

**MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 26 JULY 2017  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR JOHN FOX**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Fitzgerald, Fower, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, and Whitby

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 7:00pm on 26 July 2017.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sylvester, Ferris, Harper, and Elsey.

**28. Questions on Notice**

- (a) To the Mayor**
- (a) To the Leader or member of the Cabinet**
- (b) To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee**

The Legal Officer advised that the order in which questions were asked was determined by ballot.

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

1. Manor Drive Development;
2. Lessons Learnt from St Michael's Gate;
3. Taxation without Representations;
4. Pavement and Verge Parking;
5. Safety Measures at Gladstone Park Astro Tuff;
6. Parking Enforcement Officer Resources;
7. Dog on Dog Attacks;
8. Activities at St John's Hall;
9. The TACT Partnership;
10. The Status of the Green Backyard;
11. White Goods Shop at Dodson House and Amey Impact;
12. Numbers Housing at St Michael's Gate;
13. Penalties for Breaking Planning Regulations;
14. The Local Transport Plan and Rhubarb Bridge;
15. The North Westgate Development; and
16. Anti-social Behaviour in Millfield Consultation.

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

- (c) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives**

The Legal Officer advised that the order in which questions were asked was determined by ballot.

Questions (d) to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Transport and Leadership Powers transferred to the Combined Authority Mayor.

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

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

#### **(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 - 2020**

The Mayor advised that a request had been made to withdraw the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 – 2020 from the agenda on the grounds that further changes to the Partnership's priorities may result from the countywide policy review.

It was agreed to withdraw this item from the agenda, to be considered at a future meeting of Council, once further information was known.

#### **(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Adoption of the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan**

Cabinet, at its meeting of 10 July 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to seek approval to recommend that Council adopts (or 'makes' to use the legal jargon) the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan and thereby make it part of the Development Plan for Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that a long time had been spent developing the Neighbourhood Plan, with a significant amount of effort put into the work by the Village Working Group. Consultation had been undertaken with local residents, as well further formal consultation and an independent examination. A referendum was held on 6 July 2017. 166 votes were cast, with 152 votes for approval. Following this overwhelming approval, Council were required to adopt the Plan.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary the points raised included:

- The turnout for the referendum had been 47.7%.
- It was noted that Gladstone had commenced a Neighbourhood Plan in 2013 which had not been progressed.
- The Council was urged to work proactively with Parish Council in order to encourage further Neighbourhood Plans.

Councillor Holdich exercised his right to speak and explained that this was the first Neighbourhood Plan to come forward following the change to planning laws. Ward Councillors had had little input, with the bulk of the work carried out by local people. Councillor Holdich congratulated residents on their achievement.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing endorsed Councillor Holdich's comments. It was noted that this new form of Neighbourhood Plan was different in nature to those previous, as they culminated in a referendum. Communities groups could also draft a Plan for submission.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council 'made' (which meant to all intents and purposes 'adopted') the Peakirk Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix 1, to thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within Peakirk Parish.

**(c) Audit Committee Recommendation – Updates to the Constitution**

Audit Committee, at its meeting of 26 June 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to obtain the Committee's views on proposed amendments and updates to the Council's constitution, including Regulatory Committee Functions, Standing Orders, and Petitions Scheme.

It was **RESOLVED** (unanimous) that Council agreed to suspend standing order 29.2 for the duration of the item to allow for variation of Council Standing Orders without the item standing adjourned.

Councillor Aitken introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Aitken advised that the key proposed updates to the constitution included clarification around the Appeals and Planning Review Committee speaking scheme, changes to the Planning referral and call-in procedures, a restriction on questions to council that are significantly the same as those asked in the past six months, and a update to the Petition Scheme to cover the procedure for debate at Council. The Committee removed a number of elements to the proposals which were felt to be unnecessary, where existing provision were already sufficient.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary the points raised included:

- It was commented that the Audit Committee meeting had been well chaired.
- Confirmation was sought by the Audit Committee that officers would provide assistance in formulating planning reasons for referral or call-in.
- It was further requested that Parish Councillors be provided with the opportunity to attend Planning Committee training alongside Members.

Councillor Over exercised his right to speak and explained that he was pleased to see a focus on the process for petitions to Council. The Audit Committee had chosen to limit the restriction on Planning referrals and call-in's to "planning reasons" and noted that advice from officer would still be available when formulating this reasons. Councillor Over praised the Chairman for a well-run meeting.

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

- 1) Approved the updated Regulatory Committee Functions (Appendix A to the report) subject to the replacement of any reference to "sufficient reasoning" to "reasoning";
- 2) Approved the updated Council Standing Orders (Appendix B to the report) subject to the removal of "from more than one Political Group";
- 3) Approved the updated General Standing Orders (Appendix C to the report); and
- 4) Approved the updated Petition Scheme (Appendix D to the report).

**(d) Licensing Committee Recommendation – Proposed Taxi Policy**

Licensing Committee, at its meeting of 6 July 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to advise Members of the consultation process carried out, to request

Members to properly consider the responses received and determine the direction of the policy in consideration of those responses, agree the adoption of the final policy, subject to amendments, and set the implementation date for the policy and conditions to take effect.

Councillor Ayres introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Ayres advised that the proposed Taxi Policy was not a statutory policy, but set out the principles for Taxi Licensing. The proposals had been approved by the Committee in late 2016 for consultation. Following this public consultation, the Committee then considered the responses received. The Committee considered that it was not favourable to extend the life extension for low-emission vehicles to 5 years, as they were currently not widely available, the infrastructure to support such a proposal was not available, and there was uncertainty surrounding the technology. It was also considered that the introduction of ad hoc safety checks, which were currently every three years, was not necessary. It was noted that further safeguarding training was being developed for drivers.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary the points raised included:

- The subject of Taxi Licensing was weighty and arduous, and the Licensing Committee has dealt with it well.
- The Police had further safeguarding measures in place, and would notify officers when necessary to ensure the public were not at risk.
- The Policy meant that Peterborough was moving its practices forward in relation to Taxi Licences.

