

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2015
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR JOHN PEACH

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Brown, Casey, Coles, Davidson, Elsey, Faustino, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Forbes, F Fox, JA Fox, JR Fox, Harper, Harrington, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Iqbal, Jamil, Khan, Knowles, Lamb, Lane, Maqbool, Martin, Murphy, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Shearman, Stokes, Swift, Sylvester, Thulbourn, Whitby and Yonga.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ash, Bisby, Fower, Johnson, Miners, Nadeem, Nawaz, Shabbir, Sharp and Thacker.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 July 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2015 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 6 July 2015 to 11 October 2105.

The Mayor further announced that in 2014, the Council had launched its 2014-15 reward and recognition scheme for council employees. The purpose of the scheme was 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 22 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 Pat Kilburn and the Trading Standards Team respectively. Pat had been chosen to receive the Employee of the Year award for developing a first of its kind toolkit to address the emerging issue of carbon monoxide poisoning, which could have the potential to cause deaths. The toolkit contained everything the Council needed to deal with the issue and had been rolled out, with training, which generated income for the Council to other local authorities.

The Trading Standards Team had been chosen to receive the Team of the Year award for generating income to cover their statutory duty costs. In particular they sourced funding from the Food Standards Agency and the Department of Health to cover core activities including food, sampling, farm inspections and investigating suppliers of illegal tobacco products. The team were also awarded costs and a large financial award under the Proceeds of Crime Act following a major counterfeiting investigation. In addition, the team continued to support businesses that qualified under the Primary Authority Partnership scheme, which enabled the council to recover costs for providing business advice and support, including the addition of a new partnership agreement.

The Mayor presented Pat Kilburn and the Trading Standards Team with their awards and advised that the 2015-16 scheme opened on Monday 19 October.

The Mayor further advised that the deadline was approaching for nominations for the city's Civic Awards. The closing date was the end of October and the winners would be announced at the Council meeting due to be held on 17 December 2015.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

There were 4 questions submitted by members of the public, these were in relation to:

1. The Council's policy on statements to the press;
2. Speeding issues along Manor Drive;
3. The possibility of a bus route along Manor Drive; and
4. Investment in renewable energy sources.

The questions and responses are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

8. Petitions

(a) Presented by members of the public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

Councillor Casey presented a petition signed by local residents which requested that the footpath between Benyon Grove and Sellers Grange be closed due to the excessive anti-social behaviour experienced by local residents and the damage done to their properties.

Councillor Sandford presented a petition which called upon Peterborough City Council to ring-fence library funding in the 2016/17 budget for Vivacity.

9. Questions on Notice

(a) To the Mayor

- (b) To the Leader or member of the Cabinet
(c) To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee

Questions (b) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. OVO and the 100% renewable energy tariff;
2. Acoustic barrier protection, north of the Perkins factory site;
3. Variation to the S106 agreement at the hospital site, Thorpe Road;
4. Central avenue works and the effect on traders;
5. Programme of maintenance for 'Gym in the Park'; and
6. Monitoring emergency problems in Central Park.

A summary of all questions and answers raised within agenda item 9 are attached at **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

10. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Flood Risk Management Strategy

Cabinet, at its meeting of 20 July 2015, received a report which had been prepared in order to meet a statutory requirement for the Council to adopt a local flood risk management strategy. This followed public consultation on a draft strategy in 2014.

The purpose of the report was to consult and seek agreement from Cabinet that the Peterborough Flood Risk Management Strategy be recommended for adoption by Full Council.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. He further highlighted that Peterborough City Council was the lead flood authority and the potential for flood issues occurring needed to be taken extremely seriously. The Council worked extremely well with its partners and the Strategy was the first of its kind for the city, having been informed by extensive work and research, leading to a robust and easy to understand document, which set out a ten year strategy intended for review every five to six years.

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

Members sought clarification as to whether Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS), as detailed within the Strategy, were to be fitted in new developments only or whether there were plans for retro-fitting.

Councillor Holdich did not wish to exercise his right to speak as seconder of the recommendations.

Councillor Hiller summed up and advised that in respect of the question raised regarding SUDS, there were plans to look at the roadway systems as these were the main areas for surface water flooding and SUDS would be a policy element for new development.

A vote was taken (Unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council adopt the Flood Risk Management Strategy.

(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2025/26

Cabinet, at its meeting of 21 September 2015, received a report which formed part of the Council's agreed process within the Budget and Policy Framework that required Cabinet to initiate and consider financial strategy and budget proposals in order to set a balanced budget for the forthcoming financial year.

The purpose of the report was to:

- Update Members on the forecast financial position of the Council for both the current and future financial years;
- Outline national and local issues which would need consideration within the medium term financial strategy for 2016/17 onwards; and
- Set out the proposed process and timetable for the 2016/17 budget process including dates for the 'budget conversation' with the public.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within, which included a request to Council to permit a move away from the Budget Procedure Rules within the Council's Constitution to permit a two staged approach to the Budget process, as had been well received the previous year.

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

Members debated the report and in summary raised points including:

- The severe financial pressures being faced by the Council;
- The uncertainty around the business rates;
- The Scrutiny Committees having the right to scrutinise elements of the budget, but being denied that right;
- Briefings being required to ensure Members were aware of what they were voting for, an example being the removal of the Community Leadership Fund;
- Support for a two stage budget process and the implementation of the cross party budget working group;
- The need for clarification as to what could and couldn't be communicated to groups by the budget working group representatives; and
- The alternative governance arrangements being explored, and the budget process utilised by Wandsworth Borough Council, whom Peterborough were utilising to base their hybrid model upon.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak as seconder of the recommendations and re-confirmed the benefits of a two stage budget approach.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendations and advised that at the current time, the finer detail of budget proposals were not available. These were being worked upon and would be brought to Scrutiny in due course.

