

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 17 OCTOBER 2018  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR CHRIS ASH**

**Present:**

Councillors Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Eley, Farooq, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, King, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Warren, Walsh, and Whitby.

**29. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali, Davidson, Lamb, Aitken, Goodwin and Mahabadi.

**30. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Ellis declared an interest regarding the agenda item 12(2) on Welfare Reform Policies, as he worked for the DWP and he advised he would not take part in the debate or vote for that motion.

**31. Minutes of the Meetings held on 25 July 2018.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**32. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced the forthcoming Armistice 100 on Remembrance Sunday would take place at the War Memorial outside the Town Hall on Sunday 11 November 2018 followed by a Service of Remembrance at the Cathedral. The military parade would commence at 10:45 outside the Town Hall with the cathedral service at 11:45. All were welcome.

**33. Leader's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Leader.

**QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

**34. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

**(a) To the Mayor**

Questions from members of the public were raised in respect of the following:

1. Private tuition for secondary school pupils.
2. Parking issues in Geneva Street.
3. The Council's policy on Airbnb (not asked as questioner not present).
4. Re-instating Herlington Post Office.
5. Homelessness and housing shortage.

## 6. Animal welfare and food safety after Brexit.

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

### 35. Petitions

#### (a) Presented by Members of the Public

A petition was received from Mr Peach containing 40 signatures from residents in Kings Gardens in Park Ward. The petition called on the Council address the problems at the council owned Elizabeth Court development regarding anti-social behaviour including violence, alcohol and drug abuse and the selling of drugs,

#### (b) Presented by Members

A petition was received from Councillor Dowson containing over 1500 signatures. The petition called on the Council to take a more active approach in saving the Cherry Tree public house in Oundle Road as a designated community asset as it has been standing empty over two years.

#### (c) Petition for Debate – ‘Stop the Close of the Manor, Respite Home for Children and Young People with Disabilities’

On 7 March 2018 a petition was received with the Council from Ms Helen Harber. Following the undertaking of a verification process, the petition was confirmed to include 930 eligible signatures. Ms Harber requested that the petition was debated by a meeting of the Full Council, as per the Petitions Scheme.

The petition calls upon the Council to:

- Let the Manor continue providing a service to families requiring respite provision.
- Reject any alternatives: Direct Payments or Outreach.

Members expressed concern over the delay in bringing this to Council and questioned why an additional meeting had not been arranged for this item. Councillor Sandford raised a point of order before the debate commenced regarding the general position of petitions within the council, expressed concern over the delay in bringing the petition to Full Council and if the business of the council should be affected by Purdah.

Council Sandford requested that petitions should be added to the agenda of the next Constitution and Ethics Committee meeting and this was agreed with Councillor Seaton in his capacity as Chair of that committee.

As the petitioner was not present, Councillor Smith introduced the report and moved the recommendation to note the report and take no further action. Members were assured that she has met with the local ward councillors and the lead petitioner after the petition was presented originally and they have not been left waiting for discussions to take place. The council was committed to supporting children with disabilities and their families and carers.

Members were informed that in March it was agreed to redesign the short break service to meet a wider need for children with disabilities. In March, 13 people were accessing The Manor. Since then, two families have declined alternative support and their services have ceased, one has moved to adult services due to their age, the remaining six are currently attending the centre, four of which are in transition to their new provision, two don't have confirmed provision but each child has a couple of alternatives and these will be confirmed on the 22 October 2018.

The staff consultation had now ended. Staff had been redeployed within the council, there were 2 redundancies one of which had since become a link foster carer to provide short breaks and there were two resignations and service will cease on 15 November. Ofsted had been aware of the request to de-register the provision which could be re-applied for at a later date if the need arose. The building would be retained by the council and managed alongside Cherry Lodge.

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

Members debated the petition and in summary raised the following points:

- That the petition could have been debated at the meeting which was cancelled in April.
- Debate was meaningless now as the staff had been redeployed and alternative arrangements made for the children.
- Concern was expressed that the council could be losing a potential success story.
- The Manor was a refuge for families and changes could affect their health and well-being.
- Implementation plans were not sent to ward councillors as promised.
- Staff, service users and democracy had been treated in a shoddy way.
- The possibility of the decision being reversed.
- Services like this should not be considered only from a financial viewpoint.
- The Manor only has a 26% usage however this service is vital to the people who use it.
- Foster carers were desperate for respite care, there is a market which could be exploited to provide respite care for other areas and generate an income for the council.
- Closure of The Manor had been proposed as part of the budget process in March however no one had suggested money was invested in The Manor at that time.
- The Joint Scrutiny Committee was not the correct forum to debate amendments to the budget, that was Full Council.
- Councillor Smith had always considered the best interests of the children across the city in all decisions and should be given full support.
- Congratulations were expressed to Councillor Smith for placing the children and staff into new provision and all were happy with their new arrangements.
- The Manor itself was not closing. It was underused in respect of overnight provision and the council was making best use of resources available.
- The proposal was a reasonable course of action.
- The petition had not been notified to councillors at the time it was received.
- Current funding would not justify the council supporting a service which is underused.
- Members were reminded that if they wanted to move an amendment to a motion regarding a petition, the request needed to be submitted 24 hours before the council meeting as per the Petition Scheme.

In her summing up, Councillor Smith confirmed that the building was being retained by the council and managed by Cherry Lodge going forward and would remain available for young people to access. As the new Peterborough Pathways outreach service was developed the building would be used more extensively and members would be updated on the outreach proposal as it progressed. As overnight care will no longer be provided, deregulation with Ofsted was necessary as it attracted a different inspection regime however the facility would be re-registered if the need arose in the future. Overnight respite would continue to be provided in a family home environment by specialised foster carers which was a preferable environment as The Manor is a large building which can be daunting when there is only one child in residence. Councillor Smith advised members she had attended every meeting relevant to the closure of The

Manor and the new placings for the children and was confident that all children would have alternative placements by 22 October and she would adhere to her original promise that The Manor would not close until each child had been an alternative provision.

A recorded vote was taken (37 voted in favour, 16 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, King, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Against:** Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Fower, Judy Fox, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Whitby

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the petition 'Stop the close of The Manor, Respite home for children and young people with disabilities' received from Helen Harber and the comments raised, and take no action.

### 36. Questions on Notice

(a) **To the Mayor**

(b) **To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet**

(c) **To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee**

Questions (a) to (c) were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. The definition of Temporary Accommodation.
2. The extension of St Michael's Gate contract or the purchasing St Michael's Gate.
3. The provision of a pedestrian crossing on Hartwell Way.
4. The provision of Social Housing through Medesham Homes.
5. Improvements to Norwood Lane.
6. Street Light Upgrading in Fulbridge Road, Werrington.
7. Anti-social behaviour.
8. OVO Energy price increases.
9. Bus services to Norwood / Paston Reserve.
10. Homelessness.
11. Shoplifting in Gunthorpe area.
12. Plastics contaminating waterways.
13. Live streaming of Full Council meetings.
14. SATS results.
15. Road Improvements.
16. Travel Lodge accommodation.
17. School places in Hampton.

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

(d) **To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives**

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

1. Community Land Trusts.
2. Review of bus services.
3. Bayard Place.
4. Housing.

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

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

#### **(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Peterborough City Council’s Tree and Woodland Strategy**

Cabinet at its meeting on 24 September 2018 considered a report updating the Tree and Woodland Strategy following consideration by the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 10 January 2018 with initial consideration by Cabinet on 15 January 2018 and a four week public consultation from 2 March 2018 to 29 March 2018.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the report laid out the council’s statutory responsibilities and standards and had been developed to take account of how the city has grown and the current legislation. He acknowledged the beauty and necessity of trees in our city and also that some trees were a growing problem and required maintenance.

Councillor Smith seconded the recommendation and reserved her right to speak.

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

- That the tree resource was maintained and enhanced.
- There were too many of the wrong type of trees rather than too many trees in the city.
- This was the third Tree and Woodland Strategy.
- There were plans to plant 1121 tree to commemorate Armistice Day, one for each person from Peterborough who died in the First World War.
- Concerns were expressed how Amey were currently managing the tree policy.
- There was the odd dwelling where people cannot use their house properly due to a lack of sunlight caused by trees and it was hoped that the policy would be flexible to accommodate these circumstances where the need was genuine.
- The maintenance service would be delivered more effectively and efficiently if the service was bought in house.

