

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2022
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DOWSON

Present:

Councillors Ansar Ali, Imtiaz Ali, Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bi, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Hussain, Iqbal, Jamil, Alison Jones, Dennis Jones, Knight, Moyo, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Perkins, Qayyum, Ray, Robinson, Rush, Sabir, Sainsbury, Sandford, Seager, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Tyler, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

66. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Rangzeb, Councillor Lane, and Councillor Stevenson.

67. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

68. Minutes of the Council meeting held on:

a. **12 October 2022 – Extraordinary Meeting**

The minutes of the extraordinary Council meeting held on 12 October 2022 were approved as a true and accurate record.

b. **12 October 2022**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 12 October 2022 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

69. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor advised that, in order to allow guests to leave, the agenda would be re-ordered and agenda item 13(a) 'Report of the Peterborough City Council Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel' would be discussed following agenda item 8, 'Questions on Notice'.

The Mayor informed Members of a number of events attended by the Mayoral Party in the past few months, including:

- The opening of new offices and businesses in Peterborough, including Respond, Starbucks and Karak Chai.
- A ceremony celebrating the 50th anniversary of the arrival of Ugandan Asian community in Peterborough.
- The Armistice Two Minutes' Silence on 11 November 2022, and Remembrance Sunday on 13 November 2022.
- A Fly the Flag ceremony for the White Ribbon Day on 25 November 2022.
- An open day for pensioner groups on 2 December 2022.

Members were also reminded of the Christmas Wreath laying event on 15 December, to which they were all invited.

The Mayor invited Councillor Sandford, as Chair of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, to announce the winners of the 2022 Civic Awards as follows:

Community Involvement Award

Azhar Chaudhry
 Family Voice
 Louise Craig
 Miriam Whittam
 Faustina Yang
 Simon Kail
 Fiona Winchester
 Gemma Wells
 Raja Raashid
 Rukhsana Sannee & Helen Walkinshaw
 Mohammed Afzal
 Arif Aziz
 Fiona Cifaldi
 Christine Cunningham
 Lisa Chadwick
 Sally Hudson
 Bettina Lufferodt
 Phillippa Phillips
 Cliff Walker
 Raimonda Gecaite, Snieguole (Snow) Maliavskaja & Asta Kavaliuskaite
 Good Neighbours (Neil Boyce)
 Martin Chilcott
 Carol & Andrew Avery
 Dianne Dearden
 Prudence Lear
 Chinese Community Peterborough

Contribution to Art & Culture

Sue Magill
 Tony Nero
 Romsey Mill

Lifetime Achievement

David Jost
 Stewart Francis

Outstanding Commitment to the Environment

Fred Truss
 Safina Azam & Intikhab Ahmed
 Nathan Minter
 Johnny Richardson

70. Leader's Announcements

The Leader made a number of announcements on the following areas:

- 29 per cent of pupils taking the multiplication table assessment scored the full 25 marks – higher than Cambridgeshire and the East of England and national averages.
- In the national Progress 8 table, which measured how far young people progressed in their education across secondary education in eight subjects, Peterborough had recorded an improvement of 0.24. It was the first time Peterborough had had a positive Progress 8 outcome. Out of the 151 local authorities, this placed Peterborough at 38th nationally, up from 107th.
- Welcome to Rochelle Tapping, as the new Director of Legal and Governance.
- Elaine Redding had been appointed as interim Executive Director of Children's Services, to take forward the strategic leadership of Children's Social Care and Education.
- Amanda Warburton, Partnership Officer for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Domestic Abuse and Sexual Abuse Partnership was a finalist in the Women Achieving Greatness in Social Care Awards 2022 for work on developing solutions to support older survivors of domestic abuse and sexual violence.
- The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Young Inspectors group, made up of young people with a social care involvement, were recognised for their Supervised Contact Centres Project with the A National Voice Award for Participation from Coram Voice.
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fostering Service hosted its first Foster Carer Long Service Awards ceremony since the COVID-19 pandemic, which was attended by over 250 guests
- The Council signed up to the UNISON Anti-Racism Charter which will see the Council undertake a number of measures over the next 12 months.
- Work had been undertaken with community groups to open 20 winter support hubs across the city offering food support. Many of the hubs were also offering energy and warmth related essentials, and social activities.
- The targeted Family Worker team supported families in Peterborough as part of the Homes for Ukraine scheme.
- Thousands were in attendance in Cathedral Square for the annual Christmas lights switch-on.
- Cathedral Square ice rink, although not being run by the council, had been a success for the organisers, with over 300 people on the first day.
- The Council had retained its Customer Services Excellence accreditation, with an increase in areas of compliance from 21 to 24.

Group Leaders responded to the Leaders announcements, the key points raised included:

- Group Leaders were pleased to hear of the success of Peterborough students, as well as the Customer Services Team.
- It was felt as a step forward that the Council was signing up to the anti-racism charter and embracing the different communities in Peterborough.
- Rochelle Tapping and Elaine Redding were welcomed.
- The Council was commended for the opening of 20 winter support hubs over the season.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

71. Questions from Members of the Public

One question was received from members of the public in respect of the following:

1. Civil defence facilities in Peterborough.

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

72. Petitions

a. Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by Members of the public at the meeting.

b. Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members at the meeting.

73. 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) were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. New residents in St Michael's Gate.
2. Parking in designated Taxi Ranks.
3. Lime Academy hydrotherapy session costs.
4. Bus service cuts.
5. Spend on placing Asylum Seekers in local hotels.
6. Notification of Asylum Seeker arrivals.
7. Number of users of Lime Academy hydrotherapy sessions.
8. Refugees causing a 'risk to strategic infrastructure' wording explanation.
9. Care Home places.
10. Clare Lodge Ofsted inspection.
11. Street light repairs.
12. Average length of planning application determinations.
13. Number of enforcement tickets issued.
14. Manor Drive bus services.
15. Review of success of Combined Authority tendered bus services.
16. Steps the Combined Authority are taking to recover the subsidy to Stagecoach for cancelled bus services.