A vote was taken (40 for, 5 abstentions, 0 against) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council adopt the Flood Risk Management Strategy. approved amendments to the Budget Framework Procedure Rules to follow a two stage budget process as set out within the Cabinet report.

The Chief Executive left the Chamber for the following item.

(c) Employment Committee Recommendation – Shared Chief Executive

Employment Committee, at its meeting of 17 September 2015, received a report which followed an approach by Cambridgeshire County Council to Peterborough City Council of exploring the possibility of a shared Chief Executive arrangement following the resignation of the Chief Executive at Cambridgeshire County Council.

The purpose of the report was for the Committee to consider the outcome of exploratory discussions, to endorse the proposal and to recommend to Council that it approves the shared arrangements and enters into an agreement with Cambridgeshire County Council for a shared Chief Executive.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report on behalf of the Chairman of the Employment Committee and moved the recommendations contained within. He further highlighted that it was proposed for the arrangements to be in place for twelve months and for a review at six months, possibly by a peer assessor. Each Council would remain responsible for delivering its own political priorities, strategies and policies but the arrangements would enable benefits including joint commissioning and shared best practice. There would be savings to Peterborough of £110k and the Chief Executive would remain with all her statutory appointments under the Peterborough Constitution. The arrangements were expected to start on 19 October 2015.

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

Members debated the report and in summary raised points including:

- The steps being taken to protect the data confidentiality of both authorities;
- Would the Chief Executive be able to apply for the Cambridgeshire County Council job if it arose?; and
- If Peterborough City Council could afford to let the Chief Executive go now for a number of days a week, would this not be the same in a years' time?

Councillor Hiller did not wish to exercise his right to speak as seconder of the recommendations.

Councillor Holdich summed up as mover of the recommendations and advised that relevant data protection policies would be followed. The Chief Executive worked extremely hard and the relevant 'get out clauses' had been implemented should there be issues arising.

A vote was taken (Unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the shared arrangements and entered into an agreement with Cambridgeshire County Council for a shared Chief Executive.

The Chief Executive re-joined the meeting.

11. Questions on the Executive Decisions made since the last meeting

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

1. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 June 2015;
2. Decisions from the Extraordinary Cabinet Meeting held on 3 August 2015;
3. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 21 September 2015;
4. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting;
5. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had been invoked since the previous meeting as follows:

The Chairman of the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny agreed to waive call-in for the following decisions:

- i. Installation of Solar Power on Roof Tops – Extension of Qualifying Property Ownership – OCT15/CMDN/83
- ii. Installation of Solar Power on Roof Tops – Extension of Scheme to Axiom Housing Association Limited – OCT15/CMDN/84
- iii. Installation of Solar Panels on Roof Tops – OCT15/CMDN/85

The reasons for the waiver of call-in were as follows:

1. That the cut to the Feed-in Tariff was unexpected and there now remained only a limited, and short, period of time in which to maximise the feed in tariff.
2. That any delay in progressing this matter was likely to have a serious impact upon the funding to be achieved from the solar panel scheme, that such schemes were designed to alleviate fuel poverty and therefore acting with urgency would benefit those residents most in need of this assistance and that the promotion of such a scheme was environmentally beneficial, which was one of the Council's key priorities. The impact of failing or delaying this scheme, which had a limited window of opportunity, could impact on the Council's ability to sustain other services as the predicted income from these schemes was built into the MTFS at the higher FiT rate.
3. That the decision to waive call-in was therefore reasonable in all the circumstances and this urgency was justified.

The Monitoring Officer had been consulted accordingly.

6. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 8 July 2015 to 15 October 2015.

Questions were asked about the following:

Subsidised Passenger Transport Service Provision

i. Councillor Sandford sought confirmation from the Leader that the proposals from the Subsidised Passenger Transport Working Group would be considered at the relevant time, this being during Phase 2 of the budget.

Councillor Holdich confirmed that the proposals would be considered.

ii. Councillor Thulbourn sought further explanation as to why the proposals had been deferred and where the £150k put aside in the budget had gone.

Councillor Seaton advised that it was always money that was going to have to be found in the current year and it was felt that the full budget picture was required before money could be committed to that particular service. The £150k would need to be found and the full picture would need to be seen beforehand to identify where the money would come from.

Improving Outcomes for Children and Young People in Peterborough

Councillor Saltmarsh sought confirmation of when the report would be presented back to Cabinet, following further financial analysis of the proposals to enable full consideration of the financial implications arising.

Councillor Coles confirmed that the proposals would be brought back to the next meeting of Cabinet or the one after that.

Extension of the Green Deal Provider Framework and Expansion of the Green Deal Community Area Fund

i. Councillor Sandford queried what the impact would be of the Green Deal Scheme being ceased.

Councillor Seaton confirmed that the Green Deal had indeed finished and the impact would be that no more homes would be able to sign up. Data could be provided on how many homes had signed up so far and a communication was due to go out with regards the scheme in due course.

iii. Councillor Shearman queried whether given the uncertainty around the programme and funding, it would have been better for the Cabinet Member to have waited to take the decision on the 27 July, as the statement from the Secretary of State had been released on 23 July, four days earlier.

Councillor Seaton advised that he did not believe that he should have waited and reconfirmed that the scheme had ended for new people wishing to sign up, however there were people who had already signed up who would now be going through the process.

iv. Councillor Jamil requested an update on behalf of residents as to what would happen now that the Mark Group had gone into administration in terms of works being completed.