Councillor Allen exercised his right to speak and considered that the proposed policy was of high quality and he felt the Committee had done a good job with their recommendations.

Councillor Ayres summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing thanked Members for their comments and congratulated the cross party committee on its work.

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

- 1) Adopted the draft Taxi Policy, subject to the amendments proposed by the Licensing Committee;
- 2) Agreed the Taxi Policy implementation date to be of immediate effect, subject to:
  - (i) An allowance of 3 months for the amendment of the Off Street Traffic Regulation Order; and
  - (ii) Relevant procurement process for outsourcing driving test;
- 3) Approved the amendment of the Licensing Committee terms of reference to state that:
  - (i) On recommendation by the Licensing Committee all statutory policies within the Licensing Committee's remit must go to Full Council for formal adoption. This includes an modifications, amendments to those policies; and
  - (ii) On recommendation by the Licensing Committee all non-statutory policies must be submitted to either Full Council or Cabinet for formal adoption. Thereafter, any minor amendments or modifications can be adopted by the Licensing Committee.

### **30. 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 10 July 2017
2. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 5 April 2017 to 30 June 2017.

#### **Questions were asked about the following:**

##### Implementation of Peterborough Lottery

Councillor Sandford asked what guarantees were available that that Peterborough Lottery would succeed in the face of national competition. Clarification was also sought on the risk to the Council should the scheme fail.

Councillor Seaton advised that the set up cost of the scheme was £6,100, and that this was the level of loss to be incurred if the scheme failed. It was noted that similar local lotteries had been more successful than expected in other areas of the country. Work was being undertaken with local community groups to promote and encourage engagement.

Councillor Fower asked how much money was expected to be made from the scheme.

Councillor Seaton responded that an estimated income of £65,000 a year was expected from 2019. This was discussed at the Cross Party Budget Working which Councillor Fower had been involved with.

##### Payment Strategy

Councillor Ellis sought reassurance that users of the Cash Offices would be consulted on its proposed closure in person.

Councillor Holdich responded that there was a list of alternative locations that individuals could pay within the report, which was being updated following feedback.

Councillor Seaton advised that online consultation was being undertaken alongside liaison with voluntary sector organisations to reach vulnerable groups. Officers were also present in the Cash Officer to discuss the proposals directly with users.

#### Budget Monitoring Report Final Outturn 2016/2017

Councillor Ellis asked for clarification around the £1.3 million underspend and asked the Cabinet Member to join him in asking the Government for further funding.

Councillor Seaton responded that savings had been made through Highway efficiencies, reduction in demand for concessionary fare, and financial services assurances. The Council still faced pressure from social care and the cost of housing families. It was advised that efficiencies were not the same as services cuts.

Councillor Murphy commented that this was £1.3 million not spent of services.

Councillor Seaton responded that this represented a 0.6% underspend and suggested that the Council were accurate in their budget setting.

#### Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 - 2020

Councillor Murphy asked why the priorities identified by the public had not been included in the Partnership Plan.

Councillor Walsh advised that the Plan's priorities focused on high harm risks that the public may not be aware of the. The Plan further set out how the concerns raised by the public would be addressed.

Councillor Sandford questioned how the public could be assured of the Safer Peterborough Partnership's priorities when the Board met in private.

Councillor Walsh responded that the work of the Partnership was transparent and that information was available if requested. The possibility of opening the meeting to the public could be investigated.

Councillor Mahabadi asked whether KPI's would be included within the Plan when it was presented to Council.

Councillor Walsh responded performance indicators were already available, and that this could be provided to Members in the future.

Junction 20 Capacity Improvements (A47/A15 Interchange) – JUN17/CMDN/08

Councillor Murphy asked whether these works were in relation to Rhubarb Bridge.

Councillor Hiller advised that they were not.

Academy Conversion – JUN17/CMDN/09 & Academy Conversion – JUN17/CMDN10

Councillor Mahabadi raised concerns about the funding for SEN child in these academies and sought reassurance that academies would not remain a 'black box'.

Councillor Ayres responded that such matters did not bare any relation to the two decisions made.

Award of Contract for the Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre – JUN17/CMDN/13

Councillor Fower asked for clarification on how the termination of the Amey contract would impact on the Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre contract.

Councillor Holdich advised that he would provide a response in writing.

**31. Questions on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives Made Since the Last Meeting**

The Mayor introduced the report which detailed Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the Board meeting held 31 May 2017
2. Decisions from the Audit and Governance Committee held 26 June 2017
3. Decisions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held 26 June 2017
4. Decisions from the Board meeting held 28 June 2017

**Questions were asked about the following:**

Strategic Transport Infrastructure Schemes

Councillor Sandford asked whether the project for the reopening of Wisbech Garden Town Station would be taken forward.

Councillor Holdich responded that this was within the Transport Plan for Cambridgeshire and that the Combined Authority were currently considering it.

**COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

**32. Notices of Motion**

**1. Motion from Councillor Ali**

*The Council recognises the concerns of traders, local community organisations, residents and road users of Lincoln Road, Millfield with regard to traffic congestion caused by the buses using the bus depot at the end of the day. As bus drivers bring their buses back to the depot at the end of the shift, long tailbacks ensue as buses try to enter the depot. This holds up the flow of the traffic through this already congested area and stops people from entering the area for shopping or eating, thus having an impact on the businesses.*

*Action needs to be taken to address this issue which has been constantly raised by the traders and others affected within the North, Central and Park Ward area.*

*The Council resolves to:*

- 1. Request the relevant Council Officers to work with the Bus Company to look at staggering the times for Buses coming into the depot to avoid tailbacks in the short term; and*
- 2. Work with the Bus Company to look at the feasibility of relocating the Bus Depot as a solution to this problem for the medium to long term.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Ali advised that the Bus Depot had been at its current location for a very long time. Times had changes and it was no longer appropriate. That part of the city was busy in the evening, and action needed to be taken to address the issue.

