

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 23 JUNE 2021
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR STEPHEN LANE

Present

Councillors Ansar Ali, Imtiaz Ali, Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Ishfaq Hussain, Mahboob Hussain, Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Knight, Lane, Moyo, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Robinson, Rush, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Tyler, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

16. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Howell, Councillor Qayyum, and Councillor Skibsted.

17. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

18. Minutes of the Meetings Held on:

(a) 26 May 2021 – Mayor Making

The minutes of the Mayor Making meeting held on 26 May 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(b) 26 May 2021 – Annual Council

The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 26 May 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

19. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor announced that Councillor John Fox and Councillor Tyler had signed up to undertake a sponsored diet for the Mayor's Charities, and invited Members to support them in achieving their goals.

20. Leader's Announcements

Councillor Fitzgerald announced that tenders for the production of the embankment masterplan had been requested and that the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and the Peterborough United Football Club had been made public that

afternoon. Councillor Fitzgerald further thanked the Cathedral for hosting the Council for the evening.

Other group leaders responded and it was suggested that the masterplan tender process should have been initiated sooner.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

21. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

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

1. Paston Reserve Section 106 Funding – Combined Authority Compliance
2. Paston Reserve Section 106 Funding – Investment

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

22. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

(b) Presented by Members

A petition was received from Councillor Hussain in relation to increasing the size of the public car park at Russell Street.

A petition was received from Councillor Hemraj, on behalf of Councillor Qayyum, in relation to the lack of consultation with residents on proposals for the alcohol and drug facility at Fengate, and the recycling plant.

A petition was received from Councillor Casey in relation to the installation of a footpath next to the children's centre at Herlington pre-school.

23. 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. Implementation of Article 4 designations
2. Details in relation to free bulky waste collection
3. The future of Peterborough City Market
4. The transfer of ownership of land on the embankment and arrangements with Peterborough United Football Club
5. The relocation of Peterborough Market
6. The cost of hiring venues for COVID-19 safe Council meetings
7. The impairment of the Empower loan
8. The free bulky waste collection service

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

24(a). Scrutiny Committee Recommendation – Parental Leave Policy

The Mayor was advised by the Leader of the Council that, with the prior agreement of Group Leader's, this recommendation would not be moved, and instead would be deferred for consideration at the next meeting of Full Council.

The Mayor sought the consent of the meeting and, with no objection received, noted that consideration of the Scrutiny Committee Recommendation – Parental Leave Policy would be deferred until the Full Council meeting on 28 July 2021.

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

Peterborough Investment Partnership 2020/21 Update

In response to a question from Councillor Murphy, Councillor Fitzgerald confirmed that if Members had specific questions about the due diligence completed ahead of the any investment, or compliance with the fair tax charter, these could be directed at Councillor Fitzgerald, who would respond in writing.

Empower Community Interest Company – Update

In response to a question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Councillor Coles confirmed that the refinancing of the Empower loan had been agreed previous, however fell through due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Delivery of Leisure Services Since 1 October 2020 by Peterborough Limited

In response to a question from Councillor Murphy, Councillor Fitzgerald was not aware of whether a co-opted model had been considered.

Contract for cloud-based services housing the Council's service estate

In response to a question from Councillor Wiggin, Councillor Cereste confirmed that the IT services would be reviewed in due course, in light of the repeated use of urgency procedures.

Cultural Strategy Commissioning

In response to a question from Councillor Day, Councillor Allen confirmed that grant funding was provided to the Nene Park Trust for the commissioning of a Cultural Strategy as the trust was one of the Council's strategic partners.

Sale of the freehold of the London Road Stadium and the Allia Business Centre

In response to a question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Councillor Hiller confirmed that he would provide a written response in relation to any rent that had been written off by the Council.

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Hiller further confirmed that the Council had made a profit from the sale of London Road Stadium and the Allia Business Centre

Disposal of the former Fletton Pupil Referral Unit

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Hiller advised that the PRU had stood empty for a long time and had been on the disposals list a while. The sale would enable local business to expand operations.

Purchase of new Refuse and Recycling Vehicles

In response to a question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Councillor Simons advised that none of these vehicles would be electric, but would be using carbon neutral diesel.

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Simons confirmed that new brown bin collection vehicles would be electric, though they did not form part of this decision.

Citizens Advice Funding 2021/22

In response to questions from Councillor Wiggin and Councillor Murphy, Councillor Fitzgerald confirmed that funding would decrease, and invited Members to let him know of any alternative funding sources.

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

Audit and Governance Committee 5 March 2021 – Assurance Framework

In response to a question from Councillor Sandford, Councillor Fitzgerald confirmed that he was aware of the concerns expressed by the Committee in relation to wanting the Business Board to meeting in public. Councillor Fitzgerald would feedback on the outcome of these discussions.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

27. Notices of Motion

27(1) Motion from Councillor Iqbal

Councillor Iqbal moved the motion and explained that he felt Peterborough was fortunate to have excellent officers who worked closely with Councillors and local leaders in relation to cemetery services, particularly the chaplaincy at the hospital. It was considered to be vitally important to preserve cemetery space within Peterborough and to bear in mind the sensitivities of families while doing so.