Councillor Smith exercised her right to speak and advised that she had first bought the tree modelling strategy to Council in 2012 as Cabinet Member for the Environment and acknowledged the help given by Councillor Sandford. This strategy built on the principles agreed then of the right tree in the right place. She emphasised their benefits in beauty, air quality, sound barriers and preventing flash flooding and the creation of wildlife havens that the trees and woodlands provided.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing confirmed the comments made by Councillor Smith and again acknowledged Councillor Sandford’s support.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the Tree and Woodland Strategy.

**(b) Employment Committee Recommendation – Appointment of Director of Law and Governance/Monitoring Officer**

The Employment Committee, at its meeting on 19 September 2018, agreed to a shared Director of Governance and Legal and considered an appointment to this position at its meeting on 11 October 2018.

Fiona McMillan, the Interim Director of Law and Governance was asked to leave the room while this item was discussed.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendation and advised the council it had a legal requirement to have a Director of Law and Governance and a Monitoring Officer and there had been an Interim Director since July 2017. This appointment was a result of the decision to share senior posts across Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. Cambridgeshire had resolved to approve the position at their council meeting on 16 October 2018 subject to approval at the Peterborough council meeting on 17 October 2018.

Councillor Seaton seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members were advised the saving to this council would be approximately £70,000 per annum as a result of this appointment.

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

1. noted the decision by Employment Committee on 19 September 2018 to appoint a shared Monitoring Officer by of secondment arrangements with Cambridgeshire County Council, and
2. formally appointed Fiona McMillan to the shared Monitoring Officer role.

**38. 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. Approval of Future Arrangements for the Existing Enterprise Managed Services Contract.
2. IT Improvement Plan.
3. Permanency Service and Arrangements for Regional Adoption.
4. Budget Control Report May 2018.
5. To Retain the Footbridges on Junction 18.
6. Peterborough City Council's Tree and Woodland Strategy.
7. Outcome of Ofsted Inspection of Peterborough's Children's Services.
8. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Working Arrangements.
9. Budget Control Report August 2018.
10. Outcome of Petitions.

**Questions were asked about the following:**

Approval of Future Arrangements for the Existing Enterprise Managed Services

## Contract.

Councillor Murphy asked if a staff employee representative could be included on the board.

Councillor Cereste advised it would be considered.

Councillor Saltmarsh asked if the £810,000 was in addition to the £500,000 extension already agreed and was the contract to continue indefinitely or would it expire on 1st February 2019.

Councillor Cereste advised it was an additional payment made to extend the contact to 31 January.

Councillor Joseph asked if councillors could have sight of the business case and also copies of the other two options of bringing the service in house and the co-operative model to enable members to make an informed decision.

Councillor Cereste advised the matter was in hand.

Councillor Nawaz asked had other additional services been explored and if not, when would this happen.

Councillor Holdich advised the council need to take over the contract and evaluate it first before extending the service.

Councillor Ellis asked for confirmation that the contract encompassed all the services provided under the old Managed Services from Enterprise contract.

Councillor Cereste confirmed, yes. Councillor Holdich advised that the original contract had been with Enterprise Services who were taken over by Amey, the original contract value was £16.9m and now it is about £9m and more services are being carried out.

## IT Improvement Plan

Councillor Sandford asked how much it cost to switch from Microsoft to Google and how much would it cost to switch back.

Councillor Seaton replied he would check and advise. The IT improvement plan included switching back to Microsoft and the target was to establish shared services in the county with a target of £9m pa which will involve moving to one ICT platform with common systems which was why this decision came forward. Moving to Microsoft would give the council a better rate of return than staying with the current system.

Councillor Murphy commented on the costs and mistakes made in the recent IT changes.

Councillor Seaton responded that the decision to change the IT services was made before being aware of the decision to move to shared services with Cambridgeshire which necessitated a change of direction.

Councillor Fower asked why the council was following Cambridgeshire and moving away from Google rather than Cambridgeshire moving to Google and what impact will this decision have on the use of Salesforce. He also asked if Google Chromebooks would still be used after the change, how many had the authority purchased and at what cost,

Councillor Seaton advised Microsoft was considered the best option. Chrome books would continue to be used.

#### To Retain the Footbridges on Junction 18

Councillor Ferris asked for a clear explanation as to why it remained necessary to install at-grade crossings at this junction:

1. Given the costs involved
2. The safety concerns expressed
3. Given the restriction on providing a suitable shared space for cyclists and pedestrians on the central roundabout.

Councillor Holdich advised the bridge will have to close whilst the work is undertaken and therefore an at-grade crossing was required. The footpaths would not be compliant with disabled legislation as the gradient is 12:1 and to comply the gradient needs to be 20:1 making an alternative necessary. The Combined Authority provided the funds to carry out the survey. The bridge was expected to last 10 years and long term it couldn't be replaced due to the huge amount of room required to comply with the disabled facilities regulations. The money previously allocated to knock the bridge down was included in the money received from the Combined Authority to complete the road around, which added approximately 35% to the traffic flow.

Councillor Murphy asked if the at-grade crossing option could be removed from the plan as it was dangerous and would expose users to pollution.

Councillor Holdich replied there were 66 defects to the bridge. The pre cast part of the bridge is fine but that the element cast on site has concrete cancer, the extent of which was not clearly obvious and therefore the costs not clear however the crossing was not considered to be dangerous. This junction included the only set of traffic lights in Peterborough not connected to the traffic system and the wiring at this junction also required replacing.

Councillor Sandford asked why councillors were advised the bridge could not be repaired but that decision had been revised and whilst the council continued to change direction the council would remain in financial crisis.

Councillor Holdich replied if the condition of council finances were known five years ago, different decisions may have been made and the financial position was constantly changing. The bridge repairs would only last 10 years when further work would be required however this was the decision reached by the public and therefore the course of action adopted which would cost £100,000 pa plus ongoing maintenance.

#### Budget Control Report May 2018

Councillor Amjad Iqbal asked if the underlying reasons for the SERCO overspend was understood and how this would be mitigated in current and future year budgets.

Councillor Seaton advised that details of the overspend are contained within the budget reports. He reported that the number of children and adults in care was unpredictable and this had partially driven the overspend. Referring to PSSP, Councillor Seaton advised this showed the combination of investment needed to move to shared services as covered in the ICT report. He agreed there were savings not delivered and not delivered on time which included the ongoing negotiation to reduce Business Support. Mitigating actions would be reported in due course.

#### Outcome of Ofsted Inspection of Peterborough's Children's Services

Councillor Saltmarsh asked why the wording in point 3 stated “agreement in principle” when it should state “agree wholeheartedly”.

Councillor Smith advised she was unable to comment on the wording but added that TACT had received a visit from the Chief Social Worker who was impressed and the video report was available on Facebook.

#### Jack Hunt School expansion - Award of contract for the expansion works

Councillor Murphy asked can the council look at better ways to get work done and did the council regret that Carillion had costs the council £100,000s.

Councillor Ayres confirmed that the council regretted that Carillion had gone into liquidation and caused the delays in the Jack Hunt School expansion and advised that the situation had been monitored for six months prior to their demise during which time the government were still recommending their use. Five schools were affected and R G Carters had now been appointed to continue the work.

Councillor Holdich advised that Carillion locally had provided good value for money and good service and the reason for their bankruptcy was due to poor contracts in Asia and Canada.

#### Amendment to Loan Facility (Empower Community Management LLP)

Councillor Hogg asked if it was known that the contract would roll over and why was it reviewed every two months rather than over a longer period.

Councillor Seaton advised that money was lent to Empower Community Management LLP to deliver an income stream through the margin to set up solar panel farms and panels on buildings. The scheme was being reviewed but it was taking longer than anticipated which had meant the facility had been rolled over. The council was fully remunerated as per the terms of the original contract.

#### Disposal of freehold in Centre of the City

Councillor Jamil asked if the sale was completed at market price and will the results of the sale be spent within Central Ward.

Councillor Holdich replied that the tender process had been implemented and the highest bid was accepted however the results of the sale will go to a central fund rather than just one ward.

#### **Additional Outside Organisation - Live Peterborough Limited**

Councillor Hogg asked if the name of the new company could be confirmed.