Councillor Seaton advised that the Council would continue to work on a complete list of residents and landlords who had contracts with the Mark Group as part of the Heataborough Scheme and this included the status of works and if any monies were paid to the Mark Group. It was now understood that the company had contracts to carry out work at around 150 properties in Peterborough, however the Council was not party to these contracts as they were between the Mark Group and the property owners. The Council was in touch with the Mark Group's administrator and was starting to get more information about the contracts, therefore it was expected that the Council would be in a position to start contacting affected residents directly in the coming days and a more detailed update would be available within the next week. Information would be available on the Council's website and a statement was due to go out which would be circulated to Councillors.

Councillor Holdich further advised that Councillors would be kept up to date as information came forward.

West Town Primary School

Councillor Murphy sought clarification as to what the plans were for the old school and school field and whether there were any plans to mitigate against the issues of children crossing Thorpe road to get to the playing field.

Councillor Holdich advised that although Councillor Murphy's question did not relate to the decision, he was happy to give him a briefing on the other issues outlined. Furthermore, building on the site had commenced that day.

Installation of Solar Panels on Roof Tops – Extension of Qualifying Property Ownership

Councillor Thulbourn advised that many people still did not understand that the 'mortgage rooftop' issue had now been resolved, could a programme of education be set up?

Councillor Holdich advised that work would be undertaken to get the message out to residents.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

12. Motions on Notice

1. Motion from Councillor Knowles

Councillor Knowles moved the following motion:

That this Council records its concern that members convicted of electoral fraud should be permitted to stand for election and that this Council ought to write to the Electoral Commission expressing its concern and calling for a change in the law for a lifetime disqualification on any proposed candidate who has such a conviction.

In moving his motion, Councillor Knowles advised that five years following release from prison, individuals could once again stand for Council. The motion was an attempt to discourage further fraud and to bring about a change in the law.

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

Members debated the motion and commented that individuals standing for election asked residents to put their trust in them and individuals who tried to cheat the democratic process broke this trust in the worst possible way. A stance did need to be taken against the issue.

Councillor Whitby exercised his right to speak and advised that if people did not believe the electoral process could be trusted, the whole democratic process could be put at risk. The honesty of politicians was very much in question at the current time and they should not be treated any differently to any other convicted criminal.

Councillor Knowles did not have anything further to add in summing up.

A vote was taken (40 for, 15 against, 1 abstention) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

2. Motion from Councillor Knowles

Councillor Knowles moved the following motion:

That in order to assist our councillors to communicate effectively with their residents, the Council makes annual training available, backed by a financial support scheme, to Councillors who wish to undertake a course of training to improve their skills in verbal and/or written English.

In moving his motion, Councillor Knowles advised that instruction could come from the college at little cost and would enable Councillors to be better understood and would also remove the bars to enable Councillors to take up higher posts in the Council.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Would provision be made for other Councillors to learn other languages?
- Members Services regularly sent out training opportunities to Councillors and Members could request training if required;
- If Councillors had been elected, they had obviously already communicated well with their electorate; and
- Peterborough City Council offered an intensive training programme for all Councillors and it was a good scheme.

Councillor Whitby exercised his right to speak and advised that if individuals wished to do so, they should be permitted the opportunity to improve their standard of English

either written or verbal and if the Council could help and make this training available it would be a good thing.

Councillor Knowles summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the motion was necessary as there were some very good candidates whose grasp of English was limited and efforts needed to be made in order to support those candidates.

A vote was taken on the motion (4 for, 36 against, 5 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

3. Motion from Councillor Knowles

Councillor Knowles moved the following motion:

That Council notes the damaging impact that electoral fraud has on democracy and that the Members of this Council can actively discourage electoral fraud by removing photographs of ex-Mayors from the Council chamber if that Councillor has been convicted of an electoral offence.

The position of Mayor is a highly respected civic role and those convicted of electoral fraud, even where those convictions may be spent, ought not to be allowed the privilege of their photographs remaining on display in the Mayor's Parlour. The shame of knowing that their Mayoral photograph will be removed from the Chamber is a good deterrent and this Council is invited to consent to the removal of any such current photographs from the Mayor's Parlour.

In moving his motion, Councillor Knowles advised that he personally had looked up to previous Mayors and seeing the photographs of those convicted of electoral fraud was disappointing to him.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Irrespective of whether or not the individual had been convicted of electoral fraud, they were part of the history of the city and the retrospective removal of photographs was deemed petty;
- It was not believed the implementation of this motion would be enough alone to deter individuals of committing fraud if that was their intention;
- The motion was an attempt to re-write history and this was not acceptable; and
- It was important for the city to have continuity and a complete record of the Mayors serving in the city.

Councillor Whitby exercised his right to speak and advised that if the motion was not implemented it could be perceived as condoning the actions of those individuals who had committed fraud. Individuals convicted of fraud, particularly in the current climate, should not be celebrated.