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

Councillor Hiller moved an amendment to the recommendations requesting that changes be made to consider traffic in the area in general, not just tailbacks from the Bus Depot. It was noted that business were not affected permanently, but for a short period in the evening. Councillor Hiller was happy to work with the private company to look at a potential relocation, but wished to also consider the broader issues affecting the area.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Over who reserved his right to speak.

Members were invited to comment on the amendment and during debate, and the following key points were raised:

- The area was impacted by double or triple parking on the street.
- A review was needed into Council policy to ensure that this did not continue.

Councillor Over exercised his right to speak and explained that the area suffered a dangerous level of double parking. It was noted that the Bus Depot was run by a private company and that addressing the traffic issues in the area would require consideration additional factors.

Councillor Ali exercised his right of reply as mover of the original motion and stated that he appreciated the comments made by Members and looked forward to a positive resolution. Councillor Ali accepted the amendment to his motion.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

*The Council recognises the concerns of traders, local community organisations, residents and road users of Lincoln Road, Millfield with regard to traffic congestion caused by the buses using the bus depot at the end of the day. Sometimes when As bus drivers bring their buses back to the depot at the end of the shift, long tailbacks can occur ensue as buses try to enter the depot. This holds up the flow of the traffic through this already congested area and stops people from entering the area for shopping or eating, thus having an short term impact on the businesses.*

*Action needs to be taken to address this issue which has been constantly raised by the traders and others affected within the North, Central and Park Ward area.*

*The Council resolves to:*



- 1) ~~Request the relevant Council Officers continue to work with the Bus Company to try to resolve traffic problems look at staggering the times for Buses coming into the depot to avoid tailbacks in the short term; and~~
- 2) *Work with the Bus Company to look at the feasibility of relocating the Bus Depot as a solution to this problem for the medium to long term.*

## 2. Motion from Councillor Ferris

*Annual consumption of plastic bottles is set to top half a trillion (500, 000, 000, 000) by 2017. Recognising the damaging impact that plastic waste is having on the Earth's ecosystems, it is imperative that we reduce this through a greater commitment to recycling and reuse.*

*This Council is asked to introduce a 'refill-reuse' scheme, similar to those already in operation in other cities across Europe. Such a scheme invites local businesses to sign up, allowing people to refill their water bottles on their premises rather than throwing them away after single use. If every Peterborough resident refilled once a week instead of buying a single-use plastic bottle, the city would reduce its waste plastic bottle consumption by approximately 10 million a year.*

*To take this forward, this Council is asked to:*

1. *Promote a refill-reuse scheme with local businesses, with an aim of recruiting them to become Refill Points;*
2. *Seek a commercial sponsor to act as a partner in the scheme;*
3. *Develop a Refill App which shows users which businesses nearby are happy to fill water bottles; and*
4. *work with other public space operators to contract companies to install drinking water fountains with visible and convenient attachments made to refill bottles in areas of high footfall.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Mahabadi noted that the proposals were closely linked to the Council's priority to become the UK's environment capital. To achieve this priority it was considered important to recognise the use of plastic bottles. Less than 60% of plastic bottles were recycled in the UK. The motion set out a number of innovative ideas, including a refill scheme to make the city greener. It was noted that there were significant economic benefits to the city becoming cleaner. Councillor Mahabadi accepted the amendment to the motion.

Councillor Ellis seconded the motion and supported the amendment.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

*Annual consumption of plastic bottles is set to top half a trillion (500, 000, 000, 000) by 2017. Recognising the damaging impact that plastic waste is having on the Earth's ecosystems, we need to continue and further develop our ~~it is imperative that we reduce this through a greater~~ commitment to recycling and reuse.*

*This Council is asked to introduce a 'refill-reuse' scheme, similar to those already in operation in other cities across Europe. Such a scheme invites local businesses to sign up, allowing people to refill their water bottles on their premises rather than throwing them away after single use. ~~If every Peterborough resident refilled once a~~*

~~week instead of buying a single-use plastic bottle, the city would reduce its waste plastic bottle consumption by approximately 10 million a year.~~

~~To take this forward, this Council is asked to:~~

- ~~1) Promote a refill-reuse scheme with local businesses, with an aim of recruiting them to become Refill Points;~~
- ~~2) Seek a commercial sponsor to act as a partner in the scheme;~~
- ~~3) Develop a Refill App which shows users which businesses nearby are happy to fill water bottles; and~~
- ~~4) work with other public space operators to contract companies to install drinking water fountains with visible and convenient attachments made to refill bottles in areas of high footfall.~~

### **3. Motion from Councillor Ferris**

*Council notes the need to promote pedestrian and cycle routes in the city of Peterborough.*

*This Council believes that pedestrian and cycle facilities in Peterborough can be enhanced and better coordinated particularly in the city centre.*

*This Council believes that a footbridge and cycle route to Fletton Quays should be constructed.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Mahabadi recognised that the issue of a bridge across the River Nene was an emotive topic. It was considered that such a bridge would provide an important link between the Fletton Quays development and the Embankment.

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

Councillor Hiller moved an amendment to the recommendations requesting that the proposals for a footbridge be fed into the cross party budget working group should the Peterborough University be cited at Fletton Quays. Councillor Hiller noted that the provision of bridge was desirable, but could not be included in previous plans for Fletton Quays due to the lack of commercial viability. As such a bridge would attract a significant cost, the matter should be carefully considered before being factored into the budget.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Serluca who reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Mahabadi accepted the amendment to the motion.

Members were invited to comment on the motion as amended and during debate, and the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised proposals for a bridge were not included in original plans for Fletton Quays.
- It was noted that original proposals did include a bridge, which was still the Council's wish. The plans were amended due to the cost of such a bridge and viability issues.
- The location was ideal for a bridge, given its proximity to the Embankment, Key Theatre, and Football Ground.

