

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD
28 JANUARY 2015**

The Mayor – Councillor David Over

Present:

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

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Arculus and Shabbir.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Khan, Over, Cereste, Holdich, North, Peach, Nadeem and Nawaz declared an interest in item 12 'Motions on Notice' in relation to the motion from Councillor Richard Ferris, as landlords with properties in Peterborough.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2014:

The minutes of the Council Meeting held on 17 December 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 14 December 2014 to 25 January 2015.

The Mayor further announced the Civic Award winners which recognised residents, groups, organisations and business that had made a real difference in their local community.

The following nominees had been selected to receive a Civic Award:

- Ted and Shirley Sargeant, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- The Hampton Community Sports Associations, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- John Cant, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- Tony Lambert, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- Marlene Stalker, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- Ken Doughty, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- The First Sensory Legion, Community Involvement Civic Award;
- Brian Pearce, Environment Civic Award;
- Matt Newton, Young Person Civic Award; and
- The Hampton Community Sports Association, Sports Civic Award;
- Genadijus Skutel, Sports Civic Award;
- Mask Theatre, Contribution to Art and Culture Civic Award;

- Diane Goldsmith, Contribution to Art and Culture Civic Award;
- Steponas Bronius Vaitkevicius, Lifetime Achievement Award.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

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 were no questions submitted by members of the public.

8. Petitions

(a) Presented by members of the public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

Councillor Davidson presented a petition on behalf of Fulbridge Road Allotment Association, containing 387 signatures, the purpose being to obtain the following objectives:

1. To obtain assistance from Peterborough City Council in making the fences and gates along the access road to the site more secure following a spate of thefts and acts of vandalism; and
2. To obtain assistance from Peterborough City Council in making the fencing and gate at the rear of the site more secure as it has fallen into disrepair and unauthorised access is being gained by intruders.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

9. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Local Council Tax Support Scheme

Cabinet at its meeting of 19 January 2015, received a report following consultation on the proposals for Council Tax Support for 2015/16 launched by a Cabinet Member Decision Notice on 2 December 2014, including discussion at the Joint Budget Scrutiny on 3 December 2014.

The purpose of the report was to make a recommendation to Full Council on the Council Tax Support Scheme to be implemented in Peterborough from April 2015.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- It was questioned if the level of reduction in benefit for working age claimants was proposed to be 30%, why was 40% referenced in the report;

- It was questioned why a £2.4 million spending gap was predicted, if a reduction in benefit of 30% was not maintained;
- An increase of the reduction in benefit to 40% would effectively increase council tax for those who could least afford it. The last minute change of mind was beneficial;
- It was clarified that the 40% detailed in the report was an alternative put forward by officers, who had a duty to outline all possible options. It was not a proposal of Cabinet; and
- It was noted that the Government had cut the funding for local council tax support, subsequently the level of reduction needed to be maintained at 30%.

Councillor Cereste exercised his right to speak and clarified that it had never been the intent of Cabinet to increase the level of reduction in benefit for working age claimants beyond 30% and stated that officers had come forward with the right decision for the City.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendations and addressed several issues raised in debate. The potential £2.4 million spending gap would result from not agreeing to maintain a 30% reduction in benefit as the level would subsequently default to 0%. Councillor Seaton stated that he was not comfortable with many of decisions the Council had to make to cut its budget, however more still had to be made.

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

That Council agreed the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Peterborough and that the level of reduction in benefit for working age claimants be kept at 30%.

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 19 January 2015;
2. Use of the Council's Call-In mechanism, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting;
3. Special Urgency and Waive of Call-In Provisions, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting; and
4. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 9 December 2014 to 19 December 2014.

Questions were asked about the following:

New Delivery Model for Peterborough Library Service

Councillor Miners sought assurance that Councillors of affected wards would be included in discussions around the model trial in order to keep communities updated. Councillor Serluca agreed that this would be the case.

Councillor Fower questioned the viability of installing new technology in libraries and subsequently moving services to the Town Hall. Councillor Serluca was not aware of plans to move the service to the Town Hall, however understood that the majority of the technology discussed was already in place in the libraries.

Councillor Fower asked how the covenant on the City Centre Library affected the recommendations. Councillor Serluca advised that she would provide a written answer to Councillor Fower.

Councillor Shearman queried why the review was being undertaken by the Council and not Vivacity, who ran the library. Councillor Serluca advised that Vivacity

delivered the library service on the Council's behalf and Vivacity were working in partnership on the consultation process.

The Erection of Barriers at Northminster Multi-Story Car Park

Councillor Murphy questioned why it had taken so long for this matter to be considered when the Coroner had issued a regulation 28 notice in July 2014 and queried whether it was appropriate to defer a decision to erect barriers at the car park for any length of time. Councillor Seaton advised that it had been agreed with the Coroner to monitor the situation for six months, as Northminster Car Park had not previously experienced such issues as Queensgate.