Councillor Knowles summed up as mover of the motion and advised that it was not his intention to attempt to re-write history

A vote was taken on the motion (5 for, 36 against, 4 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

4. Motion from Councillor Murphy

Councillor Murphy moved the following motion:

That this Council:

- 1. Notes that the proposals to close Bridge Street Station and dispose of the buildings have not been discussed widely.*
- 2. Notes that a new Chief Constable has recently been appointed and that the incumbent Police and Crime Commissioner has indicated he may not be seeking re-election.*
- 3. Believes that major decisions should be made transparently and that the closure of the Bridge Street Police Station should be considered in consultation with Peterborough City Council and its Leader. Confidence in frontline policing in the Peterborough area is a major issue and the closure of our Police Station is a matter of public concern and interest.*
- 4. Requests that the proposal to close Bridge Street Station is determined through transparent decision making and following the Police and Crime Commissioner elections in May 2016, the police service leadership engage with council representatives over any future ideas to close Peterborough police stations.*
- 5. In view of this motion Council requests that any decision on the disposal of Peterborough Police Station is deferred until such time as the new leadership of the police service in Cambridgeshire at the forthcoming election is determined.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Murphy advised of the history of the site and his concerns at the proposals to close the Station. The Police Crime Commissioner had the responsibility for the estate and the Station should not be closed without a plan for policing in the city. The current Commissioner had stated that he would not stand again and therefore any decision on the Station should be deferred until the new Commissioner was in post in order to allow appropriate discussions to take place.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- It was always the intention to close the Station with the move to Thorpe Wood;
- The building was not fit for purpose, and it was only a few offices and vehicles workshop. No practical opportunity for use for officers based at Thorpe Wood and Bayard;
- It was not really the base where officers operated from;
- There had been no communication mentioning the closure of the station. Having a central station was symbolic of a police presence in the city centre;
- There needed to be open public consultation on the closure before a decision was taken;
- What the use of the building was currently needed to be further explored;
- The station had outlived its time, many officers were based at Bayard Place;
- The station was in the right location and was a visible message to people in the city, the function of the building should be looked at in the future;
- Although not fit for purpose, Councillors should be involved in any discussions to close the station; and
- If there was no base in the city centre it would take police cars a while to get to the city from Thorpe Wood.

Councillor Jamil exercised his right to speak and advised that it was about the public perception and reassurance. The station acted as a deterrent to crime and the motion

asked for the Council to be involved in the process for consideration for the future of the station.

Councillor Murphy summed up as mover of the motion and advised that it was about perception of a police presence in the city. Councillors should be involved in any decision relating to the building and Bayard Place was not fit for purpose for major public disorder instances.

A vote was taken on the motion (20 for, 25 against, 0 abstentions) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

5. Motion from Councillor John Fox

Councillor John Fox moved the following motion:

That this Council:

1. *Acknowledges the extraordinary risks that members of our Armed Forces, past and present, take with their health and lives in defence of our freedom. Unfortunately, this unique sacrifice is not being properly recognised within our social care charging policies as only veterans who were injured after April 2005 are able to retain their military compensation awards in full when accessing support for their care. In contrast, veterans who were injured before April 2005, who are known as War Pensioners, typically find that all but the first £10 per week of their military compensation is taken to cover their care costs.*

2. *Agrees that it is profoundly unfair that the date when a veteran was injured should determine the level of support that they can expect to receive when accessing social care. This is particularly true given that both forms of military compensation are otherwise treated the same and fully exempted from other means tests for statutory benefits, including Universal Credit. To add insult to injury, the current situation amounts to a clear breach of the Armed Forces Covenant, which states that;*

“Those who serve in the Armed Forces, whether Regular or Reserve, those who have served in the past, and their families, should face no disadvantage compared to other citizens in the provision of public and commercial services”.

This is because current charging guidance stipulates that compensation awarded to civilians injured at work must be fully exempted if placed in a trust fund. War Pensioners are unable to protect their military compensation in this way as their payments are received in regular, weekly instalments, as opposed to a one-off lump sum payment.

3. *Recognises, in light of the information above, that there is an unfair anomaly in existing social care charging guidance and accordingly resolves to:*

- i. Identify the number of War Disablement Pensioners currently accessing social care support from the Council;*
- ii. Honour its Community Covenant commitments by bringing a report to Cabinet which explores whether both forms of military compensation can be fully exempted from financial assessments for social care support; and*
- iii. Support the Local Government Association’s call for additional funding to be provided by Central Government to ensure that such a policy change is financially sustainable.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Fox advised that the Authority was signed up to the Armed Forces Covenant, one of the main principles being 'no disadvantage due to service'. Members were therefore asked to support the motion.

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

There was no debate on the motion and the motion was **CARRIED** unanimously.

6. Motion from Councillor Ferris

Councillor Ferris moved the following motion:

Recognising the extent of the Syrian refugee crisis, and the significant public support for action, this motion calls upon Peterborough City Council to offer its full support to HM Government's commitment to accepting 20,000 Syrian refugees across the UK over the remainder of this Parliament.

Specifically, it calls upon this Council to make an offer to support the expanded Syrian Vulnerable Person Scheme, working through the East of England Regional Strategic Migration Partnership; to agree and put in place appropriate arrangements to house and support vulnerable refugees, noting that the cost of supporting them in Britain for at least their first year will be funded from foreign aid spending.

In moving his motion, Councillor Ferris advised of the terrible situation in Syria and the number of people who had fled their homes, leading to the large numbers of refugees. The intention was to resettle 20,000 refugees in the UK and the Council was requested to sign up to the Syrian Vulnerable Person Scheme to support those individuals coming to the UK. Expressions of interest were required by the end of the following week and the first year of resettlement was covered financially, with years two and beyond also possibly being covered. Nearly all Local Authorities had expressed interest in the scheme and the Local Government Authority were only looking for expressions of interest at the current time.

Councillor Sylvester seconded the motion and stated that the scheme would cost the Council nothing for at least a year and the Home Office had said they would assist for two years and maybe beyond. The Council had yet to make any declaration of support for the scheme and other local authorities had done so. Any help was better than no help at all.

Councillor Holdich addressed Council in respect of the current motion under debate and also the subsequent motion from Councillor Sandford. Councillor Holdich requested that the motions be turned down as the Government's scheme was not fully understood and to pass the motions would weaken any bargaining position. There were details yet to be resolved relating to both funding and process and past experiences meant that it needed to be right. There was a shortage of houses and there were not enough school places. It was because of the concern for the individuals that the Authority needed further detail before making any promises. Many refugees would have multiple health issues, and the city was short of GPs and social workers and any influx would increase the pressures on staff.

