MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 27 JANUARY 2021
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR GUL NAWAZ

Present

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lane, Lillis, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin and Yurgutene.

A minute's silence was held in honour of the late Councillor Janet Goodwin, Ex-councillor Pam Kreling, Ex-councillor Zahid Hussain, and community leader Brian Gascoyne.

47. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lamb and Councillor Fower.

48. Declarations of Interest

Agenda Item No. 13(2)

Councillor Bisby declared a conflict of interest in relation to agenda item 13(2) as a result of his position as Acting Police and Crime Commissioner and would therefore leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Agenda Item No. 13(8)

Councillor Ayres declared a pecuniary interest relation to agenda item 13(8) and would therefore leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

49. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 9 December 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2020 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

50. Mayor's Announcements

Councillor Hiller was invited to address the Council regarding the Civic Awards, the winners of which would be presented with their awards at a later date, once a ceremony could be safely organised.

The winners were thanked for their hard work, congratulated and announced as follows:

Community Involvement Civic Awards

- Brian Townsin

- Celseo Oliveria
- Chiltern Cold Storage Group
- City Leadership Forum
- Del Singh
- Derek Brown
- Femi Olasoko
- Interfaith Support Group
- Jack Hunt School
- Katharine Gator-Condon
- Kings School
- Mick & Jackie Coulson
- Multi Agency Forum
- Nathan Murdoch
- St John Fisher School
- Tom Brown
- Tony Forster
- Torin Gibson
- Voluntary Support Group
- Zara Robson
- Wendy Sayer

Contribution to Art and Culture Award
- Nathan Murdoch

Sports Award
- Stuart Haw

Lifetime Achievement Award
- Mandy Eddings
- Sarfraz Khan

51. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

52. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

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

1. City Tree Belt
2. Unadopted Roads
3. Hampton School Places

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

53. Petitions

a. **Presented by Members of the Public**

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

b. **Presented by Members**

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

54. Amendment to the Virtual Meetings Protocol

Council received a report in relation to the amendment to the Virtual Meetings Protocol in order to remove the requirement for questions from Members to be responded to verbally, while retaining the ability for Members to ask supplementary questions at the meeting.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz introduced the report and moved the recommendations. The Councillor

Councillor Sandford seconded the recommendation.

Council debated the recommendation, and the summary of points raised by Members included:

- Confusion was raised as to how members of the public would be able to understand the context of any supplementary question or response without having heard the initial answer.
- It was felt by a number of Members that it was important for the public to hear responses from Cabinet Members.
- It was noted that responses would be published in advance and that the proposal was a transparent manner by which to make meetings more efficient.

Councillor Sandford exercised his right to speak and conveyed his disappointment in the debate. It was felt to be necessary in order to allow more time for the debate of motions at virtual Council meetings.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz summed up and suggested that there had been some confusion doing the debate. The answers to questions were to be published the day before the meeting within the additional information pack. Such a process was undertaken at Cambridgeshire County Council and was considered to be very simple.

A vote was taken (27 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and the recommendation was **DEFEATED.**

Councillors For: Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Against: Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

55. 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**

d. **To the Combined Authority Representatives**

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

1. Stopping SARS-COV-2
2. Business Support Post-pandemic
3. COVID Marshals Rotas
4. COVID Vaccinations
5. Loss of Green Space
6. Digitising the City
7. COVID Marshals Performance
8. St Peter's Arcade
9. Action Taken on Hunting Motion
10. COVID Mental Health Inequalities
11. Hampton Section 106 Trigger

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS
56(a). Independent Remuneration panel

Council received a report from the Independent Remuneration Panel, which set out the recommendations of the panel in relation to the Member Allowance Scheme.

Councillor Holdich thanked the Independent Remuneration panel for their work and moved a recommendation to defer consideration of the recommendations for a year, while referring the consideration of a parental leave policy to the Task and Finish Group established to promote equality and diversity amongst Councillors.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendation and exercised his right to speak. The Councillor felt that it was not the right time to consider such recommendations.

A vote was taken and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous) to defer consideration of the recommendations of the IRP for one year, subject to the referral of its recommendation in relation to a Parental Leave Policy to the Task and Finish Group established to promote equality and diversity amongst Councillors, for that group to consider as part of its work.

57. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

Additional Highway Maintenance Funding

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg and Councillor Jamil, Councillor Hiller advised that a list of which roads that would be receiving additional funding should have been received and would be circulated to all Members.

Compensation Relating to Delays with a Legacy Housing Lease

In response to a question from Councillor Haynes, Councillor Allen advised that it was always unfortunate when the Council made mistakes, but it was appropriate to provide compensation when it did. Further detail on this particular instance could be provided in writing.

58. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

The Mayor confirmed that there had been no decisions made by the Combined Authority to report since the last meeting.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

59. Notices of Motion

59(1). Motion from Councillor Qayyum

Councillor Qayyum introduced the report and moved her motion. The Councillor wished to highlight the abuse of political individuals, especially women. The motivation behind the motion had been motivated by Councillor Qayyum's own experiences and the anecdotes of others. It was considered that the perception of the abuse of women in politics was part of the barrier to participation for many women. It was noted that female candidates were disproportionality the subject of abuse, with many not having the courage to speak out. The matter was felt to be one of urgency and necessity, and would not be needed in a non-discriminatory world.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz seconded the motion.

Councillor Walsh moved her amendment to the motion. The Councillor considered the original motion to raise an important issue. The issue of abuse could affect people of all groups. Councillor Walsh relayed knowledge of male colleagues who had suffered through online harassment campaigns. The amendment to the motion sought to share the benefit of the Task and Finish Group's learnings with all Members, as the matter of abuse was not solely a female one.

Councillor Coles seconded the amendment.

Council debated the motion and amendment, and the summary of points raised by Members included:

- A number of comments were made by Members that online abuse could be directed at Members of all genders.
- Some Members considered that the proposed amendment unnecessarily brought men into a motion focused on women in politics and watered it down.
- Further comment was made that the amendment obscured the issue and assisted in deterring women from politics.
- It was noted that in 2019 up to 18 women in parliament were not seeking re-election due to abuse.
- It was considered important to recognise the bullying that took place of men and women, but that it was a predominantly female issue, for which the Council should have a zero tolerance approach.
- Comment was made that the issue of harassment was not limited to acts, but also the atmosphere created in political spheres that discouraged women from speaking up and damaged their confidence.
- A number of Members agreed that a zero tolerance approach was needed, in relation to men and women.
- A Member commented that it was easy to fall into the trap of wishing to reference all potential groups who were victims of bullying, rather than focusing on vulnerable groups, in this case, women.
- It was considered by a number that the amendment did not take anything away from the motion, but simply added to it.
- Members expressed appreciation to other Members who had spoken with passion during the debate.
- It was considered that the motion and amendment reflected the idealised version of political environments and the reality of such. The amendment was held to take into account the practicality of the environment.