Creation of a Peterborough Domestic Energy Supply Tariff

Councillor Harrington queried how the new tariff would run with the already established scheme. Councillor North advised that OVO Energy Limited would help produce a tailor made tariff for the residents of Peterborough. Residents would be able to opt in or opt out.

Strategic Partnership between Peterborough City Council and AVIC International Corporation (UK) Ltd

Councillor Murphy queried why the agreement to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) had not been advertised on the Forward Plan nor gone through Scrutiny. The ethical implications of entering into business with a company owned by the Chinese Government were also questioned. Councillor Seaton advised that China was not the only County that the Council dealt with.

Councillor Ferris queried whether any other companies had been invited to enter into a MOU. Councillor Cereste advised that this was a good opportunity for Peterborough. The best way for such companies to learn the correct way to undertake business was to work with them. A MOU was an agreement to enter into discussions, which would then enable a move to contract. At that point, the policies of the Council would be followed.

Councillor Harrington questioned why the topic had never been brought up at a Group Leaders Meeting. Councillor Cereste indicated that this was the earliest point of discussion, as a MOU was an agreement to discuss possible future options. Group Leaders had been given an opportunity to receive a briefing, however had declined.

Councillor Knowles asked whether other alternatives could be investigated. Councillor Cereste stated that if an opportunity arose from the MOU, processes would be followed and everyone would have an opportunity to put across their views.

Councillor Sandford queried the fact that the Council did not have an Ethical Policy and whether this was acceptable. Councillor Seaton advised that the Council did not have a policy that this agreement would be in contravention of. If there was a desire to add something to the constitution regarding ethics than that could be taken up with the Constitutional Review Group.

Councillor Fitzgerald sought clarification on whether the Council would listen to any organisation which approached them with an investment proposal. Councillor Cereste affirmed this and stated that that was the purpose of an MOU.

DEC14/CMDN/110 Progressing Funding for Peterborough's Future Growth

Councillor Saltmarsh queried what a loan note was. Councillor Seaton explained that it was another way of borrowing money. He was happy to provide a more detailed explanation in writing.

DEC14/CMDN/111 Residential and Nursing Care Contracts

Councillor Murphy queried whether it was correct that there had been backdated payments of approximately £150,000 to private nursing care providers and if so, why.

Councillor Fitzgerald advised that Councillor Murphy was correct, although it was noted that the figure had not been increased for five years. The payments were backdated because discussions had started several months before an agreement had been reached.

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 were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. The lighting in the underpass at Dukesmead, Werrington;
2. The amount of funding received directly by the council for the provision of adult social care;
3. The Schedule for the Brown Bin collection in December and January;
4. The lighting on the Multi Use Games Area on Mountsteven Avenue recreation ground;
5. The financial cost to the Council in making sure enough school places are available locally;
6. The Trustees of the Green Backyard and their bid to buy the site; and
7. The money paid by the Council in landfill tax per tonne and the amount of garden waste placed in black bins.

The following questions were submitted, but due to the time limit being reached for the item, the responses were to be circulated in writing:

8. Timeline for repair of faulty street lighting;
9. Damaged bollards;
10. Road resurfacing works and LED lighting in Werrington and beyond;
11. Suicide prevention at Northminster;
12. Sure Start claw back and the Veranda Centre;
13. Street light PCC 10 in Carron Drive, Werrington;
14. Follow up on motions at Full Council;
15. Cost of the new financial system; and
16. Parking on front curtilages with dropped kerbs.

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 Richard Ferris

The Council note previous debates at Full Council and work that has been undertaken on selective licensing schemes in Peterborough. We believe that a city-wide licensing scheme for privately-rented dwellings would:

- *provide increased protection for tenants;*
- *ensure improvements to the standard of accommodation;*
- *support effective enforcement, and*
- *offer responsible landlords an accreditation standard*

Council asks the Cabinet and relevant officers to prepare a report on the feasibility of introducing a city wide scheme for licensing of landlords of privately rented dwellings

and submit it to a meeting of the Strong & Supportive Scrutiny Committee not later than October 2015 and prior to any decision by Cabinet.

Councillor Lee declared an interest in the following item, as a landlord with property in Peterborough.

Councillor Ferris advised that an amendment had been proposed from Councillor Fower and he was agreeable for this to be incorporated into his motion. This was agreed by Council.

Councillor Ferris introduced and moved his motion.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- There was a huge difference between a landlord accreditation scheme and selective licensing. Good landlords should not be penalised;
- To introduce a selective licensing scheme, evidence would need to be produced, of which there was none;
- Work could be done with substandard landlords and tenants, though a city wide scheme could not be implemented. Other options were more appropriate;
- It was questioned whether there was a pilot scheme already being discussed and whether a report should be taken to Scrutiny to examine the feasibility of a city wide scheme;
- A city wide agreement was not legal or technically possible. Dialogue was ongoing regarding particular schemes for particular troubled areas;
- It was recognised that the secretary of state would be monitoring any selective licensing scheme;
- It was suggested that selective licencing did not work, following several cities that had abandoned such schemes;
- Programmes such as Operation Pheasant were being used to assist in the identification of substandard landlords;
- Pilot schemes were often undertaken in the east of the city. It was suggested that a pilot be carried out in the west of the city and then extended to the whole city; and
- It was advised that the Council has all the powers it needed to assist suffering tenants if it was made aware of them.

