it was difficult to obtain a number of signatures on them. The chief aim of petitions was not just to get issues of a city-wide importance before the council, but also to represent ward issues;
- Members should take a flexible approach to the issue, and the numbers should be revised if not enough petitions were coming forward;
- The scheme should still take into account smaller wards, not having the numbers of residents. Cabinet should take a flexible approach to these areas;
- The proposed scheme would drive people away and make it harder for members of the public to have access to the Council; and
- It was requested that the Leader revise the figures in order to maintain the threshold contained within the amendment for Full Council but to increase the threshold in the amendment for Cabinet.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and requested that Council vote with the recommendations.

Councillor Cereste summed up as mover of the recommendations and stated that he appreciated that there was a clear divide on the issue and the importance of members of the public being involved in the democratic process, being accessible to the community. He further stated that if it was found that the scheme stifled the opportunity for the public to have their say, it would be revisited. Councillor Cereste further agreed a compromise in that anyone who brought a petition to Cabinet would be permitted to speak.

A recorded vote was requested and Members voted as follows:

**Councillors For:** Arculus, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Lamb, Maqbool, Nawaz, North, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Scott, Serluca, Stokes, Thacker and Walsh.

**Councillors Against:** Ash, Davidson, Ferris, Fletcher, Forbes, F Fox, JA Fox, JR Fox, Herdman, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Okonkowski, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester and Thulbourn.

**Councillors Abstaining:** There were no abstentions.

Following the vote (23 for, 26 against and no abstentions). The motion was **DEFEATED**.

**(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Flood Risk Management Strategy**

Cabinet at its meeting of 22 September 2014, received a report which presented the Draft Peterborough Flood Risk Management Strategy.

The purpose of the report was to recommend that Cabinet approved the Draft Peterborough Flood Risk Management Strategy for the purpose of it being publically consulted on during October and November 2014 and to support the proposal of the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee to include further explanatory text in the FMS prior to its publication and to further support the recommendation of the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee to amend the Constitution and thereby place the Flood Management Strategy as a Major Policy item.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within, highlighting that under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Council was now a lead local flood authority and responsible for coordinating the management of flood risk from surface water, ground water and ordinary water courses. The Act also brought a number of new powers and duties, one being the preparation of a Flood Risk Management Strategy.

The draft Strategy had been well received by the Scrutiny Committee and they proposed that Cabinet recommend the Strategy to Council and for it to be incorporated as a Major Policy document.

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

There was no debate on the matter. A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED:**

That the Constitution be amended to reflect the Flood Risk Management Strategy as a Major Policy item.

**10. Questions on the Executive Decisions made since the last meeting**

Councillor Cereste introduced the report which detailed executive decisions taken since the last meeting, including:

1. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 28 July 2014;
2. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 22 September 2014;
3. Use of the Council's Call-In mechanism, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting.
4. Special Urgency and Waive of Call-In Provisions, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting.
5. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 30 July 2014 to 24 September 2014.

**Questions were asked about the following:**

20mph Speed Limit

Councillor Shearman sought clarification as to whether further research had been undertaken into the reports which had now been published relating to the impact of the 20mph speed limits. Portsmouth City Council had produced a report which had demonstrated that there was a financial incentive to go ahead with the proposals and that it had reduced the number of accidents. Councillor Shearman also queried whether the budget consultation was the most appropriate forum for discussions on the 20mph speed limit proposals for the city. Councillor Cereste responded that the scheme had been looked into seriously and was a worthy aspiration for the Council but could not be afforded at the current time.

Councillor Ferris queried whether the Leader was aware that there were over 13m people who lived in local authorities which had adopted, or were in the process of adopting the

policy of 20mph speed limits, furthermore was he content that cyclists, pedestrians and other road users, in some of the extremely crowded parts of the city, were safe with speed limits set at 30mph. Councillor Cereste stated that there was a cost to the issue and there were many other important matters for which decisions needed to be taken. If members of other political groups wished for the scheme to be incorporated within the budget, they needed to provide details of how the budget would be cut in other areas in order to balance the budget.

Councillor Sanders sought clarification as to whether it was felt that the police had sufficient numbers to enforce a 20mph speed limit. Councillor Cereste stated that he did not feel that they did.

#### Emergency Stopping Places

Councillor Miners requested that the Dogsthorpe community be given proper assurance that the sites close to the Dogsthorpe areas would be properly managed and would not be used more than 28 days a year or mixing of family units on the site. Councillor Hiller stated that he could give those assurances. The 28 day limit was a legal requirement. Mixing of families was not an issue which Councillor Hiller was able to respond to at the time, but stated that he would follow-up with Councillor Miners on this point.

Councillor Saltmarsh queried how long the trial would last. Councillor Hiller responded that the trial would last for an initial six-month period.

Councillor Ash sought reassurance that the site located near to Harebell Close would not have an adverse impact on residents. Councillor Hiller responded that he could offer this assurance, as the sites would be particularly well-managed, the individuals would be moved onto these sites for a short amount of time and still under eviction notice. The effect on local residents would be minimal and the rationale behind the choosing of the sites was to relieve the impact of illegal gypsy and traveller encampments on the city as a whole.

Councillor Jamil thanked the members of the working group and queried what would trigger a decision to move from trial sites onto other sites included within the document, if for example there were a large number of illegal encampments all at the same time. Councillor Hiller stated that the sites proposed would be used to move on the highest-profile unauthorised encampments. If there were two encampments, one encampment may have a slightly higher profile than the other and that one would be moved onto the ESP site.

Councillor Fletcher questioned how many days the emergency stopping places would be open in a single year. Councillor Cereste responded that they would be open for 28 days a year.

Councillor Davidson queried if there were measures in place around the times of year when there were a large influx of travellers into the city, for example the beer festival weekend. Councillor Hiller responded that the Emergency Stopping Place provision was for unauthorised, impromptu, high-profile gypsy and traveller encampments. It was not for instances such as the beer festival, a contained location and would not run for 28 days back-to-back.

Councillor Miners asked if all three top-priority emergency stopping places could run at the same time. Councillor Hiller stated that this was not the case. It would not necessarily be all unauthorised encampments which would necessitate the need to utilise an emergency stopping place, but only the highest-profile ones.

Councillor Murphy stated the Council should look further at transit site provision with planning permission. He queried whether there was a risk that the police would move individuals to the Council's emergency sites and further queried whether the Leader was aware that there was no documentation available within the Council with regards to consultation undertaken on the proposals. Councillor Hiller stated that he would take Councillor Murphy's comments

on board and if he had any other locations in mind for Emergency Stopping Places, he could share these with Councillor Hiller.