The authority was doing its best to help, a number of minors had been picked up off the street which were costing a million pounds per year. A balanced approach was required, showing care for both the citizens of Peterborough and those in need.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The UK had a tradition to be proud of in offering sanctuary to refugees.

- Refugees and immigrants were entirely different, refugees had been forced from their country in times of war and conflict;
- Peterborough should not be known as a place that was not willing to help individuals;
- Was it 20,000 individuals or were families included within that number?
- Almost all authorities in the Eastern region had shown a willingness to participate in the scheme;
- The motion did not stipulate numbers, this would be a matter for officers;
- To protect the services for the people of Peterborough, the Council must find out from the Government in writing what support the city would receive;
- If the motion fell, it gave the message that the Council was not compassionate;
- The individuals would need a considerable amount of support, this needed to be taken into consideration;
- There should be more effort put into ending the conflict to allow people to return to their own countries;
- The fate of these individuals could not be ignored. These were not economic migrants, these were refugees;
- There were no financial implications to the motion, it was purely an intent at the current time; and
- The city had a long history of supporting refugees and economic migrants, and it was correct that the Council should understand the ramifications of any decision before one was made. The levels of support needed to be understood and what that support would be for.

Councillor Ferris summed up as mover of the motion and advised that no numbers were mentioned within the motion. The Council needed to show leadership on the issue and it should not be confused with economic migration. The motion requested the Council to enter into negotiations only, by signing up to the scheme.

A recorded vote was requested and taken:

Councillors For: Davidson, Ferris, Forbes, Jamil, Khan, Maqbool, Martin, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Scott, Serluca, Shaheed, Shearman, Swift, Sylvester, Thulbourn, and Yonga.

Councillors Against: Aitken, Brown, Casey, Coles, Elsey, Faustino, Fitzgerald, F Fox, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Harrington, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Seaton, Stokes and Whitby.

Councillors Abstaining: Knowles.

Following the vote (18 for, 27 against, 1 abstention) the motion was **DEFEATED**.

7. **Motion from Councillor Sandford**

Councillor Sandford moved the following motion:

This Council recognises that:

- i. Around four million Syrians have fled their country since the civil war began four years ago;
- ii. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees has stated that Syria "has become the greatest tragedy of this century - a disgraceful humanitarian calamity with suffering and displacement unparalleled in recent history"

- iii. The UN has organised an international scheme that aims to resettle 130,000 Syrian refugees by the end of 2016;
- iv. A number of Western European countries have so far resettled tens of thousands of Syrian refugees under this scheme;
- v. The UK Government has only committed to taking 20,000 refugees over five years. In comparison, Germany has taken more than this in one weekend.

Council believes that the UK should be resettling more Syrian refugees than it currently is, and that it is our moral responsibility to do all we can as a Council and as a country to help to alleviate this humanitarian crisis.

Council therefore calls on:

- i. The Leader of the Council to write to the Prime Minister expressing dismay at how small a number of refugees a rich country like the UK is willing to take.
- ii. The Leader and Cabinet to do all they practically can to work with other local authorities, the LGA, government agencies and third sector organisations to provide assistance to refugees that are being settled in Peterborough.

In moving his motion, Councillor Sandford advised of the importance of taking the refugees. The problem was so great, a fair and equitable share of refugees should be supported across all European countries. It was important however that the Government recognised the extra burden on local authorities. Peterborough should be at the head of the queue and these were refugees and not economic migrants, they would contribute positively to society and would not be a burden on resources as mentioned.

Councillor Davidson seconded the motion and exercised her right to speak. She advised that the plight of thousands of refugees should not be ignored by the Government, the UK needed to take its fair share of refugees and the Government should provide the necessary financial support to settle these refugees.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The situation was a very emotive one, however the city had its own problems, homeless people, people with health issues and a strain on a number of services;
- The city did have a proud history of welcoming in migrants however a rational view of what was to be expected was required;
- The motion went too far. Many people coming across Europe were not refugees, they were economic migrants;
- Peterborough was struggling to preserve necessary services and it would be the poor who would suffer if further resources were taken away from them; and
- Local MPs should be lobbied requesting more support for the refugees.

Councillor Sandford summed up as mover of the motion and advised that the decision made on the motion reflected what type of city Peterborough wanted to be. There was an international crisis happening and it needed to be addressed.

A vote was taken on the motion (13 for, 30 against, 1 abstention) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

13. Reports to Council

(a) Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman to the Audit Committee

Council received a report which requested that Council appoint Councillor Kim Aitken as Chairman of the Audit Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/16. The report further requested Council to appoint Councillor David Over to the position of Vice Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/16, should the position become vacant following the appointment of the Chairman.

Councillor Holdich moved the recommendations in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Maqbool.

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

1. Appoints Councillor Kim Aitken as Chairman of Audit Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/16; and
2. Appoints Councillor David Over as Vice Chairman of Audit Committee, for the remainder of the municipal year 2015/16, in the event that the Vice Chairman position becomes vacant following the appointment of the Chairman.

(b) Notification of Changes to the Executive

Council received a report which advised of changes made to the Executive by the Leader and for Council to note these changes. Councillor Sheila Scott resigned her seat as Cabinet Member for Children's Services with effect from 20 July 2015 and the Leader appointed Councillor Andy Coles to fill the position. There were no changes to the delegations within the portfolio.

