

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 6 MARCH 2019  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR CHRIS ASH**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Eley, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fuller, J A Fox, J R Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azhar Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren and Whitby.

**68. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Fower.

**69. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Seaton declared that he was a member of the POSH Supporters Trust and was also an Executor to his late father's estate and he had been a minority shareholder.

Councillor Hiller declared a pecuniary interest as he was a director of Medesham Homes. He advised Council he had received dispensation to speak on such items but would leave the Chamber if there was a vote.

Councillor Sandford declared he was a member of the POSH Supporters Trust.

**70. Minutes of the Meetings held on 23 January 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2019 ordinary meeting and 23 January 2019 special meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**71. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced the Civic Awards, a scheme which recognised organisations and business groups that have made a significant difference to the local community.

The following nominees had been selected to receive a Civic Award:

Community Involvement Civic Awards

- Mrs Barbara Holdich
- Ms Belinda Speechley
- Mrs Brenda Fearon
- Ms Diane Nicholas
- Mr Dick Talbot

- Mr Eric Winstone
- Mr Ian Davies
- Mr John Bartlett
- Mr Jonathan Rippon
- Mr Lawrence Wright
- Mr Louis Deplancke
- Mr Michael Chambers
- Mr Mick Mead
- Mr Mohammed Saeed
- Mr Muhammad Nawaz
- Running Advisory Group – Perkins Great Eastern Run
- Mr Steven Pettican
- Mr Trevour Purlant
- Fiona Henry
- Bernadette Gibbons
- Kirsty Hadfield
- Needless Needles

Lifetime Achievement Award:

- Mr David Boddy
- Ms Evelyn Speechley
- Mrs Karen Hepworth-Lavery

Business award:

- Mrs Katherine Hlalat

Environment Award:

- Fiona Henry
- Bernadette Gibbons
- Kirsty Hadfield
- Needless Needles
- Mr Mohammed Saeed

Awards would be presented at a ceremony to be held at the Town Hall on Tuesday 3 April 2019.

Members were also advised of the forthcoming charity events, the Quiz Night on 13 March, a talk with David Lowndes on the 21 March and a Proms Evening on the 14 April.

The annual Mayor's Ball would be held on the 18 May and a Curry Evening on 28 April 2019.

Council Members were also advised of a Charity Evening Meal on the 11 March hosted by Councillor Ali.

## **72. Leader's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Leader.

## **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

### **73. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

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

1. Repayment of the Empower Loan
2. Travel to Sand Martin House
3. Street Cleaning in West Town

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

### **74. Petitions**

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

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

#### **(b) Presented by Members**

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Ali requesting that the Council considered the restricted parking areas on Clarence Road.

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Jones requesting that the Council installed a light controlled pedestrian crossing on Eastern Avenue.

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Shaz Nawaz requesting that the Council reconsidered the new electronic system for visitor parking permits used by the residents in Parking Zone E.

### **75. Questions on Notice**

Discussion took place between Members on whether the questions should be read out or taken as read. Members were concerned that if the questions were read out in full, less questions would be asked due to the time limit placed on this item. Members also felt that the questions should be read to make more sense to those watching the livestream and in the interests of transparency. The Legal Officer advised questions were available on line.

It was proposed that the questions were read out in full for this meeting.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation (35 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Else, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Against:** Barkham, Bond, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, John Fox, Hemraj, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Whitby

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that the questions on notice would be read out in full.

#### **(a) To the Mayor**

- (b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet**
- (c) To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee**
- (d) To the Combined Authority Representatives**

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

1. The welfare of taxi drivers
2. The relocation of Peterborough United football stadium
3. The process for collection of bulky waste
4. The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report
5. The reduction in carbon emissions from council owned vehicles
6. Solar panels on council buildings
7. Planning permission for affordable homes
8. Education funding
9. Fines for dog fouling
10. Fines issued for parking related offences outside the city centre
11. Neighbourhood parks and green spaces
12. The social housing waiting list
13. The move to Microsoft 365
14. Deaths as a result of being homeless
15. Repairs to broken street lights
16. Pedestrian access at Rhubarb Bridge
17. Change Programme Funds
18. Prosecutions for fly tipping offences

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

### **76. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council – Part One**

#### **(a) Cabinet - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 - Tranche Three**

Council received a report on the current position regarding the Tranche Three Budget Consultation, including the consultation feedback received after publication of the main report.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He also addressed the fake news recently reported in the press and advised that he had written to all Councillors to advise them of the legal situation regarding the sale of council buildings no longer in use. He advised that using the funds these sales generated to repay existing loans was lawful and confirmed that external, independent auditors had checked and approved the Council's financial management.

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

Councillor Amjad Iqbal moved an amendment to the motion and proposed an alternative to the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy as detailed in the additional information pack. He acknowledged the financial situation the Council was in but stated more was demanded of the Council to provide more services. The proposal included growth within the economy by attracting more business to move to the city to take advantage of the digital services, low operating costs and commuter links.

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

Council debated the amendment and Members raised the following key points and comments:

- The addendum had not been properly researched.
- 90% of start-up business failed to survive the first 12 months and if £10million was loaned to start-up business, there was a potential loss of £9million.
- It was felt that not all Members understood the workings of the Forward Plan and the workings of the Scrutiny Committees.
- If Members had ideas and proposals they believed had merit, these should have been raised when the budget was being developed.
- Some Members felt there was insufficient time between meetings and budget publication to make suggestions on the budget however Members were reminded that the Budget Working Group had been running for a number of years and ideas could have been presented at any meeting or at any other time.
- Although the suggestions contained within the amendment had been received too late for this budget it did however contain some good ideas which should be considered and possibly incorporated in future plans.
- Members felt that housing development in Peterborough was behind that in Cambridge and this amendment would enable funds to be released to invest in new council homes. Discussion then took place over whether new homes were being built in Cambridgeshire.
- 151 affordable homes had been built this year.
- Outside bodies had been consulted on the current budget proposals and quality impact assessments had been carried out; there would be similar requirements for any amendments.
- There were no legal implications concerning the amendment detailed within the report.
- Council tax had not increased in previous years but can this year be increased by 3%.
- The current year's budget had been balanced by using £11.5million Capital Receipts and £3.5million from Reserves which some Members felt was not be prudent. Over a three year period over £27million of Capital Receipts had been used however £8million of Reserves was currently available to support change programmes. Some reserves must be retained.
- Forming a Housing Revenue Account (HRA) would enable the Council to bid for funds from Central Government and Members were advised plans were already in place to move toward establishing this and taking advantage of the Government Housing Infrastructure Fund.
- Consideration could be given for the Council to build houses for sale in the same way that the Development Corporation had done and Members were advised that a joint venture housing company had already been set up in the form of Medesham Homes which could be used to achieve this.
- The Council had now purchased 35 homes with offers accepted on over 50.
- The building of houses had not kept up with demand for homes following inward migration to the city.
- The reduction in the bus subsidy had not had a significant impact on the basic services however a working group had been set up to look at other areas of public transport within Peterborough to see if any further savings could be achieved.
- £3.6million would be paid to the Combined Authority as a transport levy but Members were unclear what this was for and who would be responsible for public transport in the next financial year.
- The idea of setting up an investment fund to lend to business for a profit, as contained within item 1 of the amendment, aligned with the current loan investment.