The Legal Officer advised that motion was accepted as lawful. The Council had the power to agree a selective licensing scheme, if it was considered to meet the relevant criteria. Members of the Cabinet had previously debated this issue and concluded that the criteria was not met. It was acceptable for Council to ask Cabinet to review its earlier decision.

Councillor Thulbourn exercised his right to speak and stated there were substandard landlords through the city who were negatively affecting the good landlords. It was suggested that the good landlords in the city would support this scheme.

Councillor Ferris summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the legal reasons for restricting a city wide scheme were appreciated. It was believed that the proposal would have a positive effect on rent levels and capital values. The motion was intended to move the debate on the matter forward without being prescriptive.

A vote was taken (20 for, 32 against, 2 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

2. Motion from Councillor John Fox

Members know of the great value to Peterborough communities that Special Constables give to policing and the role they play as unpaid volunteers within their respective communities.

We also acknowledge that Special Constables have full Police Powers, unlike PCSO's, and are therefore in our opinion more effective as front line Police Officers.

I respectfully ask that this Council write to our two Members of Parliament asking for them to look into the feasibility of paying a retainer fee to Special Constables, so as to help encourage more volunteers to come forward.

The retainer fee could be paid on an annual basis as a result of fixed hour's attendance per annum, such as the Volunteer Fire Brigade and the Reserve Forces.

We believe that this would help encourage more citizens to come forward and volunteer their services, especially in the rural areas where we are seeing less and less of a Police presence.

Councillor John Fox introduced and moved his motion.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- It was suggested that Special Constables be able to take time off in order to undertake their duties without having to take it out of their annual holiday allowance;
- There were alternative methods of providing a safer Peterborough. The funding of the proposals could be considered detrimental to tax payers;
- It was stated that there had been a rise in violent crime in urban areas. The addition of a retainer for Special Constables would take away resources for urban areas where it was needed;
- Issues in relation to the police should be taken to the Police Crime Panel;
- Special Constables had the full powers of a Police Constable;
- It was suggested that a problem could arise if Special Constables were funded by specific parishes and then drawn to other areas in times of need;
- It was suggested that Special Constables did not do the job of Police Officers and were equivalent to volunteers. As such, a retainer was not necessary; and
- The funding would come from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Councillor Lane exercised his right to speak and expressed his disappointment at the opposition raised. He advised that the proposal was not restricted to rural areas, but for all communities.

Councillor John Fox summed up as mover of the motion. He clarified that the motion was to look at the feasibility of paying a retainer to Special Constables only. It was suggested that a retainer may encourage more Special Constables and assist in regulating the hours worked. Councillor John Fox further advised that the proposal would improve links between the police and Communities.

A vote was taken (37 for, 5 against, 11 abstentions) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

3. Motion from Councillor Ed Murphy

That:

- 1. Peterborough Council notes the recent A&E crisis at Peterborough City Hospital and elsewhere in England, and reports that there were 40 patients with no pressing medical needs awaiting discharge taking up beds at the Peterborough hospital;*
- 2. The Council believes that the private sector provision of nursing home, social care and community care in Peterborough is not adequate enough to deal with the current crises. Council believes that a long-term solution involving the public sector with the development of a national care service and integrated NHS strategy should be pursued; and*
- 3. Members instruct the Council to review the situation and consider direct provision of care places in response to the current crisis and we call on the NHS as a matter of urgency to tackle the current shortage of nursing care places. Longer and medium-term solutions such as employing home helps and providing better preventative services should also be implemented so less elderly people in particular present at A and E because their needs will have been addressed at an earlier stage.*

Councillor Murphy introduced and moved his motion.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The motion was thought to be contradictory. Problems with bed blocking at the hospital was not the responsibility of the Council;
- The Council was already taking an active role in providing extra capacity of nursing care beds;
- Better Care Fund integration work was already underway. £120,000 in funding would be received from the Government in April;
- It was considered that the proposals looked backwards and were not sufficiently innovative. The bed blocking was caused by a number of issues that required inventive solutions;
- It was suggested that the Health and Wellbeing Board could consider various schemes and consider what would be best for Peterborough;
- It was noted that the issues had resulted from a fundamental structural problem with the NHS. There were insufficient numbers of doctors and nurses in the country. It was suggested that the focus of discussion should be on providing more resources for primary care services;
- A claim was made that significant number of individuals were barred from becoming nurses because certain level of qualification was required; and
- It was stated that the NHS was stretched as a result of its own success.

Councillor Jamil exercised his right to speak and stated that the Council needed to look at the current problems being faced. It was explained that the motion sought to find ways to review the current situation.

