

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 10 NOVEMBER 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, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Howell, Ishfaq Hussain, Mahboob Hussain, Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Knight, Lane, Moyo, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Tyler, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene.

**45. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Elsey and Cllr Fenner.

**46. Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Sainsbury declared an interest in agenda item 12, Motions 2 and 5 as he was employed by the MP the Council was being asked to write to. Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, Cllr Sainsbury would continue to participate and vote as normal.

**47a. Minutes of the Special Council meeting held on 28 July 2021**

The minutes of the Special Council meeting held on 28 July 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record

**47b. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 July 2021**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 28 July 2021 were approved as a true and accurate record

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**48. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor made the following announcement:

"I do have one special announcement to make, details of which are deliberately absent from our papers but this will become obvious as I continue....The Covid-19 pandemic has touched the lives of everyone in the world and has led to significant challenges and personal loss of many and we extend our condolences to those that have experienced personal tragedies in the past 18 months. It only seems right to recognise those who played a key role in helping set up the emergency action plan to support the residents of Peterborough during this difficult time. These individuals overcame the barriers posed by social distancing, self-isolation and disruption to their own lives to make sure others were able to cope. These awards recognise those who have made a difference

by making sure vital services continued. The pressure they must have experienced is far beyond our imagination and as elected members we feel they need public recognition. That recognition is being made tonight, in the form of a Special Commendation Award, and its citation reads:

You worked in unfamiliar, demanding and success-critical roles at the most vulnerable time for our community. Your selflessness and tireless dedication to duty went far beyond anything experienced before. You directly contributed to the vital fabric of our society. These leaders will say it was a team effort, and I will agree and leave instructions for each council department to receive a similar message of thanks for display when their offices are fully re-opened. It is a small gesture perhaps – but entirely heartfelt. It is a pleasure to make this award to the following lead officers, to thank them for all they achieved during the most challenging time of their working career. I will now hand over to Rachel to announce the well-deserved recipients.”

Awards were presented to the following Officers:

- Gillian Beasley – Chief Executive
- Dr. Liz Robin – Former Director of Public Health
- Wendi Ogle-Welbourn – Executive Director, People and Communities
- Adrian Chapman – Service Director, Communities and Partnerships
- Jonathan Lewis – Service Director, Education
- Ken McErlain and Amanda Rose – On behalf of the Communications Team

#### **49. Leader’s Announcements**

Cllr Wayne Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council, made remarks summarised below:

- Praise was given to cross-party work being undertaken to address the challenges posed by the recent Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) reports on the Council’s finances.
- Members were encouraged to attend the recycling workshop scheduled for Thursday 11 November at 6pm.

The Mayor invited Group Leaders to comment on the Mayor’s announcement:

- Cllr Shaz Nawaz, Leader of the Labour Group, praised the work of officers during the COVID-19 pandemic and the value of recognising this via the awards.
- Cllr Nick Sandford, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group endorsed the comments made so far and noted the challenges faced by officers on all levels of seniority. Cllr Sandford also commented that the Liberal Democrat Group would engage constructively to address the Council’s budgetary challenges, while still holding the administration to account for the development of the current situation. The current challenges were faced by the entire City and an Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council should therefore be held at the earliest opportunity.
- Cllr John Fox, Leader of the Werrington First Group, praised the hard work of officers for the benefit of Peterborough and commented that they should never be taken for granted.
- Cllr Julie Howell, Leader of the Green Group, endorsed the comments made so far and noted that the COVID-19 pandemic represented a mental health crisis, as well as a public health one. Officers’ support for Members had enabled Members to serve their residents during this time. The Green Group would aim to make a strong contribution to addressing the Council’s financial challenges and would also be attending the Recycling Workshop

- Cllr Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council, praised the ongoing work of officers and commented that their contributions would not be forgotten.

## **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

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

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

1. Bretton Tree (questioner not in attendance)
2. Water Usage
3. Speed calming measures Atherstone Avenue and Buckland Close

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

### **51. Petitions**

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

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

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

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

### **52. 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. HRA
2. PIRI
3. Rough Sleeping
4. Progress of motions passed at full council
5. COP26 / Net Zero
6. Ofsted focused visit
7. Pledge to reduce carbon emissions
8. Driver Shortage / Bus Service
9. Brown Bin Waste
10. Maintenance of boarders on footpath and cycleways
11. Temporary Accommodation
12. Regulate Smaller HMOs
13. Food Waste Bins
14. Speedway Team
15. Livestreaming of meetings
16. Vaccination Pens
17. Street Parking
18. City Market
19. EV Charging Points

20. Green Flag Status Cost
21. Misused garages
22. Vision for Transport
23. Bus Franchising

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

### **53(a). Cabinet Recommendation – University Funding and Finance Interim Update**

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to the re-allocation of the capital programme budget to deliver a car park for the university project. Information on this can be found in the agenda pack.

Councillor Hiller moved the recommendation.

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

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

- Members suggested that the proposals should be suspended and reviewed in light of the CIPFA and DLUHC reports.
- Members echoed the comments above and asked for information on the status of ring-fenced funding.
- Cllr Coles responded that the original Council expenditure of £2m had been reduced to £500k. This could also be classified as an Invest to Save programme via rental income from the university, enabling this sum to be repaid.
- Members suggested that the recommendations were inappropriate given DLUHCs instruction to suspend all capital expenditure and the Council's Corporate Priority to address climate change. Concerns were also raised about the potential size of the car park and whether spaces intended for the Regional Pool would be gifted to the University in the future, following the pool's closure. Council should consider referring the proposals back to Cabinet for further explanation.
- Members expressed concern about how the scheme would be justified to the DLUHC.
- Members challenge the assertion that the reduction of £2m to £500k capital expenditure represented a saving when new money was being spent.
- Members challenge the points raised above, stating the DLUHC would consider any proposal that did not incur a net cost to the Council such as this. The reduction in capital cost to £500k would produce savings in revenue costs that could factored into the Budget. There were also no firm plans to close the Regional Pool.

As seconder of the recommendation, Cllr Ayres, commented that it was important for the proposals to be agreed given the importance of the University for the City. This was challenged by some Members. In response, Members commented that the University considered the proposals critical to their development. Cllr Ayres continued that the funding received for the third University building needed to be protected by implementing plans within a certain period of time, otherwise the City could lose the funding.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Hiller summed up and commented that the proposals were an important part of the University scheme, were cost neutral and Council's approval was needed to take the scheme forward.

Cllr Sandford raised a Point of Accuracy by challenging the assertion that the Scheme was cost neutral and asked where this was referenced in the report. Councillor Hiller responded that this was referenced in information provided by Councillor Coles to Members, not the report.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (49 voting in favour, 9 voting against, 0 abstained from voting) to authorise the re-allocation of the capital programme budget for University Access / Slip Roads to deliver the car park by December 2022, utilising Getting Building Funding Grant, and £500k of council match funding.

### **53(b). Cabinet Recommendation - Budget Control Report 2021**

The Council received a report relation to capital budget virements and a review budget virement. Information on this can be found in the agenda pack.

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation, summarising the contents of the report and outlining details of the proposed virements.

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

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

- Some members felt that there was inadequate information in the report for the Council to make an informed decision on the proposals but welcomed assurances that improvements would be made to future reports.
- Members queried why the Council was being asked to approve payments to Highways England when this was agreed several years ago and suggested that the payments were now unaffordable given the financial position.
- Members questioned the record of the administration on delivering cost-neutral schemes.
- Members praised the forecasted break-even position.
- Opposition groups' participation in the Financial Sustainability Working Group would be dependent on the assurances given by the Administration and officers of openness and transparency.
- Members praised the continuation of funding for Westcombe Industries and asked if this would continue in the future.
- In light of the payments to the Highways Agency, members asked if £7m funding previously committed for Millfield would also be delivered.

As seconder of the recommendations, Cllr Fitzgerald commented that the arrangement with Empower had proved profitable for the Council. Work was underway to address the issues raised regarding the level of information contained within reports.

As mover of the recommendation, Cllr Coles summed up by highlighting the achievement of a break-even position and committing to making reports clearer. All Members were welcome to raise any issues with him. The proposals in the report were cost neutral and members were encouraged to support the recommendations.

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

1) Capital Budget Virements as outlined in Appendix C, these included:

- a. £1.577m - Clare Lodge Refurbishment and Safety works (Third Party Funding)

b. £1.500m - Contribution to the Highways Agency for the A14 improvement scheme, the payment to take place as equal payments of £60k a year for 25 years from 2020/21 (Funded from Community Infrastructure Levy)

2) Revenue budget virement, in respect of the revised use of the Capitalisation Direction as outlined in section 5.5.

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

Cllr Fitzgerald introduced the report which outlined the record of Executive Decisions made since the last meeting.