- The proposed investment fund was very limited whereas the current commercial strategy did not limit the council to lending only £10million and each applicant was considered on their own merit.
- There was no evidence that due diligence had been carried out in support of the proposals contained within the amendment.
- The Peterborough United Football Ground (POSH) sale, should it proceed, included plans to build a technical innovation hub.
- No data had been included to support the availability, location and cost of land.
- The setting up of a brokerage firm for transport was considered an interesting idea which could provoke further discussion.
- Members were invited to put forward any proposals to the Finance Director or the Chief Executive at any time and were invited to attend the next Budget Working Group meeting.

Councillor Bashir proposed a motion that Council move directly to the vote without further debate and this was seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald.

Discussion took place on whether there should be a response from the mover of the amendment and Members were advised that, under Standing Order Item 21.10, the mover of an amendment does not have the right of reply.

A vote was taken on moving directly to the vote (35 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 1 abstained from voting)

It was **RESOLVED** to move directly to the vote.

As mover of the original motion Councillor Seaton summed up and advised Members he welcomed the ideas contained within the amendment and advised Members that some of these suggestions were already taking place, such as investment in business hubs. He advised this could be considered but adequate security would be required.

The proposal included building further homes over the next three years in addition to current building plans however plans were not included to manage the speed of growth and the subsequent impact on services, such as medical facilities and school places.

Councillor Seaton's advised that he could not commit the Council to the level on investment the amendment proposed.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment to the recommendation (19 voted in favour, 33 voted against, 2 abstained from voting, 1 did not vote).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Dowson, Ellis, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, 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, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Howell

**Councillors Not Voting:** Aitken

The amendment to the recommendation was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor Cereste proposed moving directly to the vote, this was seconded by Councillor Elsey.

The Mayor considered that there had been insufficient debate on the main motion and debate continued with Members raising the following points:

- The level of Reserves remaining and the use of Reserves to balance the budget.
- Lost community assets could not be replaced.
- Council tax had not increased in recent years however this year it would be needed to compensate for reduced funds from central government.
- Some Members could not comprehend how the sale of assets was not a sustainable financial strategy but, at the same time, could be one that provided a strategic approach.
- Reference was made to the defeated amendment which included a proposal to lend to businesses. Members were advised the amendment did not propose to lend to start-up business but to existing local business who employed local people.
- Some Councillors announced that they intended to make their views known of Facebook.
- £500,000 per annum was spent on clearing up and enforcing fly-tipping and the Fly-tipping Task and Finish Group was continuing to investigate ways to address the problem.
- Under the Council's responsibility for the homeless, when there were no hotel or bed and breakfast facilities available in the city, the Council had no alternative but to provide accommodation further afield although the reliance on out of town accommodation had now been eliminated.

Councillor Fitzgerald proposed that there be no further debate and Council moved directly to the vote.

Councillor Holdich seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken and it was agreed (unanimously) to proceed to the vote.

As mover of the motion Councillor Seaton summed up the recommendation and acknowledged earlier comments and Members varying views on Council Tax increases. He advised that the Council were emphasising the need for more funds from Central Government.

A recorded vote was taken on the original recommendation (32 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 2 abstained from voting) and the motion was **AGREED**.

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

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

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Lane

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **AGREED** that the Council approved:

1. The Tranche Three service proposals, outlined in Appendix H to the report, this included a 2.99 per cent council tax increase.

2. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20-2021/22-Tranche Three, as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
  - Appendix A – 2019/20-2021/22 MTFS Detailed Budget Position-Tranche Three
  - Appendix B – Budget Proposals- Tranche One, Two and Three.
  - Appendix C – Council Tax Information
  - Appendix D – Grant Register
  - Appendix E – Fees and Charges
  - Appendix F – Performance Data
  - Appendix G – Capital Programme Schemes 2019/20- 2023/24
  - Appendix H – Budget Consultation Document, including Tranche Three Budget Proposal detail
  - Appendix I – Savings RAG Rating
  - Appendix J – Equality Impact Assessments
  - Appendix K – Treasury Management Strategy
  - Appendix L – Capital Strategy
  - Appendix M – Asset Management Plan
  - Appendix N – Investment Acquisition Strategy
  - Appendix O – Budget Consultation Feedback
  - Appendix P – NNDR Retail relief discount 2019/20 and 2020/21
  - Appendix Q – NNDR Local Discretionary Relief Scheme for 2019-20 and 2020-21
3. The Local Discretionary Rate Relief scheme for 2019-20 and 2020-21 as set out in section 5.8 of the report and Appendix Q to the report.
4. To approve the Business rates retail discount scheme for 2019/20 and 2020/21 as set out in section 5.8 and Appendix P to the report.

## 77. Council Tax Resolution

Council were presented with the report on the council tax requirement as part of the formal budget process as set out within the constitution and in accordance with legislative requirements.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He drew attention to the supplementary information pack which contained an update to paragraph three of the Council Tax Resolution to reflect the change in the Housing Benefit Grant Allocation.

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

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Ellis, Elsey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Against:** Nil

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **AGREED** that the Council approved the Council Tax Resolution which proposed a rise in general Council Tax of 2.99%.

## **78. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council – Part Two**

### **(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Council Tax Support Scheme 2019/2020**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 25 February 2019, received a report in relation to the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/2020 including feedback from the consultation and the continuation of the Council Tax Hardship Policy.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and provided Council with some background information. He advised that until 2013, residents on low income could claim Council Tax Benefit which had the potential to cover up to 100% of their Council Tax. The amount received was dependent upon income and family circumstances with the local authority being reimbursed by Central Government. In 2013 Council Tax Benefit was abolished and each local authority designed its own scheme. Central Government funding was devolved and reduced. Pensioners were exempt from the changes and the new schemes only affected working age claimants who received a 30% reduction. The scheme has remained in place since 2013 however funding from central Government had continued to diminish.