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

74. REPORTS TO COUNCIL

74(a) Report of the Peterborough City Council Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel

The Council received a report in relation to the second report of the Peterborough City Council Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel.

The Mayor advised that the Chair of the Peterborough City Council Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel was in attendance to answer any questions.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendation and advised that the Chief Executive and he attend meetings of the Panel, though had had no influence in the drafting of the report. The Council had made a great deal of progress since this time last year, due to the collaborative working of Members, particularly through the Financial Sustainability Working Group. There was also felt to be a greater understanding of the Council's finances from all Members, who better recognised their responsibilities towards setting the Council's budget.

Councillor Steve Allen seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

Council debated the recommendation and the summary of the points raised by Members, and responses provided by the Chair of the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel included:

- It was felt that the smaller groups were now able to play a full role in the budget process.
- Members were pleased that the Council were now working on medium and long-term plans.
- Questions were raised in relation to the use of income from the energy from waste plant to supplement reserves, and the Panel's interest in this area. Members were advised that this was a positive use of the profits. It was noted, however, was the potential for this income to be subject to the newly-introduced 'windfall tax', though it currently falls outside of this category. It would be prudent for the Council not to rely on this income.
- Comment was made that all the information provided to the Panel was also provided to the Financial Sustainability Working Group.
- It was felt that, in the past 12 months, there had been more cross-party working than ever before.
- Concern was raised in relation to comments made in the report about the All-out Elections proposals, and Members were advised that the Panel were happy that the Council had genuinely considered a move to All-out Elections and were now demonstrating a much more professional and collegiate manner or work. As long as this behaviour continued while in a position of no overall control, the move to All-out Elections need not be revisited.
- In response to a question around the ideal next steps for the Council, Members were advised that continuing to work together and bringing forward a budget with shared knowledge and information was the best option. This did not necessarily mean that all Members would have to vote in favour of the budget, but should the budget decision transpire in the same manner as last year, this would be cause for concern for the Panel.
- It was suggested that the scale of the work necessary for the Council would be challenge and that there needed to be a continued balance between leadership, direction and listening to those who worked on the frontline.
- In relation to the Council's Audit Committee and Scrutiny, it was suggested that opposition chairs was a positive addition alongside the work of the Financial Sustainability Working Group.
- It was felt, in response to a question around the Council's scrutiny function, that the Council's Governance arrangements were strong and that

the Council's new Director of Legal and Governance would be in a good position to review arrangements.

- Members thanked members of the Financial Sustainability Working Group and officers for their open attitude and hoped that this could continue.

As seconder of the recommendation, Councillor Steve Allen thanked Eleanor Kelly for her attendance, and the work of the Independent Improvement and Assurance Panel. Previous comments were echoed in relation to the spirit of co-operation across the Council and the importance of continuing this in order to achieve sustainability.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Fitzgerald summed up, advising that the positive nature of the Panel's report was a result of the successful collaboration between political groups. While the Council was in a position of no overall control, working together was vital. It was noted that the Department of Levelling Up, Communities and Housing was still monitoring the Council closely.

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

1. Ask the Cabinet to consider this report and respond with the action it wishes to take as a result.
 - Request the Growth, Resources, and Communities Scrutiny Committee to review this report, the Cabinet's response to it and the progress being made with the delivery of the Improvement Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

75. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

75(a). Cabinet Recommendation – Tree Management: Review of Existing Policy for Managing Tree Related Subsidence Claims Against the Council

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to a review of the existing policy for managing tree related subsidence claims against the Council.

Councillor Simons moved the recommendation.

Councillor Sainsbury seconded the recommendation.

Council debated the recommendation and welcomed the strategy, as it was felt that further transparency around the process would be beneficial, as would consideration of applications by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.

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

1. Agree to amend the Trees and Woodland Strategy by way of introduction of the newly created tree related subsidence policy.

75(b). Cabinet Recommendation – Making of Helpston Neighbourhood Development Plan Following Successful Referendum Outcome

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to the Helpston Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendation and advised that the plan had been developed with the support of the local community, who had voted 95% in favour in a referendum. Prior to the referendum the plan was subject to an independent

examination and the Council was satisfied that it met all relevant legal requirements. Congratulations was passed onto the parish for this achievement and their hard work.

Councillor Over seconded the recommendation and welcomed the adoption of the plan. He implored the Council to take the plan into consideration when determining planning applications in the Helpston area.

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

1. 'Make' (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') the Helpston Neighbourhood Plan, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purpose of making decisions on relevant planning applications within the Helpston Neighbourhood Area (the Helpston Neighbourhood Area is the same area as Helpston Parish).

75(c). Cabinet Recommendation – Local Area Energy Plan

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to the Local Area Energy Plan.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendation.

Councillor Howard seconded the recommendation.

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

- It was felt that the plan was ambitious, but a query was raised as to references in the plan that the Council's previously agreed goal of net-zero carbon by 2030 as unfeasible. Instead, the plan seemed to suggest a new goal date of 2040. Clarity on this matter was sought.
- It was noted that the report was supported by the Climate Change and Environment Scrutiny Committee, with the Council being one of only two authorities in the country to have adopted it.
- Concern was raised around pushing back the target date for net-zero carbon and it was suggested that plans needed to be accelerated rather than being restrained by milestones.

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

1. Adopt the Local Area Energy Plan.

75(d). Cabinet Recommendation – Fees, Charges, and Inflation Review

The Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to a review of fees, charges and inflation.

Councillor Coles moved the altered recommendation and advised that the report set out the division between statutory services and non-statutory services. An inflation rate of 10.1% had been generally adopted. The proposal had been through the Financial Sustainability Working Group and Cabinet, with the only change being to the proposals around the bereavement service.

Councillor Sainsbury seconded the recommendation.

