

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 28 JULY 2021  
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, 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, Coles, Dowson, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Howell, Ishfaq Hussain, Mahboob Hussain, Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lane, Moyo, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Tyler, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yurgutene

**In Attendance Virtually**

Councillors Day, Yasin

**33. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Fox, Councillor Yasin, Councillor Day, Councillor Knight, and Councillor Cereste.

**34. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**35. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 June 2021**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 23 June 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the amendment of item 27(2) to read “Councillor Ishfaq Hussain seconded the motion ...”.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**36. Mayor’s Announcements**

The Mayor announced that that the Mayor’s Charities was launching a virtual fundraising scheme, in light of challenges arising from COVID-19 restrictions. It was hoped that this new platform would be a great success.

**37. Leader’s Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Leader.

**QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

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

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

1. Safety of Orton Northgate Roads
2. City Centre Toilets

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

### **39. 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 Walsh in relation to an HMO built in Oakley Drive and Thornleigh Drive.

A petition was received from Councillor Haseeb in relation to removing the residents only parking restrictions on Thistlemoor Road.

### **40. 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. Support for students in the summer holidays
2. Use of the Town Hall
3. Anti-social behaviour/social housing
4. Flooding
5. Success of Selective Licensing
6. Post-Euro online behaviour
7. Brown bin income
8. Accommodation for Syrian refugees

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

### **41(a). Scrutiny Committee Recommendation – Parental Leave Policy**

The Council received a report from the previously titled Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, in relation to the Parental Leave Policy.

Councillor Casey moved the recommendation.

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

Councillor Fitzgerald moved an amendment to the recommendation and emphasised the desire to develop a policy that helped to attract and support the best quality

Councillors, from diverse backgrounds. The amendments proposed altered the policy to ensure that the Member parental leave arrangements were no greater than the employee parental leave arrangements. This also included the limitation that Members who received a Special Responsibility Allowance would not continue to receive this while on parental leave.

Councillor Casey seconded the amendment and advised that the initial proposal had been agreed by the scrutiny committee prior to his becoming chair, and he felt that there was need for further cross party consideration of the proposals, incorporating the suggested amendments.

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

- Members were pleased to see the police return to Full Council and hoped that its introduction would benefit the general approach to Councillors requiring child care.
- It was noted that the cap of six months on the time Members would be permitted parental leave was in line with the legal and constitutional requirement for Members to attend at least one meeting within a six month period.
- It was emphasised that Members and officers were both valuable in their Council work.

Councillor Sainsbury, as seconder of the recommendation, confirmed that he supported the amendments as proposed.

As seconder of the amendment and mover of the recommendation, Councillor Casey summed up and, in so doing, thanked all those Members and officers who had worked on the recommendation and revisions proposed.

A vote was taken on the amended recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to adopt the Parental Leave Policy for Councils as set out in the revised Appendix 1 to the report.

#### **41(b). Audit Committee Recommendation – Annual Audit Committee Report**

The Council received a report from the Audit Committee, in relation to the Annual Audit Committee report.

Councillor Over moved the recommendation and thanked those Members who served on the committee in the past year. The Councillor noted that the committee played a key role in scrutinising the governance arrangements in place within the Council, particularly following the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Councillor Sainsbury seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to approve the Annual Audit Committee report as shown at Appendix 1 to the report.

#### **41(c). Cabinet Recommendation – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan Document (Version for Adoption)**

The Council received a report from the Cabinet, in relation to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Document.

Councillor Hiller moved the recommendation and noted that a number of typos had

been identified in the document, which would be corrected ahead of publication, specifically relating to the date of the Waste Needs Assessment, which should read December 2019, not June 2019. The document had been submitted for examination and approved by an inspector. Cambridgeshire County Council had adopted the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Document already. The document was of key importance when identifying locations for mineral gathering, in managing waste, and the creation of wildlife sites from formal mineral extraction locations.

Councillor Harper seconded the recommendation and congratulated officers on their work on the document.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Hiller summed up and, in so doing, confirmed that the document was an important element of the Local Plan.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Subject to resolution 3, adopt the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan as set out in Appendix B to the report, which incorporated modifications as recommended by the Inspector (Inspector 'Main Modifications' as found at the end of Appendix A to the report) and other minor editorial modifications ('Additional Modifications' – see Appendix C to the report);
2. Subject to resolution 1, endorse that the Peterborough 'Policies Map' be updated in accordance with Appendix D to the report;
3. Agree that recommendation 1 only come into effect if Cambridgeshire County Council had already agreed to adopt the Local Plan (which it is scheduled to do so on 20 July 2021); or, if that agreement was not yet achieved by Cambridgeshire County Council, recommendation 1 come into effect from the date that Cambridgeshire County Council does agree to adopt the Plan. If Cambridgeshire County Council agree not to adopt the Plan, then Cabinet decisions taken on 12 July 2021 in relation to the document, and recommendation 1 and 2 become null and void.