Councillor Casey seconded the proposal and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members wanted to know how many residents were affected by the changes and by how much.
- Moving the existing 30% reduction applied at the end of the benefit calculation to the start of the calculation would lead to higher council tax increases for some of the poorest residents.
- Members felt that Council Tax would rise and disproportionately affect poorer people who would receive a reduction in the amount of assistance received.
- The Council Tax Support Scheme discourages people from taking up employment and some Members felt for this reason they could not support the proposal.
- The online consultation was complicated and not easy to understand and only two people responded. Members asked how the consultation could be justified with only two responses.
- 30% change from net to gross liability would generate an additional £225,000 and would affect 1,991 people. The 1% increase would generate £79,000 and affects 8698 people and the £6,000 capital limit will generate £22,000 which will affect 43 people. This was not confirmed by the Cabinet Member for Resources.
- Concerns were raised regarding the disregard of child benefit affecting poorer families and pensioners had expressed concern about the capital limit reduction from £16,000 to £6,000.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the proposal and in so doing responded to comments and questions raised by members. The main points included:

- Pensioners would be exempt from the scheme.

Councillor Seaton proposed that Councillor Murphy not be heard further on this item under Item 28.3 of the Constitution, Part 4, Section 1 – Council Standing Orders and this was seconded by Councillor Bashir.

A recorded vote was taken (28 in favour, 19 against, 3 abstaining, 2 not voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Eisey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Harper, Hiller Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

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

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Lane, Serluca

**Councillors Not Voting:** Allen, Fuller

It was **RESOLVED** that Councillor Murphy would not be heard further for this item.

Councillor Seaton continued:

- Members could have attended briefings to fully understand the implications of the Council Tax Support Scheme.
- Councillors could have taken part in the consultation.
- The answers to other questions raised in the meeting were contained within the report.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation (30 voted in favour, 19 voted against, 3 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Eisey, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simson, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

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

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox, Lane

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

Council **AGREED** a local Council Tax Support Scheme for Peterborough that contains the following local components:

- a) The existing 30% reduction that is applied at the end of the benefit calculation is replaced with a 30% liability reduction applied at the start of the calculation
- b) Increasing the 30% liability reduction by 1% a year for 3 years, starting in 2019/20.
- c) Reducing the capital limit to £6,000 for non-passported claims
- d) To amend appropriate rates in line with annual upratings.
- e) To allow the use of Universal Credit Data Share documents as claims for Council Tax Support

## **(b) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Template Submitting Motions to Full Council**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee received a report at its meeting on 28 January 2019, in relation to a motion referred from Full Council on 23 January 2019 proposing the use of a template for submitting motions a Full Council.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and advised Members that the Constitutions and Ethics Committee were not ready to commit to a report template at this stage.

Councillor Bashir seconded the proposal and reserved her right to speak.

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

1. That officers would provide training for new Members on the procedure for submitting motions.
2. To note that points on relevance and remit of motions were covered by the current constitution and needed to be reinforced.
3. To request that costs to the Council from motions be kept under review and a further report brought back in 12 months' time to the Constitution and Ethics Committee.
4. To encourage Members to seek help from officers when drafting motions if needed.

### **(c) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Member Officer Protocol Update**

At its meeting on 28 January 2019, the Constitution and Ethics Committee received a report in relation to amending the Member/Officer Protocol as contained within Part 5, Section 3 of the Constitution following requests from Committee Members.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and outlined its contents and subsequent amendments which were contained in the Supplementary Information Pack, advising members there were no new ways of working. He confirmed that auto forwarding of calendar invites is discouraged, however Members may forward such invites to their personal diaries on an ad hoc basis if necessary.

Councillor Bashir seconded the proposal and reserved her right to speak.

The Legal Officer confirmed that the a correction to the amendment was included in the Supplementary Information Pack.

Members debated the recommendation and in summary the points and opinions raised included:

- Members felt the proposals reduced the functions for opposition or ward councillor capacity.
- Members did not appreciate the removal of their right to present an agenda item to the Cabinet.
- Members were not happy with the removal of the provision for officers to carry out research on their behalf.
- Members were disappointed with the removal of briefings to Group Representatives however they did acknowledge that these very rarely took place.
- Ward Councillors would lose the opportunity to comment on reports affecting their ward.
- It was unclear if personal information should be withheld when a Councillor notified another Councillor they had a case covering their ward.
- Members felt the rights of ward councillors would be reduced.
- Members felt they should be invited to join officers when they visit their ward.

Councillor Bashir exercised her right to speak and confirmed that the invitation to attend a recent visit in Central Ward had been sent by a candidate for Central Ward

and not from someone within the Council.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the proposal and in so doing addressed points raised including:

- There had been no reports that the existing Member/Officer protocol was not being followed.
- As there were 60 Members, it must be up to the Members to conduct their own research.

At this point the guillotine was reached in accordance with Standing Order 14.2 the Mayor announced the meeting would end at 11:15pm.

Councillor Murphy moved to recommend a 15 minute extension which was seconded by Councillor Lillis.

A vote was taken on the recommendation (18 voted in favour, 32 voted against, 2 abstained from voting).

The motion to extend the meeting beyond the guillotine was **DEFEATED**.

Members expressed disappointment that insufficient time was available at Full Council meetings to discuss all items on the agenda and there was no opportunity for Members to present motions. Members felt there should either be more Council meetings or the policy motions should be moved higher up the agenda and asked if the Constitution and Ethics Committee could consider this at their next meeting.

Councillor Seaton responded in his capacity as Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee and advised that the next agenda would include an item to discuss bringing the start time of Council meetings forward to 6pm.

A vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous) and Members **AGREED** the updated Member/Officer Protocol, subject to the deletion of wording under section 14 'Support Services Provided for Members' in relation to acknowledging survey responses.

#### **(d) Cabinet Recommendation – Governance of Council Companies, Partnerships and Charities**

Cabinet received a report at its meeting on 4 February 2019 in relation to the Governance of Council Companies, Partnerships and Charities regarding the revised Executive Procedure Rules, Executive Delegations, and related structures and the revised Audit Committee Terms of Reference.

Councillor Holdich moved the proposal.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the proposal and addressed concerns about the ability of Members to attend the meetings by confirming that any Member could attend and address the sub-committee at the discretion of the Chairman.

A vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous) and it was **AGREED** to:

- 1) Note the Leader of the Council's approval of the revised Executive Procedure Rules, Executive Delegations, and related structure chart as set out Appendix A and B to the report for the purposes of formal oversight of the Council's companies partnerships and charities which comprise of additions to the delegations to Cabinet and the setting up of a Shareholder Cabinet Committee, subject to the correction of numbering and inclusion of Vivacity in Appendix B.

- 2) Approve the revised Audit Committee Terms of Reference set out in Appendix A of the report.