Councillor Cereste advised the name was Peterborough Ltd.

#### Approval of funding for the provision of accommodation to reduce homelessness

Councillor Murphy asked if the decision was signed on the 9 October or 8 October as the plan had been to draw down these funds in September. He enquired how much Cross Keys were investing in the plan, where the land was coming from and whether it represented value for money. He asked if the project planning and management could be improved to avoid missing deadlines on critical issues. He asked why the decision had not been brought forward earlier.

Councillor Seaton advised there was an explanation.

Councillor Barkham asked how many social housing properties had been lost due to the right to buy receipts to get this money and is £4.9m good value for 30 properties.

Councillor Holdich advised most of the capital receipts had come from the transfer which took place in 2004. The houses were in poor condition at the time and funds were provided to Cross Keys to return them to a good standard. 50% of the right to buy sale revenue was retained and £16m was from these funds. The remainder from was from Section 106 agreements. He was unable to say how many houses were lost due to the time elapsed.

Councillor Hogg asked if the build price of £163,000 for each property represented good value for money.

Councillor Holdich answered that he could not say as he did not know the housing models. He explained that costs varied across the city due to such elements like the number of bedrooms and different land had different infrastructure costs such as the ground type and cited one area of the city required the use of rafts and piles as an example. Any valuations of the properties were conducted by professional valuers.

Councillor Seaton advised he would write and confirm the actual numbers.

Councillor Martin questioned the value for money and asked if Cross Keys were matching the investment made by the council.

Councillor Seaton advised that a four bedroomed home in Peterborough could not be purchased for £163,000 but nearer £250,000.

Councillor Sandford asked, why the council did not purchase property rather than constructing them, given the current property prices.

Councillor Holdich advised that developers did not want sell to the council. 29 houses had been bought in Midland Road and negotiations were ongoing at other sites.

Councillor Nawaz asked why Medesham Homes were being given £4.9m when it was known they were unable to submit a credible planning application for Bretton Court.

Councillor Hiller declared an interest as he sits on the board. He denied the accusation that Medesham Homes is incompetent and pointed out that the officers recommended the planning approval but the cross party Planning Committee decided not to approve to provide temporary accommodation on a technicality concerning parking spaces. He pointed out that if the additional storey had not been included the process would have been covered under permitted development and the building could be used as office space with no parking facility required.

### **39. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions made since the last meeting**

A report was received by council that detailed Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting including decisions taken at:

- The Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee met on 20 July 2018 and 28 September 2018
- The Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on 23 July 2018
- The Combined Authority Board met on 25 July 2018 and 26 September 2018
- The Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee met on 24 September 2018

There were no questions asked relevant to the decisions.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **40. Notices of Motion**

#### **(1) Motion from Councillor Ferris**

Councillor Ferris withdrew his motion and explained to the members why he had done so. He explained the report had been written by the people of Peterborough and he had their approval to withdraw stating that the amendment was an attempt to close down the full consideration on the fossil fuel industry.

Members were advised the amendment had been sent to Cllr Ferris the previous week for approval and that the council had no direct or indirect investment in fossil fuels.

Discussion took place between members regarding procedures and the Director of Law and Governance advised no debate or comment would be allowed as the motion had been withdrawn.

#### **(2) Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

Councillor Shaz Nawaz moved the motion regarding national government welfare reform policies and in so doing advised members that, according to an NHS England, Peterborough is the 20% most deprived unitary authorities in England with 23% of children living in low income families. Life expectancy in some parts of the city was 8.5 years lower than the national average and there was a need to improve the outcomes for all. He advised that Universal Credit had not helped and as a result 1972 children in Peterborough would lose free school meals and families were struggling to make ends meet.

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

Councillor Seaton moved an amendment to the motion and advised members he hoped to clarify the points the motion was seeking to make whilst retaining the sentiment. He confirmed the introduction of the Stand up for Peterborough Campaign which had cross party and MP support. The government had responded with additional school funding although further funding was needed.

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

Members debated the Amendment and in summary the points raised included that:

- Universal Credit had been introduced to solve serious problems and unfortunately had issues which needed to be addressed. The principle that it should pay to work was correct rather than people being locked into benefit dependency.
- There was a child poverty strategy.
- There was a funding bid to government under the Integrated Community Strategy.
- The Peterborough Community Assistance Scheme supported the most vulnerable including those in financial crisis through food banks, care zone schemes and assistance with advice on welfare benefits.
- Councillors were involved in other schemes in the city.
- The Amendment took the heart from the motion.

- The council needed to look at the way Amendments to Motions were discussed and dealt with and proposed that the Constitution and Ethics Committee should review the procedure.
- The Amendment removed reference to the Universal Credit, Bedroom Tax and added praise for the Welfare Reform Policy.
- Life expectancy had increased in the city over the last few years child poverty had reduced from 25% in certain areas.

Councillor Fitzgerald exercised his right to speak and advised that he regretted an agreement had not been reached on the wording on the Amendment. He advised that a policy was already in place through the Housing Benefit Cap that the council would only pay for the bedrooms the claimant was entitled to and this was in line with the bedroom tax policy. When the housing association cannot relocate residents into smaller accommodation with less bedrooms, the bedroom tax should not be applied however where residents refused to downsize the subsidy should be applied. The implementation of Universal Credit had not been great.

Councillor Nawaz waived his right to reply.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Seaton (29 voted in favour, 19 voted against, 2 abstained from voting, 1 did not vote):

**Councillor For:** Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Against:** Barkham, Bond, Ferris, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, John Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Ellis

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

Debate continued on the Amended Motion and points raised included:

- The amended motion still dealt with the issue of fairer funding and there were difficulties in people being transferred to alternative accommodation with less bedrooms.
- The city needed fair funding from the government.

Councillor Fitzgerald summed up as seconder for the Amendment and praised the delivery of the original motion.

Councillor Nawaz summed up as mover of the original motion and advised members he failed to see how Universal Credit supported the weakest and most vulnerable in society. He advised that he had sent the motion to the Leader for discussion however the response was an amended motion. He questioned whether the issues children are suffering are being dealt with however he acknowledged there have been improvements with life expectancy.

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

“This council notes:

- That issues with the approach and roll-out of welfare reform policies have had a negative impact on certain residents ~~The far-reaching negative impact of national government welfare reform policies and austerity measures on residents of Peterborough.~~
- That increased demand and reduced Government funding is making the sustainability of Council finances challenging.

The council believes:

- That action is vital needs to be taken to support the weakest and most vulnerable in society who have been impacted the most by the austerity measures.
- Welfare reform is a key part of delivering a just and fair society but must be undertaken in an empathetic and clear way to ensure the weakest and most vulnerable are fully support.
- The Council already plays a vital role in supporting such people
- The government should do more through its Fair Funding Review to support its work and the people of Peterborough.

This council resolves to:

- Call upon all city council group leaders to be signatories to a letter to the government raising concerns over the impact of welfare reform and reduced Revenue Support Grant the effects of government austerity on the residents of Peterborough.
- In particular to raise concerns about the increasing levels of homelessness, increased dependency on food banks, the detrimental impact on child poverty and those the suffering inflicted on people living with a disability as a result of the introduction of measures such as Universal Credit, Bedroom tax and Personal Independence Payments.
- Most importantly urge the government to consider the issues outlined above in its Fair Funding Review.”

### (3) **Motion from Councillor Martin**

Councillor Martin moved an altered motion and as all members were in agreement there was no debate.

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

“This council notes:

- There is a housing crisis in our city
- Travelodge and other accommodation is costing the Council millions
- Families in temporary accommodation are suffering in many ways

This council believes:

- More needs to be done to address the housing crisis in the city

- Families need to be kept within Peterborough with longer-term accommodation so that they can live normal lives
- The financial costs are unsustainable and a better solution must be sought

The council resolves that:

- It will commit to delivering at least 100 homes per year via its joint venture company Medesham Homes
- As part of this commitment it will consider the option of using modular homes due to the speed of delivery. We would also welcome other house building initiatives such as co-operatives, community land trusts and schemes funded by the Combined Authority and Homes England.