Councillor Coles exercised his right to speak and commented that the debate held by Members had been interesting and important. It was acknowledged that women were disproportionally affected, but it was further considered that finding a solution that wasn't just for one part of the community was important.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz exercised his right to speak and explained that the motion can about following a conversation with Councillor Qayyum and the realisation that it was necessary to bring the matter into the spotlight. Councillor Shaz Nawaz had initially been supportive of the amendment, but had subsequently realised how the amendment changed the entire meaning of the motion. It was considered that it was important to listen to the increasing number of female Councillors who were expression concern over the behaviour directed towards them.

Councillor Qayyum, as mover of the original motion, summed up and thanked all those who had taken part in the debate. It was commented that there was no intention with the motion to claim that men were not victims of abuse, however, to agree to the additions of the amendment would be a mistake. The Council's resolution must be decisive and specific to women, who were exclusive when it came to this kind of abuse.

A vote was taken on an amendment from Councillor Walsh. The amendment was **AGREED** (28 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 0 abstained from voting, the Mayor exercising his casting vote in favour of the amendment).

Councillors For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Against: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Mayor's Casting Vote: For

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Qayyum as amended. The amended motion was **AGREED** (40 voted in favour, 16 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) as follows:

"The Council notes that:

- Online abuse, bullying and harassment against women in politics is an issue which is increasingly growing in visibility.

- The LGA are aware that an increasing number of councillors and candidates are being subjected to abuse, threats and public intimidation, undermining the principles of free speech, democratic engagement and debate. The growth of social media has provided an additional and largely anonymous route for individuals and groups to engage in such activity. This abuse is more prevalent towards females

- While debate and having different views is all part of a healthy democracy; abuse, public intimidation and threats are designed to undermine democratic decision making by generating fear in those who represent it. The LGA further goes on to state that, ***"Councillors, and in particular female Councillors, are unfortunately increasingly the subject of online abuse, bullying and harassment on social media."***

The Council resolves to refer this matter to the current Task and Finish Group to promote equality and diversity among Councillors to:

- **Consider how to best assist Councillors in relation to online abuse, bullying and harassment, particularly but not exclusively against female Councillors, with a view to report back to the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting on 2 March 2021 with appropriate recommendations.**

- **Share any learning, training or any other opportunities that may arise from the work of the Task and Finish Group with all Councillors.**"

Councillors For: Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day Dowson, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

Councillors Against: Ali, Ellis, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

59(2) Motion from Councillor Ali

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Ali. The motion was **AGREED** (28 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) as follows:

"Council notes the budget concerns of the police service in Cambridgeshire which is one of the fastest growing areas of England, with Peterborough's population rising in particular when police funding has not been rising accordingly. The Chief Constable has proposed a reduction in Police Staff including reducing PCSOs to a fraction of the previous level.

Council believes that this is not the correct time during a pandemic to be cutting established staff who know their communities and in particular have been able to help engage with the public and educate on public health covid matters and the rules. This is the time for security and continuity rather than the insecurity of cutting these staff.

Council believes that the Chief Constable should seek additional funding for the additional Coronavirus work the Constabulary is and has been undertaking and not progress any plans to cut these Police Staff who play such a significant role in protection our communities here in Peterborough.

Council resolves that a letter be sent from the Chief Executive to the Chief Constable outlining the above and asking the consideration to be given to these points within budget proposals."

Councillors For: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Against: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

59(3) Motion from Councillor Jamil

A vote was taken on an amendment from Councillor Allen. The amendment was **AGREED** (28 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 0 abstained from voting, the Mayor exercising his casting vote in favour of the amendment).

Councillors For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Against: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Jamil as amended. The amended motion was **AGREED** (unanimous) as follows:

"Council believes:

- Everyone ~~has a right to~~ should have a home.
- Current emergency measures put in place during the pandemic may need to be extended beyond the crisis response to support people who become homeless, or resort to rough sleeping, through no fault of their own
- The government ~~should~~ recognises the impending challenge faced by households that are ineligible for support from the housing service or have no recourse to public funds
- The current crisis has caused thousands of people in privately rented accommodation to be in possible danger of losing their homes through eviction.

Council recognises:

- It is unacceptable that we have homelessness and rough sleeping in modern day Britain.
- After the emergency measures introduced during the coronavirus pandemic come to an end, many people ~~will~~ could be left without a safety net, resulting in ~~This could lead to~~ an increase in rough sleepers. ~~due to less support being available.~~
- Many renters have been unable to work or lost their jobs due to the pandemic and currently the situation is worsening due to rising infection and death rates. Citizens Advice says half a million renters are now in arrears, owing an average of £750. More than half (56%) of those struggling to make payments had no previous history of arrears before the start of the COVID-19 outbreak last Spring. This could result in eviction.

This Council believes that:

- A tenant should not be evicted from their home without good reason;
- Tenants should have more stability, avoiding the need to make frequent moves at short notice and enabling them to put down roots and plan for the future;
- Abolishing Section 21 no-fault evictions would help to make renting more secure and communities more stable, improve standards and increase tenant confidence;
- Landlords should be able to regain their property should they wish to sell it or move into it themselves;
- Tackling homelessness, ~~which~~ should be a priority for government at all levels; and,
- The Government should bring forward its legislative proposals as soon as practicably possible.

Council resolves:

- ~~To write to the government to ask for stronger measures to help with the housing crisis and specifically:~~ To write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to reiterate its support for these reforms and urge him to respond to the consultation and introduce legislation in this Parliamentary session.
- To review the priority need categories, ~~which currently support only the most vulnerable single people, to include anyone who finds themselves to be homeless and rough sleeping.~~
- To review eviction laws and offer better protection to tenants, starting with a~~n immediate~~ widening of the ban of evictions under Section 21 of the Housing Act 1998. ~~which since January 11th 2021 allows eviction of renters with just 6 months of rent arrears.~~
- ~~Follow through~~ Reinforce ~~with~~ their ambitions to end rough sleeping by ~~increasing~~ reassessing funding to local authorities ~~and providing longer term funding~~ for rough sleeping initiatives so that services are ~~better~~ fully resourced and equipped to deal with individual circumstances. ~~on a case-by-case scenario~~."