Members asked questions on the following Executive Decisions

##### CMDN SEP21/CMDN/28 – Appointment and Nominations to Outside Bodies

Members suggested that the Council should maintain its representation on the Westrav Community Association (Stafford Hall Management Committee) to assist with finding future uses for the Hall. Cllr Fitzgerald responded that the decision had been taken following advice by Democratic Services and he would ask the Service Director, Communities and Partnerships to provide an update to members on Westrav Community Association (Stafford Hall Management Committee) and its trustees.

##### **ACTION AGREED:**

The Service Director, Communities and Partnerships to provide an update to members on Westrav Community Association (Stafford Hall Management Committee) and its trustees.

##### AUG21/CMDN/26 – Street Light Dimming – post pandemic

Members asked if any further dimming was planned beyond 40%. Cllr Hiller responded there no further dimming was planned. The scheme had resulted in reduced costs, reduced light pollution and reduced CO2 emissions. However, it was important that Peterborough met the minimum expected levels of illumination among other local authorities.

##### SEP21/CMDN/33 – Cycling and Walking Member Working Group – Proportionality

Members asked why this Working Group's membership was proportional, given that this was not a legal requirement, nor established practice for Peterborough City Council. Cllr Fitzgerald responded that he had amended the Membership of the Group from 5 to 11 to enable representation from all parties; in proportion to the Council, to ensure fair representative.

Members asked why the Group had not held meetings regarding the concerns raised by the Department for Transport (DfT) and Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) regarding the Councils use of Active Travel Funding with respect to Crescent Bridge. Cllr Fitzgerald responded that this was not an accurate representation and the DfT had not criticised one particular scheme. The DfT sought a reassurance of the Council's commitment to promoting cycling and walking and funding the appropriate infrastructure. Cllr Fitzgerald favoured more permanent, well thought through, schemes rather than temporary solutions. The DfT's intervention was prompted by a vocal minority who put the funding in jeopardy. The situation had now been clarified.

Members suggested that making the working group proportional set a poor precedent. Such groups should be apolitical and report back to a political decision-making body.

Would this proportionality now be used for the membership of future working groups? Cllr Fitzgerald responded that proportionality would indeed be used going forward, and this principle had already been applied to the Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion Member Working Group (EDDI). The Council was a political organisation and disagreements were inevitable. A different administration would be able to make a different decision.

#### OCT2021/CMDN/37 - Ox-Cam Arc Spatial Framework Consultation

Members commented that there had been inadequate time provided for Members to comment and amend the Council's draft consultation response. Could an assurance be given that greater time would be given in future to allow potential call-ins of decisions to submit responses? Cllr Hiller responded that he was happy to give this assurance. This consultation had been broad in scope and the upcoming consultation phases 2 and 3 would be more in-depth.

#### SEP21/CMDN/36 – Commissioning of Domestic Abuse Refuge Provision

Members asked if local providers of support, such as Peterborough Women's Aid, could continue their work when services were commissioned on a county-wide basis? Cllr Allen responded that decision was intended to produce economies of scale. Cllr Allen would investigate the issue raised by the Member and report back.

#### **ACTION AGREED**

Cllr Allen to investigate if local providers of support, such as Peterborough Women's Aid, could continue their work when services were commissioned on a county-wide basis.

#### OCT21/CMDN/42 – Purchase of New Passenger Transport Coaches.

Members asked why the Council had prioritised financial savings over acquiring alternative-fuel vehicles to tackle the climate emergency. Cllr Ayres responded that the principle of the decision was to save money, acquire the existing reliable vehicles and save on maintenance costs. The Council was not yet in a position to purchase electric vehicles but this was still planned by the 2030 deadline.

Members asked if the new vehicles would be able to use the same low-carbon fuel utilised by the new refuse collection vehicles. Cllr Simons responded that they were hopeful this would be possible, following receipt of the results of the HVO fuel trial underway.

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

The Mayor introduced this report in relation to the Record of Combined Authority Decisions.

Members asked questions on the following decisions:

#### Appendix 2 – Audit and Governance Committee (24 September 2021) – Agenda Item 8 – Business Board Format of Meetings

Members praised the decision of the Business Board to agree the recommendations of the Audit and Governance Committee that there should be a presumption in favour of Business Board meetings being held in public and asked for the Council's congratulations to be conveyed. Cllr Shaz Nawaz responded that he was happy to pass on these comments.

## **ACTION AGREED:**

Cllr Shaz Nawaz to pass on the Council's thanks to the Combined Authority that Business Board meetings would be held in public by default.

Appendix 7 – Combined Authority Board Decision Summary (28 July 2021) – Agenda Item 3.1 – Future Transport Strategy and One CAM Limited

Members asked what was planned instead of the Cambridgeshire Autonomous Metro (CAM) that would benefit Peterborough. Cllr Fitzgerald responded that the Combined Authority Mayor had no such plans.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **56. Notices of Motion**

#### **56(1) Motion from Councillor Murphy**

Under Standing Order 20.1d, Councillor Murphy moved a motion without notice to refer this motion to the Licensing Committee.

Councillor Ali seconded the motion without notice and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members voiced opposition to the motion without notice and the motion itself as moral considerations could not be taken into account when making licensing decisions.
- It was clarified that a vote on the motion itself would be taken following a vote on the procedural motion.
- There was debate regarding whether a sex establishment licence had recently been considered by the Licensing Committee.

Following debate, Cllr Murphy advised that he no longer wished to move his motions.

#### **56(2) Motion from John Fox**

Councillor John Fox moved the motion and indicated that both former and current police officers had been consulted and had raised no objections to it, raising examples of the problems caused by people in custody being treated the same way as other members of the public in A&E and stating how the system used to function in the past when prisoners in custody were given priority. Prisoner anonymity and patient safety were raised as reasons for segregating suspects in A&E. This would also prevent police officers spending a large amount of time guarding prisoners.

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

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

- Members expressed support for the motion but felt that it should be extended to cover prisoners from Peterborough Prison being transported by prison officers.
- While opposing the motion, members commented that it was well-intended. A&E was currently operating above capacity and the Winter Plan aimed to reduce the time from admission to discharge. The North West Anglia Foundation Trust (NWAFT) had a deficit of care assistants and it was not currently practical to give



precedence to people in custody. The motion instructed the Director of Public Health to write the letter but this issue did not fall under her remit. The presence of two police officers was necessary to prevent violence and absconding and the existing triage system was credible and had proved effective in reducing waiting times.

- Members commented that following discussions with health colleagues who worked in A&E, the motion could not be supported. While suspects were sometimes placed in a separate cubical, this was not always possible. All patients were seen in priority order of need and it was not appropriate for this to change. The motion would place additional strain on A&E.
- Members echoed the comments above, stating that the principle of treatment according to need was paramount. The presence of the police helped to create a sense of patient safety.
- While expressing sympathy for the difficulties faced by police officers, members felt they could not support the motion due to it putting greater strain on health staff.
- Members commented that the motion did not ask for prisoners to be treated more urgently, only for hospitals to explore this possibility, and the principle of the motion should be supported even if its wording required improvement.
- In response to the statement above, members raised Points of Accuracy stating that the lack of capacity to segregate patients at all times was an established fact and that NHS trusts did aim to segregate those in custody when there was space available.
- Members commented that a large amount of police time was currently taken up guarding prisoners in A&E. The Council should aim to facilitate dialogue between the NHS and police to address this problem and the motion should therefore be supported. It was positive that funding was available for health staff and this could potentially be used facilitate the police being able to drop off prisoners or people experiencing mental health crises, knowing that they would be looked after appropriately.
- Members sought clarity that the motion did not aim to prioritise prisoners, only to treat them separately.
- Members queried the purpose of the motion asking hospitals to provide a room where available, when the hospitals already facilitated this when it was possible.
- Members expressed agreement with Cllr Fox's concerns regarding prisoner anonymity and police officer time and stated that the motion might have been more effective if it had requested additional funding for both the NHS and police to improve capacity.
- Members suggested that Standing Order 20.1d could be employed to refer this motion to the relevant Scrutiny Committee or Cabinet to gain greater clarity of its purpose.
- Members commented that a private room was available for people with mental health issues. However, this room was often occupied when prisoners entered A&E. The motion was therefore requesting greater capacity. Comments regarding NHS COVID-19 pressures were noted but this could not be used as a reason to block suggestions for improvements. The motion should be supported to provide the opportunity for police time to be used more efficiently.

In response to a Members' suggestion and with unanimous consent, Cllr Fox agreed to move an altered motion with the following sentence removed from the preamble: 'It would benefit all parties if people in custody were seen urgently so the officers can get back on the road serving the general public'.

Cllr Bisby spoke as seconder of the motion, commenting that the pressures of the NHS were acknowledged and the motion did not seek to prioritise prisoners but instead asked for them to be treated separately. Patient safety, anonymity and police officer

time were raised as reasons for doing so. The motion sought greater A&E capacity to achieve this.

Members raised a Point of Accuracy that the motion would not be workable, even with the sentence removed from the preamble, as the issue did not come under the remit of the Director of Public Health.

