

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 27 JANUARY 2016
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR JOHN PEACH

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Ash, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Coles, Davidson, Elsey, Faustino, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Forbes, Fower, F Fox, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Harrington, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Lamb, Lane, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Stokes, Swift, Thulbourn, Whitby and Yonga.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Iqbal, Maqbool, Sylvester and Thacker.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 December 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2015 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

4. Mayor's Announcements

Members noted the report outlining the Mayor's engagements for the period commencing 14 December 2015 to 24 January 2016.

The Mayor advised that the Mayor's Charity was holding a 1940's charity ball on Friday 12 February 2016 at the Town Hall, for which there were tickets still available.

5. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

6. Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

7. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

There were no questions submitted by members of the public.

8. Petitions

(a) Presented by members of the public

There were no petitions from members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions from Members.

9. 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

Questions (b) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. The road sweeper missing the cul-de-sac off Uldale Way;
2. Reports of fly tipping in rural wards;
3. The five day requirement to obtain a tip permit;
4. The introduction of a roundabout on Gunthorpe Road;
5. The wooded area near Sobrite Spring;
6. Plans for schools in the new Gunthorpe Ward;
7. Street lighting along Bretton Way;
8. Proposals to raise business rates; and
9. Regeneration of the Werrington Centre.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

10. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Fourth Local Transport Plan

Cabinet at its meeting of 18 January 2016, received a report which asked it to consider and recommend to Council the adoption of the fourth Local Transport Plan (2016-2021), including the review of the Long Term Transport Strategy (2011-2026). It also requested that Cabinet consider the comments of the Sustainable Growth and Environmental Capital Scrutiny Committee, which had considered the proposals at its meeting held on 6 January 2016 and had suggested further additions.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within, along with the amendments from Scrutiny as detailed. Improved transport was a priority for the city and the Local Transport Plan, produced every five years, outlined how transport issues would be tackled going forward. The plan was deliverable and had been extensively consulted upon.

Councillor Elsey seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- The Plan was lacking in ambition and many previously mentioned longer term schemes had been removed;
- There was no mention of park and ride within the document, this was an important element due to the increase in population and the number of cars travelling into the city centre;
- Air quality in parts of the city centre were already bad and were getting worse;
- Public consultation responses had shown that respondents wished the Council to prioritise cycling, walking and public transport. The Plan did not do that;
- Buses were only hourly in the evenings and cycle routes were often inadequate in busy areas, such as the city centre;
- The Plan did not join up with other important strategies such as the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Environment Capital Plan;
- The park and ride should not have been dismissed, it could have been made to work;
- The Plan did not meet the visions for the city as laid out within the Environment Capital Action Plan;
- There needed to be ambitious plans in place in order to cut car emissions by 50-70%;
- It was regrettable that the Plan did nothing to address air quality in the city. More work needed to be done rather than proposals put forward to monitor air quality;
- The city's footpaths needed to be better maintained and regularly swept in order to prevent cycles and mobility scooters receiving punctures;
- The Plan lacked inspiration. There was no provision for increase in traffic levels and no mention of how issues would be addressed and progressed;
- Historical figures had shown that park and ride did not work particularly well in Peterborough;
- One of the worst causes of air pollution was cars stopping because of too many traffic lights etc. Peterborough had some of the best flowing traffic in the country;
- The Transport User Hierarchy stated that pedestrians and cyclists should have priority;
- There was no long term vision within the Plan, the population was growing and this would mean more traffic congestion, leading to more air pollution;
- More investment was needed in sustainable transport. Park and Ride had been a key aspect of the previous transport plan, along with water transport;
- There was no commitment to electric vehicles within the Plan or any other areas to reduce air pollution;
- A significant number of early deaths in the city could be attributed to respiratory ailments. Air pollution was a major health issue;
- The Plan outlined realistic achievements for the local authority;
- Peterborough could not be considered as heavily congested in comparison to other major cities;
- The issues with the buses were for the bus companies to address, their services were designed around demand;
- Park and ride would only work if the city centre was congested and had high parking charges, this was not the case in Peterborough; and
- Peterborough had some of the best cycle routes in the country.