Councillor Ansar Ali seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

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

- The motion dealt with a sensitive issue and, as the motion requested consideration of the feasibility of such arrangements, was considered to be reasonable.
- It was felt that the motion should apply to those of the Muslim faith, any other faiths and those without any faith equally.
- It was suggested that 'no faith' should have also been included in the motion, but was missed on submission.
- It was noted that Eastfield Cemetery had provision for a further 15 years, and so there was no pressing need to safeguard space.
- Comment was made that digging graves of a smaller size was less efficient, as these had to be done manually.
- It was advised that the bereavement service had recently carried out an in-depth

review as to the remaining space available, and had concluded that resources would be available for the next 20 years, and that this would be extended with a number of projects due to commence shortly.

Councillor Ali spoke as seconder of the motion and reiterated that those providing burial services within Peterborough could be proud in the way they have responded to the needs of residents. During such difficult time as current, it was important that the community's needs were met with sensitivity and understanding. There was already concern within the community that space in Peterborough's cemeteries was running out.

Councillor Iqbal, in summing up the motion, confirmed that he would be happy for officers to implement the motion for those of any and no faith. It was considered to be of the utmost importance that the Council was prepared for the future and safeguarded its resources.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Iqbal. The motion was **AGREED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) as follows:

"The growing shortage of gravesites in the UK is a nationwide problem. With almost a half of all local authorities claiming that they will run out of burial plots in just 20 years, burials in cemeteries and church yards may one day turn into an exclusive privilege reserved for the wealthy.

Currently, Peterborough City Council provides grave sizes as follows:

- Adult - 7 feet and 8 inches long by 2 ft and 8 inches wide.
- Babies at any stage of gestation or after birth - 3ft long and 2 ft wide.

The Council believes it is important to:

- Provide facilities and services which meet the needs of all the local communities who use the service, with the highest possible standards of care, dignity and choice.
- Provide cemeteries, a crematorium with gardens of remembrance, and associated facilities at the highest possible standards.
- Facilitate the best possible options for meeting the needs of the public, by encompassing the values of Business Excellence in the management of the cemeteries, Crematorium, and associated services including the general administration of all closed churchyards.
- Demonstrate that the service effectively meets the needs of the community, without tolerance for mediocrity or non-compliance with published service standards including meeting religious/ethnic needs.

There are unique circumstances affecting the Muslim community who carry out their burial rites in an Islamic manner. Peterborough City Council and the funeral management committee have always enjoyed a close and respectful relationship with the Muslims community and taken their views and needs on board when considering modifications to improve funeral experiences for Muslim families within the city.

Given that the area we have is limited and in consideration of circumstances surrounding Covid-19, the perception of increased projected burial space and its effect on our communities may require additional space within our cemetery.

This Council resolves to request that the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities consider exploring the feasibility and potential benefits of:

- **Ensuring babies, at any stage of gestation or post term, to Muslim and other faith families are laid to rest in a grave size that is appropriate for**

their size of gestation or term, akin to Huntingdonshire District Council where burials of babies and infants take place according to the size of the casket.”

27(2) Motion from Councillor Sainsbury

Councillor Sainsbury moved the motion and advised the meeting that he felt that knife crime presented a serious problem with profound consequences for communities and young people. The number of young people carry out knife crime and being the victim of knife crime had increased in the past few years and, while action was being taken by the Safer Peterborough Partnership to provide a tactical response, Councillor Sainsbury wished to see a particular focus on knife crime in the future. This was supported by the new force leader within the Cambridgeshire Constabulary making the response to knife crime a priority. This would be benefitted by a whole system approach, including education playing a key role to ensure that people were aware of the consequences of such attacks.

Councillor Imtiaz Hussain seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Comment was made that previous work on targeted youth support had succeeded in decreasing reoffending levels, though had had the budget cut. It was considered that the current levels of knife crime may be as a result of this.
- It was advised that the Safer Peterborough Partnership was tackling these issues through a multi-agency approach and was working on a prevention and enforcement strategy, which had already reported successful outcomes.
- Members considered this to be an important topic and felt that it should be a priority for the Safer Peterborough Partnership as it reviews its priorities.
- It was recognised that knife crime, and the process of going through the court system, can be damaging to individual's mental health.

Councillor Imtiaz Hussain, as seconder of the motion, advised that Dogsthorpe had been affected by instances of knife crime and that this had impacted on the community's spirit.

Councillor Sainsbury, in summing up the motion, thanked Members for their contributions and noted cases reported in the local news in the past few weeks highlight the impact of the problem, with two young boys in Paston found with a machete, a knife being found on somebody in the city centre, and a case of a 9-year-old being stabbed repeatedly. In light of this, Councillor Sainsbury expressed his concern about where the city would be in the future.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Sainsbury. The motion was **AGREED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) as follows:

“Council notes that:

- Knife Crime is a very serious issue and can have long term impact on victims, their families and whole communities.
- In 2019/20, Cambridgeshire Police recorded 565 offences across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough involving a knife or sharp weapon, more than double the rates reported in 2012/13.
- Some areas of the UK have achieved significant reductions in knife crime amongst young people by adopting a public health approach to the issue and working closely across partner agencies including with youth services, the voluntary sector, social care, health and education.

- The Safer Peterborough Partnership has set up a multi-agency Problem Solving Group which manages the tactical response to local issues as and when they arise but there is not currently a specific focus on knife crime within the work of the Group.