59(4) Motion from Councillor Casey

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Casey. The motion was **AGREED** (unanimous) as follows:

"Council recognises that:

- Access to IT hardware and good broadband connections have become essential tools in:
  - enabling children to continue with their studies remotely
  - enabling adults to work effectively from home, as well as access services and businesses, including supermarkets

- There are families within the Peterborough local authority area who are not equipped adequately with IT tools as a result of their being on low incomes or having more than one child who are sharing equipment. This affects the short and long-term outcomes for school-aged children and also opportunities for adults

- There are also families who may not have the necessary digital skills, including parents and carers, which is inhibiting the potential for them to take full advantage of IT tools

Therefore, Council resolves to:

- **Support the survey that is being conducted at Peterborough's schools which aims to identify those children who are most in need of support with technology, and request that government support to be extended at pace.**

- **Request that the Council's administration writes to government with a view to providing access to broadband services to families on low incomes.**

- **Request that Members and officers work together to ensure equality of access for all pupils in a coordinated and safe way.**

- **Request that the Council's adult skills service, City College Peterborough, to work with skills providers across Peterborough to ensure the necessary training opportunities are in place to support parents and carers to support their children.**"

59(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Sandford. The motion was **AGREED** (unanimous) as follows:

"Council notes that:

1. The Paston Reserve/Manor Drive housing development was started in 2011 and has now grown into an estate with more than 1000 new homes, with further extensions planned, including new nursery, primary and secondary schools.
2. Nearly ten years after the start of the housing development, the estate still has no bus service (even though bus stops and a turning circle were put in at an early stage), no shops, no other amenities and not even a post box. The nearest bus service is in Gunthorpe Ridings but to get from there to the estate involves crossing a footbridge over the A15, which has very poor lighting , and walking along a long passage way with high fences on either side. This has forced many Manor Drive residents to try to cross the A15 at ground level, which is a highly dangerous procedure.

Council strongly believes that the Combined Authority should as a matter of urgency address the lack of a bus service in this area.

Council asks our Council Leader to raise the matter with the Mayor and the relevant committee of the Combined Authority at the earliest opportunity.

Council also asks the Executive Director of Place to ensure that, where appropriate, viable and having factored in competing infrastructure demands, the Council uses its planning powers so that for all future large housing developments financial contributions are sought from developers to ensure that public transport and other important amenities are included at the start of a development and not left until years afterwards"

59(6) Motion from Councillor Sandford

A vote was taken on the amended motion from Councillor Sandford. The amended motion was **AGREED** (unanimous) as follows:

"Council notes that:

1. Initial work by the Council's Climate Change Member working group has identified that carbon emissions from domestic dwellings are one of the top three sources of carbon emissions in Peterborough.

2. The Peterborough Local Plan sets planning policies for new development in Peterborough and there is a lot of new housing proposed, so any changes to the policies within the Local Plan could potentially have a large impact on carbon emissions over coming years and decades.

3. There are also other parts of the Local Plan which have major impacts on carbon emissions and climate change, including the policies on transport, renewable energy generation and the natural environment.

4. The current Peterborough Local Plan was produced before the Council declared its climate emergency and target for reaching net zero carbon as a city by 2030.

Council therefore asks our planning policy officers to investigate whether a revision to our local plan, an addition to it or production of a supplementary planning document on climate change be of significant benefit in helping us reach our climate emergency targets and to report their findings, including budget implications of the options investigated, to the Cross Party Working Group on Climate Change and to the Growth and Environment Scrutiny Committee."

59(7) Motion from Councillor Day

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Day (28 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 0 abstained from voting, the Mayor exercising his casting vote against the motion). The motion was therefore **DEFEATED**.

Councillors For: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Against: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Mayor's Casting Vote: Against

59(8) Motion from Councillor Murphy

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Murphy, on behalf of Cllr Amjad Iqbal. The amended motion was **AGREED** (31 voted in favour, 25 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) as follows:

"Council notes that Saint Peter's Arcade access has been closed for some time now, a decision that wasn't taken with great transparency or consultation. An alternative route for disabled people is to use Bridge Street round a narrower entrance on a pavement where the width has been restricted due to building works. It has been commented that two wheelchair users can't use this at the same time.

Council believes that a number of people and residents, particularly those who use wheelchairs, would wish to see Saint Peters Arcade opened as an access route into the town centre and that both routes could have been used to reduce possible COVID-19 risks with a one-way advisory in place.

Council believes that as and when Covid risks reduce Saint Peter's Arcade should be reopened.

Council resolves to request that the Cabinet Member consider, when appropriate, the reopening of Saint Peter's Arcade to allow for ~~and~~ enhanced access for disabled people ~~into the city centre,~~ along with the potential for registering it as a public right-of-way."

Councillors For: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, John Fox, Judy Fox, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lane, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Against: Aitken Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

60(a) Political Balance and Allocation of Committee Seats

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

1. Note that there were 109 seats on committees.
2. Agree the allocation of seats on those committees subject to political balance arrangements (Appendix 1 to the report).
3. Agree the allocation of seats on those committees not subject to political balance arrangements (Appendix 2 to the report).

60(b) Chair and Vice-Chair of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee

A vote was taken and Council **RESOLVED** (45 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 11 abstained from voting) to appoint Councillor David Over as Chair of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

Councillors For: Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Warren, Walsh, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Against: Nil

Councillors Abstaining: Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Haynes, Hogg, Howell, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

A vote was taken and Council **RESOLVED** (28 voted in favour, 17 voted against, 11 abstained from voting) to appoint Councillor Andy Coles as the Vice-Chair of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.

Councillors For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

Councillors Against: Ali, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors Abstaining: Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Haynes, Hogg, Howell, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

60(c) Draft Programme of Meetings 2020/21

A vote was taken and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous) to approve, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2021/22 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report).

The Mayor
6.00pm – 10.45pm
27 January 2021

Page Break

FULL COUNCIL 27 JANUARY 2021
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	
Questions from members of the public	
1.	**Question from Carmel Leaves** **Cllr Cereste Cabinet member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment** We are all acutely aware of the benefits to nature and to ourselves that the trees that make up Peterborough's shelter belts provide, such as protection from air pollution and noise, as well as precious habitats for local wildlife. However, for the trees to thrive, for the shelter belts to fulfil their intended purpose, and to keep people and property safe, our shelter belts must be properly and regularly maintained. Residents in part of Orton, where the shelter belts were once glorious, are increasingly concerned that after decades of growth, many of the trees now present a threat to property and people. We understand the Council's Trees and Woodland Strategy sets out policies on how the Council's trees should be maintained, but many of us feel that Orton's shelter belt should be treated differently. The tree officers can only do what the policy allows and tell us they cannot do anything about the height of these trees. We are seriously worried that many of the trees have become top heavy, and that there is a risk that properties could be badly damaged should these trees fall in high winds. Would the Council please consider revisiting the policy on the city's shelter belt to return them to their former glory and to ensure the safety of our communities? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Yes I'm more than happy. I guess this question covers Cllr Cereste's portfolio as well as my own. Peterborough City Council's shelterbelts are maintained in accordance with sound arboriculture practice and works to these trees are regulated under felling licences administered by the Forestry Commission. The current management arrangements are regularly endorsed by the Forestry Commission, evidenced by recently approved felling licences based on proposals defined within the current Trees and Woodland Strategy. I would like to take the opportunity to reassure anyone with an interest that the Council's shelterbelts are routinely inspected for health and safety reasons. Where evidence of unacceptable hazards has been identified action will be taken to mitigate the risk. The trees are inspected by competent trained staff within Aragon Direct Services. Actions to reduce the height of shelterbelt trees is considered inappropriate management, and is likely to lead to greater risks, not less risks, and

