

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 2 MARCH 2022
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, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Howell, Ishfaq Hussain, Mahboob Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Knight, Lane, Moyo, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robins, Rush, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Tyler, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yugutene

92. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Haseeb, Councillor Iqbal and Councillor Gul Nawaz.

93. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

94. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 January 2022

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 26 January 2022 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

95. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor congratulated those involved in the Council's nomination towards the Excellence in People Management Award for 2022, specifically for Best Health and Wellbeing Initiative.

The Mayor also invited Members to attend the final three events of his mayoral year, which included a Quiz with Fish and Chip Supper at the Ploughman's Pub on 25 March 2022, the Meal with the Mayor at the Willow Restaurant in Central Park on 8 April 2022, and the Mayor's Finale Ball at the Holiday Inn West on 15 May 2022.

Finally, the Mayor advised that, due to the level of public interest in the item, and to ensure a full debate, agenda item 12(1), 'Motion from Councillor Sandford' would be debated immediately following agenda item 11(a), 'Council Tax Resolution'.

96. Leader's Announcements

The Leader commented on the process around the Embankment Masterplan and advised that, in order to ensure that the process remained as transparent as possible, the results of the consultation would be published on 25 March 2022.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 6:12pm until 6:18pm in order for technical issues with the livestreaming of the meeting to be resolved.

In response to queries raised, the Leader advised that the consultation process had been thorough and exhaustive, and that two of the four options put out for consultation would be taken forward.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

97. Questions from Members of the Public

There were no questions from members of the public.

98. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

Questions (a) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet were raised in respect of the following:

1. The cost of wasted recycling and action to be taken

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

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented at the meeting.

99. Petition for Debate ‘Save the Embankment’

The Council received a report in relation to a petition, containing 787 signatures, requesting that the Council ‘retain the Peterborough Embankment as public parkland’.

Martin Ferguson, on behalf of the lead petitioner, addressed the Council and, in summary, raised the following points:

- It was felt that the consultation on the embankment proposals had not been properly in the public sphere, nor had the whole of Peterborough been able to note it.
- Queries were raised as to the reason behind the extension of the consultation, with the suggestion that it was due to the responses not aligning with the Council’s intentions.
- It was advised that scientific studies has evidenced the benefit of open space being available for the public.
- It was considered that a number of facilities would be lost, including views to the cathedral.
- In order to service the new stadium, significant work would need to be undertaken to provide supporting infrastructure.
- It was felt that the perception that the area was rundown was inaccurate.
- Queries were raised as to who held responsibility for boat maintenance, as a number were partially sunk.
- It was suggested that Peterborough United Football Club supports were being used as leverage to progress the development of the embankment site.

- Hope was felt that the site could be used creatively and that options for its future would be properly considered.

Councillor Hiller moved the first proposal as Cabinet Member and advised that a number of assumptions had been made in relation to plans for the embankment site. The content of the petition had been considered by the independent master-planners alongside the feedback from the consultation. It was proposed that the petition be noted and that no further action be taken, due to the fact that comments had already been taken into account as part of the consultation process.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the first proposal and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Sandford moved a second proposal, seeking that the petition be referred to the appropriate scrutiny committee. It was felt that scrutiny was the appropriate body to undertake an in-depth investigation into the outcome of the consultation and the masterplan proposals. Green space was considered to be of great value, a fact which had been emphasised during the COVID-19 pandemic. It was felt that, while the football club may have wished to be relocated, other locations should also be considered.

Councillor Wiggin seconded the second and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members thanked the petitioner and those who had signed the petition.
- Consideration was given to not supporting the recommendation, and debating the petition at the scrutiny committee, taking into account that nearly 1,000 people had expressed their views via the petition.
- The independence of those drafting the master plan was questioned.
- Concern was raised that the masterplan proposals needed a full debate at scrutiny.
- Members recognised the value of green space amenity, and the potential for the development of the site to provide further benefit as green space.
- Further concerns were raised about potential wasted space should a new stadium not be able to be filled.
- Confusion was raised in relation to not referring the petition to the scrutiny committee after specifically seeking the public's opinion on the matter. It was felt important that the public be allowed a voice.