- It was considered that there was no point introducing a bridge at the current time until it was determined where the University would be cited. The Council did not want to build a bridge to nowhere.
- The cost of a potential bridge was discussed, up to a level of £3 million. It was estimated that this was cost £300,000 to borrow.
- Such costs would have to be weighed against other Council demands.
- The Transport User Hierarchy was referenced, highlighting that pedestrians and cyclist topped this list. Comment was made that this hierarch often seemed to be ignored.
- It was suggested that even without the University, a bridge at this location should still be considered.
- It was advised that such proposals were included in the original scheme, and that commencement of such was a matter of financing.
- It was considered that plans for a bridge needed to be right, and the priority of funding needed to be appropriate.

Councillor Mahabadi summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing considered that the amendment had been accepted on good faith that the proposals would be pursued.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

*Council notes the need to continue to promote pedestrian and cycle routes in the city of Peterborough.*

*This Council believes that pedestrian and cycle facilities in Peterborough can continue to be enhanced and better co-ordinated particularly in and around the city centre as part of the Council's wider growth and regeneration plans.*

*Funding for the provision of a foot and cycle bridge This Council believes that a footbridge and cycle route to Fletton Quays from the embankment should be constructed considered as part of the Council's budget setting process, because the potential for a footbridge provision was originally, and still is, an element of this landmark development and will certainly be a foremost consideration should the City's university be positioned here.*

### **33. Reports to Council**

#### **(a) Notification of Changes to the Executive Functions – Officer Delegations**

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that authority had been delegated to the Chief Executive to loan officers to other authorities to discharge their functions, and that the threshold for Director ex-gratia payments in respect of complaints had been increased to £1,000.

Councillor Smith seconded the recommendations.

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

#### **(b) Consultation on Changes of Governance with Fire**

Councillor Bond introduced the report and moved the alternative recommendations set out in the supplementary information pack. Councillor Bond considered that representative model was the more sensible approach, taking into account evidence from the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire Authority. Further collaboration was thought to be a good idea. It was suggested that combining the governance of the

Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire Authority would have a negative impact on public safety. It was also believed that this would not result in any form of cost saving. It was considered to be important to spread the power of the Police and the Fire Authority of two bodies, as the governance model proposed by the Police and Crime Commissioner would provide the Commissioner with too much influence over the Fire Authority. There was a number of examples of the two bodies communication and working together already, including shared facilities, and a joint education team. It was not felt that changes in the governance approach would improve this. Finally, it was suggested that the creation of a blue light hub would ensure that the emergency services bodies worked more closely together in the future.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary the points raised included:

- Councillors Peach, Over, Jamil, and Bond were members of the Fire Authority.
- It was considered that the current governance format was working effectively.
- Public Safety was believed to be key, and required maintaining.
- Comment was made that such proposals were being supported in other parts of the country.
- It was noted that the relationship of the Police to the public was different than that of the Fire Service.
- Concern was raised in relation to one person having power over both the Police and the Fire Services.
- The blue light hub was considered to be a good idea, which could improve communication between services.
- Suggestion was made that the relationship between the Fire Chief and the Fire Authority, and the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Police and Crime Panel were significantly different.
- It was not considered that the recommendation of the Police and Crime Commissioner was in the best interest of the public.
- It was suggested that a large organisation would be too unwieldy and unresponsive to change. Safety should come first.

Councillor Peach exercised his right to speak and explained that that Cambridgeshire County Council had recently agreed the same recommendation. It was hoped that similar cross party support would be shown by the Council this evening. The Fire Authority had equally agreed the same response.

Councillor Bond summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing thanked Members for their support.

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

- 1) Objects to the option as detailed within the Police and Crime Commissioner Business Case option 3 (Governance Model) and supports option 2 (Representative Model);
- 2) Uses the response of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Fire Authority to the consultation either in whole or part to support the preferred option 2;
- 3) States it is the view of the Council that a blue light hub, based on the Fire Service and Ambulance service, is looked at in greater detail, as there is a clear and historical synergy between both of these important public services; and
- 4) Delegates the preparation of a full written response to the Chief Executive, in consultation with Group Leaders, by the closing date of 4 September 2017.

**(c) Appointment of the Interim Monitoring Officer**

Stephen Gerrard, Interim Director of Law and Governance, left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that the Council had a legal requirement to have a Monitoring Officer in post. Following the secondment of Kim Sawyer, it was proposed that Stephen Gerrard be appointed to the post on an interim basis.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Mr Stephen Gerrard (Interim Director for Law and Governance) as the Interim Monitoring Officer for Peterborough City Council.

**(d) Urgent Report – Appointment of the Interim Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer**

Stephen Gerrard, Interim Director of Law and Governance, re-joined the meeting.

The Chairman agreed to take this report as an urgent items, due to the statutory requirements of the Council to have a Section 151 Officer in place, and to avoid the need for an extraordinary meeting.

Marion Kelly, Interim Service Director Financial Services, left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Holdich advised that the Council had a legal requirement to have a Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer in post. Following the resignation of John Harrison, it was proposed that Marion Kelly be appointed to the post on an interim basis.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Ms Marion Kelly (Interim Service Director Financial Services) as the Interim Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer for Peterborough City Council.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 9:44pm

## RECONVENED FULL COUNCIL 26 JULY 2017

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b>	
<b><u>COUNCIL BUSINESS</u></b>	
<b>8. <u>Questions on notice to:</u></b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The Mayor</li> <li>ii) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet</li> <li>iii) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee</li> </ul>	
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>Local residents living along the Manor Drive Development are concerned already with a range of traffic related issues, given the planned opening of a new primary and secondary school in the coming years at this location, plus further additional housing, could the relevant Cabinet Member assure me that relevant and required road safety measures will be introduced, and whether we can look forward to a 20mph speed limit, specifically around the planned location of the schools?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>The main spine road through Paston Reserve, Manor Drive, is subject to a 30mph restriction, as it will be for the remainder of it when fully built. Our highways officers will of course to monitor the traffic and the issues ongoing.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Johnson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>Residents in my ward are still upset and angry about the St Michael's Gate situation., especially highlighted this week through the court case on Monday the fact that if Chris Phillipou hadn't offered the tenant a deal that the case would have been struck out of court due to incorrect procedures according to court papers submitted. It appears that Simon Magic Homes or Stef and Phillips never obtained a "Deed Of Assignment.</p> <p>Can I get clarification on the plan for St Michael's Gate and have lessons been learnt from this debacle to ensure this scandal is not repeated and does not escalate further? Also on observation, there appears too many empty properties on St Michael's Gate is the council paying for each property that they have tenants in or for the ones it doesn't?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p>