Councillor Murphy summed up as mover of the motion and advised that it was not specified that the Council was the cause of the recent A&E crisis. It was explained that the motion asked the Council to request the NHS to take the lead and the Council was asked to support this stance.

A vote was taken (23 for, 27 against, 3 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

13. Reports to Council

(a) Review of Polling Districts, Places and Stations

Council received a report which outlined the compulsory requirement in conducting a statutory review of polling stations and recommended that Council approved the Returning Officer's proposals in relation to polling districts, places and stations.

Councillor North introduced the report and moved the recommendation contained within. He stated that the proposals had been published in October 2014 and consultation had ended in November 2014. If the recommendations were agreed, the register of electors would be amended accordingly by 31 January 2015. This was seconded by Councillor Holdich who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and it was stated that the Disability Forum had not been consulted. It was further requested that officers ensured that the Disability Forum was consulted next time such a review was undertaken.

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

- i) That the Council noted the compulsory requirement in conducting a statutory review of polling stations; and
- ii) That the Council approved the Returning Officer's proposals in relation to the polling districts, places and stations.

(b) Senior Management Restructure – Phase 2

Council received a report which notified of the changes the Chief Executive intended to make to the senior management structure. The report also sought the approval of the Council for the salary range for the new post of Corporate Director: People and Communities, which the Chief Executive proposed to establish under the restructure.

In accordance with the Council's Pay Policy and Guidance issued under section 40 of the Localism Act 2011, the Council was required to approve any proposed salaries of £100k or more.

The Legal Officer advised that previously Employment Committee had appointed to a position and then had sought Council's approval for the level of pay. For practical reasons it was now the case that Council's approval was sought for the relevant pay band prior to any appointment to post. This was in line with Council policy.

Councillor Nadeem introduced the report and moved the recommendation contained within. He explained the new roles that had been created within the restructure and advised of the proposed pay bands for each role. Three director roles had been deleted, saving £300,000. This was seconded by Councillor Holdich who reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The second phase of the senior manager restructure had been carried out in an open and consultative manner;
- Concern was raised regarding the use of market supplements and whether this could take any successful candidate outside any pay band approved by Council;
- It was suggested that Council needed to see the whole pay package before it was offered to a successful candidate;
- It was advised that Employment Committee would only decide where a

- candidate would be positioned within a pay band;
- Reservations were expressed about the ambiguity of the current Council policy. It was suggested that when it came back to Council in March, clarification could be given in relation to pay bands and specific salary;
 - The new structure would be monitored to ensure that it delivered what was expected;
 - It was noted that it was sad to see officers losing their jobs and that the time table for recruitment was very tight, which could be improved; and
 - Consideration was given to the process of seeking Council approval for the relevant pay band before appointed and it was suggested that this was the most sensible approach.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and advised that this approach was more appropriate than appointing an individual to post, who may accept, but whose pay level may subsequently be rejected by Council.

Councillor Nadeem summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the restructure would deliver the right format to attract the best officers in a competitive environment.

A vote was taken (36 for, 6 against, 10 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

- i) Noted the changes which the Chief Executive intended to make to the senior management structure of the Council;
- ii) Noted the proposal from the Chief Executive that she intended to establish a new post of Corporate Director: People and Communities; and
- iii) Approved the proposed salary range for the Corporate Director: People and Communities of £127,014 to £155,250.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 10:25pm

FULL COUNCIL 28 JANUARY 2015

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
	There were no questions received.
<u>COUNCIL BUSINESS</u>	
<u>Questions on notice to:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Mayor b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet c) To the chair of any Committee or Sub-committee
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>Would the relevant Cabinet Member please confirm as to when the lighting in the underpass at Dukesmead, Werrington will be upgraded. These lights have been in operation since the 1970's and residents living locally to the underpass have raised concerns that the current lighting provision is inadequate.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Dukesmead underpass has been scheduled for lighting replacement before the end of the financial year. There is an active programme for 5 underpasses in the city and Dukesmead is to be addressed after work at Nabs Lane, which has no lighting currently due to vandalism. I'm told there has been a number of emails received regarding this matter generally, and I'm told our officers have been keeping interested parties regularly updated. If you're not being updated Councillor Davidson would you please let me know and I'll make sure that happens. I'm also told as a matter of record that your fellow Councillor, Councillor Thacker, has had these cleaned only last year.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I am in the loop of receiving emails, but in respect of the underpass, I wonder if it possible if we could see an introduction of CCTV to be introduced to minimise vandalism and also by the introduction of CCTV you would be able to collate any evidence enabling enforcement teams to prosecute when vandalism is taking place. That said, the underpass lighting system would greatly benefit from an upgrade to a more efficient lighting system such as LED and this would provide minimal energy costs resulting in less maintenance, high visibility, optimising lighting conditions which would provide greater visibility and safety for old age pensioners and children and those other people who use the underpass.</p>

Councillor Hiller responded:

Dukesmead underpass has been scheduled for lighting replacement before the end of the year. The actual specification of that lighting I'm unsure I will certainly check that it is the most efficient lighting systems that we have available, always subject to cost of course, but the ongoing costs, the invest to save in low energy LED but high brightness LED has got to be looked at very seriously.