Councillor Eley exercised his right to speak and advised of the rationale behind the removal of proposed park and ride schemes since the previous Transport Plan of 2011, owing to them not being financially viable for the city. He further advised that there were a number of future schemes proposed which did not focus solely around car travel.

Councillor Hiller summed up and addressed a number of the issues raised during debate. He reiterated the decision of the cross party Sustainable Growth Scrutiny Committee in relation to the park and ride scheme, and it not being viable. Assurance was given that Peterborough was committed to lessening congestion, this being a main culprit of air pollution.

A recorded vote was taken:

Councillors For: Aitken, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Coles, Eley, Faustino, Fitzgerald, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Harrington, Herdman, Hiller, Holdich, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Nawaz, North, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Sanders, Scott, Seaton, Serluca, Stokes, Swift and Whitby.

Councillors Against: Ash, Davidson, Ferris, Forbes, Fower, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Knowles, Martin, Miners, Murphy, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shabbir, Shaheed, Sharp, Shearman, Thulbourn and Yonga.

Councillors Abstaining: F Fox.

Following the vote (32 for, 20 against, 1 abstention) it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

Adopted the Local Transport Plan 2016 to 2021 (LTP4) including the Long Term Transport Strategy 2011 to 2026 (LTTS) as set out in the report, subject to the following additions:

- i. Air quality be monitored in the fourth Local Transport Plan in a manner that is easy to understand and would allow Peterborough to be compared with other cities; and
- ii. The long term aspiration to support the addition of further stations along the Stamford and Spalding train lines be included within the Fourth Local Transport Plan and the Council will pursue these aspirations with the relevant rail authorities subject to these (a) being supported by Cabinet and (b) only where they do not take priority over existing proposals for the rail network.

(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Council Tax Support Scheme

Cabinet, at its meeting of 18 January 2016, received a report on proposals for the Council Tax Support Scheme 2016/17, including the outcome of public consultation and discussions at the Joint Budget Scrutiny on 26 November 2015.

The purpose of the report was for Cabinet to make a recommendation to Council on the Council Tax Support Scheme to be implemented in Peterborough from April 2016 and to approve the introduction of a council tax discretionary hardship policy.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. It was advised that despite government grant funding continuing to reduce year on year, for the last three years the Council had managed to maintain a scheme with a reduction in council tax benefit of 30%, this had meant a subsidy of council tax support of the level of around £1m each year.

There were no changes proposed to the existing scheme, but there were some technical changes proposed to align the scheme to housing benefit rules. Cabinet had also agreed to the introduction of a discretionary hardship policy for those experiencing significant financial difficulties.

Councillor Holdich seconded the recommendations and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- Comments were made in relation to the universal credit process and the effects this would have on the hardship fund; and
- It was queried as to who would sit on the panel to decide who would qualify for the discretionary hardship relief.

Councillor Holdich did not wish to exercise his right to speak as seconder of the recommendations.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendations and responded to the points raised. He advised that a budget had been set for the hardship fund and if issues arose, then this budget may have to be revisited. In relation to the discretionary hardship relief policy, there would be a set of criteria that people's needs would be assessed against.

A vote was taken (40 for, 0 against, 11 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

Approved a Local Council Tax Support Scheme for Peterborough that contained the following components:

- a) No change to the existing scheme reduction of 30% for all eligible working age claimants;
- b) Aligned the Council tax support scheme to Housing Benefit rules making it less complicated for claimants, namely to:
 - i) Limit backdating of council tax support to one month; and
 - ii) Removed family premiums from all new claimants, or existing claimants who would otherwise have had a new entitlement to the premium, with effect from 1 May 2016.

11. Questions on the Executive Decisions made since the last meeting

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed executive decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Republished decision from the Cabinet Meeting held on 7 December 2015;
2. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting held on 18 January 2016;
3. Use of the Council's call-in mechanism, which had been invoked once since the previous meeting, this being in relation to the decision taken by Cabinet on 7 December 2015, and republished on 31 December 2015, relating to 'City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement'. The call-in request was due to be considered by the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2016 and as a result the outcome would be included in the report to Council on 9 March 2016.
4. Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provision, which had not been invoked since the previous meeting; and
5. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 7 December 2015 to 5 January

2016.