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

- Members were happy with the revision to the bereavement services fees and charges and thanked the team for meeting with residents.
- Concern was raised over the new charges for electric vehicle charging points, which were felt to be higher than typical.

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

1. Adopt the increases in Fees and Charges as outlined in the report and Appendix 1 to the report, subject to the revised Burial & Cremation fees at weekends as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report.

75(e). Audit Committee Recommendation – Treasury Management Mid-Year Update

The Council received a report from Audit Committee in relation to the Treasury Management mid-year update.

Councillor Imtiaz Ali moved the recommendation and advised that the Audit Committee had been asked to review the Council's position against performance indicators. The proposal included adding non-specified investments to the strategy. The annual report would be brought to Full Council for consideration in early 2023.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz seconded the recommendation.

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

1. Approve the addition of non-specified investments detailed within Appendix C to the report (Property Funds, Bond Funds and other pooled funds) to the Treasury Management Strategy.

76. 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.

Fees, Charges, and Inflation Review

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the Fees and Charges proposals were discussed at length at the Financial Sustainability Working Group, with some delay due to discussions around the bin services.

Fees and Charges formed part of the budget setting process, however, as this year's budget was a 'tactical' one, changes to fees and charges were being implemented as soon as possible.

It was further advised that the charge for EV charging was based not only on kilowatt charges, but also parking costs and infrastructure and installation costs.

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

The Mayor advised that there had been no Combined Authority decisions received since the last meeting.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

78. Notices of Motion

78(1) Motion from Councillor Hogg

Councillor Hogg advised that he no longer wished to move this motion.

78(2) Motion from Councillor Qayyum

Councillor Qayyum moved her motion and advised that the park home community felt they were unrepresented despite paying taxes and working hard. Officers at the Council had been working hard to ensure residents were communicated with, however, despite recent updates to legislation, challenges by residents were still subject to tribunals. Councillor Qayyum thanked her fellow ward councillors, who had been working together on this issue.

Councillor Jackie Allen seconded the motion and was pleased to relay that the Mobile Home Bill had been passed through the House of Commons, and hoped that it would pass swiftly through the House of Lords, too. Residents at these parks continued to face rules that should be challenged wished for improved enforcement and compliance.

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

“The City of Peterborough has 8 Mobile Park homes sites, home to some 1,000 people of our city.

Over the years, people who have lived in such homes have expected to live a peaceful life with dignity and enjoy their lives, without worrying about legislation which can lead to greater expense, and which can cause distress and undue anxiety. In frequent cases, residents may be devoid of the support that is necessary to ensure that their quality of life in retirement is safeguarded.

This Council notes that:

- Whilst licensing legislation is a necessary step after the introduction of the Mobile Homes Act 2013, in order to safeguard residents’ rights and wellbeing it is necessary to establish clear lines of communication between site owners, the authority and residents and ensure the authority is given greater autonomy to carry out due diligence.
- There are certain challenges to be met with reference to providing evidence around safety parameters for residents and officers
- The cost-of-living crisis has placed residents facing increasing financial difficulties with state pensions and other income inversely proportional to the rise of inflation, and support from the local authority in such instances is sadly insufficient, resulting in the ability to meet standards or paying for pitch fees at the Retail Price Index (RPI) rate along with 10 percent commission fees upon selling homes, near enough impossible. In October 2018 the government committed to use the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as the index for pitch fees (as happens in Wales and Scotland) but this change has not yet happened as primary legislation is needed.

The Council resolves to:

- **Develop a consistent approach towards all Mobile Park homes across the city irrespective of their ownership and to ensure that legislation and licensing conditions are applied equitably to prevent unnecessary costs and inconvenience to the residents.**

- To recognise the difference in the rights of park homeowners and bricks and mortar-built dwellings and offer the support needed to all residents under section 12 of the Mobile Homes Act.
- To continue to work with UPPH (United Peterborough Park Homes) to achieve agreed outcomes in the best interests of all who reside and own park homes, including ensuring the confidentiality of residents' concerns to prevent safeguarding issues arising acknowledging appropriate issues to signpost residents and work with agencies ensuring protection from the fear of harassment and intimidation.
- Welcomes the House of Commons passing all stages of Sir Christopher Chopes' Mobile Homes (Pitch Fees) Bill on 18th November 2022 and urges the House of Lords to pass the Bill swiftly, so the switch from RPI to CPI becomes law."

78(3) Motion from Councillor Skibsted

Councillor Skibsted moved her altered motion and advised that the motion sought to identify a link between the climate emergency and cost of living crisis. Climate change was affecting inefficient houses more, particularly those who could not finance energy efficient measures. This needed to be addressed, along with continued lobbying of the Government to provide further support, which should be funded by the profits from fossil fuels.

Councillor Imtiaz Ali seconded the motion and advised that sea levels were already predicted to rise by 3 or 4 metres, which would impact the UK. The climate was set to become unbearable for millions of people across the globe, with 100 million climate refugees predicted by 2050. Action had to be taken and retro fitting houses, while providing support to those who did not have the resources to do so, was vital.

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

- It was considered to be an important matter to discuss and it was suggested that Peterborough was leading the way in raising awareness and providing support to local businesses.
- It was thought to be most important to focus on communities in these times, who would play a key role in the recovery process.

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

"This Council notes that:

- We are experiencing the highest inflation in 40 years. Energy is costing more, directly threatening household budgets and the viability of local businesses.
- Historical evidence suggests that increases in food poverty and fuel poverty will lead directly to increased health problems and winter deaths.
- Poor insulation, inefficient heating and the effects of climate change are intensifying the impact of energy prices, increasing pressures on families and businesses, and there are insufficient skills in the city and East of England to deliver on these issues.
- As the cost-of-living increases, people and businesses are less able to finance adaptations to improve energy efficiency and to prepare for extreme weather events.