Regarding CCTV installation, I would suggest that any CCTV installation has to be evidentially based. I can certainly enquire and we can get a costing and I can ask our officers to see whether in fact it would be warranted.

2. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Fitzgerald, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Could the Cabinet member for Adult Social Care please confirm the amount of funding received directly by Peterborough City Council for the provision of adult social care, for how many people this applies and could he also give details of the total amount expended on direct provision and the total payments to residents to purchase their own care?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

All these figures relate to the 2014/15 year.

The gross budget for Adult social care is £59,333,030 and we receive on top of that an income of £14,790,718, giving a net figure of £44,542,312.

The Council has received funding that makes up that amount of £14,790,718 of Better Care Fund £661,000, Care Act £125,000, S75 Agreements £2,110,000, S256 Agreements £3,827,000 and local reform grant of £143,432.

The second part of your question was the amount spent on direct provision and that was £35,977,867 netted down after income received in terms of fees and charges that would be £26,814,746 and those in regard to direct payments, there are 512 of those and the figures are £8,142,364 netted down to £7,104,666 after income.

Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:

The BBC have been running the story today and I'm asking if you are aware of it, and I think it clarifies some of the issues around this question. Today the research indicates that payments for social care for people over 65 in England have fallen by 20%. Is that the case in Peterborough, and in Peterborough, have we been getting money earmarked for Adult Social Care which have not been passed on to Adult Social Care but using it for other things?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

To answer that question in the limited time we have here is somewhat difficult, but what I would reiterate is I am happy to hold a briefing session with the Director of Adult Social Care and with our Director of Commissioning where we can go through the numbers in real terms because for me to try and explain this now would be difficult in the time we have. I am aware of the figures and we can talk about figures and I think it is a disgrace that Governments of allsorts are not addressing this issue.

In real terms since 2003 there has been a 6% decrease in social care funding and a 17% increase in the number of service users, so at some point something has got to

give, and we've seen some of that giving perhaps arising in the health sector. Until the Government decide and provide a solution to this we are going to have to make the best of a bad job. I personally would like to see a totally integrated health and social care system. I am happy to give a briefing on all the numbers.

In 2012/13 we were spending £144,000,000 on 3,014 people £47,044,500 latterly.

3. **Question from Councillor Sylvester**

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

Does the Cabinet Member responsible for garden waste realise that the lack of Brown Bin collection in December and January means that a full six weeks is wasted during the time allowed under the Wildlife and Countryside Act for people to trim their garden hedges and trees? Many people reluctantly pay for this collection due to lack of their own transport.

Please can this be brought to the attention of the contractor as it is noted that the contractor abides by the Wildlife and Countryside Act when carrying out public work on behalf of the Council.

Please can the Cabinet Member point out that normal collection of Brown Bins during December and January should entail no extra cost to householders bearing in mind the cost of collecting fly tipped garden waste as a consequence of non-collection.

Councillor Elsey responded:

The new paid-for brown bin service does provide for a collection in both December and January, as well as a fortnightly service throughout the rest of the year, so I am not sure how there is a lack of service in these months.

Previously, this would have been correct as we had suspended the garden waste service for three months.

The monthly, as opposed to fortnightly, service in December and January reflects the very significant reduced tonnages of garden waste that were presented in this period previously.

Specifically relating to missing six weeks of the Wildlife and Country Act, all residents still have the option to cut their shrubs and trees in that period and can store it because we do make a collection, equally they can also take their garden waste to the household recycling centre so I'm not sure how we are preventing the service.

Councillor Sylvester asked the following supplementary question:

Do you realise that in mid-January and February that the weather is so poor each year that no gardening gets done, or very little, certainly no tree or hedge cutting and I worked it out with my own bin that there were six weeks that trimming could have been done in that you couldn't do because there was no brown bin collection and not everybody has got transport to be able to take things along to the tip and I think that the contract should be renegotiated, perhaps it would be better not to collect this garden waste in the period mid-January to the end of February for example.

Councillor Elsey responded:

I'm a bit confused as the first question was relating to a cessation of the service in January and she is now suggesting that there is no gardening done in January, so it seems an irrelevance. But I reiterate, the fact the we have reinstated the service over

those months means that there is each and every month throughout the twelve months of the year, whereas previously there was a three month period where we didn't collect garden waste and I still don't understand how a reduction in the collection means that people are unable to actually physically do their gardening. They simply do the gardening and if they can't take it to the household recycling centre they store it in their brown bin until such times as the bin is collected.

4. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital

Could the Cabinet Member tell me when the lighting on the Multi Use Games Area on Mountsteven Avenue recreation ground is going to be working properly? The lights were out of action for nearly a year and when I complained about this on behalf of residents I was told that Amey had lost the key and were unable to open the control panel to allow the lights to be repaired.