#### Report of the Solar and Wind Energy Review Group

Councillor Murphy asked why, as a member of the working party, he had been informed that he was unable to attend the Cabinet meeting to speak. Councillor Cereste responded that Councillor Murphy was not the leader of the Labour group, and it was Cabinet policy to hear representations from Group Leaders.

#### The School Organisation Plan 2014-2019 – Delivering Local Places for Local Children

Councillor Miners queried how much money the local authority had put into the school building programme overall, has some of it been borrowed and if so what is the interest that the Council would have to pay back? Councillor Holdich stated that he would research the question and respond in writing.

#### Children's Services Update Report

Councillor Saltmarsh queried why the report contained such a large amount of acronyms and was it not sufficient to simply note the contents of the report. Councillor Cereste thanked Councillor Saltmarsh for her comments.

#### Petition relating to the re-introduction of the Local Link 406 bus service or similar

Councillor Davidson asked that, for those residents who used to use the 406 bus in Gunthorpe, could this be extended to the number 22 bus as residents in Gunthorpe would find this accessible. Councillor North responded stating that he would respond to Councillor Davidson in writing.

#### Review of Appointments and Nominations to External Organisations

Councillor Murphy asked that the Leader undertake that the external bodies are informed when Council Members are appointed to them and also the Members are invited to discuss what their roles and responsibilities are. Councillor Cereste responded that this process should be undertaken and he would ensure this happens in future.

Councillor Arculus queried whether the Leader was aware that there were still vacancies on the North Level Internal Drainage Board. Councillor Cereste stated that he was not aware of this, but sometimes it was difficult to fill vacancies. He would deal with this as well as he could.

#### Selection of Education Provider to Operate a New Secondary School

Councillor Murphy asked for clarification over this item as the recommendation did not appear to make grammatical sense. Councillor Cereste noted this error.

Councillor Shearman noted that this may be an error but asked if it was appropriate for the Cabinet Member to make a decision for him to be a director of the board. Councillor Cereste responded and stated that information did need to be presented to Council in the appropriate way.

#### Award of Contract for the Extension of Thorpe Primary School

Councillor Khan sought clarification on this decision, as he believed that the planning permission had not been granted. Councillor Holdich stated that the decision was not relevant to the planning permission, this was a separate issue. The planning application had been adjourned at the request of the local ward councillors, however it was believed that a compromise had now been reached and the application was due to go back to the Planning Committee on 21 October 2014.

Councillor Arculus clarified that the ward councillors were not quite yet in agreement with regards to the officer proposals. Would Councillor Holdich continue to work with the

Councillors to reach a compromise? Councillor Holdich responded that he could not comment on a planning application.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **11. Questions on Notice**

**(a) To the Mayor**

**(b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet**

**(c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee**

Questions (b) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet; and (c) to the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. An alternative economic growth strategy;
2. Senior officer pay;
3. Cycling along Bridge Street;
4. The Living Wage;
5. Burford Lawns Estate;
6. Conditions for open space provision;
7. Cycling along the one way street off Hall Lane and Church Street, Werrington;
8. Central Government cuts; and
9. The libraries consultation.

Owing to the time limit being reached for this item, questions on the following were to be responded to in writing:

10. Works near the shops at Central Avenue;
11. The Living Wage;
12. The use of electric cars by social workers;
13. The plans for an incinerator;
14. Refuse lorries and oil spillages;
15. The Hallfields Lane Recreation Centre;
16. Parishing in the city;
17. Remuneration for Members;
18. Roadworks in the Western Avenue area of Dogsthorpe;
19. The consultation relating to cycling along Bridge Street; and
20. Traffic and parking issues along Thistle Moor Road.

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

### **12. Motions on Notice**

#### **1. Motion from Councillor Nick Sandford**

1. That Council notes that successive local transport plans issued by Peterborough City Council since 1999 have contained a Transport User Hierarchy, which states that:

*In all matters of land use and transportation planning, consideration will be given where practical to the needs of user groups in the following priority order:*

- *Pedestrians and those with mobility difficulties;*
- *Cyclists;*
- *Public transport including coaches and taxis/private hire vehicles (PHV) (higher priority for electric and low emission vehicles);*

- *Motorcycles (higher priority for electric and low emission vehicles);*
  - *Rail freight;*
  - *Commercial and business users including road haulage (higher priority for electric and low emission vehicles);*
  - *Car borne shoppers and visitors (higher priority for electric and low emission vehicles); and*
  - *Car borne commuters (higher priority for electric and low emission vehicles).*
2. In a period of budgetary cutbacks, Council believes that it is even more important to ensure that spending and operational decisions reflect clearly the policy priorities of the Council.
  3. Council therefore requests the Cabinet and the Cross Party Budget Working Group to carry out a full review of the transport projects in the Council's Capital Programme to ensure that these priorities are being delivered.
  4. Given recent concerns about issues relating to cycling in the City Centre and recognising its high position in the Transport User Hierarchy, Council asks the Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committee to carry out a review of all measures designed to encourage or restrict cycling and make any recommendations it thinks appropriate.

In moving his motion Councillor Sandford stated that in order to face up to the challenges of climate change, one of the key areas to address was transport and making it more sustainable. Transport accounted for around 20% of the carbon emissions produced by the United Kingdom and it was also a vital part of the city's aspiration to become environment capital.

Further key points highlighted included an overview of the Transport User Hierarchy and whether this was working; the number of schemes within the Council's Capital Programme; statistics from the department of transport showing a drop in car travel; the work being undertaken in other cities across the country and the investment in sustainable transport; the importance of the issues around cycling and the levels of cycling being significantly less than other cities and the subject of cycling should be looked at in more detail.

Councillor Davidson seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Peterborough did aspire to be an environment capital and the hierarchy in the motion should be respected where possible. The problem with the motion was it was used as a form of opposition to cycling measures being implemented in Bridge Street. That was legitimate, but it should be raised as an individual issue and not wrapped up into a larger motion;
- A scrutiny review would be a wasted exercise as the issue was being looked into in any event;
- The hierarchy should be supported. The motion was not about Bridge Street, but was about the Council doing the right thing in a city with a history of cycle ways. The cycle ways in the city were not properly maintained and cycling in the city needed to be improved, as did the provision for pedestrians;
- There had been inherited problems which made it difficult for bus routes to cover certain areas. A rapid transit system for Peterborough did need to be explored, but a trolley bus system was perhaps not the best solution for the

city;

- The city had a good pedestrian and cycle network which it should be proud of. The motion was therefore unnecessary;
- The cycle ways in the city were of a good standard, but they could be improved. The Leeds trolley bus scheme cost £250 million, and the council could therefore not afford a tram system;
- The Council was facing budgetary problems and a full review of the transport projects was a lower priority at the moment;
- The Green Wheel was very well used and cycling was increasing; and
- All capital projects were being reviewed and it was a struggle to deliver the ones the Council already had. Some things just would not happen as the Council did not have the money at the current time.