- More families are in need of help. Yet steeply increasing inflation means this Council's ability to mitigate impacts and provide essential services is increasingly challenging.
- As the cost-of-living increases and the effects of climate change take hold, our residents also face the reduction of local bus routes. Many families are now challenged with finding alternative transport to work and school. This places added strain on family finances, increases carbon emissions and drives up air pollution.

The Council agrees to:

1. **Recognise that the Cost of Living and Climate Crisis are interlinked and jointly require attention to ensure the wellbeing of local people and businesses in Peterborough.**
2. **Make decisions on the budget and major policies that, wherever possible, contribute to environmental and social benefits across the Peterborough area.**
3. **Advocate to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority for more robust, affordable public transport that connects employees with work, links students to education and reduces carbon emissions.**
4. **Continue and expand the work with social landlords operating in the Peterborough City Council area to review the energy efficiency of their housing stock, recognising that poor insulation and inefficient heating are key factors in the rising cost of living.**
5. **Request that the Climate Change and Environment Scrutiny Committee revisit this motion in 12 months as part of its work programme to look at targets on climate considerations in budget proposals as well as retro-fitting of social housing for energy efficiency gains via a report from officers.**
6. **Request That the Leader of the Council asks our local MP's to write to the Prime Minister, our local MPs and the relevant government ministers to call for:**
 - **Increased financial support for residents, with most support provided to low-income households.**
 - **More funding for small and medium local businesses, helping them manage the challenge of increasing energy costs and rising inflation.**
 - **A more ambitious nationwide commitment to fund improvements in the energy efficiency of homes, resulting in energy bill reductions and environmental benefits.**
 - **Increased grant opportunities for community groups, housing providers and public sector partners to improve energy efficiency in their buildings.**
 - **Insulation schemes and renewable energy generation programmes funded by fossil fuel profits."**

78(4) Motion from Councillor Sandford

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

79. REPORTS TO COUNCIL

79(b) Notification of Change to the Executive Delegations

The Council received a report in relation to notification of a change to the Executive Delegations.

Councillor Fitzgerald moved the recommendation and advised that the report was just for noting, and brought the number of Cabinet Advisor positions back to original levels.

Councillor Steve Allen seconded the recommendation.

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

The Mayor
7.00pm – 9.37pm
7 December 2022

FULL COUNCIL 7 DECEMBER 2022 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Mrs Rosemary Steel</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council</p> <p>During covid I understand there were 12 field hospitals built in the country to be manned by the armed forces personnel. None were used as isolation units seriously affecting our NHS capability for normal functioning.</p> <p>Which makes me ask - what facilities does our Civil Defence sector in Peterborough have in the event of war (disaster, natural, health or ecological) and what trained personal are there currently?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>All activity regarding emergency planning is governed by the Civil Contingencies Act, which replaced the Civil Defence Act 1948. As a result of this change, Peterborough City Council has no direct responsibility for planning in relation to war.</p> <p>The council does employ a team of four officers shared with Cambridgeshire County Council, to undertake the work of preparing for other types of emergencies. This preparation is undertaken in partnership with the emergency services, other statutory bodies in the area, and representatives from the voluntary sector, who provide a vital contribution to any response.</p> <p>The partnership is called the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF), and its purpose is to coordinate risk assessment, planning, training, and response when any incident occurs. The partnership is currently chaired by the Chief Fire Officer, who oversees the activity of the group, along with a Board made up of Chief Officers from the contributing organisations.</p>

The partnership has an annual programme, which provides in-depth training to the staff of all contributing partnerships and organisations, and to the voluntary bodies which contribute personnel in the planning and response to emergencies in or across Peterborough.

The CPLRF has responded to numerous incidents over several years and played for example, a pivotal role in the response to COVID 19

Supplementary question:

I'm disappointed to hear there isn't actually any current coordinated plan; you said when and accident happens, or when an incident. Do you mean that their not keeping their training up to date right now? Because its exercises that were held at intervals to see that team work was active and interactive adequately, that is essential, especially in these times.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I shall repeat to you again what I said in the third paragraph. The partnership is called the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF) and its purpose is to coordinate risk assessment, planning and I'll add a word; ongoing training. I took training to mean that it is active and obviously will be as new things develop, or when new training becomes available or when new initiatives, that training will be shared by that partnership with the organisations that are a part of that forum.

I hope that answers your question?

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 Hemraj (1)

Councillor Marco Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport

Now that Peterborough residents have been moved out of St Michaels Gate and new residents have moved in, does the council know where the new residents have come from? If those residents have been re-housed from other councils, who is bearing the cost of their claims on i.e. Council Tax, Housing benefit and any other services that they may require?

The Cabinet Member may respond:

The accommodation at St Michael's Gate is managed by Stef and Phillips, although we understand that it is being offered by them to other councils for homeless households on a nightly basis.

In accordance with the Housing Act 1996, councils are required to notify us if they place an applicant in accommodation within our city, and we are currently aware of one household that has been so placed at St Michael's Gate by another council.

Any councils who places households in St Michael's Gate will be responsible to cover the costs of funding their stay. However, Council Tax Support, if required, would have to be funded by Peterborough City Council. Households placed in St Michael's Gate can access local services and will be financially responsible for maintaining their accommodation.

Supplementary question:

You said that one family that has moved into St Michael's Gate. Are you aware of any other families that are likely to move into there from other Councils?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I am not personally aware of any other families that are likely to move into St Michaels Gate; but it is, I think, reasonable to assume that if they are offering accommodation to other councils on a nightly basis, we are likely to get some. The way the market is at the moment, I would imagine the stress and strains of household homelessness are the same as everywhere as they are in Peterborough.