Council resolves to:

- **Request the Safer Peterborough Partnership Problem Solving Group to establish a particular focus on knife crime to ensure that incidents are identified and reported and that measures are instigated to prevent further incidents.**
- **Develop and instigate plans to adopt a public health approach to the issue of knife crime, as demonstrated elsewhere in the UK.**
- **Set up, in conjunction with the police, the police and crime commissioner's office, Cabinet Members for Housing, Culture and Communities and for Integrated Social Care, Health and Public Health and neighbourhood watch, a Peterborough-wide publicity and education campaign pitched at young people, their parents and carers on the subject of knife crime.**
- **The results of this work to be reported regularly to the Communities Scrutiny Committee."**

27(3) Motion from Councillor Sandford

Councillor Sandford moved the altered motion and expressed his gratitude to the Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene, and Environment for arranging a meeting with him and officers to discuss his concerns. The two key issues within the motion were the need to improve the city's recycling rates and the need to decarbonise vehicles. It was noted that in placing an order for new recycling vehicles, it had not been possible to find electric or hybrid vehicles. Central Government was currently undertaking a major review of guidelines and Councillor Sandford expressed concern that should Peterborough's guidance or equipment differ from any new national standard that residents would become confused and recycling rates would decrease. Therefore, the motion asked that future purchases be paused until Government guidance was released.

Councillor Day seconded the altered motion and emphasised that the aim of reaching a 65% recycling rate by 2035 was important. It was felt that updates to the Growth, Environment, and Resources Scrutiny Committee would be welcomed on measure in place to reach this goal. The Council was interested to find out more about the use of carbon-free diesel and noted that waste-charged vehicles were being trialled in Sheffield, and electric vehicles purchased in South Cambridgeshire.

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

- Comment was made that, in light of previous costly decision that had to be reversed, review of such decisions were imperative.
- Members were encouraged to speak with Cabinet Members about their concerns.
- It was advised that for brown bin collections, officers were currently in the process of procuring electric vehicles, and that fly-tipping would be a top priority for the Council going forward.

Councillor Sandford, in summing up the altered motion, noted that the decision to procure the new recycling collection vehicles was not called-in, as Members could not do so simply because they disagreed with the decision. It was considered to be important to wait for further guidance before investing further. Councillor Sandford was pleased to hear of the new Cabinet Member's aims for recycling levels and hoped that Peterborough City Council could replicate what the top performing Council's in the

country were doing.

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Sandford. The altered motion was **AGREED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) as follows:

"Following publication of the Waste Management Plan for England in January 2021, the Government has announced that it intends to legislate for consistent collection of recyclable materials by local authorities across England and that this may include requirements for more kerbside separation of different recyclable materials. They are currently consulting on what form these new regulations may take.

In its waste management plan, Government states that its aim is get recycling rates for municipal waste up from around 45% currently to 65% by 2035. Peterborough's current recycling rate is only just over 40%.

~~Council therefore believes it would be premature for Peterborough City Council to invest further in domestic waste collection vehicles until precise Government waste collection requirements are known.~~

~~Council also believes it is important, as part of the Council's commitment to get the city to net zero carbon by 2030, that wherever possible future investment is in electric or hybrid vehicles.~~

Council recognises that we need to procure some new vehicles now to ensure we can meet the council's statutory duty to collect household waste but, would ask that any future purchases, beyond the CMDN that has already been approved and the additional 2 fully electric RCV's for garden waste be paused, to allow for further guidance to be published. Council also believes it is important, as part of the Council's commitment to get the city to net zero carbon by 2030, that wherever economically and operationally possible future investment is in electric or hybrid vehicles.

Council therefore requests the Cabinet to pause any further investment in new waste collection vehicles beyond the approved CMDN and the 2 additional electric RCV's for garden waste and requests that the Growth and Environment Scrutiny Committee carry out an urgent review of collection of domestic waste, with a view to significantly increasing our recycling rates and ensuring cost effective investment in new vehicles and machinery. receive an update on proposed measures to be taken to increase recycling rates."

27(4) Motion from Councillor Jones

Councillor Jones moved the altered motion and expressed his wish to bridge the digital divide. Last year a number of Members donate their Community Leadership Funds to provide laptops for schools and it was felt that work could be done to make this arrangement permanent.

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

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

- Comment was made that the Council was already doing the action requested within the motion, and had had huge success with schools and local business donating IT equipment.
- The Council, it was noted, did not have a surplus of IT equipment, but would be open to extending the school scheme to those in need within the city.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz, as seconder of the motion, considered that technology

represented a huge opportunity, on a similar level to the industrial revolution. The motion before Council sought to support those who were vulnerable, on low income or seeking refuge. The proposal would also help the Peterborough reduce its carbon footprint and to help connect the wider community.

Councillor Jones, in summing up the altered motion, noted that the UK creates the second highest level of IT in the world, without a circular IT economy. It was felt timely to bring this matter to Members' attention.

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor Jones. The altered motion was **AGREED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) as follows:

"This Council notes that:

- The Covid-19 lockdowns have shown how vital technology is to keeping people connected, in particular the vulnerable in society, many of whom have been confined to their homes and unable to see loved ones.
- According to Age UK, 51% of digitally excluded people are over the age of 65, while refugees and the homeless also face worrying levels of digital exclusion. According to homeless charity C4WS, 90% of those in shelter don't have access to IT devices.

This Council believes:

- We need to embrace new ways to bridge the digital gap, as it has taken a global pandemic to show what can happen when we don't do that.
- Companies need to embrace innovative ways to upcycle their old technology rather than simply sell for scrap, which just gets shipped around the world and adds to our carbon footprint.
- Digital exclusion is particularly concerning for the most vulnerable in society, including those on low income, such as pensioners living on pension credit, refugees and those without homes.
- Along with other public bodies in local area, such as schools and universities, we have a civic duty to work together to find the most beneficial solutions to challenges we face as a local community, including digital exclusion.