As seconder of the first proposal, Councillor Fitzgerald commented that it was illogical for scrutiny to debate something that had not yet been released. It was felt that the masterplan should be debated at the appropriate time, and consideration then given to what might be done with the embankment. It was further noted that a number of issues were raised with the Leader in relation to problems with the embankment. It was further noted that the extension to the consultation period had been agreed as a number of requests had been received to do so.

As mover of the first proposal, Councillor Hiller summed up by advising that the petition had already been considered by the master-planners, and that nothing had been agreed in relation to the location of the arena. It was further clarified that should the petition be referred to scrutiny, only the petition would be discussed, and not the masterplan. The masterplan would be considered by scrutiny when it was available.

Martin Ferguson, on behalf of the lead petitioner, once more addressed the Council and, in summary, raised the following points:

- He was not against the principle of a University in Peterborough but felt the

current proposal would take up a lot of current green space.

- It was felt that the embankment was for the use of all Peterborough residents and should be given over to a private commercial enterprise.
- It was emphasised that green spaces raised the wellbeing of all residents, which was particularly important for Peterborough, which was a growing city.

A vote was taken on the proposal and Council **RESOLVED** (30 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) to note the petition and take no further action.

100. 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. Cost of advertising bin collection holidays
2. Bulky waste collection update and service charge
3. Response to question regarding library closure
4. Use of Town Hall for private hire
5. Development of swimming pool progress
6. Aragon communications
7. Interim CEO arrangements
8. Ecological emergency motion
9. Food waste caddy liner distribution
10. City of culture progress
11. Knife crime motion
12. Hardship fund
13. Highway adoption
14. Final embankment masterplan
15. Use of Aragon resources
16. Aragon communications
17. Weekend homelessness outreach cover
18. Enforcement against those not registered to vote
19. Spending on laptops
20. CAT programme
21. Disabled parking central park

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

101. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council – Part One

101(a). Cabinet Recommendation – Medium Term Financial Plan 2022/23 – Phase Two

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to Phase Two of the Medium Term Financial Plan 2022/23.

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation and noted that the Council's budget this year was unique, as it was the first budget under the eyes of the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel. Tough choices were ahead and the Council would

not shirk its responsibilities or damage its future. £20million of savings had been found, however, the Council was unable to avoid an increase in Council Tax. The report indicated the rigor that had been applied to the budget setting process that year, and Councillor Coles thanked officers across the Council for their work reaching these objectives. In order to achieve sustainability the Council would need to continue to make the right choices at the right time, for the right reasons. It was advised that the Council's resilience was weak, however was taking its first steps towards sustainability. Reserves were considered to be adequate for the year ahead.

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

Councillor Sandford moved an amendment to the recommendation and advised that, in general, the amendment stated that fees and charges should be increased by the rate of inflation and that the Council should use the additional income to help achieve a net zero carbon position. It was considered that if fees and charges were not increased, the Council was effectively subsidising these activities. It was felt that this was a sensible and responsible alternative proposal. Concerns were raised about the operation of the Financial Sustainability Working Group. Queries were also raised in relation to the amendment to the budget in March 2021, that had been moved by the Green Group and agreed by Council, but had not been actioned to date. It was felt that budget proposals at Peterborough City Council had not been well handled and it appeared that the Council's priorities were in grandiose schemes and not in local matters. Various complaints were raised in relation to the operation of NPS, Medesham Homes and City Culture in light of the CIPFA report in reference to these bodies. Issue was raised with the fact that some libraries in the city were only open 3 hours, and there would be no value in reducing these any further. It was hoped that the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel would review the areas raised and suggested that hard-working officers were being poorly led.

Councillor Wiggin seconded the amendment and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Coles, as mover of the original motion, confirmed that he would accept the amendment in full.

At this point the Mayor adjourned the meeting for fifteen minutes.

Upon reconvening, Council debated the recommendation as amended and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- The collaborative approach of the Cabinet Member for Finance was appreciated, and the intention of the Financial Sustainability Working Group was praised.
- The postponement of a recent Financial Sustainability Working Group was highlighted as symptom of a bigger problem with the budget setting process, alongside the late circulation of papers.
- Members drew attention to a letter from the previously Leader of the Council, John Holdich, which implored Members not to support the budget.
- It was felt by some Members that the proposals were not substantial enough and Members were not confident that savings would be achieved.
- Further comment was made that greater detail was needed in relation to the operation of the Council's partners and companies.
- Concern was raised in relation to the reduction of funding for leisure services.
- It was suggested that the current situation had resulted from a stream of poor decisions from the administration.
- Issues such as bulky waste, fly tipping and knife crime were raised that had not been progressed as promised.
- It was considered that fees and charges would typically undergo a thorough

review, though this clearly had been undertaken.