2. **Question from Councillor Ansar Ali (1)**

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

We have received a number of complaints from our hard-working local Taxi Drivers that the Designated Taxi Ranks in the City Centre are being occupied by other vehicles, preventing them from Parking on the ranks, this problem is particularly bad on Thursday, Friday and Saturday evenings, they complain that there appears to be no enforcement action taken to penalised offenders. Can urgent action be taken on this issue so that our local people providing a vital much needed services can feel supported and valued.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I echo the view that our taxi drivers offer a vital service for our city and sympathise with them regarding this challenge. Our parking enforcement team operates between the hours of 8am to 8pm which allows the team to cover most parking problems experienced across the city. Taxi ranks are patrolled during this time and over the last 6 months, 400 penalty charge notices have been issued for illegal parking in the ranks. Whilst the issues you have raised fall outside the normal enforcement patrol hours, we periodically arrange special late-night patrols to address this issue and will do so in response to this request.

For background information, over the coming weeks these patrols will link with a taxi marshal scheme which I am pleased to announce will be in place this Christmas, funded by the Police and Crime Commissioner. Whilst not specifically focussed on parking, these marshals will provide reassurance and support to taxi drivers throughout the festive period and will be on hand to prevent anti-social behaviour and other issues.

Supplementary question:

As you said there are from time-to-time, patrols in the evening after 8:00PM, but from

	<p>what I understand the problems continue for the taxi drivers of these ranks. What efforts is the council making? I understand that the martialls will be there in the future, but these problems seem to crop up quite regularly for the taxi drivers. We need to find a sustainable solution so the taxi drivers can operate freely without having to negotiate people taking up their designated parking spaces.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>As I mentioned in the first delivery, we periodically arrange late night patrols to address this issue. What I will do is take your point back to the council's taxi officers because I think it is unfair that taxi drivers have to engage with drivers taking up their space and I think that the taxi officers should perhaps arrange some more regular visits to the area to deal with the issues you are explaining.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox (1)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>In an article on the Peterborough Telegraph website on 25 November, announcing an extension to the council's trial hydrotherapy sessions at Lime Academy, Cllr Steve Allen is quoted: "I'm pleased we are extending sessions at Lime Academy and would encourage users to participate so that we can continue the sessions for as long as possible."</p> <p>Friends of St George's Hydrotherapy Pool have repeatedly stated that the Lime Academy sessions, which are priced at £12 per hour, are too expensive for many users.</p> <p>How does boosting participation by those who can afford the Lime Academy Sessions help those who desperately need of the sessions but cannot afford them?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>A search of national charges for hydrotherapy indicates that the charge of £12 per hour, referring to the Lime Academy, is extremely competitive. I must remind members, that hydrotherapy pools are ordinarily either private ventures operating for profit, or provided by the NHS, and not provided by Local Authorities. I also need to be clear with Members that the council make no profit from this facility – rather, based on current user levels, we are subsidising its operation despite having no obligation to do so.</p> <p>The charge contributes towards the costs of hiring the pool and providing qualified staff, and is the absolute minimum needed to maintain the facility. In fact, to make this viable in the long term, we need at least 12 users in each session, but at present we are only seeing an average of 3.</p> <p>I would encourage those who find hydrotherapy advantageous to their health mobility and well being to use the facilities at the Lime Academy and in doing so ensuring its long term availability as a fantastic state of the art facility for outside users.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>How will you guarantee that people in most need of hydrotherapy will be able to afford this facility and at what price to their future well-being as it worked in the past and I don't see why it couldn't work in the future. Do you think it is also fair to charge carers £12 a time, when they are not actually using the pool, but assisting people with disabilities? That seems grossly unfair and unnecessary to do that and I hope</p>

	<p>you review that. If they're not using the pool, why are they paying? They are doing a service to the person with the disability and therefore should do it free and they should not be charged.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I understand your concern Councillor Fox, and I know you are passionate for providing hydrotherapy in our city, which I share, but of course economics have to play a part. It is not an obligation on the part of the city council to provide the facility and I think it should be understood that there may be residents with long term health issues who are eligible for personal independent payments (PIPs). A PIP can help with extra living costs including activities, such as hydrotherapy. A PIP could help provide an affordable solution to the £12 charge at the Lime Academy. Even in these strained and unpredictable days, the potential benefits associated with water-based exercise are surely worth £12, for the user. So I understand the pressures on finances, but that is across the whole world certainly across the whole country at the moment and if you want treatment then maybe a contribution should be considered. I will take back your point about the carer though Councillor Fox. I do think it takes up space of the others, but it's not getting an awful lot of use and it's not taking up space, so may be, could be, considered.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandra Bond (1)</p> <p>Councillor Marco Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>Given the recent situation where a developer has forced Stagecoach to withdraw a bus service, two weeks after commencement, because of a dispute with the Council over road adoption, could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me what he is doing to avoid this debacle being repeated in any of the other major housing developments that are being planned in Peterborough over the next few years? What guarantees can be given to ensure that all residents of these developments have a bus service available at the outset, rather than having to wait more than ten years for it?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Council officers continue to work closely with developers across Peterborough to ensure that new sites are designed and constructed to support the provision of bus services. Officers also work closely with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, who actually have responsibility for bus services, to try and ensure that they are aware of new developments coming forward, alongside existing developer contributions to ensure services operate at the earliest possible opportunity. This is balanced with the need to ensure that physical infrastructure in place and routes are passable for the bus network.</p> <p>I can further assure you that officers, under my direction, are continuing to work with both the developer and Stagecoach to resolve the current issue. Crucially, officers are also reviewing the processes and legal agreements in place to ensure such a situation does not arise again in the future.</p>

