

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD MONDAY 27 JUNE 2016
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Allen, Ali, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Sims, Smith, Stokes, Walsh and Whitby.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lillis, Martin, Sandford and Sylvester.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

The Chief Executive left the Chamber for the following item.

(a) Employment Committee Recommendation – Shared Chief Executive Arrangements Between Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council

Employment Committee, at its meeting of 24 June 2016, received a report which requested it to note the review undertaken in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council as to the position of the shared Chief Executive, to agree that the shared Chief Executive arrangements be made permanent and to agree to a contractual variation for the Chief Executive. This had been agreed by the Committee and recommended to Council.

Councillor Nadeem introduced the report as Chairman of the Employment Committee and moved the recommendations contained within, highlighting that the temporary arrangement in place had been reviewed and considered successful and therefore the permanent arrangement was sought.

Councillor Holdich seconded the recommendations and responded to queries raised by Members regarding whether pension payments to the Chief Executive would be split 50/50 with Cambridgeshire County Council upon her retirement. Councillor Holdich confirmed this to be the case.

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

- a) That the shared Chief Executive arrangements be made permanent; and
- b) To a contractual variation for the Chief Executive.

The Chief Executive re-joined the meeting.

4. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution Proposal, Governance Review and Scheme

Council received a report which contained a number of recommendations relating to the Peterborough Devolution Proposal, Governance Review and Scheme. A copy of the Community Impact Assessment, along with associated guidance had also been circulated to Members prior to the meeting within a supplementary information pack.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. He outlined the development of the proposals following Council's vote against the original deal, which had been presented and debated in April 2016. The benefits of the revised deal were outlined and the opportunities that would be afforded by devolution. The proposals would involve the setting up of a combined authority, having an elected Mayor and it would mean more decisions for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough being taken at a local level.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary points raised in support of the proposals included:

- It was appropriate that devolution should be for smaller areas and not just for larger areas, such as Manchester and Leeds;
- The proposals would bring many benefits for the residents of the city and along with businesses too;
- The proposals would bring investment and would mean a greater control of decisions made by the Council and greater control over the services provided to residents;
- This was a cross party opportunity to do right for the city and its residents;
- Peterborough with Cambridgeshire was a significant contributor to the national economy;
- Devolution would give access to funds that would not have previously been available;
- There had been almost 1400 new homes built in the city in 2014/15 and this momentum needed to be pushed forward. Delivery on major sites was required;
- The transport capacity of roads needed to be improved, this would be imperative for larger business growth in Peterborough and improved accessibility;
- Improved transport links would bring increased levels of tourism to the city;
- Devolution would offer the chance to increase income and spend on the needs of the Peterborough citizens;
- It was important that the proposals went out to consultation, this would allow the public to have their say;
- The consultation would be robust and the outcome would be revisited in October;
- There were reservations about Devolution, however this was the first stage of the journey;
- There would be a number of different forms of consultation happening and if Members did have any concerns, these could be fed into the Devolution Working Group for discussion; and
- A Constitution would be developed and this would identify the powers of the Elected Mayor and the voting rights for each authority.

Points of concern raised against the proposals included:

- Many Members did support the principle of Devolution, but with some reservations;
- The devolution of Peterborough City Council to Unitary status had been a success, however here had been some issues along the way and therefore caution should be taken;
- There were concerns expressed that the decision was being rushed through ahead of proper consultation;
- There had been no definite commitment to a university in the city;
- The elected Mayor would have a veto on any votes and Peterborough would only have one out of the nine votes, whilst Cambridgeshire would have two;
- The directly elected Mayor concept simply added another layer of bureaucracy and additional costs;
- There was concern that the turn out for the mayor elections were likely to be low and that the concept would be difficult to sell to the public;
- There were concerns expressed that the consultation was being rushed through and confirmation was sought as to whether it was going to solely be online. If it was this would exclude a large proportion of residents;
- Consultation roadshows would be beneficial in order to get out into the heart of the public. People needed to have the ability to ask questions;
- The proposals would have such a major impact in terms of the future of the city, consultation needed to be undertaken as widely as possible within the limited time available;
- It would have been beneficial for the consultation document to have been presented to Council for review prior to its publication;
- Reassurance needed to be given that genuine investment would be provided in a number of areas across the city;
- An email had been circulated from the Director of Governance which stated that "Councillors would have the opportunity to vote against the proposals in October, there would be opportunity to provide amendments to the final recommendations and the purpose of the consultation would be to invite comments and views on the proposals and it was anticipated that these proposals would be shaped over the summer as the responses to the consultation came in";
- There were concerns at the lack of EU funding which would now come into the area. Ring fenced money would be needed for projects in the city previously in receipt of EU money;
- The administration should not be situated in Cambridgeshire, it should be located somewhere more central;
- It was hoped that the administration would take on board any issues raised during consultation;
- Devolution would be an extra tier of Government that was not needed and it was unlikely that the Elected Mayor would work for the interests of Peterborough;
- Was an elected Mayor really a necessity, or could there be a combined authority where there was not as much power in one person's hands.
- The work which had gone into the revised offer was appreciated, however it was felt that it hadn't gone far enough;
- Many of the transport links outlined within the proposals seemed to be southern based, how would any of them improve Peterborough?
- The elected Mayor role would give too much power to one individual and would mean that focus on the diverse needs of the people of Peterborough would be lost;

- There were a number of areas in Peterborough which had been left neglected e.g. Millfield. What priority would be given to address the needs of people in this area?
- There were concerns that any significant change in the proposals following public consultation would require a new Scheme to be prepared. Would this mean that any public consultation responses would be ignored?; and
- The document outlined a wish list of issues, but there was no commitment for funds. This needed to be confirmed by October.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and stated that a better deal had been negotiated than the one presented in April 2016. He addressed a number of issues raised and specifically spoke about the skills offer and proposals for local businesses in the city, along with the confirmed proposals towards Peterborough having its own university.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendations and in so doing, acknowledged a number of concerns raised by Members during debate. He stated that voting against the proposal to go out to consultation would take away the right of the residents of Peterborough to have their say. Concerns around the nature of the consultation were understood and Members were encouraged to feed any concerns into the Devolution Working Group. There were a number of things at stake and residents needed to be given the opportunity to take part in order to obtain their views.

A vote was taken (48 for, 7 against, 1 abstention) and it was **AGREED**:

1. To consider the outcome of the Governance Review and the draft Scheme;
2. To endorse the conclusion of the Review that the making of an Order to create the CPCA would be likely to improve the exercise of statutory functions in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough;
3. To approve the devolution proposal that would offer significant financial and other benefits to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area;
4. To endorse the draft Scheme for publication under section 109 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, and to recommend that Cabinet authorises the scheme for publication;
5. To authorise the Chief Executive to make any appropriate revisions to the draft Scheme before publication as she may consider appropriate in consultation with the Leader and in liaison with the other Chief Executives of constituent authorities and to take all necessary actions to progress any non-executive functions arising from the recommendations;
6. To endorse the arrangements for public consultation on the proposals in the Scheme and to note that the Chief Executive will provide the Secretary of State with a summary of the consultation responses; and
7. That the Council meet in October to consider the results of the consultation and consider giving consent to an Order establishing a Mayoral combined authority for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 8.10pm