	<p>I thank you for the opportunity and I thank Councillor Johnson for the question. The plan for the use of St Michael's Gate properties is exactly as it's always been Councillor Johnson. So I am mildly surprised you don't seem to be aware of that. It is being used for temporary accommodation for eligible households to whom the Council has a statutory duty to house.</p> <p>The council only pays for the accommodation provided by the firm Stef and Philips once they have obtained vacant possession of the property and that's after the required repairs or improvements have indeed happened. I imagine the properties are being improved so some must certainly appear empty at this time.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Mahabadi</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member tell me how many non-British council tax residents in Peterborough are allowed to vote in Local, Mayoral and Police &amp; Crime Commissioner elections, and how many of these are entitled to (under legislation) as EU nationals? Would he/she agree with me that taxation without representation is not right or proper in a mature democracy, and ask the British Government on behalf of Peterborough City Council to ensure that those folk resident in Peterborough, and paying council tax, continue to be enfranchised and therefore represented through the ballot box in local elections?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Councillor Mahabadi there are currently 17,299 European electors registered on the Register of Electors for Peterborough. That's 17,299. These electors are entitled to vote in Local, Combined Authority Mayoral and Police &amp; Crime Commissioner elections within the Peterborough area. The register of electors is compiled for the purposes of voting and is not linked to Council Tax and I am therefore unable to confirm how many of these electors are also registered to pay Council Tax. Clearly, we could do that piece of work it would cost money and take time so I am happy to talk to you outside this chamber if there are specific reasons you feel that is needed.</p> <p><b>Councillor Mahabadi asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I guess with respect to that answer and thank you my main concern is that as we are moving towards exit of the EU that these electors, if they continue to be on our register, remain on our register, considering many of them have established themselves here as citizens, well behaved, well paying, paying taxes, etc. that was the main thrust of the question and I'd be grateful for any further steer on that. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>I must admit I wouldn't want to speculate on the way Brexit negotiations go but I do have a degree of sympathy for what you are saying.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>Following a motion to this council (was it last year) numerous promises of action from the administration, the reestablishment of the working party some time ago and recommendations from scrutiny committee during the last financial year can the</p>

Cabinet Member let me know what action has been taken and what action will be taken this year to tackle pavement and verge parking through the use of traffic regulation orders as agreed by Council or if possible by any other means?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

The Verge Parking Action Group proposed a Verge and Pavement Parking Policy, which was scrutinised by the appropriate committee in March of this year Mr Mayor. In summary, this policy allows for local activation of a council wide Traffic Regulation Order which prohibits parking on the pavement and verge. This local activation would be subject to approval by residents or at the request of the highways inspectors or indeed the emergency services. It would then require the placing of official signage at the location which could then be enforced by the Prevention and Enforcement Service by the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices.

Councillor Walsh's PES team can currently only enforce verge parking where it is covered by an existing Traffic Regulation Order such as double yellow lines or specific 'no waiting on verge or footway' restrictions such as in old Dogsthorpe, Fletton Avenue and Garton End Road. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:**

The supplementary is actually the question that I asked. When is this going to be done? Is it going to be done this year or are you just pretending that you are going to do something and you are actually going to do nothing?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

I didn't notice an element of pretence in my original answer Mr Mayor but this policy requires the necessary budget to be made available as part of the 2018 – 19 budget setting process that it can come into effect from April 2018. We on this side of the chamber are very keen for opposition groups to have sensible, open minded and engaged members taking part within and contributing to the budget setting process. Rather than your usual budget pessimism I suggest that by participation, discussion and agreement you can have your policies, initiatives and the desired methodology costed, approved and assimilated for future health and wellbeing of our great city and its residents. Participate comrade, don't procrastinate. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

5. **Question from Councillor Khan**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

I am extremely concerned at the poor management of Gladstone Park Astro Turf play area. We spent around £200k in creating this much-needed facility, which is well used however I have seen over recent months children and young people climbing over the tall fencing to get into the facility and misuse it, playing games for which the facility is not suitable for. Despite me raising this with officers on numerous occasions over many months the situation is getting worse. I am concerned that one day someone is going to fall as they climb this tall fence and end up with serious injuries.

I am asking what is being done to improve management and security at this facility?

What is this Council going to do when someone falls and injures themselves?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

The facilities at Gladstone Park are indeed a great asset for the area, and in fact for the city as a whole and I am pleased that they are well used.



Officers have advised me that they are aware of some of the behaviours Cllr Khan describes at the centre and, as a result, have commissioned a police specialist to conduct a full site survey. The results of that survey, which should be available within the next month, will be shared with the ward Councillors and will include suggestions and recommendations of measures that can be implemented to protect the area from damage and the public from harm.

We are also increasing positive engagement activities with young people in the area. A well-attended youth club and football activities are already on offer, and the Council is proposing to introduce further activities including free cricket training sessions. We hope this will engage young people in ways they want and enjoy, thus preventing them from misusing the facilities at Gladstone Park.

I hope, Mr Mayor, that Councillor Khan agrees that much is being done with the young people in the area to address the issue he has raised and I do hope that he engages with the police specialist assigned to the site.