## **79. 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. Extraordinary Cabinet meeting held on 4 February 2019.
2. Budget Cabinet meeting held on 25 February 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

### Transferring Services from Enterprise Managed Services Limited to Peterborough Limited

Councillor Murphy advised that at a recent residents meeting, he received complaints that streets had not been cleaned for two years and asked if the new regime would address this.

Councillor Seaton replied this question was not relevant to the decision however he would investigate if full details were forwarded to him.

### Award of contracts for children's centres in Peterborough

Councillor Murphy asked if the contract had been awarded on the current terms and finance and, given the population growth within the city, would this result in a reduction in service to individuals.

Councillor Smith advised Council that the decision was to extend the existing contract by one year with no changes to the service.

### School Admission Arrangements for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools Academic Year 2020/21

Councillor Hemraj asked if children from the same family were being sent to different schools.

Councillor Ayres advised that this decision related to a very small number of children who are in state care, out of this country and who subsequently had come to this country to be adopted. The Cabinet Minister was keen for them to be given priority when applying for school places in the same way as our own children in care.

## **80. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed Executive Decisions made by the Combined Authority (CA) since the last meeting including:

1. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 28 January 2019.
2. The Combined Authority Board meeting held on 30 January 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

### Strategic Bus Review

Councillor Sandford asked if the CA Representatives thought it was acceptable for the CA Mayor to invest in a review of bus services in Peterborough which did not include Peterborough Councillors.

Councillor Murphy replied that report focused on the £150,000 spent on a review of bus services which did not actually include a recommendation. He reported that the Scrutiny and Overview Committee were very disappointed that the money was spent on a report that did not consider the Peterborough services and had also expressed their concern over the high salary paid to the Interim Director of Transport. He advised that the committee were concerned with the level of spending on salaries and administration when nothing has been spent on delivery, such as homes.

In accordance with Standing Order 14, no further items were debated as the guillotine had been reached.

A vote was taken on each remaining item without further discussion. Each motion was deemed to be formally moved and seconded.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **81. Notices of Motion**

The following motions had been received in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders:

#### **1. Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

A vote was taken on the motion from Shaz Nawaz (unanimous) and the motion as **CARRIED** as follows:

"This council noted:

- The closure of HMRC's office in Peterborough will result in a significant number of job losses.
- The people made redundant will suffer major personal and career losses including potential financial hardship.

This council believed:

- We should support the staff of HMRC in their campaign to stop the closure of a local office in the City.
- The closure of the Peterborough office will mean a loss of over 200 quality jobs, 63% of which are carried out by female workers.
- The loss of these quality jobs will have a significant adverse impact on the City's economy.
- That action needs to be taken to address the closure of HMRC's office.
- Unless the move is stopped, the closure will mean no HMRC office, or presence, in the whole of the East of England.

This council resolved:

- For the Leader of the Council to write a letter to the appropriate minister of state for HMRC and request that they halt this proposed closure. Unless stopped, the closure will mean no HMRC office, or presence, in the whole of the East of England."

#### **2. Motion from Councillor Joseph**

This motion was not moved.

#### **3. Motion from Councillor Sandford**

This motion was not moved.

**4. Motion from Councillor Lillis**

This motion was not moved.

**5. Motion from Councillor Hogg**

This motion was not moved.

**6. Motion from Councillor Hogg**

This motion was not moved.

**82. Reports to Council**

**(a) Pay Policy 2019/2020**

A vote was taken on the recommendation (unanimous) and Council **AGREED** the 2019/20 Pay Policy.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 11:24pm  
6 March 2019  
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 Darrell Goodliffe</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Thank you. It's quite a simple self-explanatory so I'll try my hand at getting a simple and clear answer. You never know your luck eh. I'll read it out for you. In light of the continual delays to a clear plan for repayment of the £23 million loan made to Empower Community Management LLP being produced and significant pressures on the Council Budget, what reassurances can the Council provide that this money will be returned in full and when can residents expect a clear schedule to be provided for the repayment of this loan?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Mr Goodliffe and I'll try to give a clear answer. Basically I'd first re-iterate the answer given regarding the Empower investment at Full Council on 23rd January this year. It is fully secured over the solar rooftop assets of ECS Peterborough 1 and is delivering a commercial rate of return to the Council. That return is contributing towards our budget position, mitigating the pressures you mention and supporting the delivery of services.</p> <p>The Council has received a net return of over £2m in the last four years and currently receives a net return of over £80k per month and £10k per month to cover any internal administration costs.</p> <p>There has always been a clear and explicit plan for repayment at the end of the construction period. In November 2018 the suitability of the Empower refinance proposal with Triodos Bank was reviewed in the light of alternative sources of finance available in the long term renewables financing market. The Council has approached, major refinancing organisations who have an interest in renewable energy and is actively pursuing a number of those proposals.</p> <p>The Council's loan will be refinanced following the conclusion of all legal and technical due diligence by the refinancing organisation.</p> <p>Mr Goodliffe asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>In light of the fact that Empower Community Management LLP hasn't submitted accounts to Companies House for two years now is the company still solvent and operational? They refuse any request for comment, from the press and the media so is it still operational? You know, I think that is a valid question because it pertains to</p> |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>the security of that loan.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. You know there have been occasions when I have agreed with you Mr Goodliffe. I think when you wrote that Labour locally had serious organisational failings, no feel for the city and was completely inept, I agreed with you. When you said about their alternative budget they are presenting tonight I thought it was amusing. You said until there is some more detail it's a wish list, not a budget. One of the nicer comments. This time -</p> <p>The Mayor interjected:</p> <p>Councillor Seaton, would you like to answer the question.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton continued:</p> <p>I am answering the question, I am putting it in context Mr Mayor. If you want me to sit down then please tell me.</p> <p>The Mayor interjected:</p> <p>I think it is becoming a bit of a speech.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton continued:</p> <p>However this time I have to disagree with you. As I have said the investment is fully secured over solar rooftop assets delivering a commercial rate of return. But more so, you have just said there have been no accounts for two years. Well they have actually been filed. I know of the top of my head they were signed off on 14 February and filed after that. I am looking here at <a href="http://compnaieshouse.gov.uk">compnaieshouse.gov.uk</a> they were filed on 26 February 2019. Now I know you have previously stated I don't know where the money is and we've lost it because those accounts haven't been filed, they're actually two totally separate things. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> |
| 2. | <p><b>Question from Terri Haynes</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Given the lack of parking at Sand Martin House could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me what measures are being taken to encourage council officers and contractors to use public transport to get to work?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Ms Haynes for the question. I have to say, Ms Haynes, I don't actually recognise the picture you paint about the Council's new offices You said in your question that it is a given that they lack parking but in reality there's</p> <p>More dedicated facilities there than there ever has been at the Town Hall or other Council offices like Bayard Place. If you could possibly help me understand perhaps you could please explain what you mean when you say there given the lack of parking spaces. Could you just let me know what you mean by that?</p>  |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>Ms Haynes asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Well, considering residents of the Vista Development are often posting pictures of cars inconveniently and sometimes dangerously parked, Council Officers have actually been challenged by people I know reminding they should not be parking there and they are parking. So the issue comes from the fact that people are parking on the Vista Development. They are not moving on when they are asked so the lack of parking would seem to be self-evident and there seems to be a lack of public transport, certainly in the north direction so just wondering, why if I am wrong, residents are being inconvenienced by council staff parking on the Vista Development?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Yes, absolutely. Thank you for that Ms Haines, I mean, that clarifies your question to a degree however vehicles parking in the Vista Development, I mean some may very well be employees of the council, some may not be employees of the council so it is very difficult for me to answer that specifically but I can reiterate that there are far more dedicated spaces at Sand Martin House than there ever have been at the Town Hall or indeed other council offices which were in use. I'm not sure if you've ever been down to Sand Martin House itself, but there is quite a large open area to the rear of Sand Martin House which is parking for employees, for officers. There is also a large multi storey. I hope you'll also be aware the excellent bus services through and around our city at commuting times to that destination and the several bus stops nearby. In answer to your specific question the Council has recently undertaken a staff survey in order to understand how people do in fact travel to work, what issues they face and what changes could be made to help them consider travelling by more healthy, sustainable modes including indeed public transport, walking and cycling. Thank you Ms Haynes.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked:</p> <p>Mr Mayor, could I raise a point of accuracy? Because Councillor Hiller is misleading the Council because he's actually said in answer to that question, that there is ample bus stops in the vicinity of Sand Martin House. The fact is that there is a bus stop if you are going in the southbound direction, there is no bus stop on London Road if you are going in a northbound direction. So what he said is factually incorrect.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>If I might come back in that Mr Mayor. I thank Councillor Sandford for his interjection. In fact we did have dialogue about this a few Full Councils ago and our officers in preparation for a response to that, did actually discover that there were three bus stops, north and south in the very close vicinity to Sand Martin House, one of which is of course, by TK Max. Your suggestion at the time I think Councillor Sandford was that the buses backed out onto the bridge at that time which was of course absolutely ridiculous. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> |
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Yasir Quershi</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>My walk to the train station each morning is depressing. Peterborough should be</p>  |