The Council resolves to request that the Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation consider:

- **Donating IT equipment locally to those in need rather than scrapping it, using schemes such as the Laptops for Homeless and Vulnerable Initiative.**
- **Encouraging public bodies, council suppliers and other local businesses in Peterborough to take similar action as set out above, by use of the Council's-**
- **~~Encouraging council suppliers, together with the Council, to proactively take part in sponsoring and promoting this message to local businesses, through traditional media and social media channels and any other means appropriate.~~**

28(a) Political Balance and Allocation of Committee Seats

Council received a report in relation to the allocation of committee seats on the Growth, Environment, and Resources Scrutiny Committee and the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee, following a request from the Labour Group and the Green Group.

The Mayor moved the recommendations, which were seconded by Councillor Shaz Nawaz.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to agree the amendment to the allocation of seats on those committees subject to political balance arrangements:

- The Labour Group to lose a seat on the Growth, Environment, and Resources Scrutiny Committee and gain a seat on the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee.
- The Green Group to lose a seat the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee and gain a seat on the Growth, Environment, and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

28(b) Chair of Parish Council Liaison

Council received a report in relation to the appointment of the Chair of the Parish Council Liaison meeting for the remainder of the 2021/2022 municipal year.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendations, which were seconded by Councillor Allen.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to appoint Councillor David Over as Chair of the Parish Council Liaison meeting, for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year.

28(c) Notification of Changes to the Executive Delegations

Council received a report in relation to changes made to the Executive Delegations by the Leader of the Council, particularly in relation to the previous Cabinet Advisor position for Children in Care.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendations, which were seconded by Councillor Allen.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to note the changes made by the Leader of the Council to the Executive Scheme of Delegations.

The Mayor
6.45pm – 9:36pm
23 June 2021
Peterborough Cathedral
Peterborough

**FULL COUNCIL 23 JUNE 2021
QUESTIONS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Simon Kail</p> <p>For Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald, representative on Combined Authority Board</p> <p>Yes thank you, I've got two questions on behalf of the Gunthorpe and Werrington Lib Dem Focus Team and the residents of the Manor Drive Estate in Gunthorpe. So the first question is for the Combined Authority so; under the section 106 agreement for the development of land at Paston Reserve dated 11th August 2017 the applicants agreed to pay a substantial contribution 'towards the provision of a bus service between the land and Peterborough city centre or such other improvement or subsidisation of public transport links to the Land approved by the Applicants'. As the Combined Authority is now responsible for public transport provision in Peterborough can the Councillor, I assume it's Councillor Fitzgerald, explain how they are complying with this agreement?</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr. Mayor, happy to respond and thank you Mr Kail for your question. A part of the contribution towards the Paston Reserves s106 has been triggered and received by Peterborough City Council. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority will now be investigating and proposing a scheme which it allows to draw down from this funding from PCC to CPCA. Remember [CPCA] has only been directly responsible for public transport since 1 April, and they will progress the scheme as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Supplementary:</p> <p>Can we put some... [unintelligible due to microphone issues].... response will be made.</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald responded:</p> <p>I think I heard most of the question Mr. Mayor so I think he's asking when, if it's possible to put a timescale when it will be done. I think the honest answer is no but I will try to press for one. As you know the Conservatives take a great, keen interest particularly with Mr. Bryan Tyler now in the Werrington / Gunthorpe area. I'm sure a lot will happen more quickly as he's already pressing and challenging me, particularly for bus services and other improvements and, as many Members will know who keep an eagle-eyed watch on social media, myself and Mr. Bristow paid a visit to meet residents just a couple of weeks ago. The Liberal Democrat members were there and they all working together as a team with Mr. Tyler to show improvements in that area. In terms of my tenure of the Combined Authority it's</p>

only been quite recent so I will be pushing for improvements in transport with the Combined Authority and Werrington Manor Drive is very much on my radar and the Conservatives will try to push this through and drive those improvements throughout the City, not just in Werrington.

2. **Question from Simon Kail**

For Councillor Steve Allen Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities

So second question I believe is for Councillor Steve Allen as Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities. So under the section 106 agreement for the development of land at Paston Reserve dated 11th August 2017 the applicants agreed to pay a substantial contribution towards a community centre and play facilities, including a Neighbourhood Area for Play and a Multi-use Games Area and skateboarding facilities. Can the Councillor elaborate on how and when these contributions will be invested in the development?

Councillor Allen responded:

Yes indeed, thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Mr. Kail. There were 340 occupations at the site in early April 2021. There is a trigger point in the Section 106 agreement due at the occupation of the 400th dwelling. Here is a brief summary of the current position in relation to the financial contributions towards a community centre and play facilities. There's an acronym alert coming your way now so a quick crash course in play equipment acronyms.

£28,579.50 for a LEAP, Locally Equipped Area for Play, contribution has been received but unspent to date.

£63,510 Play Facilities Contribution - one half due at 400th occupation towards MUGA which is a Multi-use Play Area and one half due at the 500th occupation towards a NEAP, which is a Neighbourhood Equipped Play Area.

£42,340 Adventure Play Contributions towards the provision / improvement of a skateboard facilities within a radius of 3 miles from the boundary of the land is due in 4 instalments of £10,585 at 250th, 350th, 450th and 550th occupations. We have received the contributions due at 250th and 350th occupations, both remain unspent to date.