Questions were asked about the following:

City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement

Councillor Shearman sought confirmation that the Strategy would not just include the city centre, but many other areas. Councillor Holdich advised that the scheme was city wide.

Councillor Murphy asked whether the Leader agreed with him that the approach was wrong and could lead to issues being stored up for the future, for example, the disbanding of some local microbeat teams leading to the loss of neighbourhood intelligence and the main interface with the public. Councillor Murphy further queried whether the Leader agreed that computers would not properly be able to allocate who should go where, as computers could not make judgements. Did he also agree that the key community safety issue was the rise in violent crime of over 30% in Peterborough. Councillor Holdich advised that he did not agree with the statements.

Changes to the Council's Adult Social Care Charging Policy

Councillor Sandford queried whether the individuals in receipt of the services, and in receipt of a large increase in charges, might perceive this as a reduction in service. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that if individuals could not afford to pay, they would not pay. There were no cuts proposed to the service, just those that could afford to contribute would be requested to.

Councillor Fower questioned whether if individuals could not afford to pay, their families would be expected to if they could afford it. Councillor Fitzgerald advised that each case would be explored on an individual basis, not as a couple or a collective.

Review of the Fourth Local Transport Plan

Councillor Ferris queried what the purpose was of air quality monitoring, simply to compare with other cities, and what action was envisaged to be triggered as a result of exceedance of what was regarded as safe standards. Councillor Hiller responded that it was important that the Council knew what the quality of Peterborough's air was and further action could not be determined until confirmation of the air quality was obtained.

Councillor Shearman questioned whether the Cabinet Member would agree that the word 'realistic' was not a synonym for ambition or aspiration. Councillor Hiller advised that the Council could be realistically ambitious.

Councillor Ash sought clarification that air quality would be monitored from different areas of the city, including rural areas, and not just the city centre. Councillor Hiller confirmed that all areas would be monitored.

Councillor Saltmarsh queried whether the aspiration to have an additional train station at Hampton had been forgotten. Councillor Holdich advised that a train station at Hampton would never be feasible because slow moving trains could never be placed on a fast track.

Appointments to Outside Organisations - Peterborough Investment Partnership (Fletton Quays) Limited and Peterborough Investment Partnership (Pleasure Fairs) Limited

Councillor Sandford sought confirmation as to which Councillors had been nominated to the Board and which party group they came from. Councillor Holdich advised that it was himself and Councillor Hiller who had been appointed.

Councillor Sandford further queried whether, given the partnership's crucial importance for the growth of Peterborough, would it not have been a good idea to have sought cross party consensus, with one Member of the administration and one opposing Member. Councillor Holdich advised that the company had been set up with no overall control, two members from Lucent and two from the City Council. If there was no consensus of opinion, issues would not be taken forward. In relation to Pleasure Fair Meadow, exploration was being undertaken into the formation of a ward member committee to look at the whole area, including the surrounding land.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

12. Motions on Notice

1. Motion from Councillor Holdich

The Mayor advised that Councillor Sandford had proposed an amendment to the motion and this had been agreed by Councillor Holdich. It was therefore proposed that the motion be moved incorporating the amendment. This was agreed by Council.

That Council:

- 1. Acknowledges that there is increasing concern being raised amongst the general public and other organisations including the fire service, the police and the RSPCA, in relation to the release of sky lanterns and the mass release of balloons, and the potential risks they pose.*
- 2. Acknowledges that the release of sky lanterns and the mass release of balloons has the potential for serious impact upon public safety, wildlife and the environment, including:*
 - Fire risk from sky lanterns. Unexpired sky lanterns pose a fire hazard to residential properties, in particular thatched properties, business premises, hazardous material sites, livestock, agriculture and camping activities. An example being the immense fire in 2013 at the plastics recycling plant in Smethwick which was started by a sky lantern;*
 - Danger to wildlife. Through entanglement, ingestion or entrapment. Marine life is also at risk from lanterns and balloons falling into the sea;*
 - Environmental issues. Although some lanterns and balloons may be classed as 'biodegradable', some elements may take years to degrade. This leads to an increase in litter and waste, both on land and in the sea;*
 - Danger to humans. Through hazardous metal waste being left behind from non-biodegradable sky lanterns;*
 - Loss of resources. Lanterns can be mistaken for distress flares or aircraft and can lead to the police and the coastguard suffering a loss of resources whilst having to deal with these false alarms.*
 - Hazard to aircraft. There is a danger of both lanterns and balloons being sucked into aircraft engines and the Civil Aviation Authority has a policy in place which provides guidance for individuals or organisations wishing to conduct displays of 'directed light, fireworks, toy balloons and sky lanterns' within UK airspace.*
- 3. Acknowledges that although there are guidelines available around both sky lantern and mass balloon releases, there are no plans in the foreseeable future for the Government to make any changes in legislation relating to their use.*