Cllr Fox, in summing up the motion, acknowledged the hard work of NHS staff but did not see why separate rooms for prisoners could not be provided on Friday and Saturday nights. Members were encouraged to support the motion.

A vote was taken on the altered motion from Councillor John Fox. The altered motion was **AGREED** (38 voted in favour, 20 voted against, and 0 abstained from voting) as follows:

“On recent visits to Peterborough City Hospital, it has been noticed that when police officers bring a patient into Accident and Emergency, who is in custody, they are treated the same as any other member of the public.

This may seem to some as equality and the right thing to do, however is ill-logical and not cost effective to the tax-payers of Peterborough.

Most people in custody will be escorted by two warranted officers and there will be a vehicle parked in the car park.

As the waiting time during the busy periods can be in excess of six hours, this is not only taking two fulltime officers and a car off the streets of Peterborough but is also totally impracticable.

Therefore Council resolves:

1. For the Director of Public Health to liaise with the Clinical Commissioning Group to determine if a system can be implemented whereby a room is set aside from the public for this purpose so the public are not in any fear or intimidation from the person in custody. Also, with regards to the person in custody's identity being restricted, as they maybe in handcuffs but not possibly at this stage charged with any offences and a crowded reception area is equally not ideal for the persons anonymity.
2. For the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health, and Public Health to write to our two Members of Parliament, setting out the above as areas of concern.”

### **56(3) Motion from Councillor Ed Murphy**

Councillor Murphy moved the motion, commenting that similar motions on fireworks had been debated by Council before as this was an ongoing issue. The public made regular representatives on this issue but it was not always clear who was responsible, with powers being split between the Council and Police. The primary issue with the fireworks was the noise level; which contributed little to private firework displays. Members were asked to debate and support this motion to take action on the issue. Animal welfare would also benefit from action being taken. The Police were thanked for addressing recent incidents.

Councillor Harper seconded the motion and highlighted the importance of listening to the general public on this issue. A total ban of fireworks was not supported as they could be used responsibly. However, the noise levels could have a negative impact on both people and animals. It was suggested that the Council should promote low or no-

noise fireworks.

There was no further debate on the motion.

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

Peterborough City Council:

- i. acknowledges the conscientious efforts made by most users who enjoy firework displays in a responsible manner
- ii. recognises that fireworks are used for a variety of motives for reasonable enjoyment
- iii. further recognises that some users misuse fireworks and cause considerable irritation to residents, pets and the city as a whole
- iv. believes that action needs to be taken to raise awareness about the use of fireworks by doing the following:
  - a. To educate people on the use of fireworks, endorse and promote the Office of Product Safety and Standards national firework campaign, using both literature provided, and the council's social media platforms to maximise the effectiveness of the campaign.
  - b. Collate data of firework related disturbance and misuse made to the council and partner agencies to enable the council to provide evidence backed submissions of their impact on communities to national firework related policy reviews.
  - c. Engage with secondary schools through the Councils Education Department to raise awareness among children and circulate freely available material to support the correct use of fireworks
  - d. Promote awareness amongst community associations and networks so that they can help spread the message.
  - e. Join the Fire and Rescue Service in their campaign on fireworks
  - f. Write to government to encourage a revision of firework standards to reduce maximum decibel levels to 90db, from 120db, thereby reducing noise nuisance, and the harm to pets and animals.
  - g. Council to collate and gather supporting evidence over the next 12 months in relation to the use of fireworks including complaints and misuse. The data will be used to present a case to government to ask for legislative change to prevent category F3 fireworks which are intended for large open space areas being sold other than to event organisers, thereby reducing noise nuisance, and the harm to pets and animals.'

**Council resolves to do all it can to help reduce misuse of fireworks by working cross-agency and cross-community throughout the city."**

#### **56(4) Motion from Councillor Murphy**

Councillor Murphy advised that he no longer wished to move his motion.

#### **56(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford**

Councillor Sandford moved the motion, expressing support for the Local Electricity Bill, which would aim to make the cost and regulation of small scale renewable energy providers proportionate to their size. The Bill did not seek to prioritise certain types of renewable energy over others and was not related to planning matters. The Bill would only progress if supported by the government and this motion was intended to encourage this in order to help Peterborough achieve its environmental ambitions.

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

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

That Peterborough City Council:

(i) Acknowledges the efforts that this Council has made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote renewable energy, in furtherance of its aim to get the Council and the City to net zero carbon by 2030.

(ii) Further recognises

- that very large financial setup and running costs involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers result in it being impossible for local renewable electricity generators to do so,
- that making these financial costs proportionate to the scale of a renewable electricity supplier's operation would create significant opportunities for local companies, community groups and councils to be providers of locally generated renewable electricity directly to local people, businesses and organisations, if they wished, and
- that revenues received by such local companies, community groups or councils that chose to become local renewable electricity providers could be used to help improve the local economy, local services and facilities and to reduce local greenhouse gas emissions;

(iii) Notes that the Parliamentary Environmental Audit Committee, as a result of its 2021 Technological Innovations and Climate Change inquiry, recommended that a Right to Local Supply for local energy suppliers be established to address this;

(iv) Accordingly resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, currently supported by a cross-party group of 264 MPs and which, if made law, would establish a Right to Local Supply which would promote local renewable electricity supply by making the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate to the size of the supply company; and

(v) Further resolves to ask officers to inform the local media of this decision and write to our local MPs urging them to support the Bill in Parliament.”

## **56(6) Motion from Councillor Day**

Councillor Day moved the motion which was intended to protect Peterborough from extreme weather events, and specifically flooding and heatwaves. The motion aimed to reduce the impact of ‘baked in’ carbon emissions. The City had already experienced extreme weather and this was set to worsen. The motion aimed to take action to protect residents.

Councillor Simons seconded the motion

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

- Members commented that local authorities across the U.K. were starting to develop climate adaptation action plans and there was no time for delay. If successful, the City would achieve the continuation of good service delivery, the protection of assets and the minimisation of impacts on the daily lives of Peterborough residents. Future proofing was always a wise decision and the creation of a costed adaptation plan was supported. Concerns were however

raised about the practicality and deliverability of the proposals given limited resources and officer time.

- Members supported the motion and requested that Cabinet consider sustainable drainage systems as part of the adaptation plan.

#### **ACTION AGREED:**

Cabinet and Cllr Day to note the importance of incorporating sustainable drainage systems in the adaptation plan.

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

“The impacts of climate change in the UK and around the world are clear and demand urgent action. We are already witnessing changes that impact lives and livelihoods and reshape landscapes and communities. 2020 was the first time that heat, rain and cloudless periods all ranked in the top 10 years since accurate records began. Total rainfall from extremely wet days has increased by around 17% over 2008- 2017, for the UK overall, so as well as increased rainfall overall, intense rainfall poses additional problems. The rate of change is increasing, and causing alarm to scientists, as reported by the IPCC earlier this year.

We are experiencing warmer & wetter winters, hotter & drier summers, with high variability, increases in average & extreme temperatures, changes to rainfall patterns, leading to flooding in some places, & water scarcity in others, increased frequency & intensity of wildfire. As we reduce greenhouse gas emissions to net zero, we must also adapt and build resilience to current and future changes to our climate.

Peterborough experienced extreme rainfall in July 2020 with direct impacts on residents and local infrastructure. Bourges Boulevard was again flooded causing vehicles and ambulances to come to a standstill. Flooding caused significant tailbacks on the Fletton Parkway heading into Eye, with cars left abandoned on the roadside. The recently opened Aldi store at PE1 Retail Park was flooded and Queensgate bus station had to be closed due to water levels and the Car Haven was flooded. Other streets around Dogsthorpe and Welland were flooded.

This council agrees to:

- Ask the Executive Director of Place and Economy to produce a costed proposal, including funding streams to the Cabinet Member for the development of a climate change adaptation action plan.
- Ask the Cabinet Member to consider the above proposal once funding has been identified.
- Agree the following action plan specification:
  - The action plan should assess past and future risks to residents, organisations and the council from extreme weather events or hazards arising from a changing climate, including the impact of:
    - Surface water flooding from extreme rainfall
    - Extreme heat and cold in homes especially at night
    - Extreme temperatures in workplaces
    - Extreme wind, hail, rainfall and drought
  - The action plan should include estimated costings for the adaptation and resilience measures that are required to protect Peterborough from the disruption caused by extreme weather events.
  - The action plan should identify methods of funding this work.

- The action plan should be produced in consultation with the Combined Authority and national government along with local organisations and residents.
- Ask the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee to consider the action plan for recommendation to Cabinet.”

## **56(7) Motion from Councillor Hogg**

Cllr Hogg moved the motion which sought to ensure all planning decisions relating to properties and trees owned by the Council would be considered by the Planning and Environmental Protection to ensure greater public transparency. The motion sought for this to be investigated further, not for a final decision to be made.