#### **41(d). Cabinet Recommendation – Making Glington Neighbourhood Development Plan and Barnack Neighbourhood Development Plan Following Successful Referendum Outcomes**

The Council received a report from the Cabinet, in relation to the Glington Neighbourhood Development Plan and the Barnack Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Councillor Hiller moved the recommendation and noted the significant work carried out by the parish councils in Glington and Barnack, and their communities, all of which had been endorsed by the local electorate. The Glington Neighbourhood Development Plan received an 88% majority vote in a local referendum, with the Barnack Neighbourhood Development Plan receiving a supporting vote of 90%. Both plans were subject to consultation and expert independent examination, supported by the Council's own planning officers.

Councillor Over seconded the recommendation and applauded the huge amount of work undertaken by those in the Glington and Barnack villages. The plans before Council were welcomed as an attempt to safeguard the character and identity of local villages and to promote appropriate change.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Hiller summed up and, in so doing, expressed his enthusiasm for the development of neighbourhood development plans.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. 'Make' the Glington Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix A to the report, (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within the Glington Neighbourhood Area (the Glington Neighbourhood Area is the same area as Glington Parish).
2. 'Make' the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix B to the report, (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within the Barnack Neighbourhood Area (the Barnack Neighbourhood Area is the same area as Barnack Parish minus the part of Burghley Park that falls within the parish).

#### **41(e). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Review of Peterborough City Council's Code of Conduct**

The Council received a report from the Cabinet, in relation to the Council's Code of Conduct.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendation and confirmed that the Council was legally required to have a Code of Conduct in place. The Council's current code was approved a number of years ago. Following a review undertaken by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, prompted by the publication of recommendations by the Committee for Standards in Public Life, the proposed revised code was presented to Members for approval. A consultation process on the Local Government Association model code was carried out last year, with the Council's on scrutiny committee considering the proposals and suggesting a number of amendments to the Constitution and Ethics Committee for consideration, which included in the final recommendation.

Councillor Allen seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to adopt the new Councillor Code of Conduct (Appendix 1 to the report) and associated guidance.

#### **41(f). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Update to Petition Scheme**

The Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee, in relation to the Petition Scheme.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendation and advised that the proposal to exclude petitions on subjects that had already been decided upon was in order to assist officers in their workload. This was not intended to discourage public engagement, but to ensure that no members of the public held false expectations about what could be done on any particular issue. The committee considering several different wording iterations before settling on the recommendation to Council.

Councillor Allen seconded the recommendation and advised that the debate of the

Constitution and Ethics Committee had been fair and reasonable.

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

- Concerns were raised in relation to restrict the public's ability to call the Council to account.
- It was noted that often the public are not fully aware of a decision until after it had been taken.
- The change of direction in relation to the demolition of Rhubarb Bridge following the receipt of a petition was cited as an example of the current scheme working well.
- Comment was made that the recommendation was agreed at the Constitution and Ethics Committee meeting by a majority of one.
- Issue was taken with the wording of the proposal, which it was suggested implied that decisions taken by the executive could not be reversed, which was not considered to be the case.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the interpretation of the proposed wording and whether there was to be a time limit on when a decision was considered to be 'already taken'.
- Some Members suggested that 'realistic' was too subjective a work to be included in the scheme.
- It was suggested that the matter be returned to the Constitution and Ethics Committee for further consideration.

Councillor Murphy moved a motion to refer the recommendation back to the Constitution and Ethics Committee for further consideration.

Councillor Hogg seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation (25 voted in favour, 29 voted against, and 1 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor Allen, as seconder of the recommendation, advised that he was grateful the debate between Members.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Fitzgerald summed up and, in so doing, emphasized that the proposals were not political, but were to assist officers in their work. Officers often make suggestions to the Constitution and Ethics Committee on council processes, however, Members do not always agree. It was confirmed that members of the public could voice their objection to decisions or protest in other ways, including writing to Members, or the Chief Executive, or asking a question at Council.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (28 voted in favour, 25 voted against, and 2 abstained from voting) to adopt the revised Petition Scheme with the following addition:

- “related to a decision by the Council that has already been taken and there is no realistic possibility of a different decision being taken”

#### **42. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

##### Amendment to Arrangements with Empower

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Coles advised that the Council would be taking control of the Empower resources. The matter would continue to be discussed, but not using the particular Empower name.

### Peterborough Housing Revenue Account

In response to a question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, Councillor Steve Allen advised that it was felt a more measured approach to the number of properties to be built by the HRA was most appropriate, particular in its first year of operation.

In response to a question from Councillor Jones, Councillor Steve Allen advised that how the Council was to measure the success of the Housing Revenue Account was set out in the business plan, including how the housing list and housing demand would be dealt with.