The item was presented for information only and there was no debate on the report.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the changes made by the Leader to the Executive.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 10.14pm

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
7.	<u>Questions from members of the public</u>
1.	<p>Question from John Green</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Our question is in response to a report in the telegraph of 1st October concerning the closure of our site Toilet due to the Building being structurally unsafe.</p> <p>At the end of August when this issue was raised we requested a site meeting with Amey, without any reply.</p> <p>According to the telegraph report reps from Amey are arranging to meet allotment reps to discuss possible alternatives”.</p> <p>Our question is – Is it Council policy for their reps and contractors to make statements to the press, while ignoring requests for meetings with the public.</p> <p>I have a supplementary to my original question as there has been a slight change in circumstances. The original email was sent on Tuesday 6th October and on Wednesday evening I received a phone call from an Amey surveyor requesting a site meeting. We met on Thursday AM and a survey was carried out. We are due to meet up again on Thursday 15th, tomorrow morning. My supplementary question is, why put signs on the entrances saying that the building is unsafe before a full survey has been completed. We note that Amey operatives are still using the building to access equipment and materials.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>My understanding is that Amey deemed the building to be unsafe, their internal surveyors deemed it to be unsafe and therefore in the interest of protecting the public and not wishing to have any injuries to the public, they put signs on the door to say that until further notice the toilets were out of bounds. I can't add any more than that, as it is different to the question submitted.</p> <p>John Green asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I made it a supplementary as the original question was asking for a site meeting. I'm taking it that a meeting with a surveyor is a site meeting so I thought it only correct to acknowledge that. We've had a meeting but it brings up other points which I don't think has been answered because if the building is unsafe then it shouldn't be in the middle of our car park which we use and allotment holder's use.</p>

	<p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>I can get a reply in writing, but the bottom line is that the building has been deemed, this year, to be unsafe. It seems a non-sensical question to ask why there is a brick building in the middle of a car park which has been deemed unsafe, it was not unsafe when it was put there and that is why it is there.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Uloma Onwukeme</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can any speed monitoring equipment be installed on Manor Drive. The speed limit is 30mph but most people do not appear to take note of this. There are a lot of families moving in and kids play outside. I am really concerned that someone will get hurt. There have been at least 2 accidents that have occurred this year.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Our officers have looked at personal injury data for Manor Drive and you are right, there have been two recorded slight injury accidents one in November last year and the other in March this year. I have to tell you however, neither collision was speed related.</p> <p>Covert speed surveys are undertaken by the police and I'm pleased to tell you a request has now been placed for them to undertake a survey at this location. In the interim our Road Safety Team has been asked to undertake two random one hour surveys to gauge the average actual vehicle speed. Once the surveys have been completed the results will be shared with the different departments.</p> <p>I agree with you that concerns have been raised by residents recently, and with this in mind two mobile vehicle activated signs are proposed on Manor Drive for a number of weeks next month, so all in all I think a very positive response to your question.</p> <p>Uloma Onwukeme did not have a supplementary question.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Uloma Onwukeme</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Are there any plans to have a bus route for this area? (Manor Drive).</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>Unfortunately given budget pressures the Council does not have sufficient funds to subsidise a bus service for the Manor Drive development. I will however ask officers to contact Stagecoach to explore whether a commercially viable service link can be provided.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Dean Papworth</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>We are moving ever closer to a point of no return with regards to global warming and</p>

the effect of this on our world will be catastrophic, yet still we invest and support the production and burning of huge amounts of fossil fuels. We need a commitment from local and national governments that we will not continue to invest in these projects, whether it be fracking or burning coal. I still read about planned wind farms being refused permission due to local residents complaining about them being a "blot on the landscape" and the local councils back tracking. Unfortunately if global warming continues to progress due to the burning of fossil fuels there will not be a "landscape" to blot. The reason I write is because I am concerned that we as a nation are still not taking global warming seriously enough and by investing in renewable sources of energy not only are we attempting to save the planet but in the long term it will also be a very lucrative investment for those that chose to follow that route.

Councillor Seaton may have responded:

Thank you for your question Mr Papworth

And may I first say that personally I have considerable sympathy with the points you're making.

Your question seeks a commitment from local Government that we do not invest in projects such as fracking or burning coal. The only area in which this would apply is the County Council Pension Fund, on which I represent this City and all other employers. Whilst legally the Board members are required to invest to provide the best returns, we are looking at this issue as part of our ethical investment review.

With regards to investing in renewable sources of energy, you may be aware that we did seek to establish a wind and solar farm. I agree it would have been a lucrative investment returning up to £10m a year to support local services, supplying green energy to Peterborough residents and playing a small part in saving our Planet but this did not receive support from Councillors.

This Council was one of the original environment cities and in support of our priority to be the home of the environment capital we still seek to invest where appropriate in renewable energy resources. We also seek, just as importantly, to reduce our energy spend and that of our community.

Examples of this commitment include:

1. By the end of March 2015 installing 6.75 Megawatts of Solar Panels on 65 council buildings and schools
2. Providing at least 1500 homes in Peterborough with Solar Panels
3. And completing energy efficiency projects at 52 council buildings and schools including the installation of a Combined Heat and Power unit at the regional pool

So, to conclude, we are trying hard to do our bit for the Planet and for future generations.

Mr Papworth was not in attendance and the response to his question was provided in writing.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

9. 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 Sandford

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

Would the Cabinet Member for Resources accept my congratulations on his decision to roll out free solar panel installation to all eligible private householders in Peterborough and to Axiom Housing tenants, in advance of the big cut proposed in the feed in tariff at the end of this year. This shows great commitment to promotion of renewable energy in the City and to the Council's wider environment capital aspirations.