Cllr Sandford seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak

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

- Members stated that they could not support the motion as applications for works on conservation areas trees had to be determined within a limited time period or would otherwise be automatically approved. These applications were therefore not suited to consideration by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee. Members also had the right to call-in any decision they wished if supported by good planning grounds.
- Members highlighted that ward councillors were informed of decisions made by the Chair of the Planning Committee regarding decisions on properties the Council was responsible for, and could call them in, so democratic accountability was already in place.
- Members commented that they would not be supporting the proposals as they were impractical.
- Members commented that the issues this motion would cause to the Planning Committee meant they could not support it.

Cllr Sandford spoke as seconder of the motion, highlighting that the scope of the motion covered all applications where the Council was seeking its own approval for planning decisions. The controversy surrounding the proposed removal of the Bretton Oak Tree highlighted a lack of transparency in these instances. Planning Committee should be given the opportunity to consider reports already prepared by officers regarding the application of greater openness to protected trees. This motion was intended to address the perception that the Council was not open and transparent.

Cllr Hogg, in summing up, stated that reference to conservation areas had been taken out of the motion so the comments regarding these areas were not relevant. The motion was intended to encourage an investigation by the Planning Committee of the possibility of improving transparency. Decisions involving Council properties often had significance across the whole city, not just individual wards, and it was therefore appropriate for there to be greater scrutiny. Even if the Planning Committee determined the proposals to be unfeasible, it might decide to extend the distribution list for decisions. Councillors should support an opportunity to increase transparency.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Hogg. The motion was **DEFEATED** (8 voted in favour, 30 voted against, 20 abstained from voting).

## **57. Reports to Council**

### **57(a) Notification of Amendment to Executive Scheme of Delegation**

The Council received a report in relation to changes made to the executive scheme of delegations. Information on this can be found in the agenda pack.

Cllr Fitzgerald moved the recommendation, commenting that he had amended the Executive Delegations to allow the Corporate Director, Resources to agree Discretionary Rate Relief under £500,000.

Clls Coles seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

Cllr Coles commented that this was a small practical change.

There was no further debate.

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.

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

### **58(a) Employment Committee Recommendation – Appointment to the Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service and Determination of Salary**

The Mayor introduced the item in relation to the appointment to the position of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Salary, and determination of salary.

The mayor moved that item 58 (a) be exempt, as defined by Paragraph 4 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1972, in that it contains information relating to contemplated consultations or negotiations in connection with a labour relations matter arising between the authority and employees or office holders of the authority, and the press and public be excluded from the meeting when this is discussed.

Members raised concerns regarding the openness and transparency of the above proposal. The Mayor responded that this was standard procedure.

Members commented that they felt no need for item to be discussed in private. The Mayor responded that this view could be expressed during the vote.

A vote was taken and the Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to exclude the press and public.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (57 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) to:

1. Appoint Matt Gladstone to the post of Chief Executive/Head of Paid Services.
2. Appoint Matt Gladstone as Electoral Registration Officer and Returning Officer.
3. Agree the appropriate salary within the Council's senior manager Hay pay structure as £175,189 (scale point 2), with progression to £185,385 (scale point 3), subject to a satisfaction 12-month review.

The Mayor  
6pm – 10:14pm  
10 November 2021

**FULL COUNCIL 10 NOVEMBER 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 John Hopkins was not in attendance.</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>I am asking this question on behalf of the group of residents campaigning to save the ancient oak tree in Blind Lane, Ringwood, Bretton which is threatened by an insurance claim for alleged subsidence damage to nearby property.</p> <p>Through researching the planning history, we have found out that when the house at 9 Barnard Way was built, planning condition no9 attached to the planning permission prohibited any future attachment of any structures to the rear elevation of the property. Yet subsequently a conservatory was attached to this elevation and the current owner's insurers are now alleging that it is this conservatory that is being damaged by subsidence caused by the tree.</p> <p>So could the relevant cabinet member tell me why the Council wants to remove an ancient and healthy tree to prevent damage to a conservatory that was constructed illegally in contravention of a planning condition? Surely the council cannot be held responsible for alleged damage to a building that should not be there.</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the question, and I'm well aware of the public feeling on this tree, including a well-supported petition that I understand is scheduled to be brought to Full Council for debate at its meeting on 8 December. Like most people, no one likes to see a mature oak tree felled.</p> <p>Whilst the Council is unable to discuss an ongoing claim for data protection reasons, I can confirm that the tree is not sought to be removed on the basis of damage to the conservatory only. It is highly likely that future damage will do likewise. Nevertheless, it is accepted that the conservatory is being damaged, and such a conservatory was built without seeking the necessary permissions. I can confirm that the city council, as Local Planning Authority, has recently undertaken an enforcement review of the erection of a conservatory at the rear of the affected property. That case concluded that no prosecution action could be taken as the conservatory was at least 10 years old, and therefore immune from any enforcement action. Consequently, for any tree which is the responsibility of the city council and which is proven to be causing damage to the conservatory or any other building or property, we have a legal duty to abate that nuisance.</p> |



2.

**Question from Richard Olive**

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

I'm Richard Olive and I'm a Company Member of the Peterborough Environment City Trust. Recently I've been carrying out a study on behalf of the PECT Members regarding sustainable water usage in Peterborough. As many of you will no doubt be fully aware the future supplies of sustainable waters are predicted to be a serious consequence of climate change. Peterborough is officially located in a water stressed area. I was pleased to find that the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036, Policy LP32: Water Efficiency objective states 'To Minimise impact on the water environment all new dwellings should achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per day for water efficiency as described by Building Regulations G2'. (Note the standard requirement is 125 litres per person per day). Upon making further investigations both to the PCC's Building Development and Control Sections I was informed that the water minimisation condition has to be applied at the Outline Planning stage. However, on consulting all planning permissions granted from July 2019 to the present day I was disappointed to find that the condition has only been applied twice. Could the relevant cabinet member please inform me why this policy has not been applied to most of the planning applications over the past two years and, given that new houses have an average lifespan of at least 55 years, how much water will be wasted over the next 55 years due to Peterborough City Council's failure to properly apply its own planning policies?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

Thank you for raising this issue, which I understand was also raised with officers a few weeks ago. I fully agree that how we manage our water supplies is of considerable importance.

The matters you raise were discussed at the Cross Party Member Climate Working Group on 19th October, where it was acknowledged that the higher water efficiency standard had not been applied as a condition to a large number of planning applications since 2019, the reason being a concern around how the condition would be enforced. However, following further discussion on how to implement and enforce the policy, it was confirmed at the Working Group meeting that the higher water efficiency standard will now be made a condition on the vast majority of residential planning permissions granted by this council. Only exceptionally will this not be the case such as, for example, where it is technically impossible to achieve the standard. Turning to the second part of the question relating to the volume of water used, it is not possible to calculate precise water usage estimated over past or coming years, as ultimately this entirely depend on the homeowners themselves, and the volume of water they choose to use.

The only saving grace is that most of these properties will be on water meters so we hope that people use the water sensibly.

**Supplementary question:**

I don't accept the fact that it is difficult to ascertain an average water wastage figure. Since I've submitted this question, I've resorted to looking at the outline planning permissions which have been granted for new houses since July 2019. I

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>won't claim to have found every single planning permission, but the ones I have looked at using the standard rate of 125 litres other than the lower one has been 228 houses. Now you can in fact calculate quite easily the number or the quantity of water which has been wasted simply by multiplying the 228 houses by the average occupancy, by the wastage on each property by the number of years.</p> <p>158 million litres of water as a minimum will be wasted and just to put that into perspective, that is equivalent to 63 Olympic sized swimming pools. If you would like to have a copy of my calculations, I can pass them on to you. This is scandalous, because Peterborough.</p> <p>Could you please tell me what is the Council going to do to redress this situation? For instance, I wonder if the Council could in fact apply the code level five for water saving rather than the current one, which is only code level two.</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member Responded:</b></p> <p>Mr Olive if you have any questions, if you could forward an email to me, I'm quite happy to respond that way.</p>   |
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Colin Hammond</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>Thank you for affording me the time and opportunity to ask my question. As you know my name is Colin Hammond and with my wife and two daughters we reside on Atherstone Avenue.</p> <p>Our house has had a car driven into it twice in less than 3 years. I am sure you would have seen extensive coverage of the incident in the national news websites, local press and ITV Anglia news. This is a result of excessive speeding on Atherstone Avenue and Buckland Close. Thankfully no one was injured in these crashes but who is to say that we will be lucky if it happens again. There are 3 schools in the local vicinity, incidentally, I am involved in all these local schools, I am a trustee of the Academy trusts and Chair of Governors at Thorpe Primary. Buckland Close is used as a thoroughfare by lots of people working at and attending the hospital. There are quite a number of children and adults walking on these roads during the day. We need, as a matter of urgency, some speed calming measures in place. Neighbouring properties have had damage to their walls and cars....and light posts being knocked down by speeding vehicles. Ideally speed bumps will be the preferred choice. AND....to be more selfish...crash barriers/bollards down Buckland close to protect my property as well as keeping my family safe. The emotional stress, inconvenience and financial loss is no fault of our own. As you may have read in the local papers there has been incidents in the last few weeks where a car drove into the wall of another property in Atherstone Avenue and also the post box was demolished at the Audley Gate/Thorpe Park Road Junction.</p> <p>I'm looking for help from the Council for giving speed calming measures to be put in place on these roads?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> |

In answer to your speed calming measures, the council is working with the police to evaluate what measures might be appropriate for the area, including infrastructure. I will ask, most certainly will ask that you are included in that dialogue Mr Hammond. In answer to your second question regarding a fence move, I will ask one of our planning team to discuss this proposal and to understand exactly what it is you wish to achieve in doing this.