In response to a question from Councillor Murphy, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that if Members wished to seek a change to the business plan, this could be done prior to the business plan being agreed.

The Mayor reminded Members that questions must be relevant to the decisions set out in the report.

### Cycling and Walking Member Working Group Recommendations

In response to a question from Councillor Day, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that funding was not coming to an end, however the temporary cycle lane along Crescent Bridge would be coming to an end. Cabinet had been assured of a more permanent solution for traffic issues experience on that bridge.

In response to a question from Councillor Haynes, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the Council was following the Combined Authority transport hierarchy, with cyclists and pedestrian priorities in the best way. It was felt, however, that the temporary solution put in place was not the best to do so. It was still a priority to increase cycling and walking in the city.

In response to a question from Councillor Sandford, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that he did not feel that the temporary scheme at Crescent Bridge was a good low-cost scheme. It was suggested that many residents did not wish for it to become permanent. It was agreed that cycling into the city needed improvement and the funding from the Combined Authority would be used to find the best way to do so.

In response to a question from Councillor Murphy, Councillor Hiller advised that the Council had not had to commit any of its own funds to the scheme.

In response to a question from Councillor Wiggin, Councillor Hiller advised that the School Streets programme was available to all schools. Those schools on main roads presented a problem, with issues around parking, drop-off and pick-up. There was no simple answer to traffic issues around schools, though Councillor Hiller was happy to ask the transport team to contact Councillor Wiggin to discuss further.

### Budget Control Report May 2021

In response to a question from Councillor Haseeb, Councillor Coles advised that it was believed that a significant amount of the forecasted overspend was COVID-19 related.

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

There were no questions on the questions on the Combined Authority decisions made since the last meeting.

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

## 44. Notices of Motion

### 44(1) Motion from Councillor Skibsted

Councillor Skibsted moved the motion as altered and advised that many other local authorities had agreed to ban glyphosate from the herbicides that they use. This reduced disruption in the soil. It was suggested that there were links between the use of glyphosate to neurological disorders and gut imbalance. Alternative methods that could be used were hot foam systems, manual mulching, flame treatment, high pressure water systems and electronic control systems. The motion asked for a 12 month trial in areas controlled by Aragon.

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

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

- It was noted the impact on health of glyphosate was not certain, a number of countries had prohibited its use.
- Suggestion was made that far more herbicide was used than necessary.
- Members felt that a trial was a sensible approach.
- Concerns were raised about a ban of glyphosate in some areas that experienced high weed levels, and wished to find a solution that worked with residents.

Councillor Simons spoke as seconder of the motion and noted that the UK was one of the most regulated countries in the world in relation to herbicides, but felt it would be wrong not to investigate alternatives.

Councillor Skibsted, in summing up the motion, and suggested that just because something had been trialled before, did not mean that it should not be revisited. The Council should not be constrained by the extra cost of alternatives if we wish to meet our environmental aims.

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

“The use of herbicides such as glyphosate in the UK has increased by 60% in real terms since 1990 [1]. Italy, Portugal and the Canadian city of Vancouver have all banned the use of glyphosate [or glyphosate-based weed killers] and France is working towards this. Monsanto and German owner Bayer face 9,000 lawsuits in the USA from those that believe their illnesses are caused by their products, the first plaintiff won unanimously with many more to follow [2]. Recent studies published in ScienceDirect show a 41% increased risk of Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma caused by exposure from glyphosate-based weed killers and products [3].

#### **Council believes:**

- There are some studies that glyphosate and a wide range of other herbicides may be harmful to human health. However, it is currently regulated and permitted for use in the UK by the HSE.
- The use of weed killers reduces biodiversity, impacting negatively on insects, birds and bees, in a time when the world is losing 2.5% of its insect population per-year [4]
- Harmful weed killer residues can creep into the food chain, although it is recognised that the Councils does currently dilute the chemical used on PCC land.

**Council resolves to recommend that the Cabinet Member agrees to:**

- Investigate over the next 12 months alternative methods of weed control to establish if they are both economical and operationally viable in wards deemed appropriate and on land maintained by Aragon Direct Services.
- Trial herbicide-free alternatives during this period. Particularly those adopted by the likes of Hammersmith and Fulham and Lewes Councils who use biodegradable foam or hot steam treatments on weeds.
- Arrange to visit areas that have already moved to phase out the use of Glyphosate to learn from their practice.
- Report to Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee on the findings of the above and implement new procedures where possible.
- Grant an exception to the above ban regarding the control of Japanese knotweed, or other invasive species, where there are currently no effective mechanical techniques available. However, in this case chemicals such as glyphosate will only be stem-injected, rather than sprayed, to reduce its spread in the environment.
- Grant an exception on sprays only in relation to Giant Hogweed where it's not safe to be dug out or safely removed by other means and then cordon off the surrounding area.