Councillor Davidson exercised her right to speak and in so doing advised that the motion aimed to ensure that sustainable transport was delivered by the Council. The Leader had stated he wished to ban cycling along Bridge Street. Cycling was booming around the country, but in Peterborough it was not, and the motion sought to rectify that. A full review was required to look at what the Council was doing in relation to cyclists and to encourage more of them.

Councillor Sandford summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing concurred that the Bridge Street issue could be dealt with separately, however added that its inclusion had been due to it being symbolic of what was happening around the city. He further stated that what was happening in Peterborough was the reverse of what was happening in cities such as Leeds. The Capital Programme should be looked at, as most schemes the Council was paying for had nothing at all to do with sustainable transport. The city was growing, however the assumption was all around car transport.

Following debate, a vote was taken (18 for, 25 against, 2 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

## **2. Motion from Councillor Richard Ferris**

1. That this Council notes that the Green Backyard, a registered charity with objects to improve the life chances of the socially and economically disadvantaged and promote sustainable lifestyles, has been recognised as one of only two assets of community value in our city, and is a greatly valued and well-managed green space that delivers a raft of benefits to the city and exemplifies what being an aspiring Environment Capital should be about.
2. This Council believes that we should assist the Board of the Green Backyard in identifying external funding in order to transfer this asset to the community, and consider a discounted valuation on the basis of its significant added value.

In moving his motion, Councillor Ferris advised that the Green Backyard was the last remaining piece of open space within Fletton and Woodston Ward. It was unused for 16 years until 6 years ago and since then the site had been transformed to a flourishing community asset, recognised as an asset of community value.

Further key points highlighted the valuable relationships forged between communities, residents and beyond; its success in bringing together diverse people for the greater benefit of the city; the activities undertaken on the site; the facilities being utilised by local schools and charities; it being a great advert for the environment capital aspirations; the benefits that it had brought to the city and the health benefits of the site to residents in the city; the success and reputation of the site and the awards won by the site; the integral part played by the site in assisting Council to reach its potential as Environment Capital.

Councillor Serluca seconded the motion and stated that it was the Council's duty as an aspiring Environment Capital to ensure the Green Backyard succeeded at its current location, being both visible and accessible. The site had the potential to be a flagship project with international reach, uniting diverse communities, creating apprenticeships, jobs and new businesses, educating pupils and promoting active citizenship. Supporting the motion would benefit not just the Green Backyard but also the residents of the city, present and future.

Members debated the motion and it was stated that there were issues around how the motion would be supported, however the motion should be supported.

Following debate, a vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

### 3. Motion from Councillor Nick Thulbourn

That this Council recommends that the Cabinet halt the solar farm project in Northborough, Thorney and Eye with immediate effect. With the overwhelming local opposition to this project and the political realities within the Department for Communities & Local Government it is now the consensus that the time is right to call a halt to this project. At a time of serious financial difficulties it is the right time to release council resources from a project that has been stalled for too long and is unlikely to be delivered at all.

In moving his motion, Councillor Thulbourn stated that it was the Council's role to direct the leadership of the Council that the projects needed to halt. The project had never had a consensus for or against, could not be delivered by the Council and was not financially sound.

Further key points highlighted included the length of time the project had been ongoing and the divide created within the community and the lasting effects of this.

Councillor Khan seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The motion should be supported in order to draw a line under the issue for the sake of the tenant farmers;
- Proposals to cease Morris Fen and Newborough farms would come before Cabinet for decision;
- Most people in the city had not categorically stated whether they were in favour with solar farms or not. Suggesting that there was a lack of consensus could not therefore be correct;
- The farm sites were grade 1 and 2 agricultural land;
- The solar farms would lose money but could have potentially made money if they had been built earlier;
- Climate change was happening and all forms of renewable energy should be looked at in order to tackle it;
- The Cabinet would be right to terminate the two largest schemes, but America Farm was only a 7 megawatt project. £3 million had already been spent and the question was whether to abandon the project or pursue it; and
- There were no tenant farmers at America Farm.

Councillor Khan exercised his right to speak and stated that big projects did not seem to be deliverable by the current administration. The project would have needed consensus from residents, the government, the MP, and the authority itself, which it did not have. Furthermore, the difficulty in pursuing America Farm was that the government may force the local authority to abandon that too in any event.

Councillor Thulbourn summed up as move of the motion and stated that solar energy should be supported, but people needed to be involved in the decision-making process; this had not happened in the current instance. Regarding the financial side, resources did not just mean money but also included people's time, in order to retain focus on relevant issues. The Council would do much better with the budget setting if this project was ceased. The local authority had a duty to work with people and not to impose issues on people.

Following debate, a vote was taken (24 for, 4 against, 17 abstentions) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

#### **4. Motion from Councillor Nick Thulbourn**

Councillor Thulbourn moved the following motion:

1. That this Council believes that local authorities, including Peterborough, should be given the powers to protect the local amenities and the wellbeing of communities by stopping the proliferation of betting shops and by reducing the maximum stakes and slowing down the speed of play on Fixed-Odds Betting Terminals.

The London Borough of Newham is proposing to submit a proposal under the Sustainable Communities Act to reduce the maximum bet per spin on Fixed-Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs) in on-street betting shops from £100 to £2.

The impact on the FOBTs within the City of Peterborough have been substantial and are a growing problem causing social problems, gambling addiction, concerns over crime and disorder. Unlike pubs, bingo halls and amusement arcades where stakes are limited to £2 per spin, gamblers can via cash or debit cards gamble £100 every 20 seconds on FOBTs, more than four times as fast as the rate of play in casinos.

Across Peterborough there are 33 betting shops, in 2013 alone there was £25 million pound gambled on these addictive machines with losses to residents of our city of £4.8 million. Because there is a restriction of 4 FOBT machines per shop, they are now opening multiple outlets to maximise the number of machines and revenue.

2. This Council requests that:
  - i. The Council Leader and the Chief Executive writes to Helen Grant MP, Minister responsible for gambling, recommending a reduction in the maximum bet per spin to £2 on FOBTs.
  - ii. The Council Leader and the Chief Executive writes to Sir Robin Wales, the Mayor of the London Borough of Newham, declaring this Council's support for their proposal under the Sustainable Communities Act, which calls on the Government to reduce the maximum bet per spin to £2 on FOBTs.