In view of this, could the cabinet member please explain why the Peterborough Energy Scheme run by the City Council in partnership with Ovo, offers electricity which is only 33% derived from renewable sources. The same company, Ovo, do offer a tariff with 100% renewable electricity and this is available under partnerships which they have with some other local authorities. So why is this 100% renewable energy tariff not available to Peterborough Energy customers?

Councillor Seaton responded:

Thank you for your comments on the free solar panels project, it is much appreciated. The Peterborough Energy Tariff is a direct match for the OVO general tariff. Your question makes the point that this is only 33% derived from renewable sources, it may only be 33% derived, but I think it's worth pointing out that that's double the average for this country. You mentioned partnerships OVO has with other local authorities, I'm aware of two, one is Cheshire East Tariff which has only 15% from renewables, the other is Southend who provide 100% renewables tariff, which is some £60 more expensive.

As a council, our initial focus has always been on providing the best tariff to residents to enable areas such as fuel poverty to be addressed. So far some 756 people have switched with an average saving of £230. We subsequently launched the Pay as you go tariff which is seeing average savings of £49.

Introducing a 100% green tariff is next on our agenda with OVO, we do need to consider how best to launch it and to ensure there is no confusion with the basic tariff I'm sure many residents will be happy to move to a full renewables based tariff even if the savings are quite as much.

Councillor Sandford asked the following supplementary question:

I welcome the positive reply put forward by Councillor Seaton. I am pleased that we are promoting solar energy in particular by introducing the scheme across the whole

of the city. I think we have to be conscious of the fact that we are aiming to be the environment capital of the country so I would really hope that Councillor Seaton would look very seriously at the 100% renewable tariff that the OVO company has because would he agree with me that if we are wanting to be the environment capital, we should be giving the people of Peterborough a choice whether they go for the cheapest tariff, which some people may want to have or whether they want to go for the greenest one?

Councillor Seaton responded:

I agree with Councillor Sandford, I mean I think it is a real shame that we don't have our own wind and solar farm. That would have been a lucrative investment for us but it would have supplied green energy directly to Peterborough residents and supported local services but I think that we will certainly be looking at rolling out that 100% renewable tariff, I can't see any reason why we wouldn't do it.

2. **Question from Councillor Davidson**

To Councillor Hiller, Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development

Would the Cabinet Member explain why the new housing development site part funded by the housing association, and Central Govt. funding at the previous Perkins Walton Factory site, has had a 10ft high Ministry of Transport Acoustic fence/ Barrier installed whilst our constituents at Dukesmead and Brookfield site have been denied the equivalent level of acoustic barrier protection only a quarter of a mile north of the site of Perkins factory site?

Councillor Hiller responded:

The east coast main railway line passes adjacent to the Dukesmead mobile home park and the recently completed residential development off Windsor Avenue. The Dukesmead area was developed pre 1974, over 40 years ago, and at a time when the rules regarding noise and new development were not as strict as they are now. Because of the tougher rules, when permission was granted for the Windsor Avenue development it was quite rightly conditioned that an acoustic barrier fence was put up by the developer. For the sake of clarity I think it is important to mention that the fence is not a 'Ministry of Transport' or indeed a Network Rail Structure it was actually erected by the developer.

Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:

With retrospect could you please confirm if you would be looking to do anything with retrospect to providing some form of acoustic barrier at Dukesmead and Brookfield?

Councillor Hiller responded:

The difficulty we would have is, I'm sure you would agree, newly introduced and changing planning policies can't be implemented or enforced retrospectively on existing development. where on earth would we start, it would cost an absolute fortune and I think to look at these things as a piecemeal exercise would be terribly difficult but I'm more than happy to come down and meet with Councillor Davidson on site just to have a look at the situation down there.

<p>3.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member disclose what discussions or correspondence if any he had with the developers or their representatives concerning the application to the recent planning committee to vary the 106 planning gain agreement for the Hospital Site off Thorpe Road and when he was aware or realised that the proposed variation to the agreement would benefit the developers by hundreds of thousands of pounds.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I can confirm that I have had no contact whatsoever with the developers or their representatives prior to the matter coming to the Planning Committee and I was briefed by officers on the viability issue following them being approached by the owner about the matter.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I would like to ask you if you could reassure residents that it's not going to be four storeys high. Do you agree with me that development should be for the benefit of residents and not just the benefit of the developers and thank you for confirming that you weren't predisposed on your decision at the Planning Committee and finally, the 50 social houses we are now going to lose which are going to cost us a lot to replace and maybe more in bed and breakfast and homeless people, do you not regret that and do you not think we should take steps as a Council to try and provide those homes elsewhere?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Just to repeat, I did have no exchange of correspondence or discussion with the developer or their representatives regarding the viability of that proposal as I've already said. I was briefed by officers on the viability issue following them being approached by the owner about the matter, it was explained to me in the briefing how the viability issue would be thoroughly investigated and in order to ensure openness and transparency regarding the decision making process the matter was determined by the cross party members of the Planning Committee, so I would like to reassure Members, including the conspiracy theorists amongst us that where it's proven that sites can't be delivered, can't be brought forward the renegotiation of a S106 agreement in completely in line with national planning policy. In this case it was proven and the Planning Committee Members after much discussion, accepted the officer's recommendation. The replacement of the 50 social houses, as you term them, is something we will be looking at extremely seriously.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>I am sure that the Cabinet Member, as do we all, gives full support to local shops and recognises that they are essential to any locality.</p> <p>Though I am confident that everyone will agree that the works at Central Avenue,</p>

when fully in use, will be a much needed improvement, I'd like to ask if the cabinet member shares my concerns that these works have had an unnecessarily severe and adverse impact on Central Avenue traders and residents.