**Councillor Khan asked a supplementary question:**

A bit disappointed because this is a serious matter and what we are looking at is perhaps a month to see what the constabulary are going to bring back to us. I have some evidence taken with my camera, the video recording. My biggest concern Mr Mayor, is, that when these young adults climb the fence on one side, on the ground floor there is one side hard-core and my biggest fear is that if somebody slips and they fall on the hard-core there some serious damage and I think I'm just wondering whether the Cabinet Member could take some steps, emergency steps to avoid that happening. Whether it's possible? One thing I suggest that could be done is that we paint it with this non-climbing paint on top of those roofs that might sort of help alleviate this?

**Councillor Walsh:**

As in my previous response, I did mention a police specialist is conducting a full site survey and proposals will be put forward and I do suggest that Councillor Khan engages with that specialist and any particular suggestions he has to discuss it with them. Thank you.

6. **Question from Councillor Ferris**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Acknowledging the excellent work done by Parking Enforcement Officers, in very difficult circumstances, and recognising the scale of the parking problems we face in older residential areas of the city; is the Cabinet Member responsible able to tell this Council how many officers are currently available and when we might see the much-needed recruitment and expansion of the service?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

I thank Councillor Ferris for his question if he's here which I don't think he is. I did welcome the positive comments about the parking officers and officers with the PES are passionate about improving conditions in our communities, and I know they will appreciate the feedback.

There are currently ten Prevention and Enforcement Officers who specialise in and are equipped to conduct parking enforcement duties. This has increased by three officers since the start of the year.

	<p>A further eleven officers within the PES team are concluding their training in parking enforcement so they are able to deal with the most serious parking offences should they encounter them as part of their duties. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Why are there no safeguarding laws locally in operation at Peterborough City Council for dog on dog incidents?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Dog on dog attacks are clearly very distressing for anybody witnessing them, and for the owners of the dogs involved. Any such incidents should be reported to the Police or can be reported into the Prevention and Enforcement Service, at which point officers from the various agencies that comprise the PES team will discuss and agree the best course of action based on the individual circumstances including the impact on the community.</p> <p>We are in the process of letting a new stray dog contract, which now includes new requirements to promote responsible dog ownership as well as more overt enforcement of, for example, dog fouling. This contract will be managed as part of the Prevention and Enforcement Service.</p> <p><b>Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Walsh, for that response. Can you tell me how many incidents have been reported to the Peterborough City Council or to the veterinary practices or the police or the local dog warden? Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>I'm not really quite sure specifically what number Councillor Davidson is referring to, that she wants. Is this when people go on walks with their dogs? I'm not really clear so I'd really appreciate it if we refer this question to the PES team and see what data they can come up with and I am happy to supply that. Thank you.</p>
8.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member let me have details of the activities that were being held at St John's Hall last year and those that have been relocated elsewhere following its closure and can I have details of where these activities are now located and any details as promised as to where the Councillors surgery could be held at a venue within the West Town neighbourhood in the Ravensthorpe Ward.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The lease which Peterborough City Council held for St Johns Hall expired in March 2017. Three months prior to this date notice was given to all users. Furthermore, the council and the Community Association explored alternative local provision. An offer was made by the West Town Academy for community activities to move to their premises if they so wished. Only the popular pre-school took up the offer. The other groups instead chose to source alternative accommodation.</p>

It should be noted that the majority of regular activities were not ward specific. Should Councillor Murphy require a list of the activities that have chosen to relocate out of his ward I am sure it can be provided? In relation to Councillor Surgeries, our information is that no surgeries had been held at the venue for the last two years. Nor was alternative provision for Councillor surgeries raised as an issue when the hall closed. It is in my experience, customary for Councillors to make arrangements themselves in discussion with community venues. If, however Councillor Murphy requires assistance I am sure we can identify a suitable venue on his behalf for his surgeries. The Pupil Referral Unit maybe a possibility. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:**

Can the Councillor tell me whether she regrets closure of this popular community facility and is she aware that the Pupil Referral Unit is in Central Ward not in Ravensthorpe Ward?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Do I regret? Councillor Murphy, the Council does what the Council has to do and it is all very well to use emotive words but the council has business to do and it must perform that business in the best possible way, being of course, sympathetic and empathetic to residents at all times. Other councils have dealt with asset transfer in a much more aggressive way. We have done it in a very, very sensitive way. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

9. **Question from Councillor Bull**

To Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

Our TACT partnership (first fostering and adoption agency in England to take over a local authority's fostering and adoption service) officially started in April. It's early days for this innovative and ground-breaking alliance but can the Cabinet Member give us an initial indication of how well the partnership is working along with the kinds of improved outcomes for children and young people in care, and on the edge of care, that are being achieved; plus, whether we are likely to be on target to deliver savings of £1m a year, once fully established?

**Councillor Smith responded:**

Yes, thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Bull for your question. A great deal of work has taken place to ensure the smooth transition of not only staff, but of foster carers and resources to TACT in time for the 1st of April when the TACT Partnership took over. This has gone very well; staff have transferred across successfully and smoothly and the foster carers remain positive about those changes.

It's early days, we are only three months in to a ten-year contract. TACT have already reported success in recruiting additional foster carers, and is engaging with our children's services to identify priority children and young people who are currently being looked after in residential placements, but for whom those responsible for their care planning agree that those children would be better placed in foster care. So, we are looking at transitioning those if we can. This is better for everyone; children and young people generally do better in families rather than in residential care.