	would highly unlikely ever obtain favourable support by tree officers. Equally, it would not be recommended by officers as appropriate policy within any future updates of our Trees and Woodland Strategy. Supplementary question Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Cllr Hiller. I appreciate what you say, but the trees are at an enormous height now. I'd argue that the height is a safe height and are actually at a risk and I would invite you to come and look at the shelter belt that goes down alongside my house, to see the height of the trees and how they would pose such a risk by the wind actually getting down, because my property would be damaged. As well as that if anything were to fall into the garden it could damage the property there or people, so I would advise you to have a look at them if your diary allows? The Cabinet Member responded: Yes indeed Mr Mayor, I think it was an invitation rather than a question, but I would be very happy to organise an officers visit from Aragon Direct services. My diary certainly will allow under the current Covid regulations, if it is allowed, I will certainly check with Democratic Services, I will be more than happy to come down and have a look but I'm not a tree expert I have to say, but I will certainly organise a visit from Aragon Direct Services. Thank you Mr Mayor.
2.	**Question from James Brown** **To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments** The list of unadopted roads that can be found on the council website is an invaluable help when one of the many problems with these roads rears their head, such as a pothole, more flooding or a streetlight going dark. However actually using the contact details for developers who own the roads is an effort in futility. Most of them have very limited opening hours especially in this time of Covid, and when you do get through it takes an age to get to the right department to even start the process of getting something fixed. Then let's not mention having to do it all over and over again as the problem won't be fixed for weeks, months, or longer most likely. Therefore, as the council has said many times that it cannot adopt roads until the developer has brought them up to a particular standard, perhaps it can help in another way. The council has the people and the knowhow to deal with developers on a variety of issues, officers know how they work and have the ability to know who to talk to and what to talk to them about. Would it be possible to set up a contact person or team at the council who any issues with unadopted roads could be sent to? This contact can then use these skills and knowledge to work on the resident's behalf to get these problems fixed, instead of individuals having to chase and chase and chase to get the basic provisions they deserve. **The Cabinet Member responded:** Yes I would Mr Mayor and thank you for your question Mr Brown. I'm not sure there is any need to set up a specific team for this because the Council officers are more than happy to pass on any enquiries received from members of the public or indeed ward Councillors on these matter to the relevant developer and of course encourages the relevant developer to take appropriate action. I'm more than happy Mr Brown to send a contact detail to you and make widely available from our

	team and make sure there is a contact number and email address for someone you know you can talk to. **Supplementary Question** Hi yes, I do see that there is an email address for the highway department on the adopted roads section on the website, however, a lot of the local people I have talked to tried to use that email to get some help and unfortunately, perhaps due to manpower or something like this, that trying to get a response and for them to take it further to the developers is very rare. I was wondering that all of the payments that these developers make to the Council, when they make these estates, could some of these funds go to increase these teams to actually help the public to get what they need. **The Cabinet member responded:** Yes I'm happy to Mr Mayor and Mr Brown Thank you for your question. If anyone achieves an ambition to become a ward councillor, you quickly have to realise that any resident should be able to contact his or her elected representative for what I hope would be a helpful and worthwhile response to a perceived reported problem. I also hope that most Councillors would have the relevant knowledge to be able to contact specific Council Officers to progress an enquiry. I'm fully confident that our Conservative Councillors in the Hampton wards are indeed available all year round and serious about progressing residents queries. So your direct contact Mr Brown and anybody else that's interested as resident in that area would be to your ward Councillors who are very effective. Thank you.
3.	**Question from James Brown** **For Councillor Lynne Ayres, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Education, Skills and University** The decision of Cabinet on 16 November 2020, "Child Yield Multipliers" refers to surveying new communities, including the Hamptons. Can the Cabinet Member answer the following: a. What is the current method used for forecasting education provision locally and the impact of new developments? b. Why there is a need to move away from the current method? c. What is the benefit of the new system or are there issues with the existing method which could have impacted on the decision to approve the VA school at Hampton Water? d. When is it the intended that these new multipliers would come into effect from? e. How were the surveys of residents distributed and will the outcomes be shared with the respondents? There have been repeated assurances by local councillors Marco Cereste, David Seaton, John Howard and Mohammed Farooq that "all Hampton children will get a place at a Hampton school" once the new St John Henry Newman Catholic Primary School opens in Hampton Water in 2022. This school will operate with a selective oversubscription criteria and as a Voluntary Aided school, Governors are able to

consult on amending their admission criteria annually. Therefore, from the second year of admissions, there is the potential for all admissions to be selected based on faith, as per the Diocese's original proposal. Councillors have stated that there are four other Primary Schools within Hampton offering a variety of choice. Data from the council's website shows that in 2020 Hampton Hargate School received 255 applications, for 90 spaces. Hampton Lakes 96 applications for 60 spaces. Hampton Vale 133 applications for 90 spaces and Hampton College 169 applications for 60 spaces. (Source: Primary Allocation Sheets 2020).

Could the cabinet member therefore please clarify how places for "all" local children can be guaranteed as stated?

The Cabinet Member responded:

Thank you Mr Mayor, yes I would like to thank Mr Brown as well for all of your questions. I shall attempt to answer them all in turn but there's quite a lot to do I think, so forgive me if I speak a lot.

I answer to your question a) I can say that *each year the local authority is required to complete a 'School Capacity Return' to the Department for Education (DfE). This return includes a forecast of future pupil numbers. Regulations require the Local Authority (LA) to provide a statement to accompany the School Capacity Return of its forecast methodology.*

So in reply to your question b) t*he forecasting method has not changed. Rather, the reference data pertaining to children living in new housing developments has been updated. As stated in the original cabinet paper this data is kept under regular review and this update was based on completion of new housing development surveys for parts of Paston, The Hamptons and Stanground.*

And in answer to c) I can say that t*he new housing development multipliers adopted for the whole of Peterborough in November 2020 would not have made a difference to the earlier decision not to approve the VA school. This is because a specific demographic report called: The Review of demography: Establishing a VA Roman Catholic school at Hampton Water was produced in December 2019 to aid that decision making and this report took full account of the higher child numbers experienced in the Hamptons area.*

The demographic report actually said, that it noted a tight fit between forecast demand and places up to 23/24, a point that was explored in detail through further answers provided to Scrutiny committee at the time.