trying to attract commuters to the city. I cannot recommend Peterborough as a commuter town when the place looks like a rubbish tip.

Will the Cabinet Member explain to me what action will be taken to improve the litter situation in the west town area which has got worse over the last three years and explain what plans if any there are to improve the situation in the streets in the residential area in which I live?

The area in which I live refers to the West Town area but more specifically my issue is with the stretch of road between the top of Grange Road (where it meets Mayor's Walk), then all along Mayor's Walk, over the bridge and up to Peterborough Train Station.

Councillor Cereste may have responded:

All areas of the City are cleansed on a cyclical basis by litter pickers and with mechanical sweepers. With regards to the mechanical road sweeping we have issues in many areas, including the location that you have mentioned, with parked cars not allowing access in order for the sweeper to carry out a full cleanse. I would be happy to arrange for one of my officers and the Amey cleansing supervisor for the area to meet with you and walk round the areas of concern to look at what can be done to improve the situation.

**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 Ali**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Thank you Mr Mayor. It's not a very long question so hopefully it won't take that long. A vast majority of local Taxi Drivers both Hackney and Private Hire provide an excellent service to our city, in recent weeks there has been numerous incidents of taxi drivers having been victims of crimes, including serious assaults on drivers, vandalism and damage to Private Hire vehicles. Can I ask the relevant Cabinet Member what steps will be taken by the authorities to protect and safeguard the welfare and livelihood of taxi drivers?

Councillor Walsh responded:

Thank you Mr Mayor. Legislation requires the licensing of taxi vehicles, drivers, and operators for the purpose of passenger, not driver safety. Drivers are self-employed or work for a taxi operator. In both cases there is an onus on them to consider and take measures to safeguard their own safety, or that of their employees.

Where crimes are committed against drivers and/or their vehicles, the police are responsible for the investigation. The council has made the police aware of concerns by the trade in the past where they have felt that crimes are not being investigated.

Safer Peterborough Partnership provides funding for a taxi marshal scheme operating during peak evening periods, predominantly bank holidays and Christmas. This scheme has provided Security Industry Accreditation door supervisors to oversee the Broadway Hackney rank which minimises alcohol-related disorder, providing support to both taxi drivers and vulnerable persons. The scheme has been successful in reducing alcohol harm, keeping people safe and reducing the fear of alcohol-related violence. Thank you Mr Mayor.

Councillor Ali asked a supplementary question:

Thank you Mr Mayor, I thank Councillor Walsh for her response to my question. I have to say that we as a licensing authority, do charge and make an enormous amount of money from licensing taxi drivers and I am afraid that response, as far as I am concerned isn't adequate. We should be doing more than what the councillor has suggested. My question is that I think she needs to go back and find out what more can be done to safeguard the taxi drivers because the taxi drivers are providing a very valuable service.

Councillor Seaton spoke:

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>I was going to say Mr Mayor, a point of accuracy. Councillor Ali said we make a lot of money from licensing, actually we are only allowed to cover the costs of providing the licensing service. Any surplus that is made must be reinvested in the service.<br/>Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>I think part of the response has already been provided, we don't make a profit and therefore we don't have money to provide this safety service. But in any case these are matters for the police. Let us not mix up roles. Licensing is one thing, it is a regulatory service and the police are different, they deal with crime. It is to the police you must make representations. Thank you.</p>  |
| 2. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. This question is to Councillor Seaton.<br/>With speculation from the press regarding the possibility of the Peterborough United (PUFC) stadium being relocated to elsewhere in the city.</p> <p>POSH fans across the city are duly interested in this issue, could he please update the council on any discussion that PUFC has had with the council in this regard?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>The Council are presently in negotiations with PUFC for the purchase of the London Road Ground. A Memorandum of Understanding was signed by all parties in October and this forms the basis of the sale.</p> <p>At the Joint Scrutiny meeting on the 12th February Members sought clarification that following that sale, if a new stadium was to be built, a covenant would continue for the benefit of local residents. The Leader of the Council confirmed that to be the case.</p> <p>We also continue to liaise with the POSH Supporters Trust. With regards to speculation, that is hardly new and I'm sure the Member does not expect the Council to give a running commentary on speculation.</p> <p>Councillor Hogg asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>I do have a supplemental. If Peterborough United go ahead with purchasing the land, what safeguards are in place to stop them from just then selling the land further to then fund a move to a different location and making a profit on the money they paid for the land from the Council?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>I think the safeguarding in place is the covenant on the pitch if the Leader of the Council wants to add anything I would be pleased to have his advice as well.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich added:</p> <p>Yes, all the safeguards that are there now remain and we are talking to the trust about taking those safeguards should they move somewhere else. And the company</p> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>that Peterborough United are quite happy to do that so it'll remain. They are, I have tell you. They have got a ten year programme of which some of it is costed to stay there though they are asking for a new stadium within Peterborough and the one they are looking at isn't too far from the one they've got now.</p>  |
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Mr Mayor, to Councillor Cereste. Is there anything that Councillor Cereste can do to streamline the process for bulky waste collections to make it more customer friendly and less time consuming? Recently when booking a collection, I had to have three separate telephone conversations with council employees and the Amey contractor. There was an initial phone call to the Council, then I had to wait week for sort of Amey to contact me to provide a quote and then I had to phone the Council again to make a payment and arrange for someone to come round and pick up the items. Could we use the opportunity of the termination of the Amey contract to review and streamline these sorts of processes?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Sandford. We are currently looking at a whole range of new software to try and help sort all this out, not just bulky waste but the ordinary permits for the Recycling Centre etc. etc. etc.</p> <p>On top of looking at new software which we are actively we actually want to try and achieve the sort of things you would like to do, we are also looking at some of the options with bulky waste, to try and do something a bit different, help us with fly tipping etc. etc. So all I can say to you is I agree with you, watch this space.</p> |
| 4. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I have tried to cut my question down a little bit to save on time. Could the relevant Cabinet Officer or Member tell me how last years' IPCC (<i>UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</i>) report has changed council policy and activity to counteract the effect of climate change?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Bond for his question. Like most if not all local authorities across the country, this UN report hasn't changed what we do and how we do it.</p> <p>This council has consistently been ahead of the game on environmental matters, Councillor Bond as I hope you will be aware, always embedding that premise within our decision making processes. As has been reiterated recently within our recently updated corporate objectives. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Bond asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor. So you believe council policy goes far enough to tackle the effects of</p>   |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>climate change?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Well that's a separate issue with respect. As the science and evidence around climate change continues to evolve Councillor Bond, this council will continue to evolve its position. But as I said the environment, our environment indeed, is at the heart of what we do, as confirmed in our recently updated council objectives.</p>  |
| 5. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. My question to the relevant Cabinet Member is that given Peterborough's perceived 'green' credentials, what is being done to reduce the emissions from vehicles that are carrying out council business, please?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Shaheed for your question. Your question relates to vehicles operated by the Council and used for council business and how aware we are about exhaust emissions.</p> <p>Actually Councillor Shaheed, you are hopefully aware, the Council operates very few vehicles directly but we do work closely with our partners to ensure efforts are made to ensure emissions are kept to an absolute minimum and these include our PHS partner, Peterborough Highways Services partner, Skanska, operate a fleet of vehicles in order to improve and maintain the city's highway network. All of those vehicles are Euro 6 emissions standard, meaning reduced carbon emissions and improved fuel economy. Skanska have provided the use of an electric pool car to the Highways Inspectors who conduct short journeys around Peterborough on a daily basis. Furthermore Skanska have installed TomTom telematics across the fleet and this has allowed routes and driver behaviour to be optimised resulting in a reduction in fuel consumption by approximately 15%. Skanska are also engaging with suppliers of low carbon fuel alternatives to trial low carbon fuels indeed.</p> <p>Whilst not within my portfolio, but I am aware that Amey operate a fleet of vehicles for refuse collection, grounds maintenance and general transport. The Council have worked with Amey throughout the contract to ensure the most efficient and financially viable vehicles are operated including exploring hybrid and electric alternatives. This means that the majority of the fleet is operated at Euro 6 emission levels. In addition Amey has invested in electric Gluttons for the street cleansing and they have also trialled an electric refuse collection vehicle. As these services move over to the LATCo I am sure Councillor Cereste will continue to ensure that the most sustainable options, economically and financially, are adopted.</p> <p>In addition, within Councillor Walsh's remit, the Council parking enforcement team have operated a fleet of 3 fully electric vehicles since May 2013, with the environmental benefit of over 80,000 zero emission miles in the last 6 years Councillor Shaheed. These electric vehicles replaced a fleet of 3 ageing diesel vehicles so a significant amount of CO<sup>2</sup> emissions were removed from the local environment by making that change. An added benefit of these vehicles was a lower running cost for the council due to no fuel or road tax costs. I hope that gives you an</p> |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | overview, thank you Councillor Shaheed.  |
| 6. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. My question to the relevant Cabinet Member, are there any plans for solar panels to be installed on council owned buildings this year? Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you for your question Councillor Shaheed. There are no specific plans to install new solar panels onto council buildings this year. The council has panels across 46 sites. That is, 26 school sites and 20 corporate sites. This generates 23 megawatts of energy.</p> <p>However clearly with the transfer of the depot and launch of the materials recycling Facility (<i>MRF</i>), we will need to consider a review as to whether they offer further opportunities.</p>   |