- Members expressed concern as to how the budget could be agreed when did not feel they had all the necessary information in order to vote on it.
- Concerns were raised in relation to the high risk cuts to the adult social care service as well as the cuts to the museum and art gallery funding.
- Cultural activities were considered to be of key importance, not only to residents by for commercial income generation.
- Members were unhappy with the prospect of asking residents of Peterborough to pay high rates of Council Tax when already struggling with higher costs of living.
- Members also expressed confusion at the debate, as no similar points had been raised at the Joint Meeting of Scrutiny Committees when considering the budget proposals. It was felt that this sent a very poor message to the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel.
- Those involved in the Financial Sustainability Working Group, from Members to officers, were thanked for their contributions.
- It was advised that the Governance continued to have the power to intervene if it felt that the Council did not have a grasp of its budget, and that failing to approve the budget would risk intervention.
- It was questioned why the Leader had not approached central Government and asked for additional funding.
- Further work should be carried out with outside bodies, it was felt, in order to assist the Council in reaching financial sustainability.
- It was suggested that the Financial Sustainability Working Group should be presented with a range of options for Members to consider, rather than being presented with one set of proposals.
- It was noted that the budget was for the forthcoming year, and could never be 100% accurate. Members would take a view based on income and earnings in the next 12 months and adapt as appropriate in order to achieve a balanced budget by the end of the year.
- Members looked forward to the outcome of the review of Council's contracts.
- Members were advised by the Chief Executive and the Section 151 Officer that a budget needed to be agreed by the end of the meeting in order to be able to print Council Tax bills by the relevant deadline. If agreement wasn't reached then Government intervention was likely.

As seconder of the recommendation, Councillor Hiller advised that he had nothing further to add that had not already been raised in debate.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Coles summed up by acknowledging the frustration felt across the Council at the unpleased decision ahead. It was clear, however, that all options had been considered, and had been raised with the Financial Sustainability Working Group. It was further recognised that the budget was unusual in the sense that it employed a tactical approach to cover just one year. Councillor Coles reinforced the legal requirement for the Council to set a budget and denounced the manner in which party politics was getting in the way of necessary difficult decisions.

A vote was taken on the recommendation as amended and Council **RESOLVED** (28 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 1 abstained from voting, with the Mayor's casting vote in favour) to approve:

1. This proposed budget includes a Council Tax increase of 2.99%, (1.99% general Council Tax and 1% Adult Social Care Precept), as outlined within section 5.2
2. The Phase Two budget proposals as outlined in Appendix B as the basis for public consultation.

3. The updated budget assumptions, to be incorporated within the Medium-Term Financial Plan 2022/23. These are outlined in section 5.
4. The revised capital programme outlined in section 5 and referencing Appendix C.
5. The establishment of a Budget Risk Reserve and the forecast reserve commitments to fund the cost of transformational investment and the implementation of the Improvement Plan. These are outlined in section 6 and Appendix F.
6. The Education budget as outlined in section 5.6 and within Appendix J.
7. The proposed approach to the development of an Asset Management Strategy, in line with that included within the improvement plan. This is outlined in section 5.5.
8. The Medium-Term Financial Plan 2022/23- Phase Two, as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
 - Appendix A – 2022/23 MTFP Budget Position Phase Two
 - Appendix B – Phase Two Budget Consultation Document
 - Appendix C – Capital Programme Schemes 2022/23-2024/25
 - Appendix D – Financial Risk Register
 - Appendix E – Fees and Charges
 - Appendix F – Reserves Commitments
 - Appendix G – Equality Impact Assessments
 - Appendix H– Carbon Impact Assessments
 - Appendix J – Dedicated Schools Grant and the Schools Budget 2022-23
 - Appendix K – Treasury Management Strategy
 - Appendix L – Capital Strategy
 - Appendix M – Budget Consultation Feedback
9. That a full review of fees and charges is undertaken, to include at least inflationary increases where possible and the potential for introducing a charge for charging battery operated cars.
10. Additional income raised from such increases may be added to a reserve to address green and environmental projects that will further the Council's corporate strategy commitment to getting the city to net Zero Carbon by 2030.