**Supplementary Question:**

Do we have any timescales. I know you said you were speaking to the Police because as you know twice in three years is not a long time in terms of accidents, so what are the timescales of speaking to the police and any idea what their recommendations are?

**The Cabinet Member Responded:**

With regard to timescales for dialogue between our officers and the Police, I am not privy to that I'm afraid, but I can certainly find that out for you but I think you have sighted very eloquently the situation with your property and outside your property and the latest episode; very unfortunate episode. I would hope that the timescale is going to be very short and you will be included within that dialogue in the very near future. Certainly, Mr Hammond, like most I'm sure I would be very alarmed if vehicles regularly crashed into a property that I lived in and as I stated, the officers are taking this very, very seriously indeed.

## 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 Qayyum**

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

The current administration has on many occasions determined the need to pursue a Housing Revenue Account to facilitate the supply of desperately needed social housing in Peterborough. Can I ask what progress has been made in this direction and why this facility hasn't yet been set up?

**The Cabinet Member may respond:**

I can confirm that a lot of work has been done to establish an outline business case for the development of a Housing Revenue Account (HRA). Since an HRA will require the council to borrow to invest in new housing, a decision has been taken to halt further work until the Council's future financial position is better understood and agreed. Part of this process is the delivery of a renewed overall Housing Strategy for the Council (of which the HRA will be an integral part). Subject to a satisfactory outcome following the forensic review of Housing being undertaken by CIPFA and discussions with DLUHC, Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, work may be able to commence on the development of an HRA sometime in 2022/23.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Allen, I thank you for your response, but you've stood up several times and repeated your mantra that a HRA is going to happen. So, would you like to state publicly on record, is that now not that case and regarding about speaking about needing a better understanding of the Council's financial position, surely this is well known isn't it? It certainly should be by the Deputy Leader of the Council. I'm aware the Council has had a comprehensive housing strategy for a number of years, so if I hadn't asked this question this evening, when were you going to let us know your much heralded HRA has in fact been shelved.

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

I will put on record that I am very supportive of an HRA for this Council for this City and indeed it is a mechanism to deal with the housing crises that we do have. As you well know with your party being involved in conversations about the financial status of the Council, we have to park things until the outcome of the CipFa and DLUHC conversation is best known to us. It's ok shaking your head; the fact is I am a protagonist of this mechanism and the Leader is very supportive. Indeed, we have made an arrangement to go to another nearby Council to look at their

mechanisms providing this kind of housing. So don't shake your head, just be on side and support us in making this happen.

2. **Question from Councillor Amjad Iqbal**

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

As the shadow Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment it is both in my and our group's interest to follow and contribute to matters relating to my shadow cabinet post. I note that the Peterborough Integrated Renewables Infrastructure – better known as the PIRI - project was set up nearly 2 years ago to develop a low cost, low carbon-emission, integrated energy system design for electricity, heat and transport, to benefit the Peterborough Community.

What progress has been made with the PIRI Project?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

I note that you indicated that you are shadow Cabinet Member for Waste, street scene and the environment. I do feel slightly disappointed Councillor Iqbal we have had some real issues regarding this portfolio. Not once have you contacted me or the officers with regard to any issues. I also asked all Members to attend health and safety training to be in a position to help if required. You did not apply; you did not attend the Carbon Literacy training. We have a recycling workshop tomorrow evening. I hope you will be attending? Forgive me, ok I will move onto the question in hand.

PIRI, Peterborough Integrated Renewable Infrastructure. The project aims to deliver a smart local energy network, which integrates a next generation Heat network, Electricity through Private Wires and Mobility through electric vehicle infrastructure.

The project was launched in April 2020 and we are currently halfway through. We have engaged with circa 120 businesses, which you can appreciate has been challenging within the pandemic. We now have in place the "techno-economic" reports the next step is to do a scheme outline and development and detailed design. The final output expected in 2023, will be investment grade, green book, compliant business case bringing together all the findings and detail in the opportunity available for PIRI.

**Supplementary Question:**

I thank Councillor Simons for his detailed response to my question. There is a large amount of jargon in there and words like intelligent digital platform, modelling and option appraisal, techno economic reports and non-heat transport and I think you said and investment upgrade, green book business case. All this means little to the tax payer in the street I'm afraid Mr Mayor. I have to say, I was somewhat surprised to read on the Council's Website that Councillor Cereste was the Environment Cabinet Member at that time this lengthy programme was announced. He's quoted and then saying this would produce heat to benefit Peterborough residents.

The most exciting and innovative green energy project the City and indeed the country has ever seen. Those of us who have...

In that case I will come to the question. What you've said, Councillor Simons, after three long years of effort and expense, we just get a business case, nothing physical, nothing remotely benefiting Peterborough residents. What happens to this promise, most exciting green energy project the country has ever seen at that time. When will anything be delivered?

**The Cabinet Member Responded:**

You must appreciate that this is obviously a complexed situation. It's not as if we are starting from scratch, we've got to introduce this with the infrastructure that is already there, so it's very complex situation. It is going to require outside funding to deliver this, so hopefully be 2023 as I said earlier, we should be in a position to put it out to tender and hopefully move you on from there, but obviously it is a very complexed situation.

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

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

I appreciate the council is committed to reducing and I hope eliminating rough sleeping. To that extent could you please explain:

1. How many rough sleepers do we have?
2. What efforts have been made to find them housing?
3. What are the main stumbling blocks for find housing for those who continue to sleep rough?

**The Cabinet Member responded:**

1. The Councils Rough Sleeper Outreach team have a current cohort of 26 individuals who are still sleeping out. This number has increased over recent months following the countries withdrawal from the EU and us not legally being able to provide accommodation and services who are not eligible for assistance.
2. The Housing Needs team continues to work tirelessly to ensure that all eligible rough sleepers have an offer to come into accommodation and will be supported to address their health and welfare needs as well finding a suitable accommodation provision.

At the height of the pandemic, we were accommodating 128 households who we would not normally have had a duty to, over a hundred folk in B&B at that stage.

We continue to have an offer to all eligible rough sleepers and the team have successfully housed a large number of former rough sleepers into suitable accommodation, such as Lincoln House that we commissioned earlier this year.

We have now brought that number of rough sleeper households down to 44 and currently only have 11 households in B&B.

3. The main stumbling block currently is that many of our rough sleeper cohort as I highlighted previously, are not eligible for homelessness assistance and we are not permitted to provide accommodation to them. We are still engaging with these individuals and are able to offer reconnection to their