The paper to November 2020 Cabinet on pupil forecasting and new developments follows on from this situation to answer the question 'what does this experience of the Hamptons mean for our general policy?' with the completed new development surveys providing robust evidence for us to negotiate with developers in regard to future new housing developments.
It should also be noted that demand versus need for new school places was only one of 11 areas, including finance, which the Council, as decision maker, had to take into account when determining whether or not to support the proposal to open this new VA school.

So my reply to little d) which you asked me was the answer comes w*ith immediate effect following Cabinet decision to approve the multipliers on 16 November 2020.*

My answer to your e) question, the s*urveys were distributed by post. Residents had the option of completing the survey in writing or by going on-line. Previously officers have presented findings back to open meetings of local residents' groups but*

	understandably during the pandemic this has not happened yet, we hope to do that towards the end of February. In answer to your question (f) a*t no stage has it been stated that all local children will be guaranteed a place. As explained in the Demographic Report accompanying the Cabinet Member Decision Notice in January 2020, forecasting cannot deal in guarantees. However, experience across the Diocese (not just in Peterborough) has been that pupils in Roman Catholic primary schools are overwhelmingly local children living less than 2 miles away from their school and they expect this to be the case at St John Henry Newman School. In addition, the evidence available indicates that there will, in all likelihood, be more places available to serve the local community in the Hamptons than the proposed over-admissions criteria for the new school would suggest. This has been the case in the year 2020/21.* *It is the school's Governing Body that is the admissions authority for this school. In accordance with the statutory Admissions Code, the school's Governing Body will review its admissions arrangements on an annual basis and the Council is a consultee. This includes reviewing the provision of 'open spaces'. The Governing Body could potentially change its approach to 'open places' but the Diocese has repeated its commitment to ensure the admission arrangements continue to reflect the needs of the local community. In addition, the Diocese has re-iterated the assurances it gave to Members at the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee in December 2019. Namely, that if the Council advises that there is a need to open additional classes ahead of the currently agreed class structure, they will be happy for the school to do so.* **Supplementary question** I do think that we really need to drill down on this future change on this child multiplier. From 1998 – 2020, the Council ask the developers to contribute and plan possible schools based on four 0-3 year olds, 25 primary aged children and 17 secondary school places per 100 houses. Last November you approved a change to 25 0-3 year olds, 40 primary age and 28 secondary school children. Simple maths tells me that's a huge increase. Why has it taken 22 years to update this and how much money could that quicker update have saved the Council and would this have affected new schools in the city approved before the decision. **Cllr Ayres responded** That is rather a lot of detail for me tonight Mr Brown. What I would like to do if I can is give him a written response to that, because I think that would be more helpful to you than me trying to get through details on my paperwork tonight.

COUNCIL BUSINESS	
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 Cllr Barkham**

	For Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health Given that the UK, including Peterborough, is now at the highest alert level, could the Cabinet Member for Health tell me what is the Conservative government and this administration doing to stop the cause of SARS-COV-2, rather than just treating its symptoms? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Our administration here in Peterborough is working to prevent the local spread of Coronavirus through our many prevention and outbreak management activities led by Public Health Director Dr Liz Robin. The 'cause' of the pandemic is a matter for national government, through its support for national and international research. I'm not able to respond to your question Councillor Barkham in specific detail as a local Councillor I would suggest though that you write to your MP so he can ask this question of government for you, because believe it or not, I consider myself to be in the know, I don't get calls from Government telling me what's going on internationally, so it might best a question for your MP to propose at government for you and if you need any assistance in contacting your MP, I will happily assist you.
2.	**Question from Cllr Shaz Nawaz** **For Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance** Local businesses, especially smaller ones, will need significant support post-pandemic. What plans does the administration have to support local businesses to help them get back on their feet? **The Cabinet Member responded:** As I said when the same question was asked at the last Council meeting, I'm not sure anyone knows when we will be post-pandemic so I presume the question seeks to understand work already undertaken together with current and future activity. It is considerable and I'm again grateful for the opportunity to set it out by providing an updated answer. As I said before, we worked hard to help the city centre re-open and obtained £800k of funding from the Combined Authority to deliver improvements and our cafe culture ambitions. I have had discussions with Cllr Cereste on additional exciting opportunities to go even further that should be cost neutral. We had free parking helped many local businesses, and our Enforcement staff are working hard to ensure businesses are Covid compliant and can keep trading. We received £23.9m through the Towns Fund Grant, covering a range of great projects, to help us build back better. That includes ideas to revitalise Lincoln Road in Millfield. Our pension fund has committed £50m with £50m from Foresight to invest in

	local businesses. As part of that, nearly 30 events have happened including advice on how small businesses can respond to the pandemic and come back stronger. We continue to support small local businesses with work for the Council and, as we come out of the pandemic, buy local will be really important. Some very substantial grants that have been given to businesses, I won't go through all of them. For example, £32m of small business grant funding to some 2054 small rural retail hospitality and retail businesses. £1.6m of Discretionary Grants to 110 local businesses. I will put that in writing to you Councillor Nawaz. We always engage constructively with businesses who have difficulties paying rates or businesses renting Council properties by reviewing payment schedules. We give ongoing support to a variety of enterprises with partial rate relief. And clearly as circumstances hopefully improve this year, we will keep the challenges seen within our local economy under review and take further action as appropriate. I hope that gives a flavour of our work. **Supplementary question** Thank you very much Cllr Seaton, for that answer. A two part follow up question if I may. As I'm sure you are aware, there's quite a few business owners who've missed out on funding for example, the new self employed, freelancers, limited company directors and those who have only up to a maximum of 50% of their income which comes from non trading and haven't received much support. In your view is there anything we can do to support those businesses? And secondly, although we don't know what the new normal will look like, it is anticipated that if businesses aren't further supported some of them won't be able to survive just like the chancellor said in his previous statements at the house of commons. Based on that have you used some assumptions or projections in terms of the impact that might have on business rates? If the answer is no by the way, do you intend to do that Councillor Seaton. **The Cabinet Member responded:** Thank you Cllr Nawaz, we've actually made the application process for that easier. So for example self employed and we're also talking to Government? (signal lost and inaudible) about how we can make that even easier, free it up even more as the economy opens again. Our financial planning, yes we have.
3.	**Question from Cllr Harper** **For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities**