5.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin (1)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>How much did the council spend on legal action related to asylum seekers staying at hotels in Peterborough?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The action taken by the council has cost £2,038, including fees to seek an interim injunction in relation to the Great Northern Hotel. No legal action was taken against the Verve Hotel. Members will be aware that legal action is no longer being pursued.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Qayyum (1)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>In the interest of Safeguarding, why were the Local Councillors of Central Ward and East Ward not informed of the Asylum Seeker arrivals at two local Hotels in Peterborough, and instead the MP Paul Bristow informed?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>As widely reported, the council was not consulted on the use of the two hotels for asylum seekers, nor were we given any advance notice that they would be used. Unfortunately, it was therefore not possible to brief members in advance of the arrival of asylum seekers. Members were contacted on the day of arrival (11th November) in advance of our Press statement. Once information became fully known, a more detailed member briefing note was circulated updating on our position.</p> <p>The Asylum situation is fluid, and we are reliant upon the information released from the Home Office and their contractor, Serco. Officers are continuing to liaise closely with them to maintain an updated position and will send further member updates as and when new and significant information becomes known. Like many councils, we have also appealed to the Home Office to provide more timely information as far in advance as possible going forwards.</p> <p>Supplementary questions:</p> <p>Do you then agree that in the interest of safeguarding, when there was no risk to the public by the occupants of the two hotels, that it was not in the public interest to reveal their location, keeping in mind that I have an email right here from the Cabinet Member for Communities, Irene Walsh dated the 16 February 2021, which states quote: as in previous years, it is not our intension not to make public the exact location where the people have been housed to protect their privacy. Additionally, how does revealing this information now meet the standards of Councillor Ishfaq Hussain's motion on the city of sanctuary in June this year, where the sixth pledge of his motion states quote: fact checking and challenging antirefugee and antimigrant attitudes wherever they are found. How can you guarantee that refugees will be safeguarded in totality on the back of this publicly declared pledge, as it appears that this city of sanctuary is very selective in its offering. I would request that these points are noted for reflection in future.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>We are indeed a city of sanctuary and something we are very proud of and we take</p>

	<p>forward with positivity. The issue in question is topical and newsworthy and indeed been released by the press and spoken about by the MP, so it is very difficult to dampen something down when as I say it is out there, but I take your point and I think we should be cautious of the language used going forward. Although this council will not feed the fire.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (1)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>What has been the specific take up so far in the way of numbers per week for service users at the new Hydrotherapy facility at the Lime Academy?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The Lime facility has operated a trial service for the last 5 weeks. It offers 3 sessions on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday evenings, and 6 sessions on Saturday. Initial take up was slow but has increased slightly, and on average there have been 40 users per week.</p> <p>Overall, usage is not at the level we anticipated, but we are committed to allow more time to fully promote the facility and maximise take up. We will therefore continue to operate and promote the facility, in the hope that usage will continue.</p> <p>And I will repeat, not verbatim, but I will repeat the point in the question answered previously about the Lime facility, I would urge all users and support groups to really put the facility to use, so that we can maintain it as a fantastic state of the art facility going forward.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Given the background of some of the users who used St George's facility, in terms of some of the complex medical issues faced by users, there was a premedical assessment team and facility at the previous pool, which helped address some of the complications. What I'm really interested to find out is, do we have something similar in place at the Lime Academy and if so, how are those assessments taking place?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I'm trying to pick up on what you are saying. There was additional support staff at the previous facility? Okay, well that wasn't provided by the council, so indeed if it was provided by an outside provider, we could certainly investigate whether that could again be provided, clearly, not at the cost of the council though, that's the important thing, in these difficult financial times.</p>

8.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>In a recent press release, the City Council claimed that the presence of refugees in the Great Northern Hotel posed a “risk to strategic infrastructure” and this was one of the grounds for the abortive attempt by the Council to take enforcement and legal action. Could the relevant cabinet member explain in what sense vulnerable refugees pose a “risk to strategic infrastructure”?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Refugees causing a threat to strategic infrastructure, that’s a bit of a convoluted statement, but I will explain our view.</p> <p>The council does not consider asylum seekers themselves to be a strategic threat, but we are genuinely concerned to ensure their safety and that of our residents and visitors whilst in our city. We do not believe the Great Northern Hotel is a suitable location because of its proximity to major rail infrastructure and the identification of increased risks to asylum seekers and the hotels they are staying in. We have in mind the recent events in Kent which have been confirmed as terrorist in nature. We are also anxious that the proximity of the train station increases this risk, that it could present opportunities for people traffickers to operate more freely.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Is the Cabinet Member aware that in a recent report by the Home Affairs Select Committee, found that people arriving in the UK in small boats in 2021, only 4% have had their claims processed by the end of 2022, but of those over 85% had their claims accepted, so finding that they are genuine asylum seekers. So, would the Cabinet Member agree with me that it is therefore regrettable that our member of parliament persists on branding these people as illegal immigrants, and it is also regrettable that the council puts out press releases which implies that these asylum seekers may pose, in inverted comas, a threat to strategic infrastructure? Should they not, instead of being referred to in them terms, should they not instead be treated as what they are, a group of very vulnerable people in urgent need of care, shelter and protection?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I take the points you are making, Councillor Sandford. It may be semantics, but this is an issue of great public concern and different language, and different points of view are out there. I can’t speak for the MP, but all I can say is that perhaps inflammatory language should be avoided at all costs, but whether that is an inflammatory statement, I don’t know. We welcome refugees in this country, we are city of sanctuary but clearly, we want legal migrants arriving not only in England, but in our city.</p>
----	---

9.

Question from Councillor John Fox (2)

Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council / Councillor Howard, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health

Does the Leader of the Council take any responsibility himself as a result of his time as Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, when he went against sound advice from opposition councillors and the public, who raised concerns that closing two large care homes would cause problems, in the end?

What is he doing about the appalling lack of care home places within Peterborough and the major problem at our hospital with bed-blocking?