£524,395 contribution towards the Community Centre which is due at the 450th Occupation. I do hope Mr. Kail that that's sufficient information to allow you to see that these contributions are proceeding at pace and will be applied accordingly. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Supplementary:

Yes, only that therefore the Councillor can confirm that all of the investments that were stated in the Section 106 agreement will be made at some point, i.e. there will be a community centre, there will be a Community Centre, there will be a MUGA and there will be a NEAP in the development?

Councillor Allen responded:

	<p>Thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Mr. Kail. I mean the fact is yes, that's what the contributions are for and they will be progressed accordingly. Hopefully the sooner the better because we all want to see these facilities provided for the community.</p>
--	---

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 Councillor Wiggin (1)**

For Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities, and Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments

What progress has been made on implementing article 4 designations (planning controls on HMOs) across Peterborough?

Councillor Hiller responded:

Yes Mr. Mayor, if you'll allow me to respond and I thank Councillor Wiggin for his question. The reason I thank him particularly is because it gives me an excellent opportunity to highlight the progress we've made in this very significant area, an issue impacting negatively impacting on many residents of our city, especially in the Hampton Vale Ward represented by Conservative Councillors Cereste and Sharp, the Hargate and Hempsted Ward represented by Conservative Councillors Farooq, Moyo and Howard and Councillor Coles, Fletton and Woodston Ward. Other wards appear to be affected certainly, but those Councillors I've mentioned have raised the problem specifically. They've worked tirelessly for their residents to achieve a solution to the problem of small-scale HMOs Mr . Mayor, which blight their wards and to that end the Leader has asked me, in conjunction with Councillor Moyo, to come up with the evidenced feasibility of doing just that. This piece of work is nearly complete and I will be submitted the finished report to our Conservative Group in the very near future for their consideration, commentary and recommendations before engaging with officers. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Supplementary:

Yes, thank you Mr. Mayor, thank Councillor Hiller for his response to the question. What I would like to know is; given that Hampton parish Council unanimously agreed in July 2018 that an Article 4 designation was wanted for the parish and that was agreed by all Parish and Ward Councillors at the time, why has it taken so long for this to come forward especially, as he says, it has the support of so many Conservative councillors. Hampton Vale residents, and indeed residents across the other areas he's mentioned, are getting increasingly anxious that it appears no action has been taken so can he clarify why it has taken so long for this to come forward? Thank you.

Councillor Hiller responded:

Yes Mr. Mayor, thank you and I thank Councillor Wiggin for the follow up question. The simple answer to that is that I've been approached by, as has the Leader, by

the Ward Councillors with regard to the problem of HMOs. I believe it was a campaigning issue at the recent elections and of course, fully supported for some form of resolution. The actual timescale involved, as you cite from the Parish Council first raising it, I'm not aware of I'm afraid Councillor Wiggin so I can't really comment on that but to flesh out the issue for Councillors that aren't aware, small-scale HMOs housing up to six unrelated people need no formal planning consent, let's make that quite clear. One way to manage the problem that..... [unintelligible due to microphone issues]... balance suitable community issue, parking issues, anti-social behaviour and excess noise is to require those houses to apply for a consent through the use of what's known as an Article 4 Direction. This is what I'm working on currently, all members will be aware of that now and hopefully we'll come to a resolution in the not-too-distant future. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

2. **Question from Councillor Joseph**

For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment

I'm pleased bulky waste collections are being reintroduced as a number of opposition Councillors had requested this over the years. Could you please assist me with the following:

- 1) What will be the total gross annual cost of bulky waste collections?
- 2) Where is the money coming from?
- 3) Are any services likely to be compromised as a result of the reintroduction of bulky waste collections?
- 4) Why did it take the administration so many years to reintroduce the service?

Councillor Simons responded:

Yes, thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Councillor Joseph for your question, or four questions. How much is it going to cost? Honest answer, it depends on the take up obviously. We budgeted for around £19 per collection at 120 collections per week. We also ... [unintelligible due to mic issues] ... efficiencies. One of these is a system called Bartec which runs the booking system, giving the operatives a hand-held device to receive jobs while in transit. This system is also to be used at the Recycling Centre to allow residents who need permits to be able to do the permit on-site or later, thus removing one of their twelve visits from the system. I'm quite happy to report the costs after three months of running the service.

Where's the money coming from? Well, I was rather hoping that Members would chip in on that. Joking all apart, efficiencies. I am being told the money is coming from efficiencies.

Question three, are any services likely to be compromised? Not on my watch, no. No services will be compromised.

Why did it take the administration so many years to introduce? This service has been trailed before as we all know. I believe bulky waste service alone cannot prevent this pandemic of fly-tipping. I think we all agree on this. We are working on

making disposal of waste much easier along with tougher enforcement. I need cross-party support on this; let's all do what we can. Ride round our areas engaging, reporting. Let's all highlight the issues as much as possible on the social media. Let's show others we can make a difference.

Supplementary:

Thank you Mr. Mayor, yes. Thank you Councillor Simons for your answer. In view of the fact that we are in such a precarious position financially, having had to borrow £13m last year and already having a £20m deficit it seems extraordinary that you'll be able to find this money through efficiencies. As you've mentioned in your answer, it has been noted that in general, free bulky waste does not have a huge impact on fly-tipping and you've offered no real answers as to how you're going to make this work this time. Is it perhaps a case of this was an election promise that will be withdrawn very soon after because it won't be efficient or is this going to be a permanent situation where people will be able to get their waste picked up free on an ongoing basis?

Councillor Simons responded:

Thank you Councillor Joseph. Yeah, I'd rather leave the numbers to Pete Carpenter and Councillor Cole. I think that's for them to come up with how and why we can get the money, to be perfectly honest.