	Back in November 2020 it was announced that Peterborough City Council had deployed a 30-strong team of Covid marshals to patrol areas of Peterborough where the virus was most prevalent as part of a package of measures to drive down rates of infection as quickly as possible. Clearly this was and continues to be a logical approach but there are other areas throughout our city where such marshals would be very welcome to help give advice particular where residents are likely to congregate such as shopping precincts, and regular exercising and dog walking areas. Can the cabinet member please confirm that we still have the 30 Covid Marshals and if there would be any possibility of drawing up a rota for at least a few of them to visit the other wards from time to time to help compliment the efforts of the police? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Covid Marshals are an effective visible deterrent to help us maintain compliance with the social distancing guidance as set out by Government. We do have a team of 30 Marshals, but when allowing for shift working this equates to 16 on-duty at any one time, operating 7 days a week from 9am to 9pm. We take an evidence-based approach to their deployment, to maximise effectiveness of this finite resource. A detailed weekly review of Public Health data is undertaken to identify where we have outbreak hotspots, enhanced by additional analysis of community generated intelligence to allow us to make a considered view of where we can achieve the best impact. At present, Public Health data indicates a need for focus in our urban commercial centres, which does include many of our ward areas outside of the city centre including, for example, Hampton, Werrington, Bretton and Stanground. However, we know from the community intelligence that other locations such as rural beauty spots are a concern, and we are therefore committing resource into these areas as and when a need arises. This includes areas such as country parks and other exercise or dog walking areas, and I can confirm that at present this is receiving attention from both the Covid marshals and the Police. **Supplementary question:** Thank you Cllr Walsh for your response to my original question. As the Covid Marshals have no actual power to issue a fixed penalty to those who fragrantly breach either face coverings or distancing rules how do they escalate such a breach so that it is dealt with rather just allowing it to walk away? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Thank you Cllr Harper for your question. I have actually seen it in operation. Our Covid Marshals have a direct link to the CCTV operator who can in turn radio police and ask for immediate support. The Council Marshals and police rotas are shared weekly to align resourcing whenever possible. This allows a joint focus on pre-agreed hotspot areas and helps ensure support is on hand if required. If police support is not available, Covid Marshals will pass that evidence onto them later after the incident has occurred if follow up is required. This is also used to help shape future patrol activity. I hope that answers the question.
4.	**Question from Cllr Sandford** **For Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social**

Care, Health and Public Health

Given that it is a national and local priority to get as many people vaccinated against Covid 19 as quickly as possible, would the Cabinet Member for Health agree with me that the best way of achieving this is to ensure that everyone in Peterborough in the top priority groups is able to get a vaccination as close to their home as possible? Yet, at the time of writing this question, the nearest mass vaccination centres to Peterborough were in either Boston or Stevenage, both of which are not easily accessible for many Peterborough people. So, could the cabinet member tell me if and when we are going to be getting a mass vaccination centre in Peterborough or can he guarantee that Peterborough residents will be able to get vaccinated at the appropriate time at either their local GP surgery or community pharmacy?

The Cabinet Member may respond:

I'm sure Cllr Sandford will be aware that things have moved on since you wrote this question. Just for the benefit of the public Cllr Sandford was asking about mass vaccination centres. So the answer to your question given that this is a national local priority to get as many people vaccinated as possible, my answer will be, you will be aware that the City Care Centre today opened as the City's mass vaccination centre today, January 27th. There has been in place already since the vaccination became available a number of outlets across the City:

1. Peterborough City Hospital of course, they started them
2. Stanground Surgery
3. The Fleet Community Centre
4. Thistlemoor Medical Centre
5. Werrington Surgery
6. Thomas Walter Surgery.

So with the City Care Centre coming today, the answer to your question is, yes we have one and today it has become operational. Anything else, I am happy to answer it.

Supplementary question

In my question, I also refer to community pharmacies. The Peterborough Telegraph is running a campaign at the moment pointing that there are over 11,000 community pharmacies operation across the country, but at the moment, only 200 are being used for vaccination purposes. Given the fact that it is important to get as many people vaccinated as quickly as possible and subject to the availability of the vaccine, would the Cabinet Member support these community pharmacies in Peterborough which are quite often really close to where people are would he support them being used for the vaccination campaign.

The Cabinet Member responded:

Yes I absolutely would. I had my flu jab at my local pharmacy back in October/November whenever it was, so I think that they have a great role to play. I think if Government or the CCG leading on the vaccination programme, it's not us the Council perse it is the health CCG. I think if there becomes a situation where there where there is an over supply of the vaccine, thus if they had more people in more locations to deliver it, then they would consider branching out and widening. It's just my personal view. But where there is capacity within those examples, I have given you already there wouldn't be a need to do that. However, is it easier, is it simpler, I think it's all being kept under review, certainly we'll have to keep an eye on it in consultation with our director of public health who will liaise with the CCG and others, then yes I would support it if it became appropriate and we thought it would be

	beneficial we a) to get the vaccination sped up in terms of how we roll that out. We are all acutely aware of what the issues are. The production of the vaccine is the issue at the moment, but it is happening as quickly as it can. I think we should all be very proud of how the health care professionals, here and elsewhere have stepped up and they are really getting through all the people that need to be vaccinated. I know many friends and friends of family and everybody else that are saying that it is happening, so it is really good news.
5.	**Question from Cllr Murphy** **To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments** Recently there have been concerns expressed about encroachment on and the reduction of "green space" throughout Peterborough, for example at Bretton Park, the Embankment (with a multi-story car park potentially being developed), and Werrington Fields. Some green space has also been lost in Ravensthorpe. What percentage of green space has been lost over the last year, three years, five years, and 10 years? **The Cabinet Member may respond:** Via the planning system and other means, green space in Peterborough is continuously added to, improved and, in appropriate circumstances, changed to other uses. The Council does not maintain precise statistics or data relating to the loss or gain of green space over any particular time frame. I suggest that it would be very difficult and an exact science. The university will require some car parking provision and is anticipated as being located within the land allocated for the university in the adopted Local plan, which was approved by cross party Members of course. Options generally for car parking in the city generally are currently being investigated. **Supplementary question:** In your written reply you might have answered my question about Werrington fields as well and the loss of space in Ravensthorpe. I did ask specifically what percentage of green space had been lost in the last year, three years, five years and ten years. I guess you will only have indicative figures, but can we have those figures please. There has been some concern and I wonder if you will agree with me that we need to protect green space particularly concerning the embankment. Would plans to build on the embankment if it were taken forward be in breach of this Council's planning policy which is not currently built on the embankment. **The Cabinet Member responded:** Thank you for your question which is full of supposes what ifs and maybes which I am not prepared to answer on any of those points, indeed I don't have the facts to hand and the facts don't exist. So your question is about developing the embankment are pointless as this juncture. I don't mean that to be disingenuous but they are. Referring to your comments about green space reprovision, to put some context around the subject Councillor Murphy, one such reprovision in Bretton which you sighted in your original question, that was actually critical in enabling large schooling facilities for the special education needs of children who attend Heltwate school in Bretton. You may be aware it came before the planning Committee and that was a technical and actual loss of green space. I know the application to improve this very special school was objected to at the time by the Labour ward Member for Bretton, but common sense prevailed and the desperately needed measures for the children and their families were agreed by a cross party committee. Necessitating the reprovision of a very small percentage of green space