Councillor Thulbourn advised that following the earlier comments made by Councillor Cereste during his Leader's announcement, and following discussion, he was content to withdraw his motion or to accept agreement from Council. This was agreed by Council.

### **13. Reports to Council**

#### **(a) Changes to the Executive and Leader's Scheme of Delegation**

Council received a report from the Leader, the purpose of which was for the Council to note the change to the scheme of delegations given to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services in that he now has the additional responsibility of Rural Communities.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and moved the recommendation contained within.

This was seconded by Councillor Walsh, and she did not reserve her right to speak.

As there was no debate on the item, it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council note the change to the Leader's Scheme of Delegation for the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services.

**(b) Update to the Treasury Management Strategy**

Council received a report from the Cabinet Member for Resources, which sought Council's approval of an amendment to the Treasury Management Strategy, enabling an executive decision to be brought forward to allow the Council to invest directly into Axiom Housing, to further support the provision of housing in the area.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and moved the recommendation contained within. This was seconded by Councillor Holdich who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- In the opening statement of the recommendation, clarification was sought by what was meant by "other bodies" and assurance was sought that these were not private companies seeking to make a profit from funding from the Council;
- The 'other bodies' were not defined. Passing the report on 'Axiom' was acceptable, but delegating power to give loans to 'other bodies' could not be supported without further reports on those 'other bodies';
- The geographical location of the other bodies was not clear, and whether authorisation should be given to invest in projects in other areas or even overseas;
- Concern was expressed at the scope of the recommendation. Money given to Axiom should be utilised to directly support people in Peterborough that needed housing;
- The purpose of the scheme was to provide more social housing, which could only be a good thing. The risks had been taken into account by officers and there could not be too much limitation placed on the geographic boundaries of the scheme, as it could benefit people in Peterborough;
- Concern was expressed that part of the document was exempt. How could Members vote on this without knowing the full implications;
- The scheme was not without risk;
- Social housing was extremely important, but Members were concerned about the meaning of 'other bodies' within the recommendations. £3 million had already been wasted on the solar farm project, so caution needed to be exercised in future cases. The words 'other bodies' needed to be removed; and
- If £30 million was being loaned, then the risk needed to be understood and there needed to be more clarity.
- All schemes would be subject to a Cabinet Member Decision Notice, and could be called-in if necessary.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and advised that Axiom were a well-respected organisation, providing houses for many years. The decision would enable properties to be built in the locality, which were needed.

Councillor Cereste summed up as mover of the recommendation and stated that he would be happy to remove the words 'and other bodies' from the motion, as any future schemes would be subject to Cabinet Member Decision Notices in any event.

Councillor Cereste therefore submitted an amendment to the recommendation to remove the

words 'and other bodies'. The Mayor accepted the amendment and the amendment was seconded by Councillor Murphy.

A vote was taken on the amendment (43 for, 3 against, 2 abstentions) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion (47 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council approve the updates to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, providing the changes to approach to Minimum Revenue Provision statement to allow the Council to invest in Housing Associations.

**(c) Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England**

Council received a report which recommended the approval of the submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for revised ward boundaries on behalf of Peterborough City Council. The Mayor advised that there had been a minor amendment to the ward boundary descriptions within the submission; these being the change of name of Central North Ward, to be amended to Central Ward, and North Ward, to be amended to Central North Ward.

Councillor Peach introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within, along with the amendments as outlined by the Mayor. He thanked the officers and members of the cross party electoral review working group and advised that Peterborough's first plan had been submitted in April 2014 following a visit from the Local Boundary Commission for England, who had provided guidance on how best to draw up the submission.

The Commission had subsequently rejected Council's first plan and had released its own revised plan in July 2014. Following this, the electoral working group had been tasked with either making sense of the Commission's draft, as it broke many of the rules originally specified by the Commission itself, or by revisiting and enhancing Peterborough's first submission. The latter option was chosen and progressed and although it was to be acknowledged that this option would not satisfy all parties, it was believed that this was the best way forward.

The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Holdich who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- The submission was strong and well written by officers, this highlighted the lack of need for consultants to write reports;
- Although not perfect, the submission represented a vast improvement on the Boundary Commission's initial statement;
- The Boundary Commission's proposals lacked credibility and failed one of its own criteria, 'to reflect community identity'. However, the Council's submission was also lacking in credibility as it was simply a re-submission of proposals which had already previously been thrown out by the Boundary Commission;
- The Council's previous submission had been rejected for the under representation of Barnack Ward. Why was it still being singled out for one Member representation?
- There had been three months in which to come up with an alternative submission; and
- The Liberal Democrats had put in a revised submission, taking on board comments made by the Boundary Commission. The main contention being the Northern Area of Peterborough losing two Councillors, in the context of the area having significant growth in population.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and in so doing stated that the advice from the Commission had been to provide additional evidence for the proposals put forward and this had been undertaken. The Boundary Commission had also offered to revisit the Council once the consultation period had elapsed. It was further advised that single member wards had been approved by the Commission across the country and therefore there was no particular reason why Barnack could not be a single member ward.

Councillor Peach stated in summing up that he had nothing further to add.

Following debate, a vote was taken (42 for, 6 against, 1 abstention) and it was **RESOLVED** that:

The Council approve the submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for revised ward boundaries on behalf of the Peterborough City Council.

**(d) Approval of the Remuneration for the Post of Director of Public Health**

Council received a report which recommended that Council approve the salary package for the post of Director of Public Health.

Councillor Lamb introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. It was advised that the role was a statutory one and currently reported to the current Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Health and Wellbeing. The post carried health protection responsibilities for all citizens, and obligations to NHS England and the Clinical Commissioning Group.

The Employment Committee had met to consider the appointment and the Terms and Conditions the role. This process was carried out jointly with Public Health England, acting on behalf of the Secretary of State. Following the meeting, the appointment had been made, however as the salary exceeded £100k, the Council was required to approve the salary package, as per the Council's Pay Policy Statement.

The recommendations were seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- The Labour Group requested clarification as to whether the post had been offered to the post-holder or not;
- The Council was obliged to act responsibly on behalf of all its employees. The pay policy approved should reflect the financial climate and it would therefore be inappropriate to approve this pay package;
- The proposed pay package was far in excess of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile because of market supplements, which should only be used in exceptional circumstances;
- The Conservative party's argument that people on lower pay scales should have pay freezes whilst those at the top needed high pay increases in order to attract talent was nonsensical and created a bad impression;
- Council officers were on a good wage compared to those in the private sector;
- The interviews should have taken place following an approval from Council for the post and salary;
- There had only been two applications for the job and by the appointment, the Council had saved £30,000. If no appointment had been made prior to Full Council, it would have presented a breach of statute as the Director of Public Health was a statutory position;
- The Legal Officer clarified that no offer had been made to the candidate prior to Full Council's approval of the salary package; and

- The right candidates should be attracted by the post, not merely by the salary.