1. <http://www.pan-uk.org/pesticides-agriculture-uk/> Link to external page/site

2. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2018/oct/07/monsanto-trial-cancer-appeal-glyphosate-chemical> Link to external page/site

3. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1383574218300887> Link to external page/site

4. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/feb/10/plummeting-insect-numbers-threaten-collapse-of-nature>- Link to external page/site”

#### **44(2) Motion from Councillor Qayyum**

Councillor Qayyum moved the motion and advised that in the 20 years of her medical qualification she had not seen challenges like those faced in the past two years. Thanks was given to all those involved in making the COVID-19 vaccination programme such a success. It was noted, however, that rates of COVID-19 infection were increasing in the region. Within the latest COVID-19 briefing it was shown that cases were increasing in the over 60's and the visually impaired. It was requested that the Council work with faith-based sites, which were accessible to local residents, for use as vaccination centres. It was further considered that additional training needed to be provided to vaccination staff in order to assist blind and partially sighted people, and increase the vaccine take-up rate by such individuals.

Councillor Hemraj seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Walsh moved an amendment to the motion. It was advised that the amendment noted the work already being undertaken in relation to the points raised in the motion, with bespoke vaccination sessions for local employers and training already provided to vaccination staff.

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

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

- A Member who had volunteered at a vaccination centre noted the level of training provided as a St John's volunteer was excellent, including training on vaccinating blind people, people with mental health conditions, and disabled people.

Councillor Hemraj spoke as seconder of the motion and advised Members that as she currently worked for the NHS, she had seen first-hand the work undertaken to look after patients. It was of vital importance to get the public vaccinated. While there were city centre sites and the East of England Showground for car users, there were none in Dogsthorpe Ward, East Ward, or other non-central wards.

Councillor Qayyum, in summing up the motion, advised that she had been actively involved with the NHS delivery arm and had already put forward a query on this matter. It was further considered that training provided did not cover 'Sight' guidance.

A vote was taken on the amendment to Councillor Qayyum's motion from Councillor Walsh (34 voted in favour, 25 voted against, and 0 abstained from voting) and was **AGREED**.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Qayyum as amended. The amended motion was **AGREED** (54 voted in favour, 0 voted against, and 1 abstained from voting) as follows:

"This Council notes that:

On 3rd June 2021, England had reached an important milestone in that 75 % of adults had received the first dose of the covid – vaccine, whereas 50.2 percent had received the second dose.

The data demonstrating vaccine uptake in Peterborough, however, is less than the national average.

It is important from a Public Health and Local Authority perspective to ensure that whilst mitigating factors, such as the disproportionate impact that Covid – 19 on BAME communities is being addressed and worked towards, negative perceptions surrounding the vaccination as well as accessibility issues are posing as challenges within populations that could be a possible contribution to the less than national average uptake of the Covid- 19 vaccine within the city.

The challenges faced by the visually impaired, disabled, less able bodied and elderly populations with no access to transport due to the distance of vaccination centres must be revisited whilst there are increasing infection rates of the delta variant of covid.

It is notable that the concentration of the city's population is within its centre, with reports of long queues and waiting times at available vaccination centres, contributing to vaccine hesitancy and delay as people from outside the city also use the vaccination facilities within Peterborough.

We have already seen some excellent examples of covid testing facilities set up within Mosques, Churches and other faith-based sites and community centres in various cities which are accessible and a familiar venue for residents to access for a covid vaccine. Examples of this have been seen in Birmingham, London and Manchester.

On Thursday 4 March, SNP MP Chris Stephens tabled an Early Day Motion in the Houses of Parliament, calling for the vaccination roll out and vaccine testing to be made accessible for blind and partially sighted people, a factor that should be considered at available vaccination sites

**This Council resolves to:**

- **Continue to identify strategies actively and swiftly by working with relevant stakeholders such as NHSE and Peterborough and Cambridgeshire CCG, in identifying and encouraging more risk assessed premises within the city such as Mosques, community centres and Pharmacies to make the Covid vaccination programme within the city, more accessible.**
- **Continue to give faith groups and their representative committees the opportunity to propose their grounds and building spaces as vaccination hubs after adequate risk assessment has been provided and staff are identified as fully trained and facilities standardised with governance in place.**
- **Continue to distribute, update and implement and ensure staff working at the vaccine centres are aware of managing and guiding those who are visually impaired by reading through the vaccination management as recommended by the sight council uk's guidance thus:**

**[https://www.sightlosscouncils.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Covid-19-Vaccine- Rollout-Advice.pdf](https://www.sightlosscouncils.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Covid-19-Vaccine-Rollout-Advice.pdf)**

#### **44(3) Motion from Councillor Ansar Ali**

Councillor Ansar Ali moved the motion and advised that he did not wish his proposal to be perceived as a political motion, or to discriminate against rural communities. It was felt that the proposal reflected the values of Peterborough. The Councillor considered that the Festival of Hunting celebrated a cruel sport which was not supported by sections of the rural community and was not in the spirit of the motion agreed by Full Council in 2020, which moved to ban the sport on Council land. It was noted that traditions could be abandoned if they were no longer appropriate.