Therefore taking all issues into account, that Council:

4. *Agrees that the release of sky lanterns and mass balloon releases be prohibited from Council occupied land and properties;*
5. *Agrees that the release of sky lanterns and mass balloon releases be prohibited from taking place as part of projects or events over which the Council has control, in consultation with the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services and the Licensing Service as appropriate; and*
6. *Encourages the use of alternative and original ways to commemorate events rather than the release of sky lanterns or the mass release of balloons.*
7. **That Scrutiny, following implementation of the policy above, reviews the changes and within 12 months reports its recommendations to the Cabinet or relevant Cabinet Member.**

Councillor Holdich moved his motion, incorporating the amendment from Councillor Sandford and this was seconded by Councillor North.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

2. Motion from Councillor Davidson

The Mayor advised that Councillor Holdich had proposed an amendment to the motion and this had been agreed by Councillor Davidson. It was therefore proposed that the motion be moved incorporating the amendment. This was agreed by Council.

1. Council notes that our current Local Transport Plan (LTP3: 2011-2016) contains the following policy objectives:
 - Promotion of public transport;
 - To seek to increase the proportion of eligible secondary school pupils travelling to school by public transport, where walking or cycling to school is not possible;
 - To seek Section 106 contributions from developers to implement measures contained in travel plans for new businesses, new residential developments, district centres and schools; and
 - To implement measures identified in travel plans to ensure all new developments are built with a high level of accessibility.

~~**This has not happened in Manor Drive.**~~

2. ~~**Council therefore regrets the fact that the Manor Drive development in Gunthorpe, including thousands of houses and significant industrial and commercial premises, appears to have been developed with no regard to providing services for a community, in particular the development has been delivered without any bus service, despite the fact that it is separated from existing bus services by a considerable distance and a busy parkway.**~~
3. ~~**Council requests Council notes that the Leader has requested the relevant Cabinet Member to arrange urgent discussions with ward councillors, relevant officers and bus operators to find ways of providing some public transport to this**~~

~~rapidly growing area of the city~~ review the provision of public transport to Manor Drive, a rapidly growing area of the city.

In moving her motion, incorporating the amendment from Councillor Holdich, Councillor Davidson advised that the issue was an important one which required action. Manor Drive had been poorly designed and had a lack of amenities and this would create longer term problems with any future proposed development in the area. The issue of public transport was a priority, in particular the provision of a bus service. It was acknowledged that there was a bridge crossing over the road, but this was not user friendly. Therefore a meeting was being requested in order to ascertain how the issues could be addressed going forward.

Councillor Fower seconded the motion and queried as to why no bus service had been introduced in the area considering that the promotion of public transport was included within the Local Transport Plan. After undertaking a resident's survey in the Manor Drive area, it was apparent that the residents felt that the area had been developed with no regard for providing services for the community and in particular a bus service. There was a responsibility to develop a traffic infrastructure to show that the city was serious in its aspiration to become environment capital.

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Members were encouraged to attend the Planning Committee meetings in order to ensure their views were put across throughout the planning process;
- The bus companies needed to be approached directly in relation to any bus service provision; and
- Work had been ongoing on the Manor Drive project for the last four years and had involved a number of Members.