#### **(4) Motion from Councillor Sandford**

Councillor Sandford moved the motion on Transport Planning and in so doing advised transport contributed to almost 20% of the UK carbon emissions and was therefore one of key areas that needed addressing in order to stand up to Climate Change. He suggested that emphasis should concentrate on cycling, walking and public transport rather than private cars but the evidence suggested this was not the case. Public transport subsidies had been cut and may be cut again. Park and ride costs little to run as some years it was sponsored by Queensgate and company car parks had been used at weekend. The number of users of the Park and Ride Service varied from 17,000 to 13,000 depending on the number of Saturdays the scheme operated and whether a fare was charged. Previous Local Transport Plans had included a permanent Park and Ride however this had since been removed. There number of cars entering the city was on the increase and air pollution posed a greater issue. He emphasised the motion is to conduct a feasibility study for a Park and Ride Scheme.

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

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

- The last year the Park and Ride operated it was not successful.
- Queensgate offered free parking which had a negative impact on the Park and Ride Service.
- The cost to provide buses. was approximately £40,000
- The service was not well used.
- The council should be promoting car sharing and public transport.

Councillor Bond exercised his right to speak and advised that traffic and air pollution would increase in the city centre as the city developed and the council needed to investigate other ways to allow access for work and shopping. A Park and Ride Scheme could help however it was too late to introduce the scheme for the current year.

Councillor Sandford summed up as mover of the motion and provided the following statistics:

- In 2005 number of operating days 20 number of cars 5095, number of users 13,960
- In 2007 number of operating days 219 number of cars 6057, number of users 17321

He suggested the council should examine an all year round scheme.

A recorded vote was taken (21 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Ferris, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Against:** Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

**(5) Motion from Councillor Fower**

Councillor Fower moved the motion to reduce Members Allowances the costs of having a Chief Executive.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members advised that the Independent Remuneration Panel cannot be advised of the preferred outcome.
- All councillors received an allowance.
- That councillors had voted unanimously earlier in 2018 to have no say in allowances and that the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel should be mandatory.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz exercised his right to speak and advised he had seconded the motion to enable a debate to take place.

Councillor Fower summed up as mover of the motion and advised members the meeting was being streamed on Facebook. He advised that situations could change and he had taken advice from the Monitoring Officer. He felt the public would see the motion as a gesture of support.

A recorded vote was taken (4 voted in favour, 39 voted against, 8 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Fower, Hemraj, Martin, Murphy

**Councillors Against:** Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Jamil, King, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jones, Joseph, Shaz Nawaz

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

The Mayor asked if anyone wanted to propose a motion to suspend Standing Order 14.2 to extend the meeting to which the response was negative.

**(6) Motion from Councillor Fower**

Councillor Fower introduced the motion with references to accommodating homeless people out of the area in Travelodge hotels and called for the replacement of the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning Services, Growth and Economic Development.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Murphy and who reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Hogg moved an amendment to the original motion and agreed the problem of moving people out of area is abhorrent. He suggested a Task & Finish Group across all parties to assist the council in solving the problem.

Councillor Sandford seconded the amendment and reserved his right to speak.

The amendment was debated and the following points were raised:

- Councillor Fitzgerald advised that he would not be supporting either the motion or the amendment. He stated that the council have a duty to house people who present themselves as legally homeless and when homes were not available in Peterborough the search area was extended and no Task & Finish group can change the law. He stated there was currently no alternative.
- A Task & Finish Group would not be appropriate. There were problems within the housing department which needed to be investigated and reference was made to the motion agreed earlier in the evening to look at other options to solving the homeless issue in Peterborough.
- Bayard Place was also assigned for temporary accommodation however Councillor Seaton advised this was not the case.
- Medesham Homes did not make a profit and Councillor Hiller does not get paid for being on the Planning Committee for which Councillor Murphy apologised.
- Bretton Court was assigned for temporary accommodation which would be sold off in the event it was no longer required for that use.
- Members acknowledged the distress caused when people are housed out of the area.
- Bretton Court was a dire planning application, with little housing.
- There was a conflict of interests with the board of Medesham Homes and a cabinet member.

Councillor Holdich advised no homeless people would be housed outside the city by the end of the year and all homeless figures would be published on the internet by the end of November. He stressed that it was not the Council's or Councillor Hiller's fault that there had been an unprecedented increase in homelessness which was due to government policy and he fully supported Councillor Hiller as one of his best Cabinet Members. Temporary accommodation had more than doubled under his direction, Medesham Homes had 275 planned homes across the city, he was progressing with securing 50 homes from private landlords and purchasing private homes on the open market. He reiterated that families were being housed outside the area as there were no other alternatives and to fail to provide accommodation somewhere would be failing in the council's duty under current legislation. At a recently attended LGA meeting all councils were homing people out of area or providing homes for people out of their area.

In accordance with Standing Order 14 there was no further debate and a vote taken on the remaining agenda items without discussion.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Hogg (7 voted in favour, 42 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Against:** Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Ellis, Elsey, Farooq, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fower, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, King, Lane, Martin, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Murphy

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A recorded vote was taken on the original motion (9 voted in favour, 40 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Ellis, Ferris, Fower, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Martin, Murphy

**Councillors Against:** Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Jones, Joseph, King, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Shaz Nawaz

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

#### **(7) Motion from Councillor Farooq**

This motion concerning first time buyers was withdrawn.

### **41. Reports to Council**

#### **(a) Report of the Returning Officer**

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council received and noted the results of the local Orton Longueville by-election held on Thursday 2 August 2018.

#### **(b) Political Balance Calculation**

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council received and noted the updated allocation of seats on those council committees subject to political balance arrangements.

The Mayor

7.00pm – 11.38pm  
17 October 2018

Town Hall  
Bridge Street  
Peterborough

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>Questions from members of the public</u></b>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Question from Mr Francis Kisero</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>As I currently speak, my profession is a statistician and my dedication is to teach. At the moment I am unemployed and homeless because the Home Office delayed between 4 April and 4 August to respond to my visa renewal and I was dismissed from work by the Regional College where I was teaching and the University of Peterborough where I lecture statistics. I went on the road and lost my house, and I am at St Michael's Gate in Peterborough as I am homeless.</p> <p>With the Home Office now answering me back with on 4 August I have my right to work and I would like to return quickly into work.</p> <p>What support can the council offer me to develop a sustainable and affordable employment service to benefit secondary school pupils in Peterborough who use private practices? I can give Math, Physics and Chemistry tuition at GCSE level and Math at all levels. I am currently teaching in homes to ensure I do not lose out on the capabilities I have.</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p><b>The City Council's role in education is to work strategically with secondary schools to ensure effective transitions into employment, education or training. The council does not provide funding for private tuition or quality assure the offer made so we are unable to support directly. Access to this type of offer is for the consideration of parents and guardians of young people. The City Council website holds contact information for secondary schools if Mr Kisero wishes to follow this up with them directly.</b></p> <p><b>However in order to assist further I can point out that Opportunity Peterborough, a private not-for-profit business, wholly owned by Peterborough City Council, leads the city's economic development. As an economic development company, Opportunity Peterborough's core responsibilities include engaging with local companies to support growth and development by offering a range of impartial and independent support and guidance. Services include helping local businesses to access grants and funding, providing economic intelligence and supporting the development of the local workforce.</b></p> <p>Mr Francis Kisero asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>I would like those responses in writing. In order to start up, I am not looking for</p>

	<p>funding, I am looking for a single location where I can multiply the numbers and tell the students to come to me. My proposal in the detailed question was, locations such as The Barns and The Youth Centre in Werrington which the council has direct affiliation to in developing the youth. If I could use them I could look for the clientele to direct them there.</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p><b>The Education Department cannot assist in this matter however Opportunity Peterborough should be able to assist and I will get there telephone number to you.</b></p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Alan Bridger</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>In peak times Geneva Street, where I am a resident, gets severely congested, causing problems for regular motorists and emergency vehicles often not being able to pass through the street with sirens and lights going. I hope you will agree that this is not acceptable. Minor collisions are a regular occurrence with cars often parked on double yellow lines on a one way street and a cycleway. Only recently a pedestrian was knocked down by a car on the path.</p> <p>The street has double yellow lines and a two way cycle way running parallel to it. This means that no parking is available, or loading or unloading, at any time. Problems, however, do occur in the daytime but more often in the evening. Enforcement officers are not frequently seen in the street, nor do they work at night, except in the last two weeks when they worked until 10pm at weekends.</p> <p>I have previously written to parking services and also the police about the situation, but no improvement has been seen.</p> <p>The parked cars are causing obstructions for cyclists and for pedestrians. In particular, the entrance to the car park of Endurance House has been blocked, causing long queues of traffic for visitors to the residents inside.</p> <p>The matter is getting worse with the increase in the number of business in the areas, and increased traffic.</p> <p>Can I ask that the Council take action to address this problem before someone is seriously injured or killed? I believe that increased enforcement in the area may go a long way into dealing with offenders. Other solutions, however, could be investigated and I would be happy to discuss these with Council officers should they like to meet.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p><b>Inconsiderate parking is a problem throughout the city. The Council's Prevention and Enforcement Service is responsible for enforcing a variety of parking restrictions across the Peterborough area, and, in consultation with them, they have agreed to implement a patrol plan to cover Friday and Saturday evenings in the coming weeks, alongside their scheduled daytime patrol visits.</b></p> <p><b>Additionally, officers from both the PES and our Highways Service will</b></p>