	in an area where it was considered there was a surplus. Regarding car parking, which seems to be concerning you currently, I can say there are no approved plans to deck existing car parks. As I said to you before we are evaluating City car parking use patterns and the provision we provide generally.
6.	**Question from Cllr Jones** **For Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation** I have read, with interest, the Bristol, One City plan for digitising their city. Will the Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation please share with members Peterborough's own ambitious plans for our city? For instance, which cities are we collaborating with, if any, to achieve our goals and what is our vision in this increasingly important area? **The Cabinet Member responded:** The IT and [unintelligible] Strategy approved in 2019 echoes many of the elements that were highlighted in the Bristol Strategy 2018/2023 referred to by yourself Cllr Jones. Including a strong focus and ways of working and increase capacity across the Council. This focus had amongst other things supported the response of the Council to the Covid 19 outbreak through the coordination of services, such as the coordination of the community Hub and various areas of the public health responses e.g customer relationship management system that underpins the isolation support contact centre and the outbreak management system. It has also and quite fundamentally so supported the move of Council staff to remote working through the implementation of Microsoft office 365. With an exponential uptake of tools such as team video conferencing and collaboration the Strategy has also seen the implementation of belt of new intranet and external Council facing website. And areas that are already reflected in the Bristol Strategy document. These are all key elements of the Bristol Strategy which underpin and support the wider digitisation of the City but there are also workstreams around the specifically digital initiatives looking at key areas such as fix my street and blue badge processes. Improvements have been made both of these areas and more to come. Another key area of digitisation which affects the entire City and all citizens is around business intelligence, we're again in a similar vein to Bristol implementing cloud-based tools building on the Microsoft 365 platform to provide really powerful and accessible reporting for services. The first of these is Children's Services and due to go live very soon. What cities organisation we will collaborate with the recently appointed Director of IT and digital services Sam Smith is also the current president of Solstan, society of innovation, technology and modernisation and through that network Peterborough's link, into regional national and international initiatives. Solstan provide a network of collaboration to almost all UK authorities, district, county and unitary which is a rich source of shared information and experience. More locally there is a collaboration with Cambridge City as well as other towns shared through the smart places initiative under the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme. It is fair to say that the vast majority, if not all of PCC public facing services are represented online in sone shape or form. **Supplementary question:** I hope I am not alone in finding out what we are going to do. There is some good top level stuff there but what are we doing about social inclusion? Martha Lane Fox was on the Today programme. We've talked about hardware, we've talked about

	infrastructure which has grown within the City, but the other thing that she mentioned was skill and I didn't hear any mention then about how we're going to make sure no one is left behind. Blue Badges are online, but they can take a while; you have to have a certain amount of IT knowledge. So what can the Cabinet Member tell me what we are doing about social inclusion to make sure we keep everybody using the services that are available to them please? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Thank you for your question Cllr Jones. You are absolutely right we are working on the front face of the Council and making all the software accessibility to all the residents, so it is easier to use. Especially when you have got these discretionary grants that businesses are keen to use. The second point about skills and that We are as you are aware next to a university, there are two incubators going on where a large number of research is going on. Earlier on you said about the good work we are doing on the gigabit city and the city fibre laying more than 50 or 60 percent of the fibre network. So all that is going to encourage and attract high level organisations which in turn which will provide high level skilled jobs. I hope that answers your question.
7.	**Question from Cllr Wiggin** **For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities** Can the relevant cabinet member please confirm how performance for the Covid marshals is being measured, and whether their performance is acceptable? **The Cabinet Member responded:** We are providing a team of 30 Covid marshals across the city. This consists of 20 agency staff, supported by 10 officers from the Council's Prevention and Enforcement Service redeployed for this purpose. The Agency workers are from a specialist security company with over 24 years' experience in supporting councils and other organisations with marshal activity. From the outset we have worked closely with them to ensure that all officers are fully briefed on a daily basis and are working directly under the direction of the Prevention and Enforcement Service team. At any one time there are 2 agency supervisors working with these staff and linking directly with our Council supervision team. At the end of each tour of duty, written feedback is provided to the head of service for the Prevention and Enforcement Service team allowing us to debrief on any issues or concerns that have arisen during that day. In two months, public feedback has been very positive. An isolated concern was raised of agency marshals not adhering to social distancing, but we were able, through the performance mechanisms outlined, to address this quickly and we are confident they are providing a welcome and valuable support to the City's COVID response. **Supplementary question** I thank Cllr Walsh for her answer and her previous answer to Cllr Harper's question, which covered some of the information I wanted. I'm surprised to hear that you say that there is an overwhelming positive response from the public, because anecdotally and this is from spending a lot of time in the city centre for work. I'm not aware of anyone who have seen the Covid Marshals challenging people indeed it's the opposite they've seen the Covid Marshals not challenging people and letting them go

	past. Indeed, I am aware of one incident where a Covid Marshal had to be told to put on a facemask in a shop. That's not the level of service we would expect. Are you confident that the team are addressing all of these problems and do you think we are getting value for money for this service? **The Cabinet Member responded:** Yes, I do think we are getting value for money for this service. I think you raise a few issues and as you say anecdotally, and anecdotally I don't think is enough for us to change what we are doing. However, that's said, should you encounter any issues yourself, you should report these directly to into the PES service so they can be investigated. As far as do the Covid actually do their job, you seem to be implying that they were not going in and break up groups. I have actually seen them in action, so I could say anecdotally, they do do their jobs, but I think we should not go into the realms of anecdotally and actually let's go with the evidence and do encourage people to tell you that this or that has happened and to report it in and it will be dealt with accordingly. Thank you.
8.	**Question from Cllr Sandford** **To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments and Cllr Cereste Cabinet member for Waste, Street Scene and Environment** Every edition of Peterborough's Local Transport Plan since the first one in 1999 has contained a Transport User Hierarchy which states that in transport planning priority should be given to pedestrians first, cyclists second, public transport third and so on. A similar hierarchy is now a key policy in the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan. So, could the relevant cabinet member tell me how their proposal to permanently close St Peter's Arcade could possibly be seen as putting pedestrians first and so is it not completely contrary to the City Council and Combined Authority's transport policies? **The Cabinet Member may have responded:** St Peters arcade is currently closed in line with national guidance provided to local councils to ensure a COVID safe environment. This is owing to access issues from St Peters road which narrows down the entrance to this location and does not allow for minimum distances to be maintained. This decision has been subject to ongoing review and given the prevalence of the virus this is still assessed, as necessary. Cabinet met in October 2020 to discuss the long-term use of this space. It was noted that its closure is providing benefit to the shops in Bridge Street who reported seeing a higher footfall as a result of people accessing the town via lower Bridge Street. It was also noted that the impact on pedestrians is minimal, and that adequate disabled access to Bridge Street can be found via the footpath adjacent to Bourges Boulevard. Additionally, as part of the city recovery plans it is felt that the Arcade could offer a valuable space to support our 'cafe culture' aspirations. To explore this further, plans are being made to consider the permanent closure of the arcade. Legal advice is currently being sought. Once that advice has been received we will engage with stakeholders including pedestrian and disability groups to explore the variety of options that could be developed to improve pedestrian access to the city centre from this direction.