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>home countries, unfortunately however, many have nothing to go back to. Other issues such as drug and alcohol misuse are still very prevalent, but support services for these issues are strong and available.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question</b></p> <p>As you can appreciate the winter months are going to be difficult for those who are sleeping rough and I would like to know what significant efforts you intend to make to reach out to those people to offer them additional support. Especially those who qualify for assistance.</p> <p><b>Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>The fact is that the team work tirelessly to connect with the rough sleepers and we are very much reliant on the outside help we receive from organisations, such as the light project. So, the Council are cognisant of the problem and the team are out there engaging where they can and we are using outside assistance available to us.</p>  |
| 4. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Haynes (1)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>Following the recent COP26 conference on climate change, could the relevant cabinet member tell me whether the cabinet is still committed to the Council resolution passed in July 2019 which stated an intention to get both Peterborough City Council and the City of Peterborough as a whole to net zero carbon by 2030. Given that the UK Government's commitment is to get too next zero carbon by 2050, could the cabinet member tell me what additional measures Peterborough City Council intends to take to implement to the target 20 years earlier than the Government is proposing?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Peterborough City Council is committed to becoming a net zero carbon by 2030 also assist Peterborough become a net zero city by the same date. We have a history of having ambitious environmental targets, we lead in a number of solar panels and electric vehicles.</p> <p>We have recently been selected by government as a pilot area to develop a local area plan. We are working with stakeholders across the city to create a pipeline of projects that will enable us to meet our decarbonisation ambitions.</p> <p>I believe our cross-party environment working group is proving a very valuable asset. Let's not be under any illusions these are bold targets and they are going to require cross party engagement. I would encourage all those members who have not attended carbon literacy training to please attend.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I was just wondering exactly what we are going to do that is going beyond what the government would be recommending if their target is 2050 and ours is 2030? What is it that we have planned that make us believe that we can reach that target? And I</p> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>was wondering if you can assure me is it that we are focussing on reducing our carbon emissions or looking at offsetting a certain amount of our emissions to achieve that target?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Haynes, to be honest we are looking at every single aspect. I mean there is such a wide area that you can't pinpoint it. I think as I say, the cross-party working group is invaluable as far as I'm concerned. We are just coming up with ideas all the time and looking at every single angle if I'm honest.</p>   |
| 5. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Scott Warren</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Bisby, Cabinet Advisor to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Skills and the University</b></p> <p>I understand that Ofsted recently carried out a focus visit to Peterborough that concentrated on the quality of our services for our Children in Care. As Corporate Parents, it is important for all members to know the outcome. Could we hear a brief summary of the findings from the visit?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Advisor responded:</b></p> <p>Yes, Ofsted did indeed undertake a focussed visit to Peterborough and that was in June of this year. During this visit they concentrated on how well we support our children and young people in care.</p> <p>As Corporate Parents, I am sure that all Members will be pleased to hear that the report following the visit was very positive. Ofsted said that Peterborough was a conscientious corporate parent and praised us for the very good placement stability for children in care. Inspectors said that our social workers knew the children and young people well, and there was a clear commitment to ensure that children in care achieved good outcomes across the service and within partner agencies including, for example, our virtual school as well as the schools that our children attend.</p> <p>In any inspection, there will be things identified where we can improve. Ofsted noted that a relatively large proportion of children in care are placed at distance from Peterborough, while also acknowledging that most were placed in settled and well-matched foster or extended family homes. They also thought that some of our written recording could be improved.</p> <p>But they also said that the quality of our assessments and planning for our children in care was good, that our staff felt well supported, included through the Covid pandemic, and that they had manageable caseloads. Importantly, they said that senior leaders have a clear understanding of the issues for children and young people in care, and that children in care told inspectors that they are confident that senior managers listen to their views and take action in their response.</p> <p>Focused visits do not result in a graded outcome. Ofsted publishes a short letter about their findings and any areas for improvement. This is available at the following link. That can be passed round to everybody or you could go online and search for 'Peterborough Ofsted reports.'</p> <p>I do think it's a good idea for Members as we are all Corporate Parents, to take the time to read the letter in full, since it really does show just how well our staff, foster carers, partner agencies and Members through the corporate parenting committee</p> |



|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>have worked together to deliver what continues to be a very good service for our children and young people in care.</p>  |
| <p>6.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Imtiaz Ali</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>Given the challenges we face with respect to climate change and the Government's pledge to reduce carbon emissions by 78% compared to 1990 levels, can you please let me know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the progress towards improving infrastructure as a Local Council?</li> <li>b. Specifically, do we have a plan to ensure we have sufficient EV charging points fast enough to meet the growing need?</li> <li>c. Can we ensure that free charging continues for taxis?</li> <li>d. How is progress towards allowing residential applicants for "House to Kerb" points being installed?</li> <li>e. When can we expect residents to be informed of how these applications can be made?</li> </ol> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Peterborough City Council is committed to be carbon neutral by 2030 as already mentioned this evening.</p> <p>The Combined Authority are developing an alternative fuels strategy for the area, which will include electric charging. PCC allocates £150,000 per year, for electric charging points.</p> <p>In residential areas, you are able to receive 75% funding from Government, with often companies providing the other 25%. Along with my fellow Cabinet Member, Cllr Peter Hiller, we are committed to improve the amount of charging points. I know some Members would believe we need to be committed, but that is another argument. Charging points have been discussed at the cross-party working group. We feel these need to be cost neutral and we believe that a small cost should be levied to achieve this including taxis.</p> <p>A grant is available for off-street parking charging points for those areas without off-street parking. Again, the cross-party working group are discussing these issues. We feel this requires careful consideration due to the health and safety issues when obviously charging points outside say terrace houses. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the answer. I think there were five parts to the question, so I appreciate it was a long question and some of them were missed. But thinking outside the box, is there something in terms of putting in some kind of requirement for new planning developments to have electric vehicle charging points?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Obviously, we would look all alternatives but it is not something I am aware of at</p> |

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>the moment but it is something we would definitely consider. Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller: I'm sorry to go out of protocol, but could I just add to that supplementary answer in that the Northminster development we are creating parking spaces in Northminster regeneration with EV connectivity if that helps, thank you.</p>  |
| 7. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford (1)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>On top of the shortage of lorry drivers leading to scarcity of some essential items in supermarkets, we now hear that bus drivers are being tempted by higher salaries offered by road haulage companies to train as lorry drivers, thus leading to a consequent shortage of bus drivers which has caused our local bus company, Stagecoach, to cut the frequency of most Peterborough bus services. This follows the Covid pandemic when people were asked for a period not to use public transport and when it is now vital to get passenger numbers up again and to restore public confidence in bus services in order for the council and the country to reach its carbon reduction commitments. The cut in services is also likely to lead to buses becoming crowded at peak times, thus leading to increased exposure of passengers to the Coronavirus and a serious additional hazard to public health.</p> <p>So, what representations has the Council made to Stagecoach and to the Mayor and the Combined Authority to ensure that normal bus service frequencies are restored as soon as possible?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority is aware of the recent cuts to services by stage coach due to the ongoing driver shortage and the high rate of Covid infections. It is causing a need for drivers and other staff to self-isolate I'm afraid. We have assurances from stage coach that those reductions are indeed temporary but I might also add that other bus operators have reported other similar problems to us.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I'm grateful for that response but I do think it was a little bit complacent on the second part of the question, which is potential serious hazard to public health if at peak hours bus services are only running at half the frequency, these bus services could become over crowded. Could I ask what representations he's made and what discussions he's had with the Director of public health about the potential serious health hazard from this situation and will he also recognise that before we had Brexit, we didn't have food shortages, we didn't have shortages of heavy goods vehicle drivers and didn't have shortage of bus drivers and so does he regret his party's policy for Brexit?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Indeed both elements of his question. Both these circumstances, Covid and the driver shortages are events that need to be managed locally Mr Mayor. I personally have had no dialogue with our health folk, but I'm sure our transport officers have.</p> |