	<p><b>undertake a site visit to review Geneva Street, including reviewing the collision data. With your agreement, they will ensure you're notified of the visit so that you may accompany them.</b></p> <p>Alan Bridger asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>The answer is not additional traffic wardens as the problem continues beyond the working hours of the officers until the early hours of the morning and more needs to be done than increasing patrols.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p><b>Different options will be explored and I am sure we can find a way forward.</b></p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Matthew Talbut</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>What is the Council's policy towards Airbnb?</p> <p>Matthew Talbut was not present and did not ask his question.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p><b>The Council has no policy regarding Airbnb properties. In planning terms, a dwelling used for such short term lets providing accommodation for up to 6 persons or less remains within the legal definition of a dwelling and so planning permission is not required. The decision as to whether a property is in domestic or non-domestic use for taxation purposes is solely a matter for the Valuation Office Agency to consider and the Council has no control over this decision.</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Heather Skibsted</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>The Post Office at Herlington, Orton Malborne, was closed on 10 July advertised as a temporary closure. However it remains closed and after speaking to a number of residents</p> <p>This has caused considerable inconvenience to many people, many of whom are elderly. It is now understood that the next nearest Post Office at the Orton centre is due to close in the near future. Many residents are not able to travel the distance to Orton Longueville Post Office or get to the city centre.</p> <p>A petition to oppose the closure reached nearly 200 signatures was presented to the council showing the concern and dismay at the loss of this vital service. I was informed that the closure was due to a large increase in the rent for the premise which is owned by Cross keys and with whom the council have a close working partnership.</p> <p>The council often provides financial incentives to attract business to Peterborough and with that in mind I would like to ask what the council are able to do to assist with the reinstatement of such a vital service for the residents of Orton Malborne?</p>

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

**We have been fully aware of the seriousness of this matter for a considerable length of time and have huge sympathy for local residents following the loss of this vital service due to the unexpected resignation of the Postmaster. Members will appreciate that neither the Council nor Post Office Ltd were able to prevent the resignation of the Postmaster and the subsequent withdrawal of the premises.**

**Orton Longueville Councillors have been engaging with all parties concerned for several months and NWCCA's MP Shailesh Vara, prompted by Councillor Eley, has also been in touch with the Post Office emphasising the hardship the lack of this amenity would cause.**

**Mr Vara has been informed that a Post Office will be opening in the Orton's area but the exact location and timings cannot yet be made public for commercial reasons. Meanwhile our officers are facilitating a meeting with the Post Office and we hope to learn more at that time.**

Heather Skibsted asked a supplementary question:

When will this meeting with the Post Office take place?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

**That meeting is scheduled for 22 October 2018.**

5. **Question from Jelana Stevic**

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

What actions are Peterborough City Council taking to address the homeless numbers and shortage of housing for them for the foreseeable future?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**The Council continues to take positive and direct action to address the shortage of accommodation available for those who are approaching us for homelessness assistance. This year the Council is on target to secure around 70 properties on lease from the private sector, purchasing around 50 properties from the open market, and securing a number of properties from our Housing Association partners for use as temporary accommodation. The work is ongoing and involves a number of agencies and officer and directorates within Peterborough City Council (PCC). We have achieved a 10% decrease in households in temporary accommodation since August and in addition**

**the Council is investing £35million in Medesham Homes, our joint venture development company, which will start delivering permanent homes for households who are homeless and in temporary accommodation in next month or so.**

Jelana Stevic asked a supplementary question:

	<p>What is concerning, is that it will take PCC and their partners three years to build the necessary houses needed in just one year now. 290 in the pipeline whereas the forecast figure predict the homeless figures will increase in the future and these are figures from Shelter.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>One homeless family is one too many and you'll be aware I'm sure of the council's keenness to address the apparent issues around St Michael's Gate. To put some perspective on the national issue – the number of Peterborough households in temporary accommodation is currently 350, a downward trend. Nearby Labour controlled Luton has 3,500, twice the amount of homeless households than any other town in the East of England. Ten times the amount we have in Peterborough.</b></p>
6	<p><b>Question from Beki Sellick</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>My question is about animal welfare and our food after any Brexit. Multi-national corporations are lobbying for health, environmental and labelling standards to be lowered. Then cheap imports from outside the EU could put British food producers out of business, and would impact on jobs in Peterborough and the health of Peterborians. As an Environment Capital, what lobbying is Peterborough City Council doing and how will you engage Peterborians to support such endeavours?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>I don't imagine there is anyone in this chamber who are able to give a definitive answer about what a post Brexit deal and conditions will look like. I cannot speak with any degree of confidence as it seemingly changes every day. The LGA, (<i>the councils Union</i>) are working on behalf of all councils on what the effects of Brexit may be and I am sure they will publish their findings at the appropriate time.</b></p> <p>Beki Sellick asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>I have the same question again. I am not asking about the Brexit deal, I am asking about the lobbying being done. There is a lot of lobbying being done by the transnationals to that have the impact of lowering standards and losing jobs in our community, and will have the impact of reducing our health. I am asking in the face of that lobbying, what is Peterborough doing to protect those jobs and protect our health.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>Until we know what we are lobbying about I cannot image what we would lobby.</b></p> <p><b>As the chosen Liberal Democrat Parliamentary Candidate for Peterborough constituency and presumably some ne who does not agree that the majority of Peterborough residents were right when they voted to leave the EU I don't imagine many here tonight are surprised at you dire warnings about the health</b></p>

	<p><b>of our city's residents post Brexit. I have heard nothing of the dismissal of the Food Standards Agency, the highly regarded independent body which protects the nation's health in this area, so I do not personal accept your rhetoric in this area.</b></p>
--	--

**COUNCIL BUSINESS**

**8. Questions on notice to:**

- a) The Mayor
- b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
- c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

**1. Question from Councillor Ferris**

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

What is the working definition and duration of Temporary Accommodation as used by this Authority?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**Peterborough's definition of temporary accommodation is the same as everywhere else across the country, that being accommodation that has been provided to a household who has presented to the Council as homeless, has no suitable accommodation available for their occupation and is considered to be in priority need for homelessness assistance. The wait for suitable accommodation could be many months dependant on many different facts.**

A supplementary question was asked:

Many of the people living in temporary accommodation have quite a clear idea what the word temporary means. What is the Cabinet's view on the fact that many people are in temporary accommodation over six months with serious impact on their health and well-being.