3. **Question from Councillor Hogg (1)**

For Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities, and Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments

There has been considerable concern around the future of the City Market from across the city. Can the relevant cabinet member please outline to council why, despite the fact the Northminster development has been in the planning stage for some time, when was the decision taken that the market would not be part of that development and why are we still in the position of not knowing where the market will be relocated or even what the make-up of that new market will be?

Councillor Allen responded:

Thank you Mr. Mayor, that falls to myself, Councillor Allen, to respond to Councillor Hogg's question. This concerns the Market. The existing Northminster site has been allocated for redevelopment since the adoption of the current Local Plan in 2019 and represents one of the next stages of the city's important regeneration.

A planning application for the development led by Peterborough Investment Partnership (PIP, acronym time) is due to be submitted to Peterborough City Council later this year. If planning permission is secured, construction could begin in 2022 and this would necessitate the relocation of the existing market. PIP did investigate the inclusion of a market within the scheme but were not able to arrive at a viable solution.

We appreciate the strength of feeling for the market and the service it provides to the people of Peterborough. We are currently exploring options to identify a new permanent site that will complement the city centre retail and leisure offer long-term

	<p>and as part of its broader regeneration plans for the city. We see this as a great opportunity to secure a refreshed, modern and vibrant shopping experience for the market that benefits shoppers and traders alike. I'm thinking of something like a Peter Borough Market, copyright Councillor Steve Allen by the way.</p> <p>A final decision is yet to be made regarding the permanent location, but we are committed to resolving this and as soon as possible maintaining a continuous market offer within the city. If owing to timescales a permanent solution cannot be found for 2022, we will deliver an attractive interim arrangement which could include provision of a city centre street offer and the utilisation of vacant shop premises for those traders who currently operate with fixtures and fittings.</p> <p>We will be engaging directly throughout this process with Market Traders and other interested parties to keep them informed of progress and capture their views.</p> <p>Supplementary:</p> <p>I do. So the thing I'm perplexed about is that it just seems to me that the market has been left to rack and ruin, there's not been a Market Inspector for a number of years and these plans have been brought forward and I had asked at what point did the administration know that the market was not going to be part of the plan going forward. A lot of time has been spent on putting these plans together and yet it seems that there is no plan going forward for the market itself and that only because there has been a petition put together by market traders that the administration has now woken up to the fact that the market has. I can see that you're shaking your head but that's the perception and ultimately is that the reality, perception is more important than the reality. And what I'm looking for is some sort of reassurance. So yeah, the question is firstly to answer the question at what point did we know there was going to be no market in the plans that came forward, how long ago was that and what work has actually been done on finding a new home for the market?</p> <p>Councillor Allen responded:</p> <p>No, no and no, the petition did not stimulate the need to search. What happened was the proposal went to the Combined Authority and that meant it was in the public domain so we had to tell the market traders the situation. This has been an ongoing process and indeed COVID did delay part of the negotiations. The market traders knew that we were going to move the market. The timescale, I agree, is something of an irritation to them but we are looking at new locations and fervently doing so, not stimulated by a petition but a need to press this redevelopment. I am committed to a market in this City. It's important to cover the fact that this administration.... [unintelligible due to mic issues]... market for the City and so we will progress new location and I will hopefully be back to this Chamber at some stage with how our negotiations are going. Thank you Councillor Hogg, I appreciate your interest in this. It's something dear to the City, dear to this Administration, dear to all of us in this Chamber.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>At Annual Council recently the leader of the council stated that no decisions have</p>

been made in respect of Peterborough United moving their ground to a site on the Embankment.

Whilst that is true with regard to a planning decision in the Council's capacity as planning authority, the Council is also the owner of the land on the Embankment.

So could the leader of the Council tell us what commitments have been made to Peterborough United regarding transfer of ownership of the land on the Embankment or other arrangements for the football club to use part of it? And will he publish the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and the Football Club which we are told was signed last year and may be relevant these issues, so there is full openness and transparency with both councillors and the citizens of Peterborough, whatever their views on the issues.

Councillor Hiller responded:

Yes, I'd be happy to Mr. Mayor and I thank Councillor Sandford for the question. I'm very happy to provide a concise answer. I would say, bluntly, that no commitments have been made regarding any aspect of the Embankment Land. Regarding the MOU introduced the Leader this evening, this has been made available to Council members but I imagine it probably came as a bit of a disappointment to Councillor Sandford given there's nothing within it remotely suggesting anything other than a mutual understanding the Council will, when possible and practical, try to assist the club in finding a suitable site for their possible relocation as the Council would do to assist any significant contributor to Peterborough's economy. So Councillor Sandford, no done deals, no firm agreements, no promises on any particular areas in the City, nothing about any planning applications and no agreements about the future use, or indeed any sale or our City's Embankment to Peterborough United Football Club. I'm not sure I can be any clearer Mr. Mayor or indeed Councillor Sandford.

Supplementary:

Yes, Mr. Mayor I do. I'm really grateful that possibly the first time in my 25 years on the Council submitting a question has produced such a positive response and I actually do genuinely welcome the fact that the memorandum is due to be published but my colleague Councillor Haynes put in a request for this memorandum to be published and the Leader of the Council said it's going to be published Thursday morning, i.e. the day following the Full Council meeting so why couldn't it be published when we first requested it?