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>I'd be more than happy to relate that dialogue to Cllr Sandford. Can I say Mr Mayor, very sorry to cut across you but, it may very well be Mr Mayor that Cllr Sandford has experience of Waitrose and perhaps more up market retailers, I shop at Lidl, I struggle to afford Waitrose I'm afraid.</p>  |
| <p>8.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Sandra Bond</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>A resident has told me that when they enquired recently about what to do with their garden waste following the recent suspension of garden waste collections by the Council, they were told to put the garden waste in their black bin. Given the current financial situation faced by the Council, could the relevant Cabinet member tell me what assessment they have made of the likely financial impact on the Council's budget of the suspension of garden waste collections, both in terms of the cost of putting the additional garden waste through the Council waste incinerator and the loss of income from garden waste collection charges?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>You will be aware, that it was an operational decision to suspend the brown bin collection. We are still four crews down, plus we require an extra two crews with the expansion of the City. We also have four drivers due to retire next year. As our service has been suspended Aragon will not receive payment for the service. There will be a small cost to imburse residents.</p> <p>With regards to extra waste going through the ERF facility, it costs us around £100 a tone to tip. We do receive a feed in tariff of £40k per month. I would urge our residents to use our very good HRC if possible, to dispose of their garden waste. We also offer discounted home composters.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>If residents get into the habit of putting garden waste into their black bin is there not a danger that this habit will continue when brown bin collections are resumed? Given that they might prefer garden waste collection free of charge in the black bin rather than having to pay for it? So, what is the likely ongoing damage to Council finances of this happening?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Obviously waste strategy going through the Government at the moment previously mentioned, it's very likely that garden waste will be a compulsory collection, so I don't think there is any danger of that. So, I think as soon as we can reintroduce the brown bins, I'm sure residents quite happily put their garden waste back into that, I'm sure.</p> |
| <p>9.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor John Fox</b></p> <p><b>For Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>Why are the footpaths and cycle paths not being cut back to the true border in the</p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>same way they have been in past years?</p> <p>They are a complete mess in some areas, with mud and grass spreading out over them, narrowing the width and making certain prestigious areas look run down and unmaintained.</p> <p>What are the plans to remedy this problem?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>I agree, in some areas the grass seems to be creeping across the path. Unfortunately, there is no agreement in the Aragon contract to edge paths. I believe this is an issue we need to address going forward. I will discuss this with the appropriate team. If you are aware of any areas of concern, please do contact me.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Would you be prepared to walk around our area to see how far it is getting into a mess and if we can work out some way of remedy, I will be over the moon and so will my residents.</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>I am happy to meet any Cllrs in any area with regards to my portfolio.</p>   |
| 10. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy (1)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member tell me:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How many homeless families and other homeless applicants are there in temporary accommodation and in other accommodation arrangements awaiting permanent accommodation? and</li> <li>b) What is the longest time somebody who has applied as homeless has spent in a temporary accommodation arrangement? and</li> <li>c) What is the longest time for an applicant in temporary accommodation who is currently awaiting a permanent solution?</li> </ul> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Council are currently accommodating 319 households in temporary accommodation. This is compared to 393 households at the same time last year and 413 the year previously.</li> <li>b) The longest a current household has been in temporary accommodation for 3 years and 1 month. This accommodation is a self-contained house, which is of the right size and suitability for their household.</li> <li>c) All households provided with temporary accommodation are awaiting a permanent solution.</li> </ul> |
| 11. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Wiggin (1)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Deputy</b></p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p><b>Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>Could the relevant cabinet member please provide an update on the implementation of an article 4 direction across Peterborough to regulate smaller HMOs?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>Officers have proposed a timetable that would see an Article 4 Direction introduced towards the end of 2022 or early 2023 subject to the evidence and approval.</p> <p>We are still in the evidence gathering stage and will shortly commence city wide consultation to gather further evidence. We are running about six weeks behind schedule at present, however, we have built in potential for slippage into the programme and this should not affect the overall timetable.</p>   |
| 12. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg (1)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>The council recently launched a campaign to increase the use of food waste bins throughout the city, can the cabinet member for Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment please inform full council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What the usage is in terms of the amount of food waste collected?</li> <li>b) What the percentage of households using the bins before and after the campaign is?</li> <li>c) What was the cost of the campaign?</li> </ul> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>The food waste has been a great success with 743 tons of waste collected April to October an impressive 31% increase. Unfortunately, we do not have the data to how many households are using the service. As you may have seen, loaders empty the food into a small wheely bin and put it into the vehicle separate pod. The approximate cost was £73k and most of the cost was provided by WRAP, waste and resources action plan. Cost savings to date is approximately £65k to date.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question:</b></p> <p>The issue of food waste bin collection is one that is particularly apparent for flats. Most of them don't have the provision to separate their food waste. So, on one hand I want to know what is going to be done. We seem to have a plethora of new flats going up, in fact not far from where we sit now today and across the City. What is being done to put in the planning process the ability for residents to separate their food waste? And then secondly, what is being done with existing flats to kind of retrofit some sort of solution so they can also separate their food waste, so that it can be, they can have the same service that other citizens have got across the City.</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>That is a very good point and seriously look at that thank you.</p> |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 13. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Howell</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>Would the cabinet member join me in congratulating our city's Speedway team, Peterborough Panthers, on becoming 2021 Premiership Champions, their first league title since 2006?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member responded:</b></p> <p>I would certainly like to congratulate the Panthers on a stunning success. To go from finishing bottom in the last Premiership season to topping the league and winning the play-offs is a superb achievement, and Rob Lyon, staff and riders deserve huge credit.</p> <p>It has been a great year on the sporting front following on from Peterborough United's promotion, and hopefully there is much more for us to cheer over the coming months. So I would say go Panthers, up the POSH and not forgetting the phantoms and all our other sporting teams that bring great sporting pleasure to so many.</p>   |
| 14. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford (2)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council</b></p> <p>Does the leader of the Council recognise that live streaming of council meetings and committees is an important way of engaging the public in the important debates and decisions of Peterborough City Council?</p> <p>We were until recently live streaming on Facebook and YouTube all full council, cabinet and committee meetings. Can the Leader explain why live streaming has now stopped with the exception of full council meetings and can he explore whether a small capital investment in some new recording equipment could enable live streaming to be restarted?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>The Council is currently livestreaming all Full Council meetings. Other meetings are also livestreamed on an ad hoc basis, subject to public interest. For example, the Joint meeting of Scrutiny Committees.</p> <p>To set up and livestream an individual meeting costs £600. If no further set up is required, the meeting costs £120.</p> <p>Based on the cost of livestreaming over June and July 2021, the cost of livestreaming all Full Council, Committee's and Cabinet Meetings throughout the year, the approximate cost would be £14,100.</p> <p>Prior to the C-19, we only livestreamed Full Council meetings.</p> <p>On the basis that we would hold 6 Full Council meetings per year, the livestream of Full Council meetings would cost £3,600 per year.</p> |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>Therefore, the savings made from not livestreaming all meetings is £10,500 per year.</p> <p>As discussed at a previous Group Leaders meeting, officers have been tasked with reviewing the ICT equipment to support Hybrid meetings in all the Council's meeting rooms, which also included the Engine Shed at SMH. This would allow for video-calling into any meeting taking place in these rooms and for easy livestreaming of these meetings with no additional cost.</p> <p>Additionally, this would reduce the Council's carbon emissions by reducing unnecessary journeys for officers.</p> <p>Service AV company, the Councils current contracted supplier of audio-visual services has provided a quote, which has previously been shared with Group Leaders, to purchase equipment, but we are still in the early stages of this investigation, but will of course, update members on progress made.</p>   |
| 15. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Wiggin (2)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Irene Walsh, Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health</b></p> <p>Green highlighter pens shaped like syringes have been used by the council to promote vaccine take up in the 12-16 age bracket. This has upset parents who are concerned that they resemble drug paraphernalia. Could the relevant cabinet member confirm how much this cost, how many complaints were received, and what processes are in place for ensuring that marketing and advertising from the council is appropriate?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>The green pens were just one of many initiatives to attract younger people to say yes to the vaccine – but this promotion was short and is now finished with no more pens being handed out.</p> <p>The cost was £1,927 for 5,000 branded pens. Other than one complaint that was escalated to a councillor, we have not been made aware of any official complaints. We do have robust checking and approval processes in place for marketing and advertising, however, we will take into account the adverse reaction to this particular initiative. I am sure councillors will all agree that there have been many successful marketing initiatives throughout the pandemic which have hugely assisted in maximising the uptake of vaccinations by the public.</p> <p>Peterborough and Cambridgeshire are now an Enhanced Response Area for Covid-19, with hospitalisations rising. One of the single, biggest things we can do to improve health outcomes and support the health service is to encourage communities to get vaccinated with either the first, second or booster dose.</p> |
| 16. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Imtiaz Ali</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</b></p> <p>With residents raising issues about local companies (particularly car garages)</p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>occupying residential streets and taking up parking spaces, what can residents do to ensure they have priority parking on the streets where they live? Is there any support the council can give to residents, short of implementing a parking permit scheme which ends up costing residents to park on their own street?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>Unfortunately, there is no given right for any resident to park on the street outside their homes and kerb space in unrestricted streets is available for any motorist to park, provided the vehicle is suitably taxed to be on the road. Where untaxed vehicles are placed on the road, they can be reported directly to the DVLA online via <a href="http://www.gov.uk/report-untaxed-vehicle">www.gov.uk/report-untaxed-vehicle</a> as the appropriate enforcement agency. The only mechanism for giving priority to residents is implementing a resident parking scheme. If residents wish to request a residents parking scheme, they should submit a request to <a href="mailto:trafficregulation@peterborough.gov.uk">trafficregulation@peterborough.gov.uk</a> ideally demonstrating support from their neighbours.</p>  |
| 17. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg (2)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Communities</b></p> <p>Following on from my question from June's Full Council, can the Deputy Leader please update us on the progress being made on the plans for the relocation of the City Market and the progress of consultation with Market Stall holders?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>Excellent progress is being made with our plans to relocate the market. We have brought in a reputable market consultancy that have helped many other authorities revitalise their own city market to ensure we can deliver the very best outcome, and we have worked closely with them and our valuable traders to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have identified a new site and propose to relocate the market to bridge street, placing it at the heart of our city.</li> <li>• Extensive engagement is ongoing with traders, whom we have met in person to capture their views to develop the new market proposals. We will continue to work closely with them to shape our plans.</li> <li>• We have publicly announced plans for the new market in the media, and have engaged with the Communities Scrutiny panel who have voiced overwhelming support for the proposals</li> <li>• A formal notice is being published this week (Thursday) to close the existing market at the end of March 2022. In addition to the media, this is also being circulated to key stakeholders and community forums and it will provide opportunity for people to share views prior to the final cabinet decision.</li> <li>• A timetable is being developed to introduce the new market as early into 2022 as is possible (if plans are approved).</li> <li>• The proposed new market will operate as least 5 days a week and will feature a number of temporary stalls which will be available for new traders to rent on a short-term basis. This will provide the means to expand and contract the offer to meet seasonal and artisan demand (e.g., specialist continental markets).</li> </ul> |



|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent to new external stalls, we are working on plans to convert a fixed retail unit into an attractive 'Food Hall' that could house butchers, fishmongers and provide a delicatessen offering.</li> </ul> <p>Full details of the new market plans, including the proposed timetable, can be found in the recently published scrutiny report on this matter. This includes initial designs that really illustrate the vibrant look and feel of the proposed market, which we believe will reignite the city shopping experience and enhance local commerce not just for market traders but also for existing businesses who will benefit from the increased footfall this new destination will attract.</p>   |
| 18. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (2)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>We have installed public EV charging points in the city but are still below the UK average. What efforts are being made to get us to the UK average?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>As previously mentioned, the Council will be investing at least £150,000 a year for the next three years to fund electric vehicle infrastructure. We are increasing the capacity of a substation at Car Haven car park to create a charging hub.</p> <p>We are supporting the taxi industry to transition across to electric vehicles by installing 4 charging points for the exclusive use by taxi drivers and we are offering free charging for all taxis.</p> <p>We are also looking at solutions for our residents without off-road parking and we will start installing on-street charging points to support the further rollout of electric vehicles in Peterborough.</p> |
| 19. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Haynes (2)</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</b></p> <p>The Cabinet recently announced that three parks in Peterborough have been awarded Green Flag status but then the following day announced that there will be no further applications for Green Flag status in future years in Peterborough, as the budget is being cut. A Council press release claimed that no longer applying for Green Flag status will save the Council over £60,000 a year. Can the relevant cabinet member give me a breakdown of these costs please?</p> <p><b>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</b></p> <p>The element within this saving for specifically Green Flag is £8,000 and this is a ring-fenced budget for additional works in the Parks to get them to standard. The remainder of the £60,000 saving is to remove all bedding from being planted in the city, this will also affect the ability to obtain Green Flag Status.</p>                              |
| 20. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy (2)</b></p>   |