Then a few weeks ago a new key was produced and the lights repaired but residents then complained that rather than switching off at 9pm they were actually on all night long. When I asked officers about this I was told that there was a fault with the timer which required further repairs.

The MUGA would be a great facility for young people in the Walton area but it is most used in the evenings and in winter months, needs adequate illumination but also lights which switch off at 9pm, so as to discourage young people from hanging around the area late at night and disturbing local residents. Could I have an assurance that the Council and its contractors will fix any remaining faults and ensure that the lights are kept working properly in future?

Councillor North responded:

The lights have been out for a year, there have been no phone calls or emails and the first I have heard of it was this question. I do wonder why it has been brought to Full Council. Skanska were instructed by Serco Strategic Property to complete the repairs required for the lighting in the MUGA. On supply of a key, Skanska attended and found the fault to be with the time clock inside the feeder pillar. This is not a standard piece of equipment held in stock therefore in order to provide some illumination the lighting was set to default dawn till dusk illumination. The time clock was delivered on the 22nd January and will be installed by the end of January.

Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:

I raised the issue with the Council department responsible over twelve months ago and I was given an assurance that it was being sorted out and it was only in the Autumn period what the dark evenings came that local residents complained that this problem still hadn't been sorted out. Can I ask why it takes over twelve months to sort out what seems to be a relatively simple difficulty, and can I also ask as this is by no means uncommon, also in my ward we actually have the Rhubarb Bridge and there are some lights on and near the bridge that have been out of action for over a three month period. Why does it take such a long time to get these simple faults sorted?

Councillor North responded:

I wasn't aware additional lights were out, but I'm more than happy to look into it if he will send me a list and I'm more than happy for any Councillor to contact me if they feel there has been an undue delay in any lights and I will investigate and chase.

5.	<p>Question from Councillor Miners</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cabinet Member for Education</p> <p>Noting the Local Government Association is predicting there will be a £12 Billion cost to create the 900,000 extra school places expected in England's schools over the next decade...Could the Leader please confirm what has been the financial cost to Peterborough City Council, so far, in making sure there are enough school places available locally? The government it seems, has not fully funded the true full cost of these extra school places in Peterborough. The Local Government Association estimates that councils across England are carrying a billion pounds of costs, because the government has been late in funding these extra school places.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>The responsibility for creating sufficient school places rest with Local Authorities. The 2014 Surplus Capacity Return (SCAP) reported the creation, or planned creation, of 7,659 additional school places for the period from 2010/11 to 2016/17. This requires a total spend of £153m made up of £78m from Council borrowing, £14m from developer contributions and £61,742,799 from government funding.</p> <p>Further projects are being developed to take account of projected pressures at secondary school level and these will incur further costs to PCC. We continue to petition government for funding for school places and take advantage of schemes such as free schools and the priority school building programme to bid for more resources. Officers were recently invited to DfE to outline the challenges faced in Peterborough. Stewart Jackson MP has been hugely supportive though constantly raising Peterborough's education challenges with Ministers and in the House of Commons.</p> <p>Councillor Miners asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Is there any possibility whatsoever of this city council getting some of its money back from Central Government because we are funding some school places.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>No.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Ferris</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement</p> <p>Could the Leader of the Council update this Chamber on the progress made with supporting the Trustees of the Green Backyard in their bid to buy the site, given his commitment at the last Full Council meeting to granting them an extension? Can he also give a clear undertaking that he will do everything legally within his power to assist them? What assurances can he give that the full social, health and environmental benefits will be taken into account when assessing the bids?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>The commitment I made at the last council meeting remains in force to provide the full support of the council to support the trustees in raising funding to buy the site.</p> <p>There has been recent discussions between the trustees and both the Chief Executive and the Deputy Leader. It has been agreed, that subject to a memorandum of understanding being signed, that an extension of 6 months from</p>

March will be given to allow the trustees to develop a business case for the use of the site. This business plan will include a financial business case, including identified sources of funding, plans for the use of the site and fully capturing the community and education benefits of the Green Backyard to the City in the future.

Councillor Ferris asked the following supplementary question:

Is Councillor Cereste able to give us any indication as to how the decision to accept or reject any proposals from the Green Backyard will be made after that six month period has expired?

Councillor Cereste responded:

The process will be whatever it is that the Council requires, the Council and the Cabinet to make. If you are asking me what the decision will be, I have no idea. Frankly, I hope they get the money and I hope they get what they want but if they don't, we will all have to make a decision.

7. **Question from Councillor Fower**

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

It was recently reported that after 73% of city households had not signed up to the brown bin scheme, an extra 1,575 tonnes of garden waste had found its way into black bins in just five months. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know how much money this local authority pays in landfill tax per tonne and how many tonnes in total of garden waste ended up in the black bins during the same period?