Councillor Hiller responded:

If I might respond to that Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Sandford for his follow-up question. I think it would be fairly obvious that when the Council is engaged with memorandums of understanding with any commercial operation, before the release of any agreement, by necessity it has to go by our legal folk at the Council to ensure there's nothing commercially sensitive that we wouldn't want, or indeed the commercial organisation in this case, wouldn't want released into the general public domain. It's quite simple, quite straightforward, no conspiracy theory, that's fact.

5. **Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (1)**

For Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing,

Culture and Communities, and Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments

Peterborough market is an integral part of the city. It supports the local economy and livelihoods of many families rely on the market having a safe and secure home. Could you please explain where the administration will relocate the market?

Councillor Allen responded:

Thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Councillor Nawaz. Back to the Market, obviously a subject dear to members. You ask where the administration will relocate the market. Negotiations are taking place, it's commercially sensitive as to where we'll be looking because obviously that affects rental values and property values so it's happening. But to elaborate on that, we're currently exploring options to identify a new permanent site that will complement the city centre retail and leisure offer long-term, although of course the leisure offer is relevant because the kind of market we want to create will have leisure aspects. I said before... [unintelligible due to mic issues]... market. Great foot outlets... [unintelligible due to mic issues]... to take home but to enjoy the atmosphere of the market and make it a [unintelligible due to mic issues] for the City. A final decision is yet to be made regarding the permanent location, but we remain committed to resolving this as soon as possible and to maintain a continuous market offer within the city. As I said previously to Councillor Hogg, if owing to timescales, a permanent location cannot be sought for 2022, we will deliver an interim arrangement which could include provision of a city centre street offer and the utilisation of vacant shop premises for those traders who currently operate with fixtures and fittings. We will be engaging directly throughout this process with market traders and other interested parties to keep them informed of progress and capture their views. I think the microphone was breaking up again but I hope you heard my response.[Unintelligible due to mic issues].... Mr. Mayor.

Supplementary question:

I do, thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Councillor Allen for your response. It appears from your response that possibly the market traders were right in saying that you've forgotten about them and you don't have a very clear plan but a two part question if I may Mr. Mayor:

The first part is can you give us a very clear undertaking that next time when we do something, rather than doing it to people, we do it with people so we keep them onboard and involved?

And the second part is that it was quite embarrassing to see that mixed messages and poor communication resulted in quite a few market traders being very upset. Going forward, what changes are you going to implement in terms of processes to make sure that we firm up on our communication?

Councillor Allen responded:

...[Unintelligible due to mic issues]... microphone is working so I can answer that. I disagree about mixed messages. I think the problem was that not enough of the message got to the traders when a Council officer visited them to give further context to the date line for the move so that is regrettable but it wasn't a mixed message, it wasn't a... [Unintelligible due to mic issues]... message. We are

	<p>committed to moving the market. We are committed to supporting the traders, the good traders on the market to go somewhere else with their product. The timescale with regard to moving the market has been established for some time. It was delayed by pandemic. ...[Unintelligible due to mic issues]... perhaps got stuck in a bit of mud but the reality is... [Unintelligible due to mic issues]... was moving, has always... [Unintelligible due to mic issues]... we need to now accelerate our search for an alternative location. We are taking to landlords and locations to move the market to another location. We will keep this Chamber informed, and the market traders, as we progress the search to establish the new market location. Thank you Councillor Nawaz and thank you Mr. Mayor.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin (2)</p> <p>For Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>How much has the council had to pay for hiring venues for council meetings since the virtual meetings legislation ended, and how much of this is additional spending compared to meetings held in the Council Chamber?</p> <p>Councillor Coles responded:</p> <p>Yes, thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you very much Councillor Wiggin for your question. Firstly, I would like to outline that all public meetings, Full Council, Cabinet, Committee meetings and some Task and Finish Groups must now physically meet in person. Internal meetings and non-public related meetings can still be delivered via Zoom or Teams.</p> <p>Since the Government's decision to commence physical meetings, there have been 6 held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mayor Making/Annual Council on 26th May • Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 15th June • Employment Committee on 17th June • Cabinet on 21st June • Audit Committee also on 21st June • And Full Council this evening. <p>For Mayor Making and the Annual Council, the East of England Arena was used and, of course, the Cathedral is being used tonight. All other meetings have taken place in Sandmartin House at Fletton Quays.</p> <p>Excluding the cost of officer time, the total expenditure on venues and on livestreaming these meetings has been £9,319.25</p> <p>This further breaks down into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £3,040.50 for the Arena • £3,400.75 for the Cathedral. • £2,448 for Livestreaming • And an additional cost of £430 to set up at Sand Martin House <p>If these meetings had been held in the Chamber, we would only incur expense on the livestreaming of the two Council meetings. As such, the additional expenditure</p>

in this period has been £8,503.25.

Thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you Councillor Wiggin.

Supplementary:

Yes, thank you Mr. Mayor and I thank Councillor Coles for his comprehensive answer. The recent Members' survey of the LGA highlighted 83% of Councils said they would be likely or fairly likely to conduct meetings online or hybrid if they were allowed to. Given the state of the Council's finances, both this Council and many councils across the Country, and given the uncertainty of COVID regulations we may be in this situation for some councils may struggle to meet the costs going forward unless the Government provides further support. Will Councillor Coles join his Leader in the LGA....

Councillor Wiggin then repeated his question as some Members could not hear:

So 83% of Councils in an LGA survey said they would be very or fairly likely to conduct meetings either online or hybrid after the pandemic if they had the power. This position is supported by the Conservative Chair of the LGA. Will Councillor Coles and the Cabinet, given the precarious situation of Council finances both here in Peterborough and across the Country, write to the ministers to encourage them to extend the virtual meetings allowances to allow councils to hold virtual meetings if they so choose.