The Cabinet Member responded:

As the current Cabinet Member, I am answering your question after liaising with the Leader for you on your question. I must start by saying firstly, there is no appalling lack of care home spaces and just to offer you reassurance:

- We have a total of 1219 residential and nursing beds in 21 Peterborough based Care Homes and that is as reported from the National Bed Capacity tracker.
- As at 1st December there were 113 empty beds in 16 of the Peterborough homes.
- Peterborough City Hospital has 612 beds and of those currently awaiting discharge by Peterborough Adult Social Care, as at 1st December there were 3 people who were being discharged and processed with no undue delay.
- Our strategy and focus has been to maintain people's independence and help support people in their own home. We have invested in preventing, reducing and delaying people's needs escalating through continued, long-term investment in services like Reablement and Tech Enabled Care. The outcome of this is reflected in there being 10 additional residential placements between March '22 and November '22.
- The impression you may have of delays Cllr Fox, is not caused by lack of bed spaces, but could be caused by shortage of domiciliary home care and reablement staff.

I hope that reassures you and answers your question?

Supplementary question:

We were told as opposition Councillors and I also spoke out passionately about the closure of the two large care homes in Peterborough and we were concerned then that it would cause bed blocking. You are trying to tell me that it is not causing bed blocking, but we know from personal experience, myself and Judy having been in hospital there's people that can't find anywhere to go to, there's no places to send them to, so the beds are taken up by these people. You repeatedly, or the Leader repeatedly assured that the closure of these two care homes would not cause bed blocking. How very wrong, in my opinion you were and are you now going to take some positive action to try to eliminate the situation, especially for those of us who are getting older, because there is people in hospital and the nurses have got nowhere to send them to and that is fact.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I've given you all the numbers to reassure you that that is not the case. We stand by the decision that was made those years ago because we in fact have more bed

	<p>spaces now, in better provisions as well. So, the decision proved right in time and the numbers back that up. If you have any specific issue, you are more than welcome to email or ring me and I will of course look at it on case by case, but we have given you the information to assure you and there is more bed spaces now than there was at the closure of those two care homes.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Qayyum (2)</p> <p>Councillor Lynne Ayres - Cabinet Member for Childrens Services, Education, Skills and the University</p> <p>What are the views of the Cabinet Member regarding the Ofsted report of Clare Lodge?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The Council will be aware of the Ofsted Inspection at Clare Lodge on 13,14 and 15 September this year, where the overall judgement was that of inadequate. This was of great concern to the Service and of course to myself, as the unit always endeavours to offer the best possible care to the young people living there. The impact of Covid has compounded longstanding challenges with staffing. Nationally there has been an increase in the level of complexity for the young people that would access this provision. We accept that the high standards that we set ourselves had not been sustained which has resulted in the Ofsted judgement.</p> <p>In recognition of the complexity of need, the Local Authority increased management capacity, reduced the number of young people who could access the facility and implemented at pace and with purpose an improvement plan. An early review by Ofsted in October confirmed that all immediate safeguarding checks had been addressed, and the full re inspection took place on 29 and 30 November. The new judgement is provisional and embargoed at present, but I am reassured that Ofsted clearly recognised the intensive intervention offered by the Local Authority in recent months. Clare Lodge is a complex provision, with a long-term plan; and a long term plan is needed to ensure its future. A detailed options appraisal will be presented at the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee in January or February 2023.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Ayres for that response, but in view of the immediate notices that are to be served after the Ofsted report, i.e regulations 12 protection of children, regulation 13 leadership and management, regulation 20 restraint and deprivation of liberty and despite the measures implemented to address these including decreasing bed occupancy from 16 to 4, it is doubtful that staff are going to be trained within the short 16 week period to become competent enough to ensure the safeguarding of these very vulnerable young girls, which appears as our failure as a local authority. Could you give us reasons as to why such gross failings happened in the first place?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I think I already indicated why this came about. It came about during the Covid period of course and I have already stated to you, that the level and complexity of the young people going in there was far higher than it had been in the past. However, I do want to point out to you that we have recently had an Ofsted revisit again and could see</p>

	<p>improvements in many areas, that is what they are saying. We are anticipating and hoping to report a more positive news very shortly indeed.</p>
11.	<p>Question from Councillor Ansar Ali (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>There have been a number of incidents where vehicles have damaged Street Light columns, as a result the Streetlights stop working, and they get reported for remedial action. However there have been instances where the matter has not been sorted for over three months. This is utterly unacceptable. Can I be advised why this takes such a long time the Council to sort out?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The majority of the city's streetlights are connected directly to a UK Power Network-owned and maintained supply. Unfortunately, that should a fault with the power supply be identified, the council requests attendance from UKPN that's the UK Power Networks, to repair the fault. We are unable to carry out the work on their assets. Once the request is made and orders raised with UKPN, the council has no authority over the programming of UKPN's works which can vary between eight and sixteen weeks for certain types of works.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I appreciate the response from Councillor Cereste. We as a Council, we are responsible for keeping our communities safe in these wintery evenings, when it gets dark quite early. In certain areas, where communities have to wait up to 3 months if not more for streetlamp to be repaired, it is unacceptable. We as a council, should be able to play some part, because we at the end of the day, are the ones who are asking people to pay their council tax so that we can actually maintain the streetlights and keep their streets free of litter etc. We don't seem to be doing that very well unfortunately when we are out and about in the community.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I completely agree with you Councillor and my staff, and I will be looking very very very closely with the arrangements we have with UK Power Networks and if we can possibly improve the situation, we will do so.</p>