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**The situation is dire across the country. Temporary accommodation is made available whilst the council make investigations into the housing application and if this duty is accepted, until this duty is discharged by making an offer of suitable permanent housing. The amount of time a household spends in temporary accommodation will vary dependant upon the household need and availability of the type accommodation required. It is not uncommon for households to be in temporary accommodation for many months. In 2003 the Labour government passed The Homelessness Suitability of Accommodation England Order 2003. This bought in the rule that councils should not leave families with children in none self-contained accommodation for longer than 6 weeks. Nearby Watford run by Labour and LibDem councillors, state officially on their website that for single people or couples the wait can be twelve or more and the average wait for families can be over three years.**

**2. Question from Councillor Hemraj**

	<p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>With the number of people requiring temporary accommodation, is the St Michael's Gate contract likely to be extended? As the council is now having to pay more for temporary accommodation, would it not be better to look at purchasing St Michael's Gate from Stef and Phillips?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>The Council's Lease with Stef &amp; Philips is for two years with an option for a third. Given the continued demand for accommodation from households who are homeless, we will be entering into to a third. Should the opportunity arise to purchase the properties we currently lease at St Michael's Gate, the Council will look seriously at the viability of such an arrangement as part of our normal due diligence approach.</b></p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>What plans are there for a new pedestrian crossing or crossings on Hartwell Way to create safer access from Ravensthorpe and Westwood into the Bretton underpasses and when will a crossing be provided?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>We recognise the importance of pedestrian crossings across the city in order to ensure that people can cross the road safely, I do not recall a request from you to evaluate this particular location. Could you let me know when you did that?</b></p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>At the time you were spending £250,000m on Greasley Way and myself and Councillor Smith asked for crossings in Hartwell Way, could this be reviewed and reported back to us as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>If there is written evidence of that request then I apologise however we continually review the cities infrastructure and as a result of this we have recently installed, at the request of ward councillors, new crossings on Gresley Way near Ravensthorpe Primary School and on West Lake Avenue near Hampton Vale Primary School.</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Following a recent application by Medesham Homes to convert commercial property in Bretton to flats, where there was no provision of units designated as social</p>

housing, why is this Council led venture looking to minimum legal provision and not looking to set an example by only building units which are designated as social housing?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**All the units in Bretton Court were destined initially temporary accommodation units and affordable housing thereafter, as noted in the planning application, when the need for temporary accommodation is reduced.**

A supplementary question was asked:

At the planning committee stage we were advised that the units planned at Bretton Court were initially available for temporary housing but according to the rules, there was no provision for social housing as it wasn't necessary. The reason for the question is that Medesham Homes was sold to the council as a joint venture between the council and Cross Keys to shore up the woeful lack of social housing available to the city and we should be pushing forward to increase.

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**The question was why the Medesham application did not include units that were social housing, they were all. You sat as a Liberal Democrat substitute member on the planning committee and you decided that on a parking technicality to propose a vote against providing over 400 desperately needed temporary homes contrary to the planning officer's recommendation to approve the recommendation to approve the recommendation. The existing building could be reoccupied at any time as offices with no allocation of parking provision. This poor decision prevented the provision of temporary accommodation for the most vulnerable members of our society and was supported by Cllrs Nawaz and Iqbal.**

5. **Question from Councillor Davidson**

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

Please can the relevant Cabinet Member confirm when the 100K for Norwood Lane improvement is to start? Faulty Electrical systems would benefit by having an Electrical system upgrade.

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**Councillor Davidson has not been here for a while but s hopefully watching the live stream. The £100,000 capital funding has been provided for improvements to the Lane leading to the gypsy and traveller site. Various site meetings have taken place with residents, officers and other agencies to discuss solutions to reduce the amount of fly tipping on the Lane in order to allow residents and visitors safe passage to and from the site and their caravans.**

**This has been a continual problem here with the residents blaming outside fly tippers and others blaming residents. The issue crosses over to my portfolio and the Communities and Waste briefs in this respect. Following these**

	<p><b>discussions and with the support of most residents concrete blocks have been installed along the Lane reducing the width of the carriageway to a single lane with a passing place.</b></p> <p><b>Repairs to the road surface are also scheduled to take place shortly. Since this we have received no reports of access to the site being blocked which means a significant reduction in fly tipping and the number of calls to the fire service has significantly reduced.</b></p> <p>As Councillor Davidson was not present there was no supplementary question.</p>
6.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Please can the relevant Cabinet Member confirm when the Column Replacement and Lantern Upgrade for Fulbridge Road Werrington are going to be scheduled?</p> <p>I was advised in January 2018 by Peterborough Street lighting Growth and Regeneration that the works would be completed in August 2018 and that is not the case.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>The LED upgrade programme started in October 2016 for a three year period and is now nearing completion with the final stages due to be completed in April next year, ahead of the initial August deadline. The year of completion has always been 2019 and not 2018. LED lighting is designed to direct light downwards onto the roads reducing light pollution into properties and also producing less carbon than conventional street lighting. The upgrade project started in October 2016 and is happening in two phases, all street lights with steel columns will have lanterns replaced with an LED version, alongside any lights with concrete or cast iron columns will be removed and replaced in full. PHS technicians will fitting digital control units known as Central Management Systems within every lamp post to enable engineers to monitor each light and detect and fix faults quickly.</b></p> <p>As Councillor Davidson was not present there was no supplementary question.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Coles</b></p> <p>Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>The state of private land on the riverside in Fletton and Woodston ward between the Asda footbridge up to Wharf Road and on derelict land south of Oundle Road is very poor; private landowners are not adequately maintaining their properties, cleaning graffiti or picking up litter.</p> <p>The result of this lack of action is to have made the area a focus for drug dealing and misuse and local residents are increasingly reporting concerns about drug abuse, rough sleeping and drunkenness in this area.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please give an update on actions that are being taken to ensure private landowners deal with nuisances on their land and what additional</p>

actions are being taken to deal with anti-social behaviour in the area?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

**Following earlier calls for action, the Councillor, Leader and senior officers took part in a walkabout of this area to understand the extent of the issues. This led to the formation of a multi-agency working group tasked with addressing drug use and specifically dealing with an abandoned needle issue in this area. This included a particular focus on privately-owned land. Subsequent targeted activity has now begun, including:**

- **Scheduled litter picks of this area**
- **Working with drugs agencies and pharmacies to track needles issued, and encourage a return scheme for used needles**
- **The allocation of monies to allow for the collection of discarded needles from private land, supported by the Prevention and Enforcement Service, who are following up enforcement activity with private landowners where appropriate**
- **Placement of needle bins in hot-spot areas**
- **Increased police and council officer patrols**

**It is acknowledged that whilst this activity is focused on drug use, the concerns of wider anti-social behaviour also need to be addressed. A new Public Space Protection Order to cover this area has therefore been approved. This gives council officers increased powers to deal with persons committing issues such as street drinking and littering, and will be accompanied by consultation and discussion with owners of private land to obtain agreement that enforcement can take place on their land.**

Councillor Coles asked a supplementary question:

Do you have the date for the consultation to go live onto the council website and is it possible to have a briefing from officers on how the boundary to this PSPO area was decided as there have been questions from residents about how it was drawn up?

**Councillor Walsh responded that she would supply the relevant information.**

**8. Question from Councillor Ferris**

Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

PCC signed up to an energy agreement with OVO Energy which was touted as being the best deal available to local residents, so can the leader now explain why these residents are faced with a 35% price hike, which has led to a significant reduction in the number of accounts, from around 9,000 to 5,000?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

**With regard to the comment that this was touted as being the best deal for local residents – this has never sad this since the first press release in 2015 to the latest. It was hoped at launch date to be the cheapest for pre-payment**

meters but was made clear that tariffs vary over time.

The tariff, 'Peterborough Energy' was created to encourage those households who had never switched, or rarely switched from their existing supplier to do so. Those households typically in this bracket are on variable tariffs, are of 60 years plus in age and are the most at risk of falling into fuel poverty. It was felt this particular age generation would have more confidence in doing so if the tariff was 'white labelled' by the Council. It was publicised as an alternative competitive deal but was for residents to decide. It was part of a range of measures the council was undertaking to end fuel poverty using informal action and powers under the Housing Act, providing Repairs Assistance Grant Funding delivered by the Care and Repair Home Improvement Agency, Access to Energy Efficiency Improvements via the Green deal Community Fund and free solar PV generation on roofs.

Since 2015, the energy market has seen a significant hike in prices across the industry. All suppliers of gas and electricity have put their prices up. Initiatives such as ours and the work of OFGEN has secured a more competitive market with less people left on high tariffs and we are looking at other opportunities.

Councillor Ferris asked a supplementary question:

Given that vulnerable residents feel let down, what can the Cabinet say to those residents looking for a new energy provider who can offer a 100% green or renewable tariff with a contract ensuring a price freeze for at least three years? Will he know look at offering this, yes or no?

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

We are looking at other options are available. It is positive that people are moving away as it illustrates people are looking at different tariffs and switching what was what we wanted to encourage. Councillor Seaton confirmed yes, he would be happy to look at that.