Councillor Howell 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 as a legal event held by a private organisation and hosted by a private company, it was not within the Council's remit to interfere.
- It was suggested that the Festival of Hunting celebrated an integral part of country life.
- It was considered that, even if the motion was agreed, it would not result in any change and that the purpose of the Agricultural Society was to demonstrate countryside pursuits.
- Further comment was made that, just because an act was legal, it was not necessarily right.
- It was suggested that not all those in the countryside community were in support of the festival, with many feeling that the past practice of fox hunting was not something that should be celebrated.
- It was questioned whether trail hunting was truly harmless, as accidents while taking part in trail hunting were known to happen.
- Comment was made that the motion was not before Council in order to debate morality of fox hunting, but to consider the Festival of Hunting.
- Doubt was expressed regarding whether it was appropriate for the Council to express a moral opinion of the conduct of private businesses.

Councillor Howell spoke as seconder of the motion and highlighted that the proposal was not a criticism of the Agricultural Society or the East of England Showground. Having spoken to the Chair of the Agriculture Society, Councillor Howell stated that she understood the reasons for the event being held at the Showground and the importance of the event. However, as Fox Hunting was banned in 2005, it was

questioned why such a sport was still being celebrated.

Councillor Ansar Ali, in summing up the motion, expressed his sadness at some of the comments made during debate. It was reiterated that the intention of the motion was to bring the community together.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Ansar Ali (25 voted in favour, 30 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

#### **44(4) Motion from Councillor Cereste**

Councillor Sharp moved the motion as altered and advised that the implementation of Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) had implications regarding infrastructure, the environment and the community, with no controls in planning law to this change of use. It was noted that Hampton family homes were being converted, in some cases resulting in four or five HMOs in one street. This was adding to the existing burden of traffic in the area, which was considered unique to Hampton, with many adopted roads.

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

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

- Members welcomed the proposal and were pleased to see the alteration to extend the directive beyond Hampton, as many areas experienced the issues raised by the motion.
- Disappointment was expressed that Members who had previously raised the issue of introducing an Article 4 direction in Hampton had not been kept up to date on developments.
- It was suggested that such action could have been taken sooner by the Cabinet Member, without the need to be considered by Full Council.
- It was advised that a report on the implementation of Article 4 Directives had been drafted by the Cabinet Member, which would be shared with Members.

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

“The Article 4 direction relates to development comprising change of use from a use falling within Class C3 (dwelling houses) to a use falling within Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation).

This means that a property owner within the defined area who may want to convert their property (Class C3) into a small HMO (Class C4, 3-6 persons) would be required to apply for planning permission.

More and more family homes are being turned into Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs).

Residents are worried as this can lead to increased parking, traffic issues, health and safety (tenants and neighbours), as well as affecting the environment and fabrication of the area, which was not designed or planned for this impact.

Peterborough City Council, having received the report on the Article 4 direction, should start the consultation to implement the article 4 in the Hampton Wards and any other ward in the City that is thought to be appropriate.

**The Council agrees to initiate a further and formal public consultation with a view to introducing an Article 4 Zone trial in the Hamptons and any other ward in the**

**City that is thought to be appropriate, subject to evidence that the number of Houses in Multiple Occupation in the area is having an adverse effect."**

#### **44(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford**

Councillor Sandford moved the motion as altered and advised that this was in order to write to the Secretary of State and the Chair of the Local Government Association rather than to local MPs.

Councillor Wiggin seconded the motion.

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:

"Council thanks officers in the legal and democratic services teams for their hard work in ensuring that the democratic processes of the Council have been able to continue during the period of the Covid pandemic, albeit sometimes in a modified form.

Council notes in particular that Peterborough and many other councils have successfully run meetings on Zoom or other online platforms and that the House of Commons has run hybrid meetings, with some MPs in the chamber and some joining virtually. However, following a recent High Court ruling, councils are now prohibited from holding virtual or hybrid meetings, unless Parliament passes primary legislation enabling this to happen.

Council believes that, within reason, councils should be free to set their own rules of procedure, taking into account the needs of their councillors, officers and local residents.