Council **RESOLVED** to note:

11. The strategic financial approach taken by the Council outlined in section 4 of this report.
12. The Council's core funding position following the Local Government Final Finance Settlement published on 7 February 2022. This shows a £0.005m favourable change in comparison to the provisional settlement previously reported. This is outlined in section 5.
13. The forecast reserves position, and the statutory advice of the Chief Finance Officer outlined in section 6 'The Robustness (Section 25) Statement'.
14. The Council's Improvement Plan within Appendix I, as agreed at Council on 16 December, from which this plan is outlined as a key deliverable within the financial sustainability theme.
15. The following changes which have been made since the 31 January Cabinet report:
 - Confirmation of Final Settlement and grant allocations such as Public Health resulting in a £0.005m favourable change in budget position
 - Inclusion of the final parish precepts in section 5.2- net nil budget impact
 - Confirmation of no changes to the estimates/assumptions included within the budget proposals
 - Inclusion of the approach to the asset strategy

- Inclusion of the budget consultation feedback received up to 10 February 2022.

16. The final responses to the consultation received up to the 28 February 2022.

Councillors voting in favour: Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, Hiller, Howard, Ishfaq Hussain, Lane, Moyo, Over, Rush, Sainsbury, Sharp, Simons, Tyler, Walsh, Warren

Councillors voting against: Ansar Ali, Imtiaz Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, John Fox, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Mahboob Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Knight, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors abstaining from voting: Judy Fox

Mayor's casting vote: In favour

102. Reports to Council

102(a). Council Tax Resolution 2022

The Council received a report in relation to the Council Tax Resolution for 2022.

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation and advised that the Council Tax resolution sought was an increase in 2.99%, the maximum increased allowed without a referendum. This accounted for a 1.99% general increase and a 1% increase in Adult Social Care precept. The resolution would form Appendix M of the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

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

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

- The suggestion was made that opposition Members were not responsible for the creation of the budget, however support would be given on this particular item.
- It was further suggested the cause of the Council's financial troubles were due to the level of Council Tax being maintained at an artificially low level for an extended length of time.
- Members felt that it was upsetting the highest level of increase had to be sought when so many residents were struggling.
- Concern was raised that papers for the Financial Sustainability Working Group had been circulated late.

As seconder of the recommendation, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that he objected to a number of comments made by other speakers.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Coles summed up by advising that the funding from the Council Tax resolution was required for the budget to succeed. It was advised that Peterborough had the seventh lowest level of Council Tax in the country, and that Council would try to make sure those on low incomes would not struggle to make payments.

A vote was taken on the proposal and Council **RESOLVED** (39 voted in favour, 14 voted against, 4 abstained from voting) to approve the Council Tax Resolution which proposed a Council Tax Increase of 2.99%, which included the following breakdown:

- A rise in general Council Tax of 1.99%
- An Adult social Care Precept of 1.00%

Councillors voting in favour: Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Ishfaq Hussain, Lane, Moyo, Over, Rush, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Tyler, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

Councillors voting against: Ansar Ali, Imtiaz Ali, Dowson, Hemraj, Mahboob Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Shaz Nawaz, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

Councillors abstaining from voting: Day, Howell, Knight, Murphy

103 Notices of Motion

103(1) Motion from Councillor Sandford

Councillor Sandford moved his motion as altered in relation to the conflict in Ukraine. Councillor Sandford noted the heroic resistance of the Ukrainian population against invading Russian forces. Sanctions from the West against President Putin needed to be strong, alongside the provision of supplies to the Ukrainian people. The motion intending to ensure that Peterborough was providing as much support as possible. In 1991 Peterborough was twinned with Vinnystia, and it was felt that twinning should extend further than Mayoral visits and events. It was understood that the Council had written to its counterpart in Vinnystia already, offering support.

Councillor John Fox seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Members expressed their support for the motion and its message, and considered that Ukrainian refugees should be unrestricted within the EU and the UK.
- The increasing death-toll within Ukraine was recognised, alongside the stories shared by the many residents of Peterborough who were unsure of the welfare of their friends and family.
- The killing of innocent people was condemned and Members voice their opposition to dictators and oppressors.
- Members noted the great number of provisions that had been provided by residents already for those in Ukraine.
- It was suggested that medical supplies were of a top priority.