Councillor Elsey responded:

In 2014 /15 approximately one third of the households who currently had the garden waste service signed up for the service, that's nearly 2,000 households out of 63,000

Together with the garden waste collected at the HRC, these households generated approximately 3/4 of the garden waste collected in the same period as under the previous arrangement in the five months of June to October 2014.

We *estimated* an extra 1,575 tonnes of garden waste in black bins over this period which cost the Council £118,000 which was significantly less than the £180,000 that we had budgeted for within the figure that we already had set aside for dealing with municipal waste.

Landfill tax is set nationally at £80 per tonne.

Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:

The other day a question was asked at Gloucestershire County Council and the question was asking their Cabinet Member 'are you yet in a position to let me know the length of the contract with UBB is negotiating to dump toxic fly ash in Peterborough?' now I don't know whether there is going to be toxic fly ash finding its way from Gloucestershire to here, but will that then have a further impact on the landfill tax that this Administration pays?

Councillor Elsey responded:

I fail to see how that's a supplementary question to do with garden waste. So I do not see that it is one that should be answered. Thank you.

8.

Question from Councillor Ash

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services

Dogsthorpe Ward councillors have raised concerns on several occasions about the poor quality of street lighting.

The lack of adequate lighting at the bus lay by in Belvoir Way is of particular concern. We also have resident complaints about lack of action on lights in Western Avenue and Eastfield Road. We have also noted that other areas of the City are also poorly lit.

Can the Cabinet Member give assurances that streets are properly lit and that safety for all road users, especially for pedestrians is not compromised and could he please inform Council what is the general response/repair time in getting faulty or damaged street lighting repaired, from the first report to repair?

Councillor Hiller may have responded:

Belvoir Way: The lighting on Belvoir Way was replaced in 2011 to white light LED from the old orange lanterns. All replacement schemes are installed in line with current standards and I can confirm this is the case for Belvoir Way. Prior to the scheme there was no lighting within the layby area however when the bus stop was upgraded, the opportunity to install a street light on the green space opposite the bus stop was taken, significantly increasing the illumination of the area.

Western Avenue: A fault was repaired on 7 January 2015. This is the only fault reported on Western Avenue in the past 18 months.

Eastfield Road.: The lighting on Eastfield Road has recently been replaced. PCC 59 and 63 at the Newark Road junction require a new telecell and these will be installed shortly. A further column close to the junction with Eye Road was struck in a car accident and we are currently awaiting a new lantern in order to complete the works.

Officers proactively identify faulty lights by scouting the highway network once a month. Over the past 3 years approximately 7000 street lights have been replaced.

Lighting faults are attended to with 7 days from day of report. Standard maintenance works will be completed within these visits. There are however some faults such as cable faults, electricity supply faults and replacements that will take longer to resolve due to the requirement for the attendance of specialist resources, third parties and non-stock items.

9.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>In my ward there are several bollards located on council land that are presently damaged and therefore, no longer fit for purpose. Given, that thought must go into the initial installation of these bollards, there must therefore have a recognised value and purpose. Therefore, would the relevant cabinet member be willing to join me on a site inspection of the three locations I know of also let me know how often signage and street furniture on public footpaths are checked by council officers?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>Bollards are erected for different reasons and at many different locations across the city. Bollards and other street furniture (signs etc.) erected on the Highway are inspected during routine safety and condition inspections in accordance with the Highway Maintenance Plan; inspection frequencies vary from monthly to yearly dependent on the asset hierarchy. Councillors and residents alike are encouraged to report damaged bollards and other street furniture to Peterborough Direct. If Councillor Fower could let me know where the damaged bollards are located I will ensure that they are inspected and repaired or replaced as necessary.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>There are many roads in Peterborough which are in need of resurfacing works and improvements to street lighting. In my ward there are a number of potholes at Werrington Green Junction and along Fulbridge Road which are of substantial size and in the recent poor weather, could prove to be quite dangerous, there are also a number of roads which are still awaiting the improvement of LED lighting. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please advise as to how road maintenance is prioritised and could he give an estimate of how long on average it takes to address an issue such as repairing a pothole and when it is expected that the roll out of LED street lighting will be completed.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>Highway maintenance – Road maintenance programmes [planned maintenance] are based on the results of formal annual condition surveys of the full Peterborough road network and take into account a number of factors including asset hierarchy and of course available budgets. The draft 2015/16 highway maintenance programme includes a number of carriageway and footway treatments in the Werrington area identified in this way.</p> <p>Routine and reactive maintenance work on Peterborough’s Highway asset is identified during programmed statutory safety inspections and ad hoc inspections following reports from the public or other sources. All safety defects have specific intervention limits that dictate the appropriate response time, for example the response time for a carriageway pothole between 40 and 74mm depth is 24hrs. Whilst every effort is made to complete first time permanent repairs to potholes in some circumstances it is still necessary to carry out an interim repair making plans to complete more permanent works during subsequent programmes of work.</p> <p>Looking ahead Skanska are working in close partnership with the council to acquire an innovative mechanical solution to assist with pothole repairs.</p>