9.	**Question from Cllr Murphy** **For Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities** Following the motion agreed recently by Council on cruel sports and in particular foxhunting on Council land, what action has been taken by the Council on this matter besides the Officers at the crematorium or others writing to the Fitzwilliam Hunt about a recent encroachment on crematorium land during a funeral service? **The Cabinet Member may have responded:** Officers have had conversations with Ross Harris, Chairman of the Tenant Working Group on the implications for the Council's farm portfolio. Ross has also discussed this matter with George Dunn at the Tenant Farmers' Association. At the end of the day, we cannot force tenants to change their legal agreements, but going forward we can propose amendments on new agreements. However, we would expect tenants to put forward their demands also. Our Tenant farmers report that Hunts are not using council owned farmland Since 2005 the Hunting Act has made the hunting of foxes illegal. Currently the Covid-19 lockdown restrictions also prohibit people gathering. Both these provisions are enforceable by the police. In respect of the Fitzwilliam Hunt: Officers have reviewed the case with Legal Services. We have not received any firm evidence to confirm exactly where the trespass occurred but have communicated with the hunt to advise them of the Council position. A letter has been sent advising of the Motion and requesting that the hunt desists from entering our land. We will continue to monitor and to work with the estate to prevent any further incidents. For clarity, in a case of civil trespass we would need to show a measured response before bringing any civil action. With regard to trespass, had there been evidence of the civil breach, I believe the response available to the Council would most likely be a civil action, not prosecution, unless there was an associated criminal element with the trespass such as trespass with a weapon, associated violence, or damage caused to property or land for example.
10.	**Question from Cllr Shaz Nawaz** **For Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health** A huge area of concern is the impact of COVID-19 on mental health and health inequalities. What is the cabinet member doing in order to address this with a specific focus on additional support for people with mental health conditions? **The Cabinet Member may have responded:** Whilst I am not in any way qualified in any professional capacity to offer advice on mental health matters, As the cabinet member responsible I will continue to do all I can to support and oversee the work of officers and their staff. Tonight, I would like to remind people of the following.

In response to:

A huge area of concern is the impact of COVID-19 on mental health and health inequalities. What is the cabinet member doing in order to address this with a specific focus on additional support for people with mental health conditions?

There are several resources available to support people in Peterborough who are struggling with poor mental wellbeing or are experiencing loneliness/isolation during the pandemic. Some of these services have been commissioned or co-commissioned by the local authority:

CPSLMIND is commissioned by the local authority to run the 'good life service' for people struggling with mental health problems and loneliness.
Good Life Service, 'open to all' includes:

- Maintaining the facilitated Good Mood Cafes every weekday, currently on Zoom - An 'open to all' wellbeing session with space to connect
- Open Door calm spaces, also on Zoom, are twice a week providing focus or grounding techniques for those feeling more overwhelmed. Pre-booking on 0300 303 4363 or goodlife@cpslmind.org.uk

CPSLMIND is also commissioned to provide an online support and wellbeing community - Quell - which is available everyday: Online self-help, peer and chat resource community available 24 and Wellbeing Peer Support groups for those with mental health problems on Zoom
Please see: https://www.cpslmind.org.uk/our-response/

The STOP Suicide campaign is jointly commissioned by Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council and runs campaigns and messaging to target communities and groups at higher risk of suicide, including recently the Eastern European community. STOP suicide also identifies and support community champions across the area, who help to support messaging within communities. STOP Suicide is provided by CPSLMIND and there is a website with useful information for people who are struggling with mental health crisis - https://stopsuicidepledge.org/

Peterborough City Council along with Cambridgeshire County Council have been proactive in producing a communications campaign focusing on mental wellbeing - called 'now we're talking', which included a toolkit, tips and advice for promoting mental wellbeing and signposting to additional services for people in Peterborough. Communications continue to highlight these messages and any national mental health campaigns.

Additional services highlighted and supported by Peterborough City Council as well as information and advice for adults and young people who are struggling with mental wellbeing can be found through our local website - keep your head - https://www.keep-your-head.com/

In particular, the following services are promoted by Peterborough City Council and commissioned through our mental health partnership, available to people in Peterborough who need support for their mental wellbeing:

Lifeline - telephone support line in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. This is available between 11am -11pm FREEPHONE 0808 808 2121. Lifeline provides an opportunity to talk to someone who is trained to offer support to those struggling with

	mental health issues, loneliness or bereavement and can signpost to other services - that may be able to help with wider issues affecting people's mental wellbeing. This service was expanded as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic from being an evening only service to the 11am to 11pm service, every day of the week. Care Network offers a check and chat telephone service to support people who are feeling isolated or lonely - https://care-network.org.uk/ Mental Health Crisis - First Response Service - for people experiencing mental health crisis the local NHS First Response Service is available through 111 option 2.
11.	**WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Cllr Wiggin** **To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments** Can the relevant cabinet member please provide an update on which triggers have been met with regards to transport infrastructure from the Section 106 agreement for the Hamptons, and which triggers are still outstanding, including the most up to date figures available for each trigger. **The Cabinet Member response:** Requirement - The Owner shall procure the construction of a new road ("the Western Peripheral Road") between Junction 2 of Fletton Parkway and a point shown Z on Plan 3 before such amount of the Development as shall generate 5,900 vehicle trips in the weekday evening peak hour Status - Completed Bus Provision Requirement - In relation to the Hampton Land, for a period of 3 years from Occupation of the 50th Dwelling within the Hampton Land and in relation to the Leys Site, for a further period of 3 years from Occupation of the 50th Dwelling on the Leys Site the Owner shall use reasonable endeavours to secure that at least part of the bus provision serving the existing Hampton Development also serves the Hampton Land and/or the Leys Site (as appropriate) Status - Work by Stagecoach directed at delivery a service has been put on hold due to the impact of the pandemic.

Questions on notice to:	
d. The Combined Authority Representatives	
	None