Councillor Fitzgerald exercised his right to speak and advised that the appointment to the post was a legal requirement, furthermore the individual concerned was not simply a local government expert, but was also a medical expert and would be employed on NHS medical terms and conditions, not the Council's.

Councillor Lamb summed up as mover of the recommendation and stated that if not approved, the Council would have no Director of Public Health. The individual concerned had already been undertaking the role and would help to raise the profile of health in the city.

A recorded vote was requested and Members voted as follows:

**Councillors For:** Arculus, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Day, Elsey, Fitzgerald, JR Fox, Harper, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Khan, Lamb, Maqbool, Nawaz, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Scott, Serluca, Sharp, Stokes, Swift, Thacker, Thulbourn and Walsh.

**Councillors Against:** Davidson, Ferris, Fletcher, Forbes, F Fox, Jamil, Johnson, Knowles, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Shearman and Sylvester.

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, JA Fox, Sanders and Shabbir.

Following the vote (29 for, 16 against, 4 abstentions) it was **RESOLVED:**

To approve the salary packed for the Director of Public Health.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 11.00pm

## FULL COUNCIL 8 OCTOBER 2014

## QUESTIONS &amp; ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### **7. Questions from members of the public**

#### **1. Question from Ms Gill Flack**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services

We need safe off-road horse riding in Werrington and Newborough, please can you confirm what the Council can do about this?

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

I'm certain most residents of Peterborough will be interested in the safe enjoyment of all leisure activities other residents choose to pursue, horse riding included. Regarding the specific areas cited I'm sure the respective ward Cllrs would be keen to engage in a dialogue with Ms Flack, as Councillor Fox already has, themselves to better understand her issue in their wards and, perhaps after that dialogue, we might meet to discover if indeed better provision could be investigated'. As a matter of interest, the Public Rights of Way definitive map is available to view on Hawkeye on the Council's website:

-  
<http://hawkeye.peterborough.gov.uk/hawkeye/default.aspx?X=517493&Y=300269&DatalayerID=195&Scale=19.843&CH=N&BM=SV>

#### **Ms Flack asked the following supplementary question:**

We do have the use of car dyke but the other side of the bank does need restoring for walkers and horse riders, that is the area being fly grazed by gypsy ponies. And part of the Peterborough development corporation access for us, that needs re-opening properly. When they built the parkway they closed off the access to it by fencing it in.

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

It is very difficult for me to respond when I have very little knowledge of the areas. I am happy to talk to you and the ward councillors in order to ascertain whether any improvements can be made.

## COUNCIL BUSINESS

### Questions on notice to:

- a) The Mayor
- b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
- c) To the chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

### 1. **Question from Councillor Thulbourn**

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth

Myself and the Labour Party in Peterborough having been pushing for the past few years for a different economic growth strategy which will create a fairer, and more importantly, a balanced local economy which has the ability to define this city and set us apart.

This business centric and aspiration vision has over the past few months become central to organisations in the area including Opportunity Peterborough. Will the Leader and the Cabinet be changing their strategy to come into line with this vision that is now not only the goal of the Labour Party but most aspiration business leaders and business organisations?

#### **Councillor Cereste responded:**

I'm sure that I don't need to remind fellow Councillors that Peterborough is the fastest growing city in the UK, it is the second highest achiever for private sector jobs and that outperforms both London and Cambridge, and the fifth achiever in the whole of the country for housing growth, better than London and Cambridge. We have a clear and successful growth strategy that sets Peterborough apart. As I promised Council many years ago when you all said we wouldn't be able to deliver it, I said that we would deliver and the administration would deliver a Peterborough ahead of the game when the economy turned. That is exactly what we've been able to do. You only had to be at the recent Opportunity Peterborough bondholders dinner in the Cathedral with over 400 business were represented and you would have got the feel of excitement that evening within the business community.

The whole new city centre is completely revitalised. We have the lowest retail vacancy rates in the whole of the UK, and we're still investing in the city.

Peterborough Core, for those of you that don't know what that is – that's the gigabit development in our city. That means that every business and house in the city will have the opportunity to connect to 1000 megabytes of broadband to their homes. We will be ahead of most cities in the world delivering such infrastructure in Peterborough. And that's been done on the back of our policies for bringing this city into the 25<sup>th</sup> century, never mind the 22<sup>nd</sup> century. We have invested in the Fletton Parkway and the roads around the city, because infrastructure is incredibly important. There's no point in building new offices and new warehouses if people can't get to them. Peterborough DNA is part of our future cities programme, and that has put Peterborough on the

map as one of the smart cities and some of our people are going to Barcelona to tell the world how we do it in Peterborough, and isn't that something fantastic.

And we've spent £200m in Peterborough schools and on our children, and I think that's an incredibly important.

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

You didn't answer the question. The question was around economic development and the question was...when you've come to Scrutiny and you've spoken to me before, you've always pushed back on the idea of growth. This city, where the average salary is so low, it's time to do something about it. And across the board now, it seems to be a number of organisations are moving towards that Labour Party type policy of sector-driven...put your neck above the parapet, take a chance and let's drive it forward. All I hear is "growth" and just bland growth. All we're seeing is that the actual salaries of people are dropping and all we're doing is subsidising these salaries. Can you please answer the question? Do you agree with Opportunity Peterborough, and are you going to come to Scrutiny meetings in the future with the Council's plan to mirror that growth? Where you're going to put your neck on the line and say "we will go after that sector and we will get growth rather than bland growth – lots of warehouses, people earning no money. It's just not good enough.

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

The actual income per capita in this city has gone up by 50% in the last ten years. That 50% - it's a matter of fact. It's gone from below £10,000 to just under £15,000. That is a matter of fact. Now, you cannot say that Peterborough is any longer a low-wage society. Many of the new investments...the idea that logistics is poorly-paid, low-skilled society is nonsense. Logistics is actually now very highly-skilled, very highly-paid, and the problem with logistics is that they don't employ as many people as they used to as they're now using computers and they're using much better IT and therefore they need more highly-skilled, better people and being paid a lot better. So I'm quite happy to substantiate what I've said to you. The numbers...I know I'm right because I've checked it all out. I'm pleased that you brought the question to us, so I can actually tell the Council how well the Conservative Group has performed over the last 10 years in actually putting Peterborough on the right path, using growth as a way to create wealth for everybody and then investing that money in our schools for our children so that our children have got a future.

2. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Holdich, Vice Chairman of the Employment Committee on behalf of Councillor Nadeem, Chairman of the Employment Committee

At the April meeting of Full Council a number of concerns were raised about the large increases in pay being given to some Council directors and senior officers. It was agreed that the matter would be referred to the Employment Committee for further consideration.

Could the chair of the Employment Committee tell me when this issue is likely to appear as an agenda item for his committee and how he envisages the committee taking forward the promised review of senior officer pay. Given that there is massive public interest in this subject, could he also give an

assurance that as much of the discussion as possible will take place in public, rather than in secret sessions with the press and public excluded as has often happened in the past?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

In Councillor Nadeem's absence I will be responding to this. As you know, I did promise the Council that a review of senior manager's pay would occur and this is now happening.

At the Employment Committee held on 11 September 2014, a briefing took place with Committee Members about how they wished to approach the review.

A full report will be presented to Employment Committee in public on 20 November 2014 following which, Employment Committee will make recommendations to Council.

Can I also remind Council that these were not increases in pay. These were new jobs following a restructure of the Council's senior management with new responsibilities. To the cost of £70,000 this Council saved £1 million. I think that's good business.

**Councillor Sandford did not have a supplementary question.**

3. **Question from Councillor Ash**

To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth

I note that some inconsiderate cyclists blatantly cycle along bridge street at busy times, weaving in and out of shoppers showing little consideration for pedestrians.

Does the Leader agree with me that this presents a danger to people walking along Bridge Street particularly small children and those who are not agile, as does cycling on footpaths throughout the city.

If so can he tell us what action is being taken to ensure that people can walk around in designated pedestrian areas and footpaths in safety.

**Councillor Cereste responded:**

Firstly, let me say that as a Council we fully support cycling in Peterborough. Through our success in attracting Government funding through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, with a further £900k revenue secured for the next financial year, we will continue to invest in cycling.

However, I must agree with Councillor Ash that there are some inconsiderate cyclists who continue to ignore the restrictions in Bridge Street which were put in place to protect the safety of pedestrians, and particularly children in what is now, due in no small part to the Council's investment, a vibrant pedestrian street. We have recently undertaken public consultation on extending the existing restrictions to include Sundays and I will be discussing my proposals with group leaders before a final decision is made.

We will be working closely with the police to make sure that should we go ahead with that, the existing cycling ban is enforced, and we are aware of

	<p>successful enforcement campaigns in other cities such as Oxford that we can learn from.</p> <p><b>Councillor Ash did not have a supplementary question.</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth</p> <p>Low pay is a concern of many residents and staff, who will be striking on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> of October. Can the Leader advise me when he is planning to bring in the living wage and will he be attending the up-coming low wage conference that the MP is planning?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Since Full Council in January 2013, work has been undertaken to establish the financial impact of applying the Living Wage to Peterborough City Council employees and also staff employed in community schools. A final report has now been prepared and a meeting scheduled to consider the way forward in principle. We are supportive of adopting the living wage but also need to be mindful of the financial impact before a final decision is taken.</p> <p>A further meeting has been scheduled for the 27 October 2014.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>You haven't answered the bit about attending the meeting planned with the MP. Is that because you don't like the MP, or you don't like the living wage?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, I love my MP and I fully support the living wage.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</b></p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Street Scene, Waste Management and Communications</p> <p>Last year, the Private Contractor employed by PCC, promised the residents of Burford Lawns Estate, Dogsthorpe, improvements to their Play area, located between Blandford Gardens &amp; Wimborne Drive. After much promoting the Contractor has finally agreed to :-</p> <p>"Remove all items of equipment and the old safety surface. Supply and install new swing, slide, see-saw and whizzer. Supply and install new Jungle Mulch safety surfacing".</p> <p>Could the residents please be informed whether these works will start this financial year, or be delayed yet again?</p> <p><b>Councillor Elsey responded:</b></p> <p>We expect the work to start in the week commencing 3 November 2014.</p> <p><b>Councillor Saltmarsh did not have a supplementary question.</b></p>

6.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Swift</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member be kind enough to look into the question of conditions placed on developers to make open space land available, particularly play areas, when granting planning permissions. I have two areas in the North Ward that are currently causing residents, myself and Councillor Sharp grave concern. There is one area where the City Council gave land worth quarter of million to a housing association and the play areas now have been put up for sale. The gravest concern however is Christopher Close. When the estate was built in 1992, there was a condition that the open space land with trees, that had preservation orders, would be retained and a play area provided. This land is now been sold by the developers to a private individual and the open land is now nothing but an eyesore. I require assurances on behalf of my constituents that the planning conditions will be adhered to and the area will be cleaned up but above all that no permission for development of housing will be allowed.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Where public open space on housing developments has not been adopted by the City Council, in very rare circumstances that open space can be sometimes be sold by one private party to another. Open space enjoys protection through the Council's adopted planning policies and only in the most exceptional circumstances would planning permission be given for development on public open space. With regard to the public open space at Christopher Close, I am aware that the land has been offered at auction a number of times in recent years and was recently bought. During the time the land was advertised on the auction web site, the Council's planning officers consistently and properly advised potential purchasers that it was highly unlikely that any planning development would be granted planning permission.</p> <p>The City Council's has powers through a Section 215 notice to require owners of untidy land to undertake necessary work to make good the area. A limitation of such notices is that should the area be made good within the timeframe specified within the notice and the land becomes untidy again, a further notice must be issued. I agree it's always sad when an area of open land is neglected and brings down the neighbourhood because of that inattention. I will ask officers to look at the state of this land, Councillor Swift, and share their report with you to determine the way forward here. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Swift did not have a supplementary question.</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>In Werrington, along the one way street which is situated off Hall Lane and Church Street, children are often seen cycling up the middle of the road, heading in the wrong direction as motorists turn from Hall Lane into it. This is an accident waiting to happen. Could the Cabinet Member please assure me that exploration will be undertaken into the implementation of appropriate signage for the area for both drivers and cyclists?</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>I can assure Councillor Davidson that officers will investigate the existing signage and ensure that any additional signage required is provided to inform all road users of the highway protocol at that site.</p> <p><b>Councillor Davidson did not have a supplementary question.</b></p>
8.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Miners</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth</p> <p>Noting the recent sombre warnings of impending financial doom from the Leader, reported in the local media, could the Leader please confirm the extent of Central Government funding cuts to Local Government, particularly to Peterborough City Council, over the last four years?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>During this parliament, local government funding will have almost halved since 2010/11 spending levels, as it plays its role in supporting government's deficit reduction programme.</p> <p>The Council supports actual overall grant reductions as it believes this provides a realistic interpretation of government grants to the tax payer and further excludes council tax assumptions. Taking all grants into account excluding additional pooled NHS funding, public health grant and by removing the New Homes Bonus as this grant is funded based on our growth, the actual picture is a grant reduction of £8.9m in 2014/15 and a further £12.3m in 2015/16. This represents approximately 28% and 39% reduction in council funding since 2010/11 spending levels. By 2015/16, the Council would have seen grant reductions of £44m since 2010/11.</p> <p>Looking ahead to next financial year, the Council will have to make some very difficult decisions.</p> <p><b>Councillor Miners asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Noting all the figures the Leader has quoted, does he in fact on reflection believe we would now be financially better off in Peterborough City Council if we had increased the Council Tax precept over the past few years to the maximum amounts allowed by the central government?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>No, the answer to the question is, because actually the maximum we could have increased Council Tax was by about 2% and there had been monies placed into our baseline grant in order to balance that off. The question then arises – what happens in 2017/18? Since I don't have a crystal ball, I cannot answer that.</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Serluca, Cabinet Member for City Management, Culture and Tourism</p> <p>Now that the library consultation has ended, could the relevant Cabinet</p>