A motion was moved by Councillor Murphy to suspend standing order 14.2, to allow the meeting to extend beyond the four-hour guillotine. This motion was not seconded, and debate of Councillor Sandford's motion continued as follows:

- Members were in agreement in their support for the motion, with acknowledgement raised of the gathering held on Sunday 27 March 2022.
- It was felt that a group of could be arranged to coordinate the provision of support.
- Members expressed support for those around the world who were suffering, and calls were made to ensure that all such individuals were treated equally.

- It was noted that support was also extended to people from Russia, who were recognised as separate from the government and President Putin.
- Members suggested that the countries bordering Ukraine should also be provided with support to help with refugees settling in these countries.

As seconder of the motion Councillor John Fox suggested that the Town Hall reception desk be used as a pick up point for those within the Ukrainian community, as more remote areas weren't as accessible as the town centre.

As mover of the motion Councillor Sandford summed up and thanked Members for their contributions, including suggestions in relation to creating a co-ordination group for support to the Ukraine. It was considered that the debate at the Council meeting that evening was a clear example of democracy in action, and was what Ukraine was fighting for.

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

“Council:

1. Expresses grave concern about the situation in Ukraine and the unprovoked ~~which faces an ongoing threat of invasion of the country~~ by armed forces of the Russian Federation.
2. Supports the actions of the UK Government in trying to resolve the situation through diplomacy, ~~maintaining the threat~~ implementation of strong economic sanctions to deter any threatened invasion in response to the invasion and pledging support for the collective security provided by the NATO alliance and in particular towards the Baltic states and other NATO member countries in Eastern Europe.
3. Notes the presence in Peterborough of many thousands of people originating from Lithuania, Poland and other eastern European countries and the important role they play in making Peterborough a dynamic and diverse city.
4. Notes that Peterborough was twinned with Vinnytsia in 1991, making it our city's most recent twinning partnership. With a population of 370,000, Vinnytsia is located in west-central Ukraine and has been an important location for trade and politics since the 14th century.
5. Asks the Executive Director for Place and Communities to investigate ways of strengthening and developing our twinning partnership with Vinnytsia and of supporting the people of the city and the rest of Ukraine in the current stressful and dangerous situation.
6. Specifically asks the director to proactively follow-up with the administration in Vinnytsia following the letter recently sent to the Mayor of the town which offered our support to residents, to investigate ways of offering practical help through the twinning partnership and to look at ways of raising awareness with our own Peterborough residents of the ongoing challenges that the community in Vinnytsia is facing.”

104. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council – Part Two

At this point in the meeting the four-hour Council guillotine was reached and, as per the constitution, all remaining items were voted on without debate.

104(a). Employment Committee Recommendation – Annual Pay Policy 2022-2023

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to approve the content of the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23.

104(b). Cabinet Recommendation – Peterborough Housing Allocations Policy

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to approve the new Housing Allocations Policy.

104(c). Cabinet Recommendation – Budget Approval for the Construction of Peterborough City Market and for the Disposal of Land at Northminster

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (47 voted in favour, 6 voted against, 2 abstained from voting) to:

1. Note the indicative costs in relation to the creation of a new city market as set out in exempt Appendix 1 and delegate final approval of those costs to the Director of Resources subject to the Financial Assessment.
2. Approve funding from reserves for the revenue costs to achieve vacant possession of the Northminster site and to meet costs associated with decanting market traders to a temporary location whilst the permanent market is under construction if necessary.
3. Approve the transfer of capital budget from Strategic Property of up to £450,000 for the construction of the Peterborough City Market.
4. Approve the proposed sale of the land at Northminster to the Peterborough Investment Partnership (PIP), as set out in exempt Appendix 3, with phased completion dates of 31 March 2022 and 30 June 2022, subject to final valuation and compliance with best consideration requirements in line with the joint venture agreement with the PIP and with final terms delegated to the Director of Resources and Director of Law and Governance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance.

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

As the guillotine had been reached, there were no questions on Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting.

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

As the guillotine had been reached, there were no questions on Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

107. Notices of Motion

107(2) Motion from Councillor Hogg

A vote was taken on the motion moved by Councillor Hogg (11 voted in favour, 33 voted against, 13 abstained from voting). The motion was **DEFEATED**.

The Mayor
6:00pm – 10:26pm
2 March 2022