**Council therefore asks the Leader of the Council to lobby central government to put forward legislation giving all councils the necessary powers to hold virtual and hybrid meetings if they choose to do so and asks the chief executive to write to ~~the local government minister and to our local MPs~~ the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Chairman of the Local Government Association urging them to support this proposal."**

The Mayor  
6.45pm – 10:41pm  
28 July 2021

**FULL COUNCIL 28 JULY 2021  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b>	
<b><u>Questions from members of the public</u></b>	
1.	<p><b>Question from Stephen Jones</b></p> <p><b>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>Over the past two decades, Orton Northgate has become a residential area. Before this it was home to the Showground and the Lynch Wood Business Park, but people did not live there. There are now over three hundred properties at Orton Northgate, with many more to be built over the next few years. However, as families have settled here, and children have reached school age, the road infrastructure has not changed at all and residents are increasingly concerned about road safety. Our local councillor was able to get the speed limit on Oundle Road reduced from 50mph to 40mph but this is still too fast. It has become common for cats, foxes, deer and hedgehogs to be killed on this stretch of road and we wonder how long it will be before a child is knocked over. Many parents drive their children to the primary school in Orton Wistow because they worry that local roads are not safe. The pedestrian crossing on Oundle Road near Skye Close is not safe, as it is common for drivers to fail to stop at the red signal. What will the council do to make Orton Northgate safer for pedestrians?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>We take road safety extremely seriously so I will instruct officers from our highways department to review all of the points that you have raised. We recently undertook some major highways works on the A605 near Orton Northgate which included the creation of new footpaths and cycleways as well as signalised crossings. However, the council is always looking to make further improvements for pedestrians and we would always encourage Members and the public to come forward with suggestions on where improvements are needed. In addition to this I have asked our Road Safety Officer to prioritise making contact with all of the local schools in this area in September to encourage them to take up the various road safety educational activities we offer.</p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Julie Fernandez</b></p> <p><b>To Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>At the last meeting of full council, the leader stated that he had tasked council officers to look into the provision of public toilets for the city centre. Can we have an update on this. Where will the toilets be situated?</p>

**The Cabinet Member May Respond:**

Officers have audited the current PCC owned public toilets which shows in the City Centre the Council offer public toilets in the Car Haven Car Park (this is a changing place facility), St Peters Arcade and in the Town Hall once open again.

We are also currently in contact with two companies that offer toilet solutions to ascertain their specifications and potential costs if we were to increase our provision in areas that are currently not provided.

Following a request from the Leader, an audit of businesses earlier this month revealed that 30 businesses have toilets available for customers. The toilets at Marks and Spencer were temporarily closed. There remain some problems with the piping, however they have re-opened.

## 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 Warren**

**For Councillor Bisby, Cabinet Advisor for Children's Services, Education, Skills and the University**

The Covid-19 pandemic has seen our children's education disrupted for in excess of 15 months. It is vital that we do all we can to get these pupils back on track. We also know that children who have English as an additional language are likely to have seen significant losses in learning during this time. Can the Cabinet Member for Education please outline the support available for pupils during the summer holidays to catch up and what is the Local authority doing to support outcomes for children whose families don't speak English at home?

**The Cabinet Member May Respond:**

The council has been working in close collaboration with schools and early years setting throughout the pandemic. Ensuring children re-engage and accelerate their learning has been a key focus since March. Schools have undertaken assessment and are putting in place plans to support children including revised curriculum and more 1:1 support for those children that need it. The government has made available further funding and the council has supported the roll out of tuition via our teaching school during this period. In addition we have over 1200 places in our holiday activity and food programme which will support improved wellbeing and the majority of our secondary schools will be offering summer schools.

We have restarted our English as an additional language strategy with a refresh of our handbook for supporting improved teaching and we now have a suit of training videos for staff on the best practice in including supporting new arrivals with special education needs and disabilities.

2. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

**To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments**

Could the relevant cabinet member tell me whether any consideration has been given to the financial viability of the Council continuing to occupy a small section of the Town Hall or would we be better off transferring all activities including council meetings to Sand Martin House?

**The Cabinet Member may respond:**

Cllr Sandford, Thank you for your question.

The Council continually look at the viability of its operational asset estate. When the Council rationalised its accommodation estate and consolidated staff in Sand Martin House, the decision was taken at that time to keep Committee and Council meetings at the Town Hall. The Town Hall budget takes this into account and following the lettings to the DWP and NHS following our staff moves to Sand Martin House this is a net income budget of £162k.

The present C-19 restrictions, and the requirement to move back to face to face "Decision Making" meetings, has resulted in the use of Sand Martin House for Committee and Council meetings for the first time as the Town Hall rooms do not presently have the capacity to hold the meetings with the present social distancing restrictions.

We will review the associated costs of holding meetings at Sand Martin House once this present cycle of meetings has taken place in July, along with any ongoing "social distancing" requirements, before coming to a decision for the September/October cycle of meetings. This decision will also take into account Staff usage at Sand Martin House, as this is due to start to return to the new "normality" in the Autumn from the present restricted levels.

### **Supplemental**

If a decision is made to move meetings to Sand Martin House on an ongoing basis, we will then look at other options for the Committee rooms being used at the Town Hall.