11.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>As the Cabinet Member will be aware, I have raised questions concerning Sure Start claw back and the Veranda Centre. Can you therefore let me know why, despite raising the matter at Audit Committee and with officers on a number of occasions, I still have not been given a reply or details of the Sure Start officer/regulator with whom I can discuss the regulation of this matter. Could it please be confirmed as to what the estimate is of the amount that might be required to be paid back and why have I not received an answer to my enquiries over many months since last year?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton may have responded:</p> <p>Services in the area still continue but were moved out of the Veranda to a dedicated facility in Gladstone Primary which (with the exception of office accommodation) virtually replicates the offer at the Veranda Centre. The rationale for this was; as families were not using the Veranda Centre, it was decided to replicate the successful model of Children’s Centre services that are run out of Fulbridge Academy at Gladstone Primary.</p> <p>Officers have been in dialogue with the Department for Education regarding the shifting of services from the Veranda to Fulbridge Academy, specifically the claw back element of the Sure Start grant and the possibility of claw back being applied to this scenario.</p> <p>The Department for Education are clear that their interest, with regard to claw back, will change to the new asset in the Fulbridge Academy, rather than remain with the old asset in the Veranda.</p>
12.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>The street light PCC10 located in Carron Drive, Werrington, remains covered by unkempt leylandii, which means no light is able to be cast, causing a waste electricity and an ineffective service for local residents from this council. Can the relevant Cabinet Member, therefore tell me why this issue has not been rectified, in accordance to the authority’s legal responsibility to maintaining lights on public land and how often are street lights inspected, if ever?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>Despite a number of formal requests the owner of 33 Carron Drive has not cut back the leylandii concerned, which is located on private property. Legal action can be taken against the owner to ensure the works are carried out but to expedite matters Amey have been instructed to undertake the works.</p>
13.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Business Engagement</p> <p>Would the leader of the Council consider putting in place a robust system for dealing with actions requested or required by motions which are agreed at Full Council and reporting actions and outcomes back to Councillors. Currently it appears that many motions are passed requesting Cabinet of officers to do certain things but often Council members are not informed what if anything has happened as a result.</p>

	<p>Councillor Cereste may have responded:</p> <p>In line with usual practice, the Democratic Services Officers follow up on the actions arising from the meetings of Council and direct all approved motions to the relevant department.</p> <p>If Councillor Sandford would like to see the introduction of a monitoring process, then he can refer this to the Member Officer Working Group for consideration.</p>
14.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please confirm the actual cost to the Council of the new financial system that is due to replace the Oracle system?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton may have responded:</p> <p>The financial system is critical to the operation of the Council. We use it to raise orders and pay suppliers, raise invoices and collect debt and to manage our finances.</p> <p>It became clear that our current system needed upgrading or replacing, otherwise there was a risk of failure in the future. The Council cannot risk failure of such a critical business system.</p> <p>To support this project, a budget of £1.4m was included in the capital programme. This was included in the budget approved by Council last March.</p> <p>A thorough review of options was undertaken, starting with a comparison of six systems, and then narrowing this down to a choice of upgrading Oracle or replacing with Agresso. Ultimately the cost of replacing our system is around three quarters the cost of upgrading it over the life of the system.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member Decision Notice I approved back in May outlined the review we had undertaken, and the cost comparison.</p> <p>The contract for replacement approved was for £1.28m, the remainder of the budget being for contingency and internal costs. The project is underway, and we currently expect to come on budget.</p>
15.	<p>Question from Councillor Miners</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Services</p> <p>Noting the special Parking Enforcement Programme (PEP) bye laws operating throughout Old Dogsthorpe, and the tour undertaken in Old Dogsthorpe many, many months ago involving the Leader, Ward Cllr and a senior officer, responsible for co-ordinating an action programme to close the legal loopholes in PEP.....could the Leader please inform me what progress has been made to stop people parking in their front curtilages without a drooped kerb, driveway or hard standing....as quite a few sites are still being terribly damaged?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>The statutory duty of the Highway Authority is to ensure the highway network is safe and available for use. Where reports of verge damage are received our primary concern is how this impacts on the safety of highway users. We may under Section 184(1)(a) execute necessary works and recover the expenses reasonably incurred from the owner or occupier, however such enforcement action must be [and is]</p>

limited to those offences that represent a significant risk to the safety of highway users. Evidence in Dogsthorpe shows that the majority of verge damage reports are of a cosmetic nature and represent little or no risk to the public at large.

In the past a letter cautioning Dogsthorpe residents that they are committing an offence and how to arrange for a 'dropped crossing' to be constructed have been delivered to properties committing parking offences – as well as providing residents with information these act as a formal legal warning should enforcement action be warranted in the future.

An overall analysis of the Dogsthorpe area has shown that there would be a total cost of £53,000 - an average of £1262 per property to rectify the situation. Currently the council does not have sufficient budget to implement such action as there is a high risk we would not be able to recover the costs from the residents, particularly given most are Cross Keys tenants.