Member please let me know how many people responded, and advise what the likely impact is now on people in my ward who use the Werrington Library, or others around the city?

**Councillor Serluca responded:**

The libraries and community centre fact finding consultation closed on Friday the 26 September, in total, we have received 5,100 responses

I am delighted with the number of responses we have received to the consultation. This is testament to the hard work of our officers and councillors who have spent a great deal of time letting people know about the consultation and encouraging them to take part. It is also because the people of Peterborough care about their libraries and community centres.

We will now be spending time looking at each of the questionnaires returned to be able to draw conclusions from what people have said. Given the large number of responses received, we expect this to take a number of weeks.

A report will then go before the next Cabinet meeting on 3 November which will detail the results of the consultation.

As we have said from the beginning, we know people value our library services and community centres but we also know that the way people are using them is changing. This consultation will help us to provide library and community centre services which meet the needs of our residents.

**Councillor Fower was not present to ask a supplementary question.**

10. **Question from Councillor Ash**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services

Is the cabinet member aware of delays to the works near the shops at Central Avenue which was originally promised to begin in July 2013. I am sure he will remember it was a subject of a question asked by Cllr Saltmarsh at a council meeting held in July 2013.

Ward Councillors were eventually advised that the revised start date of September 2014 has been put back to early 2015.

Can he explain why preparatory work such as procurement and costings for example, were not completed in time for the promised September start, and can he give assurances that the works will be carried out sooner rather than later.

Does he also agree with me that these delays have the potential to give a poor impression to residents.

**Councillor Hiller may have responded:**

The original project due to be delivered in 2013 had to be halted due to budget availability but there is funding for the project to progress this financial year.

When preparatory work recommenced on the project in April it was anticipated that works would commence on site in September. As design work progressed it became clear that significant utility diversions would be

	<p>required and that this and other engineering issues would result in a time delay. I can confirm that the project will be delivered in this financial year.</p>
11.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ferris</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth</p> <p>Noting this Council's agreement to work towards implementation of the Living Wage for all of its employees (as per Council motion passed in January 2013), can the Leader of the Council update us on what progress has been made and when we might expect to see this implemented? Will he provide assurances that school staff will be included?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</b></p> <p>Since Full Council in January 2013 work has been undertaken to establish the financial impact of applying the Living Wage to Peterborough City Council employees and also staff employed in community schools. A final report has now been prepared and a meeting scheduled to consider the way forward in principle. We are supportive of adopting the living wage but also need to be mindful of the financial impact before any decision is taken.</p> <p>A further meeting has been scheduled for the 27<sup>th</sup> October 2014.</p>
12.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Scott, Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p> <p>Whilst I fully support council employees making use of electric cars, a number of social workers currently utilise the Peterborough City Council logoed electric cars when they are undertaking home visits. Could the Cabinet Member for Children's Services advise me whether she believes that this in any way affects the confidentiality of the families being visited?</p> <p><b>Councillor Scott may have responded:</b></p> <p>Electric cars are not often used within social care because of this very reason.</p> <p>However the cars are sometimes used to visit families who welcome social care support, and there are many as seen in the recent BBC film.</p> <p>Recently I accompanied a social worker on a visit to an adoptive family.</p> <p>Where there is a problem with confidentiality and a car is used, the social worker will always park around the corner so as not to breach confidentiality.</p>
13.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Street Scene, Waste Management and Communications</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please advise as to why when neighbouring Norfolk have decided to scrap their plans to build an expensive incinerator and this local authority is continuing to look at introducing one, what the costs to date on the project are and the latest expected/planned overall cost are?</p>

**Councillor Elsey may have responded:**

Firstly, Norfolk's reasons for deciding not to proceed with their facility in Kings Lynn were related to a failure to obtain planning permission, a risk for any proposed development and part of the reason Peterborough obtained planning permission for its facility in advance of beginning the procurement process.

Secondly I would like to remind Councillor Fower of the regular progress updates provided in the members bulletin, the most recent in July 2014 edition showing that construction of the facility is well advanced. To suggest the Authority is merely considering introducing one appears to be somewhat out of touch with the established policy agreed by Council in 2007.

Spend on the project to date is just under £31 million of the capital cost of £75.6 million. Conservative predictions show a saving in excess of £1 million per year on average saved from this facilities operation, on top of the significant environmental benefits already widely published.

14. **Question from Councillor Shaheed**

To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Street Scene, Waste Management and Communications

Having often walked the journey from Walton into town I regularly come across refuse lorries going about their weekly collection. Often, especially in the summer months, there is a disgusting stench along my journey which I believe is caused by old cooking oil, having been disposed of incorrectly, being tipped into the back of the lorries and subsequently just leaking all over the street in the direction the lorry is taking. Is there any way that the lorries could be fitted with a mechanism to prevent this or householders and - the more likely cause - takeaway and food outlets could be advised on the correct ways by which to dispose of the oils to alleviate the issue?

**Councillor Elsey may have responded:**

We would be surprised if the smell is as a result of the lorries *leaking* old cooking oil. All of the food pods are sealed units and we have had no other reports of liquids seeping from the refuse fleet.

The lorries are open freighters so there is always the potential for unpleasant odours arising from the contents of the bins that have been emptied.

Of course, these lorries are only supposed to be collecting **household** waste.

