

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD MONDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2016  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS**

**Present:**

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

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Barkham, Clark, Davidson, Fower, Lillis, Shaheed, and Smith.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution**

Council received a report which contained a number of recommendations relating to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution proposal. A copy of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2016 had also been circulated to Members prior to the meeting within a supplementary information pack.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. The opportunity before the Council was considered to be a once in a generation chance for people who lived and worked in Peterborough. It was advised that in moving the recommendations, item 6.5 was altered to read "Councillor John Holdich," instead of "Leader of the Council." The proposals were ambitious and had been back by public consultation. The funding that would be provided through the proposals would be essential in providing further affordable homes, infrastructure, a university, and an enterprise zone. Concerns surrounding the Elected Mayor were acknowledged, however, central Government had identified this as a requirement to the devolution deal.

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

A motion was moved by Councillor Jamil to adjourn the meeting in order to allow for sufficient time to digest and consult on the draft Order, which was thought to be substantially different to that which had been previously considered.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The majority of papers were published and circulated to Members a week in advance of the meeting. The paper circulated at a later date was six pages

long. It was thought that Members had had long enough to consider the information.

- If the adjournment were agreed Wednesday, 23 November 2016 would be the most appropriate date.
- Members required time to take advice on the changes that had been included within the draft order.
- It was felt that a significant portion of the draft order now included transferring powers from the local authority.
- Concern was expressed in relation to conferring the Elected Mayor with the General Power of Competence, and more time was required to understand the implications of this.
- A briefing note had been provided to Members which clearly outline the implications of the changes set out in the draft order.
- Members knew what they were voting on and an adjournment for a few days would not serve any purpose.

The Legal Officer clarified that the advice from the Local Government Association was that both the Combined Authority and the Elected Mayor requested the same powers in terms of General Power of Competence. As such, the Power was proposed to be conferred to both. This power is limited, however, by specific restrictions within legislation.

A vote was taken (17 voted in favour, 35 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Murphy. Councillor Murphy advised that following the circulation of the draft order, the wording within the amendment in relation to the transfer of transportation powers was simply to note, as the draft order catered to the request. It was considered that the amendment sought for further consideration on the Elected Mayor option, and provided room for the Government to agree to remove the requirement. The amendment ensured that the devolution deal agreed included quality assurance and relevant targets.

Councillor Ferris seconded the amendment to the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- It was promising to see such issues championed, however it was not the appropriate stage of the process to consider them.
- It was noted that any additions to the proposed deal, although may be agreed by Peterborough City Council, would not have been agreed by the other Councils within the Combined Authority. As such, the proposals were illogical.
- It was suggested that a similar recommendation would be more relevant during the next stage of devolution discussions.
- It was questioned what the alternative to an Elected Mayor would be.
- The proposed deal was criticised in relation to the benefits provided to Peterborough in comparison to those provided to Cambridge.
- It was suggested that Elected Mayors were an expensive option to pursue.

Councillor Ferris exercised his right to speak and considered that the amendment, though modest, provided detail to the agreement that was currently lacking. It was suggested that the results of the public consultation was of little weight, as less than 1% of the city's population had responded. It was believed that environmental criteria should be at the forefront of the deal, in order to ensure that Peterborough was truly sustainable.

Councillor Holdich, as mover of the original motion, advised that the devolution deal as

put before Council provided Peterborough with a wealth of benefits, including a university, infrastructure, skills, and funding. The amendments proposed were premature and would be considered in greater when the constitution of the Combined Authority was established.

A vote was taken (18 voted in favour, 35 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and the amendment was **DEFEATED**.

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

- The proposals represented a one off opportunity and would be to Peterborough's benefit.
- Devolution was not a new idea.
- The proposals would be developed in further detail following the initial agreement from all the member authorities.
- The relationships between the member authorities was good and provided for a positive chance to work together.
- Officers had undertaken good work in achieving the best deal possible for the city.

Points of concern raised against the proposals included:

- Issues were raised in relation to the speed at which the proposals had been presented for approval.
- It was considered that conferring the General Power of Competence on to the Elected Mayor was providing one person with too much power.
- Concern was expressed that no written agreement had been provided in relation to the grant for funding of the Combined Authority.
- It was suggested that powers were to be transferred up from the Council to the Combined Authority, which had previously not been the case.
- The distribution of votes within the Combined Authority was queried, and concern was expressed that Peterborough, as the largest authority, only had 1 vote.
- It was questioned why the proposals for a university had not been formally included within the agreement.
- It was considered that no firm proposals were in place in relation to housing.
- Concern was raised in respect to Peterborough City Council's voice and whether the Combined Authority would diminish this.

Councillor Fitzgerald exercised his right to speak and explained that the model of governance proposed for the Combined Authority was the same as the Council, with Cabinet, except that the Combined Authority would have an Elected Mayor instead of a Leader. It was further highlighted that the Council had an exit strategy in place if the arrangements were not agreed, though such a manoeuvre would not be simple.

Councillor Holdich summed up as mover of the recommendations and in so doing, identified that no cost would be incurred by the Council for the election of the Elected Mayor. The devolution deal provided Peterborough and Cambridgeshire with an additional £100 million for housing. The Council had veto powers on any transport issue. Improved rail and road routes were to the city's benefit. Plans for a university and £50 million of funding for infrastructure was also provided for within the proposed deal.

A vote was taken (33 voted in favour, 18 voted against, 2 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

- (i) consented to the Secretary of State making an Order to establish the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (Appendix A of the Council report);

- (ii) consented to the Council being a constituent member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority with effect from the commencement date determined by the final Order;
- (iii) authorised the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to consent to the final draft Order and associated documents, specifically:
  - to agree minor drafting amendments to the Combined Authority Order to be laid before Parliament;
  - to consent to the Council being included within the draft Parliamentary Order thereby reflecting this Council's decision
- (iv) authorised the Combined Authority to have a power to issue a levy to the constituent Councils in respect of any financial year. (This will be subject to the inclusion of a unanimity clause in the Combined Authority constitution on this specific matter).
- (v) recommended to the Combined Authority that the costs of establishing the Combined Authority, holding the elections in May 2017 and running the Combined Authority (including Mayoral Office) for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are funded from the gain share grant provided by Government (as outlined in para 9.11)
- (vi) appointed Councillor Holdich to act as Council's appointee to the Shadow Combined Authority and once established, to the Combined Authority;
- (vii) appointed Councillor Fitzgerald, as Deputy Leader of the Council, to act as the substitute to the above (ref (vi));
- (viii) noted the outcome of the public consultation on the establishment of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority as outlined in paragraph 4.1 and 4.2 and Appendices 2A - 2D;
- (ix) noted the timetable for the implementation of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution Order as summarised in paragraph 6.1;
- (x) noted the Government's response to the outline business case for Housing capital investment funds secured as part of the devolution deal as set out in Appendix 3 of the Council report.
- (xi) agreed in principle, for a protocol requiring the Council Leader and the representative on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to report to each meeting of Council setting out the activities and decisions related to their respective roles within the Combined Authority.
- (xii) requested that the Member Officer Working Group develop the protocol through the Audit Committee with a view to inclusion of the protocol in the Council's constitution.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 8.26pm