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

Earlier this year we corresponded about derelict, unused and misused garages and agreed that these sites could be put to better use, perhaps in order to build new dwellings. I requested that an action plan be prepared for corporate management team and would like to know how this has been progressed bearing in mind that specific sites have been identified and when will new build works will start.

**The Cabinet Member may have responded:**

Due to the current financial challenges that PCC are facing, we are currently prioritising the optimisation of our operational estate to ensure the council is on a firm footing for the future in relation to its overall estate. This includes a review of all properties on the Council's asset register setting out what these assets are held for, their worth (Capital Value), what income and expenditure (revenue) each requires on a yearly basis. This work will be completed by the end of November.

The work also includes looking at our operational building requirements and our interactions with Customers, all of which have changed since the pandemic.

This will ensure we have the right property in the right place at the right time for strategic requirements, and enable future investment, commercialisation and development of projects in line with those identified in the question and for Council core objectives.

Supplemental question - what if we hold assets, we do not need following this review?

If the analysis sets out that we have assets we hold that are not in line with the Councils core objectives they will be surplus to requirements and either repurposed to meet strategic objectives or sold.

**Questions on notice to:**

- d. The Combined Authority Representatives

**1. Question from Councillor Murphy**

**Councillor Fitzgerald, Combined Authority Board Representative**

What is the Combined Authority's vision for transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and when do you expect an agreed vision and the plan to be prepared to deliver this?

**The Combined Authority Board Representative responded:**

The current programme for the development of the LTCP is set out in the table below:

**Table 1**

| <b>Date</b>  | <b>Action</b> |
|--------------|---------------|
| 27th October | CA Board      |

|                      |                                 |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1st Nov - 28th Nov   | Soft Launch engagement          |
| Until 17th Dec       | Drafting LTCP                   |
| 6th Dec - 17th Dec   | Soft Launch Review              |
| 17th Jan - 25th Feb  | Consultation #2                 |
| 21st Feb - 4th March | Consultation #2 review period   |
| 21st Feb - 4th March | LTCPs following Consultation #2 |
| 28th Feb -31st March | Prep SEA/CIA/HIA                |

I've realised of course that you might not have got all of those down, so I will arrange for one of the team to circulate that schedule to you for the preparation for that development.

As part of the current engagement process following on from that, which commenced on Monday 1st November there is a specific question related to the revised vision for Transport in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The draft vision as it stands states:

A transport network which secures a future in which the region and its people can thrive.

It must put improved public health at its core, it must help create a fairer society, it must respond to climate change targets, it must protect our environment and clean up our air, and it must be the backbone of sustainable economic growth in which everyone can prosper.

And it must bring a region of cities, market towns and very rural areas closer together.

It will be achieved by investing in a properly joined-up, net zero carbon transport system, which is highly reliable, high quality, convenient, affordable, and accessible to everyone. Better, cleaner public transport will reduce private car use, and more cycling and walking will support both healthier lives and a greener region. Comprehensive connectivity, including digital improvements, will support a sustainable future for our region's nationally important and innovative economy.

Please note that Consultation following this initial engagement will commence in January 2022.

**Supplementary question:**

Thank you very much for addressing the LTCP and outlining the dates and plans for that. The reason for my question was that I watched the last board meeting and a couple of Members, particularly a Conservative Member asked what was the transport vision and put a marker down, maybe the Authority will not continue to be funded because it doesn't have a purpose and doesn't know what it is doing.

You did talk about some words going out for consultation and they're good words about public health and about better and cleaner and about the future. Currently, there is no agreed vision from the Combined Authority. When will we have that vision?

**The Combined Authority Board Representative responded:**

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>I think there was a vision for an innovative transport system, but the new Labour Mayor cancelled it. So I suggest you may want to ask the new Labour Mayor as the Combined Authority did, what his lead on a transport vision for Cambridgeshire is, because I certainly think as I pointed out at that meeting that the past Mayor did have a vision now that was democratically voted through, that has since been overturned again demographically, and that's the way it goes. So, I think if I was being honest about the current Mayor, and I think I have told him, I've challenged him on his vision about how he might set the agenda and lead a vision for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. That so far to my satisfaction has not been forthcoming and to a number of others on the Combined Authority, however, all I can hope is that it is a work in progress and I as representing Peterborough will play my part in shaping that vision for the future.</p>   |
| 2. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Wiggin</b></p> <p><b>Councillor Fitzgerald, Combined Authority Board Representative</b></p> <p>In light of recent cuts to bus services by Stagecoach in Peterborough, could the combined authority representatives provide an update on progress in implementing bus franchising across Cambridgeshire and confirm what representations that have made to push for this to happen faster?</p> <p><b>The Combined Authority Board Representative responded:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Combined Authority is aware of recent cuts to services by Stagecoach due to the ongoing driver shortage and the high rate of Covid infections causing a need for drivers and other staff to self-isolate. We have assurances from Stagecoach that these reductions are temporary. Other bus operators have also reported similar problems to us. I think a colleague alluded to that earlier tonight and I think that we are all aware of some issues across the country. I wouldn't except earlier statements about there being a driver shortage before Brexit either. It has been a well-known fact that people in certain industries, particularly HGV that there has been an ongoing issue for a long time.</li> <li>2. Both these circumstances (Covid and the driver shortage) are events that need to be managed locally, regardless of the ownership structure of the buses.</li> <li>3. Separately the Mayoral elections earlier this year, all three candidates stood on a platform of seeking to alter the way the bus services in the Combined Authority area are run, and work on this topic of bus reform is being progressed despite the difficulties caused by the pandemic.</li> <li>4. Earlier this year the Department for Transport (DfT) published a National Bus Strategy and as part of this, we have confirmed to the DfT that we sought authority to consider franchising in May 2019, which I can say is true. The DfT guidance is that they expect Mayoral Authorities which have started to investigate franchising should continue to do so. I will also add at this point that we are looking also with our transport team about how buses work in Peterborough and in a wider context across county.</li> <li>5. A Treasury Green Book business case is being independently audited at present, looking at the options open, the costs and risks.</li> <li>6. The Combined Authority is currently developing a public engagement round to explain to the public the options of (a) an Enhanced Partnership with bus operators or (b) a franchising solution. This engagement work will explain</li> </ol> |

the two approaches and ask the electorate for their views.

7. Once the engagement process and the audit are complete, the results of the both will then be used to take a final decision.

**Supplementary question:**

I would like to thank the Leader for his comprehensive answer there and also for Cllr Hiller's answer before giving reassurance on the resumption of services from Stagecoach when they are able to do so. I look forward to hearing further from the Leader and others as it progresses through its many stages by the sound of it.

Do we have in this Council a champion for bus and public transport users and if not is that something we could consider, thank you.

**The Combined Authority Board Representative responded:**

I couldn't specifically say that there is somebody with that title but I know that a lot of people, certainly on this side in terms of their interests for climate change, I myself have been championing recently. You would have seen me at the Combined Authority meetings and elsewhere talking about how quickly can we get electric buses into the City? And I'm very keen to do that, but there's complex in the sense that I've talked about the conversations I'm having with Charlotte Palmer and the Climate Change Team and indeed our Transport Team about how we can improve not only our bus services per se but the electrification of the bus network, because it has gone into Cambridge and there has been new funding just recently announced for that, so I am very keen to pursue that challenge. So, I suppose the answer to your question is me primarily, trying to move this forward. But it was only this week I have tasked officers already to find out how we can unlock what is a problem with setting the agenda for putting the infrastructure in to electrify bus services and working with Stagecoach and or indeed other franchisees, so let's not think it's all about that. There is other work going on, pressure going on from me and at all levels and officers, because they know I'm keen to try to develop it.