3. **Question from Councillor Tyler**

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

Most social housing tenants are hardworking, conscientious and law abiding. Lots are community minded and do their bit where they live. But I've had reports from residents, as have councillors in other wards, of some tenants bringing anti-social and criminal behaviour with them.

Residents should be able to walk around their homes without fear of being abused, robbed, beaten up or worse. I believe social landlords are letting our communities down by placing tenants who display anti-social behaviour into areas without ensuring that existing tenants are protected from this sort of behaviour from new tenants.

Can the deputy leader and cabinet member for housing advise me on what risk assessments are undertaken by our social housing providers to ensure anti-social behaviours by tenants can be prevented, and what duties they have to protect other tenants from such behaviours?

**The Cabinet Member May Respond:**

	<p>While we do not have any control over our registered housing providers and their practices, we do provide nominations to those providers from our Housing Register.</p> <p>The checks that are in place for people looking to join the Housing Register are thorough. People must be a qualifying person in order to be accepted onto the register. Those people who apply and have previously been guilty of unacceptable behaviour are not considered to be a qualifying person. Unacceptable behaviour is defined by a number of different factors of which anti-social behaviour is one.</p> <p>Anyone who apply who has previously been subject to action from their landlord due to anti-social behaviour will be excluded from applying and notified that they are not a qualifying person.</p> <p>If a person has no history of anti-social behaviour when they apply, but then display this kind of behaviour after being house the registered provider will take action against them, which if it continues, will result in them losing their home and not being able to secure a further property for some time after.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (1)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>Flooding is a huge concern in certain area of Peterborough. We saw the worst of it a few weeks ago. However, it is a recurring problem whenever it rains. I know residents are frustrated and councillors are equally as frustrated. What is the Cabinet Member doing to fix this problem once and for all?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>Climate change increases the likelihood of severe weather events. Intense rainfall is expected to significantly increase in the coming years, but this can be limited if the global rise in temperature is reduced. Reducing our carbon emissions, and therefore reducing our contribution to climate change, is essential to preventing severe weather events in the future. The Council is committed to becoming a net zero carbon organisation by 2030, and to help the city do the same.</p> <p>From a practical perspective, as a Lead Local Flood Authority, the Council is responsible for routine cleansing of the city's network of drainage gullies with 80% of the gullies cleansed biannually and 20% of the gullies cleansed annually. In addition, residents can also report blocked gullies via the Council's online 'Report it Peterborough' tool.</p> <p>However, large amounts of rain falling over a short period of time, has the potential to exceed the capacity of drainage systems. This can result in localised flooding and in the worst case this can enter resident's homes. In these unfortunate circumstances the council's drainage team will investigate the causes and issue a Section 19 report that will be published on the council's website.</p> <p>The council's website contains information detailing how people can prevent flooding to their property and what they should do in the event of a flood. I would</p>

	<p>encourage councillors to visit the webpage and refresh themselves on what advice can be offered to residents.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Iqbal (2)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>How successful has the Selective Licensing Scheme been in building a working relationship between the Landlords, tenants and the Council, and once the scheme is approved for a further 5-year tenure is it going to be rolled out throughout the city?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>The Selective Licensing scheme has required the council and landlords to work together collaboratively, ensuring good landlords are supported and enabled to comply with the requirements of the legislation, and to ensure that properties let by less experienced landlords, or the minority who seek to operate outside the law, are made safe.</p> <p>The scheme has been successful in building a constructive relationship between landlords and the council, evidenced by the fact that, where defects were found following inspection, the majority of them have been rectified voluntarily by landlords without the need for enforcement interventions. Prior to the scheme, the need for enforcement intervention was much higher.</p> <p>Of the properties inspected so far, 227 were found to have category one hazards, (the most serious level of hazard) and required formal action to address them, this again demonstrating the value of the scheme. The number of properties within the scheme with category one hazards has fallen more significantly than across the rest of the city.</p> <p>The council has also sought to work hard with landlords who are struggling with tenant issues, including providing awareness training of the legislative obligations where we can.</p> <p>Any new Selective Licensing scheme is required to be approved by the Secretary of State and must be evidence-based. Following a city-wide review, the data analysis has shown that there is not the evidence base to roll it out across the city, as the eligibility criteria for such a scheme has not been fully met. The factors that are taken into consideration include the percentage of private rented stock in an area, evidence of low housing demand, poor property conditions, levels of migration, deprivation, crime and ASB.</p>
6.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Qayyum (2)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member for Waste have any data on the income generated by the Council since the charge for the extra brown bins was implemented?</p>