9. **Question from Councillor Fower**

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

According to a recent FOI request (CRN1809545256) £545,000 has been allocated for a bus service in relation to the Norwood/Paston Reserve development. Could the relevant Cabinet member please let me know when this money was received, how much has been spent to date and on what?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

The question also alludes to £545,000 of s106 contributions in respect to 3 planning applications.

£83,626 has been received with regard to 2 outline planning applications and no further contributions are due. This contribution is to be spent only towards the provision of a bus service between the site and the City Centre or such other improvement or subsidisation of public transport links to the area.

**A further £154,079 has been received with regard to a third planning application. Another £154,079 will be due at the occupation of the 300<sup>th</sup> dwelling and another £154,079 at the occupation of the 450<sup>th</sup> dwelling. Again these contributions are to be used for the provision of a bus service between the area and the City Centre or such other improvement or subsidisation of Public Transport links to the area approved by the applicants. To date the amount received to date is £237,705 and this is being held within the s106 fund as is normal.**

Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:

This is not a new issue, how much longer the residents of the area of Manor Drive are going to have to continue to put up with this Administration taking the mick out of them when it comes to the basic provision of a bus service which is very much needed by a number of vulnerable people in that area?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**I do not agree with the premise of the supplementary question, this Administration does not take the mick out of anybody and I am not prepared to answer that question.**

10. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

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

The cost of homelessness is currently over £200,000 per month and new social homes for rent will mitigate these costs. How much expenditure so far has been defrayed in providing new homes and/or acquiring homes for homeless families and how many new homes for rent have been built?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

**The council disposed of its housing stock by transferring them to Cross Keys Homes in 2004 to free up rental properties in order to build new affordable housing leaving the Council's primary role in housing that of planning authority and ensuring an adequate 5 year land supply. Most councillors will be aware the five year land supply is critical to this local authority and at this stage we have ample supply with buffers if required.**

**However in light of the number of seeking accommodation the Council is in a joint venture with Cross Keys and also with Medesham Homes, which has a pipeline of 277 homes with 29 built to date (Midland Road).**

**The Council is also leasing homes through the private rented sector. 46 have been acquired to date.**

**In addition there are plans to purchase a minimum of 50 Homes through a £10m investment from Invest to Save. The first offers have been accepted and the 50 homes will come on stream over the course of the next 6 months.**

**In addition the Council has acquired 7 properties in Cromwell Road as part of the North Westgate regeneration programme. These will be used as Temporary**

	<p><b>Accommodation for homeless households pending regeneration of that area. There is an outline application for phase one of the North Westgate Improvement Works currently with our planning department. The number in temporary accommodation has already reduced from 385 in August to 350 at present and there has been a corresponding reduction in households in bed and breakfast accommodation.</b></p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked how much so far had been defrayed?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded he would get this figure.</b></p>
11.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Shopkeepers in and around the Gunthorpe Ward are fed up with the levels of shoplifting occurring in their stores.</p> <p>One of them told me "I do not bother calling the police now. They just give you a crime number and that's the end of it. I never hear back."</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member let me know whether the same level of tenacious tactics used by the Council's Prevention and Enforcement Service regarding cycling along Bridge Street, could be emulated to support these local businesses? Either way, will the Cabinet Member agree to visit the local stores with me, in order to offer them some advice as to what help can be offered to them from Peterborough City Council?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p><b>I am very sympathetic to the plight of retailers whose businesses are being harmed by the criminal activity of a minority of people. However, shoplifting is a criminal offence, and not an area of public service that council officers have enforcement powers.</b></p> <p><b>I would like to stress that shopkeepers should continue to report instances of shoplifting to the police, who are in a position to take the necessary action.</b></p> <p><b>Together with other local Ward Councillors, Cllr Fower may wish to recommend that shopkeepers write to the Chief Constable, setting out the problem and urging him to review the situation and deploy more resources to the area.</b></p> <p><b>I would also like to suggest that Cllr Fower recommends that shopkeepers explore the use of measures such as cameras and mirrors (if they are not already doing so), as well as advice which is obtainable on-line or through a security organisation.</b></p> <p>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>I have written to the Police and Crime Commissioner. The police have a responsibility for shop lifting however the local authority does provide CCTV in other parts of the city and what can the council do to alleviate the problem?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p>

	<p><b>CCTV cameras are working outside properties. Shoplifting occurs within the shops and the advice would be to install cameras inside shops. If you would like to discuss further please get in touch with me.</b></p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Much concern has been expressed recently about accumulations of plastic in rivers and oceans around the World and the threat which they pose to wildlife and to ecosystems. In its recently published 25 Year Environment Plan, the Government stated its intention of eliminating single use plastic materials during the lifetime of the plan. This will only be achieved through a concerted effort by Government, private industry, local authorities and individual citizens. Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell us what Peterborough City Council is doing and what it intends to do in response to this urgent environmental problem?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p><b>The Council is creating a policy with regards the use of single use plastics within Council and Partners facilities. The aim of this policy is to work towards eliminating avoidable plastic waste and will involve educating employees and residents on avoiding unnecessary single use plastic items and using alternative reusable options.</b></p> <p><b>The Government has confirmed it will introduce a Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) in England for single use drinks containers which will aim to capture the millions of plastic bottles a day that go unrecycled or escape into the environment. The Council support the government’s initiatives and await the consultation results.</b></p> <p><b>In addition to this the Council are also at the forefront of the Circular Economy agenda which involves seeking opportunities to move away from the traditional linear approach to waste by encouraging and supporting more “circular” activities such as reuse, repair and re-manufacture. I am willing take any member through what we are doing in that area.</b></p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:  The issue is not just accumulation of plastic in the seas it is also a massive carbon emissions and recently the ICC report said that we have 12 years to avoid irreversible climate change. I welcome the fact that there is a policy developing, can you tell us when we can expect to see some action. There were 1000s and 1000s of plastic disposal bottles recently and plastic disposable cakes being handed out at the Great Eastern Run and at the election counts at the Town Hall there are 100s of plastic bottles handed out to counters. When will we see some action on this issue?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b>  <b>I agree but hope they were collected at source as there is no evidence of them in the city tonight. I welcome any initiative from any member on the waste issue and disposable waste. We await the official government outcome and will keep the chamber fully informed.</b></p>

**NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WERE ASKED DUE TO THE TIME LIMIT BEING REACHED**

13. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

The live streaming of Full Council meetings has now been operating in Peterborough for just over a year. Could the cabinet member for Resources give us a short report on how many people have been tuning in to the broadcasts and any feedback which has been received from users?

**Councillor Seaton may have responded:**

**The live streaming of Full Council meetings on the council's Facebook page has been very popular, attracting a high number of views and comments. There have been seven meetings streamed to date, eight including tonight's meeting, with a total of 54,925 views.**

**Many of the comments from viewers on Facebook about the live streaming have been very positive. There has also been many comments during and after each meeting about the issues being discussed. All of the comments are publicly available to view on the council's Facebook page.**

**We recognise that residents might not be able to attend our public gallery for many reasons and this is a way of delivering democracy into their front rooms.**

**A large proportion of the views have been after the meetings have ended, the live stream remains available on the Facebook page enabling people to watch the meeting when it's convenient for them.**

**Live streaming viewing figures:-**

Date of meeting	Number of views
25/07/18	11,840
21/05/18	8,472
07/03/18	11,661
24/01/18	6,128
13/12/17	4,950
11/10/17	6,360
29/08/17	5,514

