

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEETING
HELD AT 10:00AM, ON
MONDAY 12 JULY 2021
SAND MARTIN HOUSE, PETERBOROUGH**

Cabinet Members Present: Councillor Fitzgerald (Chair), Councillor Steve Allen, Councillor Ayres, Councillor Cereste, Councillor Coles, Councillor Hiller, Councillor Simons, Councillor Walsh,

Cabinet Advisor Present: Councillor Bisby, Councillor Howard

9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bashir and Councillor Gul Nawaz.

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

11. MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 21 JUNE 2021

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 21 June 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

12. PETITIONS PRESENTED TO CABINET

There were no petitions presented to Cabinet.

STRATEGIC DECISIONS

13. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENT (VERSION FOR ADOPTION)

The Cabinet received a report in relation to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan document.

The purpose of this report was to set out the recommendations made by the independent Inspector and, subsequently, seek Cabinet's approval to recommend the Minerals and Waste Local Plan to Council for adoption.

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments introduced the report and advised that Cabinet had previously approved the version of the document that had been used for public consultation. The plan document had undergone examination by an inspector. The plan was a joint plan with Cambridgeshire County Council, who would also need to agree to adopt it. The plan covered issues such as using the correct materials, sustainable waste and conversion into wildlife sites.

Cabinet Members debated the report and in summary responses to questions raised included:

- The modifications suggested by the inspector were minimal and relatively minor, mostly around clarity rather than substance.
- It was noted that the plan would assist the Council in reaching its climate and biodiversity goals.
- If Cambridgeshire County Council did not agree to adopt the plan, Peterborough City Council would not be able to adopt it either, though it was not anticipated that this would happen.
- National planning reforms were anticipated in the autumn, though there was little information on the detail of these at the moment. Officer expected transitional arrangements to be brought in to allow for the plan to continue for a number of years before any new plan would be required under a new system.
- It was noted that the maintenance of any wildlife sites resulting from mineral extraction should not fall on the Council, but should form part of a long term arrangement with developers for 20 or 30 years.
- It was further commented that not all extraction sites were converted into wildlife sites. Returning the land to farmland was also an option.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the conclusions of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the submitted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (see Appendix A);
2. Subject to recommendation 6, recommend to Council the adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan as set out in Appendix B, which incorporates modifications as recommended by the Inspector (Inspector 'Main Modifications' as found at the end of Appendix A) and other minor editorial modifications ('Additional Modifications' – see Appendix C);
3. Note that should Council adopt the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the following council documents are revoked and must no longer be used for decision making:
 - Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011)
 - Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals (2012)
4. Subject to recommendation 2, recommend that Council endorses that the Peterborough 'Policies Map' be updated in accordance with Appendix D;
5. Subject to recommendation 2, agree to revoke the following two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) for decision making in Peterborough, but with such revocation only taking effect from the same date that the new Minerals and Waste Local Plan is adopted:
 - Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities Supplementary Planning Document (2011)
 - RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012)
6. Recommend to Council that recommendation 2 only comes into effect if Cambridgeshire County Council has already agreed to adopt the Local Plan (which it is scheduled to do so on 20 July 2021); or, if that agreement is not yet achieved by Cambridgeshire County Council, recommendation 2 comes into effect from the date that Cambridgeshire County Council does agree to adopt the Plan. If Cambridgeshire County Council agree not to adopt the Plan, then recommendations 2-5 become null and void.
7. Delegate to the Head of Sustainable Growth Strategy, in consultation with colleagues at Cambridgeshire County Council, to make any minor presentational or typographical errors to the documents referred in this item, prior to their publication

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

As outlined in the report, Council only had two substantive options available to it; either adopt the document with the modifications (and any additional very minor corrections if any arise, such as any typographical amendments) or not adopt the document. The former was recommended, as it was a statutory duty to prepare a Minerals and Waste Local Plan, and, in adopting it, Peterborough would have a clear and robust policy document in relation to minerals and waste developments.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

The option of not adopting the Minerals and Waste Local Plan is not recommended, as it would result in Peterborough not having up to date policy for planners and minerals and waste operators to use to guide and inform developments. A lack of up to date policy would leave Peterborough vulnerable to speculative developments that may not be in preferred, most sustainable or suitable locations, and could lead to greater challenges at appeal.