| 7. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Barkham</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Does the administration believe that just “12.2% of dwellings granted full permission have been affordable homes” since 5th May 2015 is acceptable? Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I thank Councillor Barkham for the question. Thank you Mr Mayor. Your question Councillor Barkham seeks reassurance regarding the level of affordable homes provided as an element of new development but I have to say there is a fair bit behind the headline actually as your well informed Planning Committee member colleague Councillor Bond will of no doubt informed you. I can state categorically that this local planning authority will always seek to maximise the level of affordable dwellings provided by developers in accord with our local plan. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Barkham asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>With the massive housing crisis we have in Peterborough just want to know what you are doing to solve it. Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Not sure that relates to affordable housing Mr Mayor. So I really do feel that question doesn't appertain to the first but I am must take issue with the massive housing shortage did you say? I don't really see that we've got that in Peterborough. We always need more development, we need growth and we have a very good record of growth, I don't recognise the supplementary question.</p> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 8. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Skills and Education</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. My question is to Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Skills and Education.</p> <p>Following the decision of the joint scrutiny meeting recently to refer to Cabinet concerns expressed by those present, which we voted on, over the cut to the amount of funding per pupil anticipated in Peterborough and asking for action to be taken to lobby on behalf of Peterborough students and pupils, what action has been taken?</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Murphy for your important question. Schools are having to make difficult choices on how to spend their limited funding as their income hasn't kept pace with the rise in costs since 2010 including recent pressures on pay and pension contributions. The study into schools funding outlined how funding has not kept pace with inflation which is leading to our schools working incredibly hard to make ends meet but this is becoming increasingly challenging.</p> <p>The Secretary of State for Education visited Peterborough on the 27<sup>th</sup> February and I raised with him directly the financial challenge we are facing and the need to fund schools at an appropriate level. This is likely to be an ongoing debate until the next comprehensive spending review.</p> <p>In addition, we have asked our schools to share with parents a petition opened by Andrew Ramanandi on the Government Petition website. We managed to secure over 1,300 signatures across both Peterborough MP's constituencies and this response has contributed to the petition achieving the required 100,000 signatures for a debate. The debate has now taken place on Monday, 4<sup>th</sup> March, and now that debate is complete we intend using our information from the 2019/20 budget setting process to write to the Secretary of State for Education to request that further funding is found, especially to support the unique challenges we face in Peterborough. We would welcome cross party support for this very important challenge.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you for confirming you will be writing to the Secretary of State. How many hundred of pounds we anticipate each pupil will be cut by in Peterborough?</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>It's a rather complicated assessment which I was only looking at today. In fact the evidence has come from a gentleman who runs the funding for Peterborough schools which I can impart to you later but it is quite a detailed calculation and I think the percentage is about 8% that we're down if you take into account the Retail Prices Index. I do know that Mr Johnathon Lewis did attend to listen to the debate on Monday and in fact it is on the website you can listen to it as I have been trying to listen to it today and only got half way through. So I shall continue to do that and then we will be writing this letter, so thank you for your question.</p> |
| 9. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. So can Councillor Walsh please inform us of the number of fines issued for dog fouling in the city please?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Yes, thank you Mr Mayor. The issue of dog fouling impacts communities across Peterborough and is a blatant form of anti-social behaviour. Whilst we recognise that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible, a small minority are not, and we are keen to do what we can to change this behaviour.</p> <p>The council has only been able to issue a single fixed penalty notice relating to dog fouling since April 2018. This is largely to do with the hidden nature of the offence, please don't giggle, the hidden nature of the offence, which makes it difficult to address through enforcement alone. Our environmental officers do not have the power to issue a fixed penalty notice to owners, but actually must observe the act taking place which as you can imagine is not easy. Or they must have witness testimony in order to meet the evidence threshold.</p> <p>We believe that education is key to tackling this issue, and when hot-spot areas are identified our officers will work with the city's dog warden to visit the location and assess signage and waste bins. Patrols are carried out to engage with dog walkers in the area to highlight the problem and promote responsible dog ownership.</p> <p>If any Member or resident has a concern about a particular area, they are encouraged to report this to us. So yes, everyone wants to do something about it but you've got to catch them in the act. Thank you.</p> |
| 10. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how fines have been issued for parking related offences for non-city centre wards during 2018?</p> <p>I did shorten my question so we could save time on the answer. Absolutely, I'll read it in full then. To Councillor Walsh, the Cabinet Member for Communities, residents from across Peterborough have told me that they are concerned that enforcement is overly focused on the city centre.</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how fines have been issued for parking related offences for non-city centre wards (All wards excluding Central, East, North and Park) during 2018?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Bond, yes that makes it clear. You're trying to save time but we don't save time in the end.</p> <p>So the number of penalty charge notices issued for parking offences in wards other than Central, East, Park and North for 2018 was 923, which equates to 6.2% of all parking notices issued in Peterborough. This includes notices issued as part of</p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>school enforcement patrols, where a lot of time is spent on prevention as well as enforcement.</p> <p>During 2018, officials made 395 school enforcement visits and issued 167 PCNs around schools, the vast majority of which were in areas which are outside the city centre.</p> <p>Parking enforcement is tailored to where the majority of parking restrictions are and therefore where it is most likely for parking offences to occur, which tends to be the residential and paid-for parking areas of the centrally located wards.</p> <p>The rest of Peterborough still receives appropriate attention; indeed 19% of officer time has been spent in these other areas, where officers are responding to calls for service from the public or proactively looking for infringements. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>  |
| 11. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Lillis</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Make sure I am reading it in full. Considering the former Conservative Health Secretary Jeremy Hunt MP described rising rates of childhood obesity as a national emergency, does the administration believe it is important that residents have access to neighbourhood parks and green spaces in line with the council policy in this area?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Lillis for his question. Yes, this authority fully understands the benefits of open space and invests annually to improve the play provisions, specifically with that problem in mind.</p> <p>Councillor Lillis asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hiller. In that case, why in wards where there is a deficit of open spaces are we planning to build on those green spaces, in particularly in my ward in Tenter Hill but also I am sure there are other places across the city. Why is the Administration building on these green spaces when you say you that don't want to?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I didn't actually say we didn't want to build on green spaces so please Councillor Lillis, don't put words into my mouth because that's unacceptable.</p> <p>The application you're speaking about was unequivocally recommended for approval by our planning officers as you'll be aware with the conditioned commuted sum being provided for open space provision off site. This area is not protected open space, and is included within our adopted Local Plan for development. I have to say, at a much higher density than was being applied for so I hope that answers your supplementary question.</p> |
| 12. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</b></p>  |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. It's to Councillor Hiller.</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member tell me if the social housing waiting list has increased or decreased in the last 5 years and by how much?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Sorry Mr Mayor, was that for me? Your question, I thank you for your question Councillor Saltmarsh and it refers to the number of applicants on the Housing Register list. I can tell you that it's increased in total numbers over the last five years by just 92 applicants. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>  |
| 13. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>As I understand it, the Cabinet Member for Resources, believes that we will either save or generate around £9m by moving to Microsoft 365. May I have a breakdown of the actual figure alongside the timeframe and underlying assumptions, predictions or projections?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Nawaz for your question. Your understanding is incorrect. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Funny that Mr Mayor, because Councillor Seaton I believe you did state on Facebook to me that the savings were £9million but maybe it was a slip of the finger. However as I am entitled to ask a supplementary question, have you taken the time to comprehensively review any other savings within the spending of IT?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I am inclined to say yes but let me perhaps take a couple of minutes to help Councillor Nawaz with his question.</p> <p>The £9m figure that he quoted, is the total savings from shared service work with Cambridgeshire and this was set out in the 2018/19 Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p> <p>The move to Microsoft 365, by both ourselves and the County who were on the old version, so the County need to move to 365 too, will help facilitate these savings by ensuring we are on the same underlying system. We then use the same applications and re-engineer processes. So it is a step.</p> <p>In response to a similar question from the PT, Peterborough Telegraph, at the end of January I said: "It has been reported inaccurately that the council's move to Google</p> |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