14.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>What plans has the cabinet member put in place to address the recent SATS results which place us at 149 out of 149 in the league tables?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres may have responded:</b></p> <p><b>Thank you Cllr Nawaz for your helpful question. I must say that I do appreciate the incisive questioning and support given by the Chair and all members of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee in the need for everyone to work together to support the journey of improvement needed in Peterborough, not merely criticising the hard work of leaders and teachers in our schools who give everything to educate our children.</b></p> <p><b>Our primary schools have almost universally seen large increases in their pupil numbers. 90% of our schools are graded as good or better by Ofsted which is better than the national average (89%) but the challenge we face is how we translate the good performance that is observed in schools into better outcomes in assessments. Officers have met with primary heads and academy trusts and there is a combined acceptance that change is needed and a focus is needed on leadership. Plans will evolve across the academic year – we need some immediate impact but the focus must be on longer term sustainable improvement.</b></p> <p><b>In the short term, we have developed a relationship with the London Borough of Newham to share their excellent practice around Phonics. We are also working with the Cambridge Maths Hub to support the improvement we need in Maths in primary schools. Ofsted have partnered with us in running two workshops in November for school leaders. We have refreshed our recruitment and retention strategy and our website ‘Teach Peterborough’ is being updated to encourage more teachers to come to the area. It will also show the strength of training opportunities we offer and will have a new focus on recruiting new governors, who are crucial in strong leadership. As a local authority, we will be using our statutory powers to intervene where schools are under performing.</b></p> <p><b>In the longer term we need a focus on developing our leaders and on assuring the curriculum in our schools to help children to achieve. Nobody is standing still in the drive to improve.</b></p> <p><b>Education is a complex area with many partners – the Local Authority, Academy Trusts, Dioceses, Regional School Commissioner and others. We all have a role to bring everyone together for Peterborough’s children.</b></p>
15.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Coles</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>It is great to see that the significant roadworks on Bourges Boulevard have now been completed after complex series of roadworks and that traffic now appears to have</p>

	<p>returned to normal. Residents in Fletton and Woodston have been concerned about the impact of the roadworks on journeys into town and on public transport bus times.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the substantial investment in road improvements and the work done by other agencies on the route will mean that we will not face similar disruption to journey times into the centre of Peterborough in the future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p><b>I think you'll agree that the works around Bourges Boulevard have been a real success and will help us to ensure that our city centre remains economically prosperous by regenerating areas like Lower Bridge Street and increasing road capacity to allow future development like we have done at the rail station car park.</b></p> <p><b>Whilst the works along Bourges Boulevard were being undertaken, we used the opportunity to do additional works including surfacing and barrier improvements to significantly reduce the need for major works in the future.</b></p> <p><b>We will be upgrading the street lights on Rivergate and small improvements will be made to the crossing on Bridge Street but we have no further substantial works planned on Bourges Boulevard. However, with continuing development and growth as well as on-going planning consents we cannot rule out some works in the future.</b></p> <p><b>As you will know the Council is currently investing money to regenerate Westgate and looking further ahead we have major plans to transform the city centre area with North Westgate and the University which will be fantastic additions to our city.</b></p>
16.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Hemraj</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Back in 2016 the relevant Cabinet Member stated that Peterborough City Council will not be using Travelodge. Now it has come to light that Peterborough residents are being housed in Travelodge as far away as Sheffield and Doncaster. Can you please advise how many families from Peterborough are being placed in temporary accommodation away from Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</b></p> <p><b>It was never the Council's intention to use Travelodge accommodation and in particular have to use Travelodge accommodation outside of the Peterborough area, however continued increases in demand from homeless households have left us with no alternative. We are not alone in this and a number of local authorities across the country are in a similar position. I am pleased though to report that we continue to make great strides in reducing these numbers and now have just 18 households in Travelodge accommodation, 17 of which are outside Peterborough in nearby town and cities.</b></p>
17	<p><b>Question from Councillor Farooq</b></p>

To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University

We are all aware that Hampton is growing at a very rapid pace. The developers are attracting young families to Hampton for it's convenience, modern properties and education.

As young families are moving to Hampton throughout the year, they are facing difficulty in finding school places for their children in Hampton and are having to drive them to surrounding areas.

All of the Hampton primary schools have waiting lists in each year group.

May I ask the cabinet member for education to allocate additional resources to create school places for the parents in Hampton throughout the year?

**Councillor Ayres may have responded:**

**Thank you, Councillor Farooq, for your question. The growth of Hampton and the need for sufficient school places is of the utmost importance to The Council.**

**Unfortunately there is little scope for the expansion of the existing 3 primary school sites which comprise of 240 places every year of reception aged children. As we did last academic year, we are undertaking a thorough review of the current school waiting lists to see if they can be reduced. We do not anticipate though that this will create any additional availability but it may reduce the waiting lists.**

**The admissions criteria are statutory and have to conform with the Schools Admissions Code which local authorities and own admission authority schools are required to use by Government. The over subscription criteria for all schools must be compliant with the Code.**

**The Council has invested approximately £13m in the past 7 years to fund expansion of the existing schools and the building of Hampton College to create additional places not foreseen when O&H Hampton originally built Hampton Hargate and Hampton Vale. We also expanded Hampton College Secondary School in 2011. Despite this all 3 primary schools are full. We are now working hard to secure the 2 new primary schools on the new Hampton East Estate, having already delivered the new Hampton Gardens Secondary School.**

8.	<p><b><u>Questions on notice to:</u></b></p> <p>d) The Combined Authority Representatives</p>
1.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Deputy Mayor</p> <p>Mayor James Palmer has backed Community Land Trusts to address the housing crisis. Could you explain what this will mean for Peterborough specifically addressing how it will benefit the city?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p><b>Until such time as the Local Development Plan has been approved, it is difficult to identify land that can be purchased through land capture.</b></p> <p><b>I am however talking to the appropriate Ward Councillors to see what plans we may be able to put forward when the Local Development Plan has been adopted.</b></p> <p>Councillor Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>So far what have you done to lobby the mayor to ensure we get maximum funding for CLTs?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p><b>You can't get a single meeting without the mayor suggesting you go for Land Capture, it is one thing on his mind. Most of the land available in this town has planning permission. Therefore if it has planning permission it has a value and to get land capture you are only going to pay about £100,000 per acre so therefore you have to work outside the planning system. And until you have done the Local development Plan as it is still under review. If I was to approach a land owner at this time someone would go to the inspector. It has to be done when the time is right. It is easier to do in a village setting where sometimes land can be made available at a cheaper rate. But it is not easy in an urban setting but I do push every opportunity and we are looking to put some schemes forward.</b></p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Deputy Mayor</p> <p>Could our representative tell us what progress has been made on the mayors review of bus services across Peterborough and Cambridgeshire and when will we, as Peterborough Councillors, be consulted about this important piece of work</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p>

	<p><b>Initial draft reports are expected on the 21<sup>st</sup> October although we now understand they may not come in until the first week in November. It is anticipated that the working groups will review and comment on draft report, it's findings and recommendations. Following this review a round of Councillor engagement sessions will be established to present the findings, this is anticipated in November 2018. However it may now be December. I will send Councillor Sandford the details of the Transport Plan findings and the details on the consultations due to take place.</b></p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Why have these consultants been working on this review for a considerable amount of time and not consulted the residents and councillors of Peterborough before the report is produced. Why are we embarking on a series of public transports cuts which could result in the loss of 25% on evening and Sunday bus services in Peterborough.</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p><b>We have a duty to tax payers not to support routes that are not being used and are costing a considerable amount of money. By the time the review takes place there will be considerable differences but they won't be delivered by the first of April as it is quite a big piece of work. I do not know the time scales given.</b></p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Amjad Iqbal</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Audit and Governance Committee Member</p> <p>Looking at the allocated budget and amounts of the defrayed expenditure for projects in the Peterborough area, can you tell me if there was there an amount allocated for Bayard place and was this then removed? Please let us have any dates when decisions were made, revoked or expenditure defrayed?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p><b>I can confirm the Combined Authority has never allocated a budget to Bayard Place.</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Deputy Mayor</p> <p>£100 million was provided for the Combined Authority for housing. How much of this has been allocated for Peterborough, how much has been spent so far and how many new social housing tenancies created to date using these funds?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p><b>At the present time of the £100m, £9.075m of funding has been approved by the CA Board and £6.5m in loans. Schemes in Peterborough total £4.075m of</b></p>

**the sum approved for grant. This is funding a total of 126 affordable homes in schemes at various stages of development and construction. We are also in the process of submitting other claims for funding.**

Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:

Of the £100m we were told we were going to get about £28m. You have £4m, and you can't say, with £4m, you have created one social tenancy and also there was £3m for the university – where did that go to? The university at Bayard Place?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

**In the deal it is 24% of the £100m that should come to Peterborough and we have half of the money dished out so far. It takes time to get the schemes in and approved but it takes time. The money for Bayard Place – if no money was granted to Bayard Place, there was money, I think £3m that was granted to the PRC to look at intermediate accommodation to increase capacity from 1000 to 3000 students before we moved onto the embankment. One of buildings considered and costed, as well as the Town Hall and other buildings in the town, was Bayard Place. The money was not specifically given to Bayard Place.**