TACT have also been successful in bidding for Innovation Funding from the Government to develop a programme to help children and young people who return home after being in care for a period. TACT will use this funding to develop a new

	<p>support programme to help children and young people transition into home. This is just one example of how bringing TACT in as a partnership will deliver benefits to children and young people.</p> <p>So, while it is early days, I think there are plenty of early indications that the new arrangements will be a success for the Council, TACT and, most importantly, for our carers, children, young people and their families.</p> <p><b>Councillor Bull asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I thank my friend, the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services for her very comprehensive response. Can I take it that it is too early to say what the indicative savings are for the first quarter? Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Smith responded:</b></p> <p>It is too early however I have been to a couple of board meetings now and those savings do appear to be on track at the moment.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ferris</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>What is the status of the proposed lease between Peterborough City Council and the Green Backyard for the important Community green space site on Oundle Road?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The council has been working in partnership with the Green Back Yard, to complete the lease documents. The heads of terms for the lease have been agreed by both sides, with the lease documents including the community occupation agreement being issued to the Green Back Yard to sign. The Green Back Yard are reviewing the documents and the signing agreement date is the end of this month, July. Thank you, My Mayor.</p>
11.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Is the white goods shop (Waste, Electric and Electrical Equipment) at Dodson House in Fengate affected by the takeover by the new contractor of the Amey contract?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p>I answer this question in the absence of Councillor Elsey who is the Cabinet Member responsible for this. The WEEE facility at Dodson House forms part of the core Waste and Recycling service offered by Amey and there is no change to service offered as part of these discussions. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the response Councillor Holdich. My supplementary question is what are the council’s plans for the re-use shop that helps people and families on benefits and low incomes to purchase white electrical equipment, is NORSE the new contractor and when will they be taken over?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p>

	<p>As it is not my portfolio I will get the response in writing if that's OK with you Mr Mayor?</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member let me know how many people have now been housed at St Michael's Gate, how much the Council pays Stef and Phillips for each individual each week (or month), and how many people do the Council eventual aim to house at this location?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>There are 57 properties currently available to the council all of which are occupied. As Councillor Walsh has made public a number of times the costs range from £19.50 a night for a one bedroomed flat to £50.00 a night for a five-bedroomed house and properties will be made available in due course. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you very much for that answer. My supplementary question is what assurances can the Cabinet Member give myself and other members of this chamber as to what will happen when the present contract stroke lease runs out in a couple of years' time at St Michael's Gate because obviously I and probably a bit like the Cabinet Member are mindful and potentially fearful that somebody like Luton Borough Council might come in and take over. So I am just looking for assurances. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the supplementary question. As this is now within my portfolio Mr Mayor I'll answer any question about it factually. Quite what happens in three years' time or nearly three years' time I think we need to determine nearer to that date Councillor Fower.</p> <p>Mr Mayor I am aware it must really irritate some of the Opposition Members that these properties were bought by an independent firm from an independent seller in a legitimate and lawful transaction. This council was offered the facility thereafter, and any half sensible independent accommodator would have find that this council took the right decision at that time. What would the Opposition would have done Mr Mayor? Would they have buried their heads and hoped that these so called nasty people would have just gone away? It wouldn't have happened like that would it?</p> <p>Of course, I agree that what this firm has done isn't moralistic or it's not nice Mr Mayor but my colleagues not taking that decision would have resulted in an additional burden on our hard-pressed tax payers, our schools and our already stretched front line services.</p> <p>Mr Mayor, this administration doesn't shy away from taking difficult decisions forced upon it by circumstances completely beyond its control and continued attempts to make political capital out of this have been rejected by the public as the Lib Dems result in the recent East Ward by-election very clearly demonstrated. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>

13.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bisby</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>On three occasions in the last few weeks, Persimmon have flouted planning applications, were told not to proceed any more but did. It took me to continually raise the issue on several fronts, such as planning and Health and Safety to get Persimmon to actually stop what they were doing. This was achieved by legal threats by one of our senior officers.</p> <p>I am all for builders building homes, but for them to break planning rules and regulations and put the public's Health and Safety at risk, including the new grounds of the primary school, I ask what powers are available to stop builders and prevent them from continued breaking of regulations. I would also ask what penalties especially in the Persimmon case, can the council impose?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>If unauthorised development is likely to cause significant harm the council has enforcement actions it might take to stop it such as Temporary Stop Notices which last for 28 days, actual Stop Notices and Injunctions.</p> <p>A stop can only be applied to the activities that are causing the identified harm and not wider construction activity about which we don't have any concerns.</p> <p>The Council itself can't impose any penalties, financial or otherwise on the parties associated with the site although we can seek to recover any costs we incurred in taking direct action to address the breach of planning control. A failure to comply with notices or injunctions will of course risk court action being taken.</p>
14.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development</p> <p>For nearly three years, ever since it first appeared in our Local Transport Plan, I have been asking when local Councillors and the public are going to be properly consulted about the proposed scheme to remove the Rhubarb Bridge at the junction of Lincoln Road and the Soke Parkway. Earlier this year several million pounds were set aside in the Transport Capital Programme for the project. A few weeks ago a notice appeared in the Forward Plan that the cabinet was going to plan to award the contract before the end of June.</p> <p>We all know that the current bridge is near the end of its life but local people have real concerns that what replaces it must maximise safety and benefit for pedestrians and cyclists, many hundreds of whom use the current bridge every day. They are concerned that by the time any consultation does take place, all the main decisions will have been made and it will be quite simply a take it or leave it situation. Can I ask the Cabinet Member yet again when will public consultation take place and will it be meaningful consultation or just a rubber-stamping PR exercise?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>In choosing to invest £5.5m the council has obviously recognised not only the key nature of this junction but also make the changes necessary so that it can continue to operate effectively. You are absolutely right Councillor Sandford to state we all know the current bridge is near the end of its life and I can tell you what I am sure you must</p>

already know that a replacement costs would be massively expensive.

A consultation exercise will most certainly be undertaken and an information event will be held. I don't yet have specific date or venue but as soon as we have I will ensure all members are informed in good time and information will be publicised in the local media and on line.

We will also ensure that local businesses, bus service operators, taxi providers, the Peterborough Disability Forum, the RNIB, the Cycle Forum and schools are all consulted Mr Mayor. I can assure you Councillor Sandford it isn't a done deal on the final design because all, I repeat all, comments will be assessed and considered. Thank you.

**Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:**

Quite often in this chamber I express very strong opinions about what I want to happen and this particular case I genuinely have an open mind about what should be done to deal with the problems at this particular location. As Councillor Hiller said I am no fan of the current bridge but I really must press him because there are £5.5m of public funds at stake here.