Councillor Davidson summed up as mover of the motion stating that the issue was an important one. The lack of bus services and community facilities on the Manor Drive estate needed to be looked at going forward and assurances given that this same situation would not happen anywhere else across the city.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

13. Reports to Council

(a) Alternative Governance Arrangements

Council received a report which set out the Alternative Governance Working Group's proposals for implementing the hybrid model and on a proposed structure for scrutiny committees. It also included proposed changes to the Council's Constitution to implement the proposals.

Councillor Thulbourn moved the recommendations on behalf of the Design and Implementation Group and stated that a further report would be brought back to a future Council meeting proposing further Constitution amendments. This was seconded by Councillor Hiller who thanked Councillor Thulbourn for Chairing the Group and also thanked Kim Sawyer, Director of Governance for her advice throughout the process.

Members debated the recommendations and in summary raised points including:

- The original motion proposed had been for exploration to a move to a Committee System. It was not felt that the proposals achieved what was originally envisaged, with the same strong Leader and Cabinet model remaining;
- It was not considered that the proposals achieved a more democratic approach, although Members would be involved at an earlier stage in the process;
- There was concern expressed regarding the proposal to cease the Rural Commission;
- The proposals would require good will from the decision makers to not ignore any recommendations put forward by Scrutiny;
- Concerns were expressed that there would be a disproportionate spread of work across the Committees proposed;
- The appointment of Chairs should be undertaken in the same way as Parliamentary Select Committees, Cabinet Members should not have a vote on any appointments;
- It was regrettable that the representative positions of other faith groups had not been taken up;
- The model proposed was in no way comparable to the Wandsworth model, as had been agreed for implementation. The model was similar to the one already in place;
- The model retained individual Cabinet Member decision making, which did not happen at Wandsworth;
- The proposals meant that the Chairs of the Committees would not necessarily be opposition group members;
- Only 30 out of the 60 Members of the Council would be involved in the Scrutiny process, there only being three committees of 10 Members proposed;
- The proposals did not address the methods of encouraging public involvement nor did it address the devolution agenda;
- There would be many important issues to be considered by the committees and there were concerns that having only three committees would not allow for adequate scrutiny. Four Committees would have been more appropriate;
- Although there were concerns highlighted about the proposals, there would be the opportunity to revisit the system in the future;
- The Chairmen should be selected by the Committees themselves, meaning that the Cabinet was at arms-length;
- In order for the new system to work, there would have to be a culture change in the amount of work distributed to the new Committees;
- The model proposed was a Peterborough take on the Wandsworth model, the best model for Peterborough's needs;
- Democracy had played a key role in the development of the proposals, with the Design and Implementation Group being a cross party group. There had also been a number of Scrutiny workshops where comments had been submitted and taken on board during the development process; and
- It was considered that on the whole, a more appropriate system for Peterborough could have been devised. However as mentioned, there would be opportunity for review in a year.

Councillor Thulbourn summed up as mover of the recommendations and advised that the consensus had been for a Peterborough hybrid model. The way the Committees functioned would rely on Members to take them forward. Members needed to make sure they were engaged in the process as it was only them who could support the system and make it work.

A vote was taken (45 for, 6 against, 2 abstentions) and it was **RESOLVED**:

1. That in accordance with paragraph 9KC of Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011,
 - (a) The Council resolved to make changes to its constitutional arrangements to a hybrid model of executive decision making with a greater involvement of pre-scrutiny recommendations as set out in the report of the Design and Implementation Working Group to take effect from the Annual Meeting of the Council in May 2016.
 - (b) That copies of the Design and Implementation Working Group's report setting out the provisions of the arrangements should be made available at the Town Hall, and details of the proposals be published in one or more newspapers circulating in the area.
2. That Council approved the following changes to the Constitution to take effect from the Annual meeting of the Council in May 2016:
 - (a) Overview and Scrutiny Article 7 (Part 2:Section 7)
 - (b) Overview and Scrutiny Functions (Part 3:Section 4)
 - (c) Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules (Part 4: Section 8)
3. The Council noted that the proposed changes to the Cabinet Procedure Rules would be reported to a future meeting of Cabinet for approval and Council for adoption.
4. That the following further consequential changes to the Constitution would be brought to the Council meeting in March:
 - a. Cabinet Procedure Rules (Part 4: Section 7)
 - b. Budget & Policy Framework Procedure Rules (Part4: Section 6)
5. That a review should be undertaken prior to the Annual Meeting in May 2017 to ensure the proposed scrutiny structure was effective.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 9.15pm