	<p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>All income received from the garden waste service is used to fund the costs of running the service including, communications, the online sign-up system, the back-office database (Bartec), vehicles required for collections and the personnel to deliver the service.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (2)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>The horrific scenes after England lost to Italy are totally unacceptable. The social media onslaught was just as bad. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. We have a huge problem in our society that needs addressing immediately and urgently. What is the council doing in order to send a clear message that such behaviour is abhorrent and will not be tolerated?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>The Council proactively promotes integrated activities throughout the year designed to foster community cohesion, understanding and tolerance – something Peterborough as a City is known for and is rightly proud of. Using all our communications channels including social media – and the work of our individual Members - we support and promote cultural activities such as Black History Month, and religious activities pertaining to different faiths such as Ramadan, Eid and Diwali. We have policies in place around social media activity, which includes non tolerance of racial abuse online.</p> <p>In a month where racism has, yet again, been exposed within our society we also recognise that this can be traumatic for some of our colleagues. We should all feel comfortable to carry out our roles in a respectful and supportive working environment. We have used the national issues to highlight throughout our organisation again this month that we have zero tolerance of bullying, harassment or discrimination and this includes any form of racial discrimination. We all have a part to play in establishing and maintaining a culture of respect at all levels of our organisation. This culture underpins employee wellbeing, and is crucial to enable us all to do our best work.</p> <p>Our newly updated respect at work policy provides more information, including contact details for our <a href="#">respect@work</a> contacts. We also have resources such as those shared by our speaker at the Wellbeing Hour we had in January (<a href="#">Why Race Matters when it comes to Mental Health</a>). Also, read about our <a href="#">Mental Health First Aiders</a> and <a href="#">Employee Assist Programme</a> scheme.</p> <p>The Council take issues of hate crime and racism within our City extremely seriously and works regularly with the Police, other partners and communities through the City's Tension Monitoring Group and Hate Crime Operational Group to review the issues that present in our City. The Council has been working closely with communities through the pandemic to ensure that they feel as safe within their communities and would encourage anyone who experiences issues relating to hate crime to contact the Police</p>

8.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Qayyum (3)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>Under the Government's Vulnerable Persons resettlement scheme the Council pledged to receive 100 Syrian Refugees for a duration of five years. We now have families who are being asked to evacuate their accommodation by the end of July when their tenure is over (day after tomorrow) with underlying medical issues and dependants. Can the Cabinet member offer us reassurances that the families will not be left homeless and not be put up in accommodation that could have a detrimental impact on their wellbeing, given their traumatic past of migrating from a war-torn area?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>It's amazing how quickly five years have passed, and that we are now coming to the time that the ongoing 5 years support that has been in place for refugees has enabled them to settle into our communities. The accommodation that was and continues to be provided to this cohort was leased from private landlords for the period of the support. It was always and still is the intention for those households to move to independent accommodation at the end of that 5 year period.</p> <p>Some landlords have requested their properties back at the end of the lease term, which is their right and some landlords have indicated that they are happy to make a rental arrangement direct with the refugee household. Whichever the circumstance I know that the team support the refugee programme and the housing needs team are working closely together and offers of suitable accommodation will be made to the households prior to the lease periods coming to an end. Support will be offered with the move and transition and there should be no need for any household to be threatened with homelessness.</p>
9.	<p><b>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Iqbal (1)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>The planting beds throughout the Gladstone area are neglected and in a deplorable state. Officers tell me that there are no funds whatsoever to manage these examples of so-called "landscaping". The verges along Bright Street are particularly unsightly and reflect badly on a neighbourhood that deserves better. The beds were introduced by the Council forty years ago but increasingly overlooked as time has gone by. When will funds be made available to correct this failure?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>The planting beds were historically planted with shrubs and are currently on the maintenance contract with Aragon Direct Services for a once per year cut. In the past we have been asked to turn certain beds into parking areas of which we do not have the budget to fund this. One of my officers has walked the area and we proposed to put a long-term plan in place to bring the beds back into a respectable condition working both with the local community and through Aragon Direct Services.</p>

10.	<p><b>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Ansar Ali (1)</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>The sports and recreation facilities at Gladstone Park were built to serve the specific needs of the local community, however it seems the local community are being priced at out of using the much-needed outdoor facilities. The outdoor cricket nets are in demand but beyond the affordability of local groups and residents. Hence this facility, although very popular with the local community, has hardly been used by the locals. Can I ask the Cabinet Member for an assurance that this issue will be addressed urgently so local residents and groups can avail themselves of this facility?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member May Respond:</b></p> <p>for information we have had a specific question raised about this directly to Cllr Ali from Jabeen Maqbool (Chair of City Cricket Club) and we will be contacting her directly to discuss access to living sport funding to cover costs over the summer. We will then be inviting her to a meeting with the school who own the land the cricket nets are on to see if there is an arrangement we can come to where the club maintain the nets in exchange for free usage. However, this last part could take some time. It would be easy to consider a free rate but then every community group would ask for one which would significantly reduce our already reduced income as a result of covid.</p>
	<p><b><u>Questions on notice to:</u></b></p> <p>d. The Combined Authority Representatives</p>
Nil	