This has been in our local transport plan for three years or four years and I keep asking will he tell local Councillors or local people what is going to happen. £5.5m is a lot of money. Can you tell us what is going to happen to this as a result of that?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

I thank Councillor Sandford for the follow up question. In essence the bridges are being replaced with an AP grade crossing which is a level crossing which will be a lot more efficient. It will ease traffic flow. It will most probably reduce congestion and it will most probably reduce environmental issues down there.

I should point out Mr Mayor, that the concept for the proposed scheme is in our fourth Local Transport Plan as Councillor Sandford alluded to which went out to consultation and was presented at the Sustainable Growth & Environmental Capital Scrutiny Committee over two years ago in January 2015. So the principle of what is being proposed is well known and accepted. The forthcoming consultation which you are rightly wanting details for will focus on the detailed part of the scheme and I can assure you it is imminent. Thank you.

15. **Question from Councillor Hussain**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, and Housing Development

I have been asked frequently by my constituents about the North Westgate Development, so I would like to ask the relevant Cabinet Member to update us as to what the current state of play is with the North Westgate and what efforts are being made to bring this long overdue much needed development in Central Ward to fruition?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

I have been part of the North Westgate discussions, planning applications and subsequent appeals over the last few years and I can assure all Members here tonight it's complicated. I am also aware as most of us do that it represents the next great opportunity for continuing the city centre's regeneration after our success' with

Fletton Quays. But as I say it's a challenging one.

As Members may be aware, there are in excess of thirty land ownerships across the site and completing the initial land assembly for starting any development will take time.

Members will recall that we have already allocated £15m towards taking this site forward and the Council is engaging now with existing land owners, and will extend this work over the coming weeks and months Mr Mayor. We've also begun the work to establish major constraints facing the site in terms of highways, utilities, legal issues and so on, which is an essential first step in developing a viable, deliverable master plan.

Over the coming months this preliminary work will continue and contribute to the development of a commercially viable scheme with a mix of uses to benefit the city centre and the wider area. Central Ward will of course be updated regularly with any significant progress reports. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Hussain asked a supplementary question:**

I just want to thank my colleague for his response and just ask him can I please ask that North West Development is perused with a vigour as people in my Central Ward are getting extremely impatient at the lack of progress and I would like to see some timescale to realise this. Thank you.

**Councillor Hill responded:**

So would we all Mr Mayor.

16. **Question from Councillor Peach**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Could the Cabinet Member please update me on progress and consultation with residents of the £7.5 million for the Millfield Area?

Residents warmly welcome this money but want an input into how the money may be spent and would like some idea of the timetable to completion.

In light of the ASB in the Century Square area could attention be given to funds for this area, just off Lincoln/Alma Road?

**Councillor Walsh may respond:**

The £7.5m investment in the Millfield, New England and Gladstone areas is, as you say, a very welcome development and it is vital we spend the money in the most effective way possible.

Members will recall that a proportion of the funding was designated for public realm works, with the remainder being earmarked for a community building on land adjacent to Century Square.

To-date, officers have met with or spoken to Ward Councillors and to other community leaders, and commissioned a short piece of work to evaluate the impact this funding could have in addressing some of the entrenched challenges the area faces. This work is now complete.



A project manager is now being identified who will shortly be arranging a Local Action Group meeting and a Can-Do Forum to discuss outline proposals in more depth. Whilst we are not proposing a lengthy public consultation period, it is, as you say, vital that we hear from Councillors, community leaders, businesses and communities themselves before finalising the details. We are hoping, therefore, for full engagement from these parties.

We anticipate work beginning on the ground during this financial year.

Regarding the ASB issues in the Century Area, a multi-agency meeting has taken place and there are emerging plans to resolve matters once and for all.

**Councillor Peach asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you very much for the answer and everybody will be pleased to hear that the project is ongoing the council granting the money in the first place. When you said it is anticipated that the work will be on the ground in this financial year that obviously takes us up to April next year, would that be work starting on the community building or on the whole project which includes the public realm works?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

I suggest that we get together and discuss this in details and you can get all that supplementary information that you want. Thank you.

**8. Questions on notice to:**

iv) The Combined Authority Representatives

**1. Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member of the Combined Authority

As you are aware significant transport and infrastructure leadership powers have been transferred to the mayor and the combined authority even though last year there was no consultation with local residents on transport powers being transferred. There has been much coverage about new transport initiatives including a Cambridge underground, new rail services, light rail and new roads. However I believe that pedestrian and cycle routes are very important. Will the Peterborough representative on the combined authority please make representations for funding for a new pedestrian and cycle footbridge to the Southbank development in Peterborough and make the case for and give support for an improved, reliable and affordable public bus service in Peterborough and the surrounding rural areas?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

You are correct that the Combined Authority do have new transport planning powers. At a future meeting of the Combined Authority there will be a report on the new transport plan. Preparations for that new plan will include consulting the public on cycling routes and bus services. The public will therefore have the opportunity to feed into the development of these important matters as part of that process as we will as Councillors. But I do have to say Mr Mayor the purpose of this new report is to give Councillors the opportunity to ask questions on decisions being made by the Combined Authority. As such your question is not directed at work that has already taken place and it should be. Thank you very much.

**Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:**

If you will bear with me for the benefit of the public who may be listening they don't get to see these questions. The question was to our representative on the new Combined Authority which has millions of pounds to spend this year asking specifically about a bridge over the River Nene for pedestrians and cyclists, asking our representatives to put pressure on the new transport authority to fund that bridge rather than underground ideas, railways, etc. etc. throughout the county of Cambridgeshire and the unitary authority of Peterborough. So I'm asking again will Councillor Holdich join with me in asking the Mayor to spend some of those millions on improved facilities in Peterborough, i.e. A bridge over the River Nene to the South bank also look at improving buses so they are reliable, public transport is reliable and safe and affordable in Peterborough. Would he agree with me that rather than spend millions of pounds on an election for posts, spend millions on administration and have three directors of transport throughout those two authorities to spend money on a bridge?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

Yes. No.