Takeaways or any other food outlet disposing of old cooking oil in household waste lorries would be in breach of their statutory duties to keep and dispose of waste properly and to hold documentation to prove this which must be available to be inspected upon request. The maximum fine in court for such an offence is £50,000. If anyone suspects any particular outlet of disposing of old cooking oil in this way, please let us know and we will investigate.

Residents and businesses both to dispose of waste responsibly – this is one of a range of issues we will be addressing through the forthcoming Clean and Green campaign.

15.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Street Scene, Waste Management and Communications</p> <p>Myself and Councillor Sandford recently conducted a site visit to Hallfields Lane recreation area with a couple of officers to review the areas designated for the biodiversity trial this summer. Bearing in mind part of the strategy was to review the effectiveness of encouraging wildlife to frequent these areas I asked the council officer how the effectiveness of this was to be measured. He said they don't really know! Could the relevant Cabinet Member either confirm this or otherwise? If this is true what measures are in place to actually review this aspect of the scheme effectively in the future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Elsey may have responded:</b></p> <p>In the first instance, we are reviewing the practical challenges that have arisen with the new biodiversity areas, given concerns that have been voiced in some locations [<i>including Gunthorpe and Werrington</i>].</p> <p>We think some <i>relatively minor</i> variations in the precise areas involved and approach taken will enable us to both respond to residents' reasonable concerns and settle on (and potentially extend) the approach we've taken – to the benefit of wildlife.</p> <p>We do plan to measure the benefits for wildlife. For example, we are considering taking a sample from each area to record the number of flowering plants present, as well as the range of species encountered, such as butterflies, bees, small mammals and birds.</p> <p>Changes could then be reported back via the annual Biodiversity Strategy Update Report to the Sustainable Growth &amp; Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee.</p>
16.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Currently only around one third of the urban wards in Peterborough have parish councils. Given that next year areas with parish councils will be entitled to between 15 and 25% of the proceeds from the Community Infrastructure Levy, would he agree that parishing the rest of the urban area should be seen as a priority for the Council.</p> <p>Could he tell us what support the Council is currently giving to communities who wish to develop a parish council and what steps is he taking to ensure that if possible we end up with a co-ordinated and joined up network of parish councils and not a jumble of parished and unparished areas across the urban parts of the city?</p> <p><b>Councillor North may have responded:</b></p> <p>The Council are committed to supporting the formation of new Parish/Community Councils with local groups that are committed and interested in doing so. The community capacity team are currently working closely with CAPALC and existing Peterborough Parishes to promote this opportunity via a programme that is financed by DCLG.</p>

	<p>Local groups in the following urban areas are exploring this are:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Werrington Paston Walton Stanground West Town, Westwood &amp; Ravensthorpe Dogsthorpe Fletton &amp; Woodston</p> <p>The programme promotes how parish councils (new and existing) can have a greater say over how their local needs are met and how they could have a greater control over how money raised locally, via CIL and other means, is spent. These are some of the many benefits in parishing but it is not possible to direct where parishes could be formed as the decision and commitment to take this forward can only come from the community themselves.</p> <p>The council is committed to promoting and maximising all opportunities available to Parish Councils to ensure all can be done to support their long term viability and sustainability. The council facilitates bringing all Parish Councils together as a networking forum on a quarterly basis as well as supporting an annual conference, to share best practice and raise awareness on matters of mutual interest.</p>
17.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth</p> <p>Question for the Leader. In Peterborough, remuneration is paid to a large number of your nominees; Cabinet Members, Advisors and Scrutiny Chairs the number of which is determined by the leader of the administration. Why have you continued to max out on the number of recipients you are allowed to pay this to and when and why did you decide to extend this payment to a member of another political party?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</b></p> <p>Cllr Murphy clearly doesn't know how the Council works. I, personally, haven't 'maxed out' on the number of recipients for these allowances. As a Council, you decide who chairs your Scrutiny meetings, not me. And as a Council we all decide how much to pay those Chairs. That decision is made each year following the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel.</p> <p>Cllr Murphy asks why I have agreed to pay a member of another political party for chairmanship of Scrutiny Committee. He should know that the decision to appoint the current chairs was agreed by us in June of this year, at the Annual Council meeting. We all agreed that the Chair of one of the Scrutiny committees would be held by an opposition member.</p>
18.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Miners</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>For the last two years, local residents living in the Western Avenue area of Dogsthorpe, and their local councillors, have been assured road resurfacing works would be taking place over some sections of the Western Avenue highway, particularly at the junctions with Chestnut Avenue and Birchtree</p>

	<p>Avenue. Alas, although the road repair markings have again been repainted, to indicate the works, there is still no word when these promised works will be completed. Can I ask "When will they be completed?"</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>Initially the work was issued on the former Ringway contract but regrettably they failed to deliver before the contract ended in September 2013.</p> <p>The work was reallocated to new contractors Skanska and they are expecting to complete the work in the next 3 to 4 weeks.</p> <p>Officers will ensure that ward members are updated when the final date of the works is confirmed.</p>
19.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth</p> <p>Following the consultation relating to the planned ban of cycling along Bridge Street on a Sunday, could the relevant Cabinet Member please update me and the chamber as to the results of the consultation, what is now planned and whether there are any plans to introduce a sensible solution of a cycle lane as a result?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</b></p> <p>We have recently undertaken public consultation on extending the existing cycling restrictions to include Sundays. We received 75 individual responses (42 against, 22 in support, and 11 that commented on the proposals without stating a preference), along with 125 signatories to a petition. The provision of a cycle lane solution did not form part of the consultation and this has not been considered as it is not a practical solution in such a busy, family focused street.</p> <p>I will be discussing my proposals with group leaders before a final decision is made. We will continue to work in partnership with the police to make the pedestrian area a safer environment for all users.</p>
20.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Swift</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>As a matter of extreme urgency would the Cabinet Member please ensure that the department concerned with traffic and parking issues look at Thistle Moor Road where the parking signs are illegible and where residents with parking permits cannot park during the day without getting a £60 fine at the Eastern end of the street. At the Western end, where there are 10 parking spaces for the shops in the area, these cannot be used. The parking spaces are permanently filled 24/7 by an adjacent garage by cars awaiting repair etc. This also applies to the laybys and also the entrance to the PSL sports field. In a nutshell there are something like 25-30 cars in the area that are taking up all of the available parking for residents. Weekends particularly are bad – you cannot even walk on pavements due to the cars.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p>The departments responsible for the traffic and parking issues will review the</p>

	issues raised and take appropriate action accordingly. I have asked that they update you directly once the investigation has been completed.
--	--