Does he, like me and many residents, believe that the works could have and should have been carried out in a way to reduce the negative impact on the area and is he, perhaps alongside the Leader and senior staff, willing to meet with local traders to discuss ways of assisting them until trade picks up and to compensate them for loss of trade?

Councillor Hiller may have responded:

Council policy is that we do not offer compensation for such works because we are acting under our statutory duty to maintain and make improvements to the highway network. It would be unreasonable to expect the Council to compensate businesses for works it is legally obliged to undertake.

Access has been maintained at all times for the businesses in Central Avenue and the works undertaken will benefit the whole community, including the businesses. Indeed feedback for the scheme has been extremely positive.

The planned completion date for the main scheme including the bus stop is the 16th October with the additional work added at the request of the Ward Councillors continuing into the first half of the following week. The overrun was due to delay on the part of the utility companies, coupled with delivering the additional work.

Councillor Ash was not in attendance and the response to his question was provided in writing.

5. **Question from Councillor Davidson**

To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm if there is a programme for maintenance in place for the Gym in the Park Scheme?

I have been contacted by a local resident who has injured themselves whilst trying to use the Crosstrainer/Stepper situated between Goodwin walk and Welbourne Primary School.

Councillor Elsey responded:

Both Peterborough City Council and Amey take very seriously the upkeep and maintenance of such equipment. The safety of our residents clearly is high on all of our agendas. As such I can confirm that there is a programme of maintenance and inspections for all of the equipment on this site. Visual inspections are undertaken on a weekly basis, followed by a quarterly, detailed and in depth operational inspection which is evidenced in an annual engineer's report.

All the inspectors are trained and hold the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) certificates.

I am sorry to hear of your residents' mishap and I totally understand the impulse on any such incident to immediately blame the equipment and whilst I make no

	<p>comment relating to your resident's recent incident, this isn't always the case. I would welcome the opportunity to see evidence that any injury was due to malfunction or poor maintenance of our equipment. Clearly the most important issue with any incident like this is to ensure that when used as intended any such risk to the user is kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I hope this is an isolated incident however I would be happy for you to arrange a site visit with me and obviously the person in mind. As I said earlier, I hope it is an isolated incident. Can you please confirm whether any other cases or incidents like this have been brought to the Council before?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>The short answer off the top of my head is no, I'm happy to look into it and report back but that's not the kind of information I carry around off the top of my head, sorry.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Ferris</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene reassure the many members of the public who use Central Park that, following the drastic cuts which mean Amey staff will no longer be present in the Park over the coming months, there will be ongoing monitoring to assess any emerging problems? Should there be any deterioration in the level of service and condition of the Park, will he immediately review and, if necessary, restore the funding that has established Central Park as a Green Flag public space?</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Ferris for your question, the short answer to your question is no. No because your question is factually incorrect and no because what you are asking for is not within my gift. Allow me to explain.</p> <p>The cuts you refer to as drastic in a predictably electioneering way, are the cuts which the whole Council agreed to as part of the budget setting process last year, the cuts you were extensively consulted on and through your representatives on the cross party budget working group discussed at length prior to presentation and acceptance in Full Council. Therefore, irrespective of the outcome of the next few months any reinstatement would be something which would have to be passed by Full Council and not me in isolation.</p> <p>Contrary to your assumption, Amey staff will be present in the park they simply won't be permanently based there. Central Park will be visited on a daily basis to carry out maintenance tasks throughout the coming months. This is well known to the Friends of Central Park who have independently suggested that, if you regularly attended their meetings, you would be better informed.</p> <p>Amey staff will report back any concerns within the park in order that the necessary corrective action can be taken. As you will all be aware the park received Green Flag status again this year and the judging took place following the reduction of maintenance already having been applied.</p>

As much as I would like to restore funding to all parks, as previously stated, we collectively agreed through the cross party budget working group and Full Council in March 2014 to make these reductions. I would also like to add, as an aside and not in direct response to Councillor Ferris's question a point of general information that several colleagues from the Labour and Lim Dem Group continue to refer to both Central and Itter Parks and the need for Amey staff to be there as a constant to deal with an increase in anti-social behaviour. It never has, nor will it be the responsibility of Amey staff to police or enforce within the parks, they are there to tend to the parks as effectively as they can, mindful of finance and resource restraints. The responsibility for policing the parks is, and will remain the remit of the Police. Thank you.

Councillor Ferris asked the following supplementary question:

Unfortunately Councillor Elsey has decided to make some sort of party political point about this, as my question was based on the concerns of very very many members of local communities and so my supplementary question concerns the depreciation of what are very valuable assets to this city. Given that we have already seen, and I quote from the Friends of Itter Park 'an increase in anti-social behaviour, vandalism, litter and dog fouling in Itter Park can you comment on the suggestion that instead of concealing cuts to park budgets within the overall £100k cuts to Amey's work in the city that it might be more helpful to make them transparent and possibly ring fence budgets for particular parks so that we can enable effective management strategies to be developed in consultation with local communities and I have a direct quote here from one of the senior Amey staff 'that the park will not be manned from 1st October this year to 30th April next year'. Yes there will be people in the park doing litter picks early in the morning, but they are not available when people need them in the event of accidents happening, it's not just about policing, Amey staff provide a useful deterrent for anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Elsey responded:

I don't really know what I can add other than what I've already said. The policing of anti-social behaviour is not down to Amey, yes I accept that their presence in these areas may act as a small deterrent to people but they are not there to police it and frankly to suggest that the park is going to be completely unmanned is ridiculous. That's not the case and to suggest that we've hidden the costs when, if anybody goes back to the budget consultation documents all of which are minuted they will see that it was quite clear that there was an item in the budget which suggested that there was going to be a reduction in service to the parks. Thank you Mr Mayor.