|            | <p>cost £4million. This is not the case and in actual fact the cost over four years has been £1million, including implementation and licensing.</p> <p>When we moved to Google, it was the right decision as Google was the only software available that allowed for collaborative working and the future licensing costs were cheaper. Our flexible working, with major reductions in office space and significant benefits from the move to Fletton Quays, has been supported by this.</p> <p>We subsequently developed our shared services project with the County. This project is targeted to deliver, as I said earlier, £9m savings per annum which is dependent upon joint systems and processes.</p> <p>The move to Microsoft 365 was discussed at the Joint Scrutiny of the Budget on the 12th February and the present plan Mr Mayor is to move the Council onto that platform by July 2019. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>  |
|            | <p><b>NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WERE ASKED DUE TO THE TIME LIMIT BEING REACHED</b></p>  |
| <p>14.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please advise me how many people have sadly died as a result of being homeless in the Peterborough area in the past 5 years?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh may have responded:</p> <p>Since 2014, we have unfortunately seen the death of 8 rough sleepers in the city. And now at a time that no one should have to sleep rough in our city, it's extremely frustrating and upsetting, not least for the rough sleeper outreach officers who spend their days building relationships with individuals to encourage them to make positive changes in their lives.</p> <p>We are working hard with our partners as part of the Safer Off the Streets partnership and we continue to get people off our streets. To-date, the partnership has raised over £7,000 and assists many rough sleepers in getting off the streets into accommodation for good and to start rebuilding their lives, supporting them to ready themselves for training and/or employment.</p> <p>Alongside Safer off the Streets the Council has increased its staffing levels supporting rough sleeping and now has a team of 4 officers, soon to be 5, who are working with individuals on support plans to assist them in leaving the streets for good.</p> |
| <p>15.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Lillis</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me what is average time and longest time it takes to repair broken street lights once they are reported?</p>  |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>This is dependent on what works are required to resolve an issue. The most common maintenance works include: lantern outages, day burning lanterns and flickering lanterns which have a response time of up to 7 days. Where an emergency situation is identified, for example a loose door or exposed wires, a repair or action to make the situation safe is undertaken within 1 hour. However, often repairs are reliant on third parties, for example UK Power Networks and the Council is then subject to their timescales which can delay works for several weeks.</p>  |
| 16. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Ali</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Work is underway at the roundabout, in readiness for repairs and renovation of the iconic Rhubarb Bridge. Many residents of my North Ward and indeed across the City have expressed concerns that works being carried out at the roundabout with ground level footpath and new pedestrian crossing lights appear to be designed as a permanent feature. Can the Leader of the Council explain what is planned and assure me, residents of North Ward and indeed the City who campaigned so hard to force the administration into a u turn, that Rhubarb Bridge will be preserved in its entirety with access for pedestrian and cyclists.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>There has been a considerable amount of consultation about these works and a Cross Party Working Group was set-up to look at the condition of the existing footbridge. The Cross Party Working group queried the need for the at-grade crossings for pedestrians and cyclists and after review they agreed that they are necessary.</p> <p>Although we are fixing the existing bridge there is a need for the at-grade crossings. One reason is that we need to fix the decking on the bridge and it is best to do this in one go and not in patches since this increases the chance of water getting into the structure (<i>which is what has been happening and has caused a lot of damage to the bridge</i>). Fixing the bridge decking will require the bridge to be closed for a period of time so it is important to have an alternative at-grade option in place (especially if future closures are needed).</p> <p>In addition, it will provide people with a choice of how they want to cross as the footbridge might prove to be too steep for some people and some people might feel uncomfortable using the bridge at night.</p> |
| 17. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>At the time of writing this question the Change Programme Funds (usable reserves) estimated balance as at 31 March 2020 stands at just over £8m. The balance as at 31 March 2017 was just over £25m. Does the Cabinet Member have a plan to replenish the reserves which have been used over the preceding few years? If so, please share your plan detailing the projections.</p>   |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | <p>Councillor Seaton may have responded:</p> <p>I'd first remind members that we will still have a General Fund reserve of £6m. The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy sets out reserves applied to balance the budget. One of these Reserves, Grant Equalisation, was specifically established to mitigate the effect on services as the Revenue Support Grant reduced over time and to support the budget as we move to new ways of working.</p> <p>The Grant Equalisation reserve was £12m at the 31st March 2016 and the 2016/17 MTFS expected this to be fully applied by 2018. In the 2016/17 MTFS the purpose of this reserve was clearly set out to provide the resource and time for the Council to implement the required changes whilst minimising impact on service users and residents and creating a sustainable financial future for Peterborough.</p> <p>What the 2016/17 MTFS did not predict was the unprecedented increase in demand for Council Services, in particular Adult and Children's Services. This is a Country wide issue - not just specific to Peterborough.</p> <p>The 2019/20 MTFS in Section 5.10 sets out the Strategic approach the Council is taking to close the budget gap and move to a sustainable budget over the medium term. Part of this approach must be to ensure that the Council has "adequate" reserves to invest in service transformation and improvement and also to "insure" itself against any emergencies that might occur.</p> <p>The rolling budget process is a key tool in the process as it allows quicker approval and implementation of budget proposals which can directly link to the use of reserves.</p> <p>I'd also highlight that the s151 Officers Robustness Statement has to comment on a yearly basis on the adequacy of the Council's Reserves.</p> |
| 18. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Barkham</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how many successful prosecutions for fly tipping offences in Peterborough were there in (1) 2017 and (2) 2018?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh may have responded:</p> <p>Fly-tipping creates a blight on our streets and is something the council and our partners work hard to eradicate. The recent Cross-Party Task and Finish Group on this subject presented its recommendations to Cabinet, which were enthusiastically supported. These recommendations included seeking to strengthen the detection and enforcement capability of the Prevention and Enforcement Service.</p> <p>In specific response to the question, in 2017 eight fly tipping offences were successfully prosecuted, with a further 8 cases prosecuted through the courts in 2018. We have, however, investigated and resolved many more cases outside of the court process, often by way of fixed penalty notice or recovery of clearance costs from perpetrators. For example, in 2017, 206 fixed penalty notices were issued, with a further 123 issued in 2018.</p>   |
| 19. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Rush</b></p>  |

To Councillor Seaton, Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee

It appears that a political group has been taking advantage of a clause in the constitution to have free acknowledgements sent to residents when they have responded to clearly political surveys. Can the chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee confirm the cost that the practise will stop and ask the group involved to refund the money?

Councillor Seaton may have responded:

At the Constitution and Ethics Committee meeting on 28th January 2019 it was recommended to Full Council that the wording under Part Section 14, services provided for members in relation to acknowledging survey responses be deleted.

Thankfully only the Liberal Democrat Group were using this service with over 400 letters in the last year in response to 10 surveys at a postage cost of over £200 but clearly the staff cost would have been substantially higher.

Obviously this clause could have had major financial ramifications if all wards had been surveyed and large numbers of residents had responded to these political surveys so it is right that it has been stopped.

**8. Questions on notice to:**

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

None received.