14. MAKING OF GLINTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND BARNACK NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOLLOWING SUCCESSFUL REFERENDUM OUTCOMES

The Cabinet received a report in relation to the making of Neighbourhood Development Plans for Glinton and for Barnack, following successful referendum results.

The purpose of this report was to seek Cabinet approval to recommend that Council 'made' (adopted) both the Glinton Neighbourhood Plan and the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan and thereby made both plans part of the Development Plan for Peterborough.

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments introduced the report and congratulated those who had worked on the plans. Both Glinton and Barnack parish council's had received endorsement of the plans by residents with successful referendum results. Extensive consultation had been undertaken on the contents of the plans, with the assistance of Council officers.

Cabinet Members debated the report and in summary responses to questions raised included:

- Members were advised that while the Local Development plan set the policies for the whole planning area, a neighbourhood development plan focused on a specific neighbourhood. When considering planning applications, the decision maker must give both the same weight.
- Such plans allowed planning decisions to be made with a greater confidence that approved developments are in line with what residents want.
- Members noted that there was a framework which neighbourhood plans had to adhere to, but this was generally quite flexible. Neighbourhood plans, however, could not undermine the Local Plan.
- Non-parished areas could create a neighbourhood plan, however, would first be required to form an appropriate neighbourhood forum.
- It was noted that national planning reform may affect the neighbourhood plan preparation process, however the current white paper was clear that neighbourhood plans as a whole would remain.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the outcome of the Referendum on the Glington Neighbourhood Plan, which took place on 6 May 2021: the outcome being 466 votes in favour of the Glington Neighbourhood Plan, versus 62 votes against the Neighbourhood Plan.
2. Recommend to Full Council that the Glington Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix A, be 'made' (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within the Glington Neighbourhood Area (the Glington Neighbourhood Area is the same area as Glington Parish).
3. Notes the outcome of the Referendum on the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan, which took place on 1 July 2021: the outcome being 175 votes in favour of the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan, versus 20 votes against the Neighbourhood Plan.
4. Recommend to Full Council that the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix B, be 'made' (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within the Barnack Neighbourhood Area (the Barnack Neighbourhood Area is the same area as Barnack Parish minus the part of Burghley Park that falls within the parish).

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The recommendations were in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (as amended). The Plans had been assessed by an independent examiner and officers agreed that the plans both met the basic conditions and other requirements of legislation. The Plans had subsequently passed a referendum. As such, the Plans should be 'made' part of the Development Plan.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

There were no known alternative options for the Council to consider, given the content of the legislation, the content of the Glington Neighbourhood Plan and the Barnack Neighbourhood Plan and the process followed in their production. The alternative of not 'making' (adopting) the Plans would only be taken if a legal process failure had been identified. Amending the content of the Plans was not a legal possibility at this stage.

15. CYCLING AND WALKING MEMBER WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cabinet received a report from the Cycling and Walking Member Working Group.

The purpose of this report was to present to Cabinet the recommendations of the Cycling and Walking Member Working Group for their consideration.

The Transport and Environment Manager introduced the report.

Cabinet Members debated the report and in summary responses to questions raised included:

- The working group was currently focusing on the drafting of the Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan, which would provide a plan for where future investment should be implemented.

- This plan was backed by central government, and would focus on urban areas and commuter routes, however, rural areas would be considered in the second wave of proposals.
- The implementation of the plan would depend on whether a funding bid was successful, but officers anticipated work to continue for a future month, prior to internal review and the public consultation.
- Members considered the Thorpe Wood cycleway project, and noted that this was one of the scheme reviewed by the group, connecting to the business park, Ferry Meadows and the Brettons.
- In relation to the school streets project, Members were advised that there were currently 11 initiatives in the city. It was intended to continue to progress these schemes and make them permanent.
- It was noted that congestions concerns on Crescent Bridge were one of the key risks of the proposal.
- Members recognised the need to encourage walking and cycling, noted that this motivated all the schemes considered by the group and would be integral to future plans in development.
- It was considered that an alternative scheme should be supported, as there was no unanimous support for the Crescent Bridge suggestion.
- It was felt that cycle routes into the City should be focused on more.
- Members felt that the Thorpe Wood project was the more appropriate project to progress.
- It was further suggested that the membership of the working group should be amended to reflect the political proportionality of the Council.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Select the Thorpe Wood on-road cycleway project for implementation, to widen the road and to create a bi-directional cycle lane from the footbridge to the business park.
2. Continue with the School Streets programme where it was safe and appropriate to implement.
3. Establish a new permanent Cycling and Walking Member Working Group and approve the draft terms of reference (Appendix 1), subject to the amendment of paragraph 7 to read:

"Five Member representatives, or another number as determined by the Leader of the Council, are invited to sit on the Working Group. The political balance of the working group will be reflective of the political proportionality of the Council. Substitutes are permitted. The Chair of the Working Group will be agreed at the first meeting of the group. Appropriate officers will attend meetings of the Working Group."

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The recommendations had come from the Cycling and Walking Member Working Group. This Group was setup by Cabinet to recommend options for spending tranche 2 of the Government's Active Travel Fund.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

A number of alternative options were considered by the Working Group (that met the funding requirements that any scheme must re-allocate road space), and after

reviewing the options Crescent Bridge and the school streets programme were selected by the Work Group as the schemes to recommend to Cabinet.

16. UPDATE TO CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP'S TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Cabinet received a report from the Climate Change Working Group in relation to its terms of reference.

The purpose of this report was to recommend and update to the working group's terms of reference regarding meetings held in public.

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment introduced the report and advised that the group had been doing important work and requested some minor edits to its terms of reference, none of which impacted its work.

Cabinet Members debated the report and in summary responses to questions raised included:

- It was noted that the working group had an evidence planning session scheduled on 15 July 2021, with speakers invited to provide evidence, including from the Forestry Commission.
- The working group had been considering all aspects of the Council's response to climate change, in relation to the Council state and across the city.
- Members suggested the memberships of the group should be politically proportional.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to approve the updated terms of reference for the climate change working group (Appendix 1 to the report), subject to the amendment of paragraph 8 to read:

"Five Member representatives, or another number as determined by the Leader of the Council, are invited to sit on the Working Group. The political balance of the working group will be reflective of the political proportionality of the Council. Substitutes are permitted. The Chair of the Working Group will be agreed at the first meeting of the group. Appropriate officers will attend meetings of the Working Group."

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

In March 2021, Council voted to require evidence gathering sessions of working group meetings to be held in public, unless the subject matter was sensitive in nature. The climate change working group agreed that its terms of reference should reflect this. The revised terms of reference also included minor changes to the wording elsewhere.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Not altering the terms of reference was considered, but it was deemed necessary to update the document to reflect the recent requirement to hold evidence gathering sessions in public.

MONITORING ITEMS

17. BUDGET CONTROL REPORT MAY 2021

The Cabinet received a report in relation to the budget control report for May 2021.

The purpose of this report was to provide Cabinet with the forecast outturn for 2021/22 as at the May 2021 budgetary control position.

The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report and advised that at the current time there was a £3.7 million overspend predicted. This had increased mainly due to the pooling of business rates. It was advised that there would be a delay in service demand resulting from COVID-19 issues. The Government continued to support COVID-19 expenditure in various forms, including welcome back funding and winter grant schemes. It was noted that paragraph 9.13 should refer to 2020/21, not 2021/2022.

Cabinet Members debated the report and in summary responses to questions raised included:

- It was noted that demand levels were estimates, with actual demand to be understood once the 'new normal' had been established.
- Members were advised that all funding from the MHCLG had been used to balance the budget.
- In relation to the capital budget, officers were currently reallocating and reprioritising, but were constrained by resources available in the area.
- It was difficult to assess the deficit position for the 2022/2023 financial year, as this would depend on how the Council recovered from COVID-19 and ongoing demand.
- It was noted that 40% of business had had business rates relief, and there was continued uncertainty in this area. This was anticipated to be a bigger issue going forward with the fairer funding review.

Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to note:

1. The budgetary control position for 2021/22 at 31 May 2021 is a forecast overspend of £3.701m against budget.
2. The additional funding, costs, and activity associated with the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic, as outlined in section 4.
3. The key variance analysis and explanations are contained in Appendix A.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

To provide Cabinet with the forecast for 2021/22 as at May 2021 budgetary control position.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

None provided.

Chairman
10.00am to 11.15am
12 July 2021