12.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>Could you please confirm how long, on average, it takes us to determine a planning application based on all cases received over the past 24 months and whether or not this meets the government's planning guarantee?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The average time taken to determine planning applications is not a specific dataset that is collected.</p> <p>For the purposes of the planning guarantee, and local planning authority performance in determining planning applications in time, there are two broad categories of planning application: Major and Non-Major.</p> <p>Major planning applications are defined, by statute, as housing schemes of ten new homes or more, and 1,000 square metres of commercial floorspace. These applications have a target time of thirteen weeks for a determination; however, some larger applications have a target time of sixteen weeks to be determined (these require Environmental Assessment, which is set out in statute). The Government target is for 60% of Major applications to be determined within either the thirteen- or sixteen-week target time, or a different time (which tends to be longer) as agreed between the applicant and the planning authority. Peterborough City Council's performance during the two years to September 2022 for Major applications was 90.1% in time.</p> <p>Non-Major planning applications are all other applications, with a target time of eight weeks to be determined. The Government target is 70% of Non-Major applications to be determined within eight weeks or other time agreed between the applicant and the planning authority. Peterborough City Council's performance in determining Non-Major applications during the two years to September 2022 was 89.9% in time.</p> <p>The Government's Planning Guarantee sets out that decisions are to be made within one year, to include any appeal, and indicates that this time is split evenly between the local authority and the Planning Inspectorate. Peterborough City Council's planning department is performing consistently well in meeting its target time for determining planning applications.</p>
13.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin (2)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>How many tickets have been issued by enforcement officers (from the council or organisations appointed by the council to do this work) outside the city centre area during this municipal year so far?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The council have a wide range of powers to enforce against offences from illegal parking to fly tipping. Tickets are an effective way to challenge behaviour and improve the look and feel of our city.</p> <p>Between April and November 2022 officers have issued, outside the core city centre area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 207 Fixed Penalty Notices for offences of fly tipping, breaches of

	<p>Public Space Protection Orders and abandoned vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7,857 penalty notices for parking offences
--	---

	<p><u>Questions on notice to:</u></p> <p>d. The Combined Authority Representatives</p>
1.	<p>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Hogg</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Combined Authority Board Representative</p> <p>What work has been done to re-establish the bus service to Manor Drive recently started and then stopped by the developer for the estate?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The main discussions are between PCC as part of its Highway and planning functions and the developer with assistance from CPCA and operator in the ongoing discussions.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Combined Authority Board Representative</p> <p>What assessment has been made as to the success the bus services tendered by the Combined Authority following their cancellation by Stagecoach in October, and what discussions have been had regarding the renewal of these tenders when they expire in April?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>It is too early to say as data for the first month of operation hasn't been collated yet. In terms of April the main issue is one of future funding and papers were presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee as well as Board of the Combined Authority last week to start discussions about how the additional funding required might be sourced. This will now form part of the budget consultation recently started, and all the details are on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CA.Gov uk website or if you need the actual link or address, if you email my office or Democratic Services, it's contained within the papers, but I'm sure they can send you an electronic version of it if you don't have it already in your papers this evening.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>One of my concerns when the services were put out to tender again, was that they were like for like for what was already there and member concerns that had been</p>

	<p>previously raised about these services and particularly the times they run for instance, the 29 to the hospital, that they don't run when people actually need them were not addressed. Will our Combined Authority representatives ensure that members views are put to the relevant Committees and that members views are sought before decisions are made, alongside us obviously responding to the consultation?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>It's probably worthwhile timed that I should remind all members and group leaders, so whether it goes through your group leaders to me as the rep on this or via Marco on the Transport Committee, of course all views can be represented at the Combined Authority, and I am happy to take all and any views. I share extreme concern about the way the Combined Authority have been dealing with the Transport Strategy, and in the case of what Councillor Sandford might say, not dealing with the Transport Strategy. So, it leaves a lot of questions that need to be asked, as you know the Mayor is off sick, but people need to progress with proper transport strategies and that included buses and we share very similar concerns and I'm sure most members do across the chamber. So, there are a lot of questions to be asked and a lot of work to do before April because I don't think the picture is looking very bright for bus services and somebody needs to find the money.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Combined Authority Board Representative</p> <p>At a recent member briefing on public transport, councillors were told that PCC pays around £3.5 million each year to the Combined Authority (CPCA) for public transport and this sum includes funding for subsidy of bus services in Peterborough. Over the past few weeks, Stagecoach have cancelled hundreds of bus journeys across their network, including some which they operate under contract to CPCA. Could the Member tell me what steps CPCA are taking to recover from Stagecoach subsidy that they have paid for journeys which are cancelled and what steps he is taking to ensure that CPCA then pass any relevant portion of that refund back to PCC?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Stagecoach are expected to adjust their invoice and not claim for journeys that haven't operated. Any information members have about journeys that haven't operated would be welcome to help checking that this has been done by Stagecoach. And again, if it was submitted through to Democratic Services, I'm sure they will be able to forward that on to the relevant team in the Combined Authority and or comment on any mechanism for whether this is then refunded back to Peterborough City Council as part of our levy. I know that officers are aware and are keeping a close eye on what money is being spent on what services and whether, shall we say, the services we provide, maybe not being spent for the benefit of Peterborough residents. So, we are aware of it and I think the team are also aware, but anybody got anything else on it as evidence, submit it.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I do find that answer a bit concerning. Surely, this is £3.5m of Peterborough City Council money that has been given to the Combined Authority. It shouldn't, you know, the majority of evening and Sunday bus services are subsidised by the Combined Authority. I'm aware of anecdotally that a number of those have been cancelled, but surely it shouldn't be up to individual Councillors to report this to the Combined Authority. So, I've actually asked this question to the Combined Authority and not had a reply, so would the Cabinet Member, would he actually undertake to</p>

ask this question to the relevant officers at the Combined Authority: what mechanism are they putting in place to ensure that that money is refunded first of all to the Combined Authority and then, if necessary, to come back to PCC. Surely that is good financial accounting practice?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I think you misunderstood Councillor Sandford. The process does not rely on you or me to report this. What I said is, if you want to add additional evidence, by way of support, then you shouldn't be prevented from doing so. What I also told you was that officers are aware of this concern. My colleague Councillor Coles is raised it at Overview and Scrutiny already. Marco will probably raise it in the Transport Committee, where public transport is discussed. So, what you are hearing is, we are aware of it, and officers are aware of it, and it is being looked into. But as I know you are an avid bus fan, and you could probably name all the routes and the timetables, anything you could add to support the members in their case would be helpful. It's not necessary that you do it, but I know you like to be involved.