Councillor Coles responded:

Thank you Mr. Mayor, thank you Councillor Wiggin. I'm not sure I heard everything that you said but if what you're asking is do I think that virtual meetings are useful, yes I do. Primary legislation suggests that we have to hold things in person which is what we're doing. My fondest hope is that we very shortly come out of these restrictions and we can return back to the Council Chamber, therefore the continuing costs that we are seeing will not therefore be the case but were we to experience larger costs then of course we could take that up to see if we could get COVID support funding for it. But as I say, it's another House that would make the changes in terms of primary legislation but I'm absolute agree with you that I do prefer virtual meetings on occasion. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

7. **Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (2)**

For Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance

The Empower loan impairment is a disaster that was waiting to happen. I did point this out back in January 2019 and I know other members have raised concerns over the years. What I want to know is:

1. Why did the council grant a 100% loan knowing full well the extraordinary risk of doing so?
2. Why was the debt not securitised by other assets and personal guarantees?
3. Why did the council not take a tougher stance on collecting the loan when opposition members were warning the administration of the risks?
4. Who is ultimately responsible in the cabinet for having caused such a colossal black hole in the council's finances?

Councillor Coles responded:

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Nawaz for your four questions. The first question, if you'll forgive me I'll avoid the hyperbole because it's not my most favourite way of addressing questions. But why did the Council grant a 100% loan? The proposal to the Council was made by Empower Community Management, a social enterprise with its primary purpose of delivering solar installations on residential properties and to deliver a community benefit scheme. The Council has full security by way of a debenture over all the assets of ECSP1

Your second question about why the debt was not securitised by other assets and personal guarantees. The Council has full security by way of a debenture over on the assets of ECSP1, the entity into which the loan was made and where the assets are held. It is only by holding this security the Council is able to take control of the assets as recommended to Cabinet on 21 June.

Your third question is why we didn't take a tougher stance on collecting the loan. The Council were pro-active in pursuing a refinancing of its loan in a way that achieved full repayment of the principal. The Empower team were unable to refinance the loan in full in 2018 when the best offer achieved was only £18m.

The Council pursued its own refinancing process and you'll note that CMDN of November 2018 and CMDN of March 2019 addressed this and it was able to achieve an offer of full value from Global Tower Solutions. And that was featured in Cabinet Report of September 2019. Global Tower Solutions had a large funding facility and had completed their due diligence but unfortunately due to the COVID-19 pandemic, their funding facility was put on hold in March 2020.

Cabinet on 21st September 2020 approved the renegotiation of the construction facility to a long-term loan facility in order to enable the loan principal to start to be repaid.

At any point from 2018 the Council would have pursued an open market sale, however this would not have achieved the best value as indicated by the March 2019 valuation of the loan £15.4m as opposed the underlying asset valuation for the Council of £20.4m.

And finally, who was ultimately responsible? The project was set out and defined in the Cabinet Report of 15th December 2014 from the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement. This office was held by Cllr Cereste. The contact officer for this report was the Executive Director, Resources John Harrison.

Extensions to the project were approved by various CMDNs. The increase was approved to enable further proposals for investment in Empower and subject to the criteria of the Invest to Save Budget.

Supplementary:

Thank you very much Councillor Coles for your response. In light of where we are, would you now agree that granting a 100% loan was something which was reckless and can you give us an assurance that a similar mistake will never ever be repeated again.

Councillor Coles responded:

Thank you Mr. Mayor. Thank you Councillor Nawaz, I think I can give my guarantee that it would be very exceptional for me to agree that sort of thing in the current

	<p>climate, it just simply wouldn't work now. I can't obviously comment on decisions that were made before, I think both you and I were councillors so I wasn't fully aware of that situation so I really can't comment. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Hogg (2)</p> <p>For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</p> <p>Election promises were made by the leader of the council regarding the provision of free bulky waste collection across the city. Can the relevant cabinet member, or indeed the leader, please confirm that this promise will be upheld and more importantly when can we expect this service to be available to residents?</p> <p>Councillor Simons responded:</p> <p>Yes, thank you Mr. Mayor. Thank you Councillor Hogg for the question, I understand this was a Lib Dem manifesto so I thank you for supporting it. Councillor Hogg, I've had the pleasure of knowing you over 20 years; you know if I say it's going to happen, it will happen. I can assure you free bulky waste will happen. I'm fairly confident it will begin the next month or so.</p> <p>Supplementary:</p> <p>I just wanted to clarify, have we clarified the situation in terms of how many free bulky waste collections per household there will be, is it unlimited? And also, the scope of how many items that will be, it's purely for the information of our residents that the devil's in the detail at the end of the day. How many items, is it going to be limited by the number of items per collection?</p> <p>Councillor Simons responded:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hogg. Okay, yeah, we said 30 collections a day. We only collect Tuesday to Friday because it's a four-day week at Peterborough Limited, I don't know if you're aware of that, so obviously that's 120 collections a week. Yeah, I'm quite happy to release the paper when we get the information to you, not a problem at all. Sorry, what was the other?</p> <p>Councillor Hogg responded:</p> <p>Sorry it was the number of collections per household so if I rang up ten times in a year, is that going to be okay?</p> <p>Councillor Simons responded:</p> <p>Six bulky items and obviously they say about half a wagon full, that's what I'm informed by the officers. Six bulky items and then half the wagon.</p>

Questions on notice to:

d. The Combined Authority Representatives

1.	Nil
----	------------