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>COUNCIL BUSINESS</u>	
9.	<p><u>Questions on notice to:</u></p> <p>a) The Mayor b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee</p>
1.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Eelsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member confirm why the road sweeper sweeps up and down the main road of Uldale Way but leaves the cul-de-sac un-swept?</p> <p>Councillor Eelsey responded:</p> <p>Due to the size of the large sweeper, sweeping in tight areas such as cul-de-sacs where cars are often parked can be problematic. As a result it is quite common for the large sweeper to sweep the main drive into such roads and then at a different time for a smaller sweeper to go in to the cul-de-sac to get into the tighter areas which I can confirm is the case in this particular case.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>With regards to that response, could you then tell me, as a secondary option, that there would be a smaller sweeper to use to get into the cul-de-sac because obviously I'm getting concerned residents who are plaguing me with this particular situation to say yes, the sweeper is coming into Uldale Way but they are omitting to go in to the cul-de-sac and it's causing them big concerns.</p> <p>Councillor Eelsey responded:</p> <p>I can confirm that yes, there is a smaller sweeper and yes, it is used in those circumstances. I have it on very good authority that it is used in this particular area. They're not used at the same time so if the resident is looking out at the large one and noting that the smaller sweeper is not going into the cul-de-sac, it may be sometime later that the smaller one does. Obviously by virtue of it being significantly smaller, it is not so detectable or noisy when it actually arrives.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Judy Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Eelsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>At a recent meeting of the Rural Commission, it stated on the committee papers that there were only 54 reports of fly-tipping in the Rural wards in one year up to September 2015.</p>

	<p>I believe that these figures are inaccurate and I would respectfully ask the Cabinet Member to confirm the figures, to advise how they were compiled and to confirm how each report is recorded at the time of receiving a complaint.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>When a report of a fly tip on PCC land is received, it is recorded on the Amey Works Manager system with the specific location. This information is then used to plan the work for the operatives and also produce management reports e.g. fly tip numbers</p> <p>Unfortunately Amey have found the report they did for the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities, had not captured all of the address records correctly, and they have apologised for the error.</p> <p>Amey have now addressed this error and amended the report and can confirm that between August 2014 and September 2015 there were 509 fly tips removed on PCC land in the Rural wards.</p> <p>It is also worth pointing out that one of the targets for the new service provided by the proposed Joint Community Enforcement Team will be to reduce fly tips in all areas through better enforcement and targeted prevention activity.</p> <p>Councillor Judy Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>The reason I ask this, I know personally because I ring in with about four or five fly tips most weeks. Could I please ask if you can reassure me that you will keep me informed on this? I know that there are a lot of residents who are very concerned about what is being dumped, the amount and how often. But I am pleased to see that the figure has actually been altered and that, to me, is a lot fairer figure.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>Yes I will.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Digital, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>I recently applied online within the five day notice requirement, for a permit to take rubbish to the tip.</p> <p>I arranged a company marked van to come to my house to pick up the waste and transport it. On the relevant day the permit had not arrived at my address so I chose not to risk going to the tip in case we were turned away.</p> <p>I appreciate that I could have gone to Bayard Place to pick up a permit but the van driver was busy and did not have the time to wait around for this.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member reassure me that the five day notice requirement is adequate under normal circumstances or should this be extended or better still should a review of the whole household waste collection policy be looked into?</p>

	<p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>The timeframe given to residents to allow a permit to be delivered is 5 -10 working days, this is stated on the website where you apply for a permit online. Peterborough Direct inform residents when they apply of this time frame, if it does not suit the resident they can collect immediately from Bayard Place.</p> <p>Permits are <u>not</u> issued instantly online as they are only issued to Peterborough residents, they are posted to a Peterborough address to avoid residents in neighbouring authorities obtaining one. With neighbouring councils reducing the hours of Householder Recycling Centres (HRC's) near Peterborough we risk opening the site to residents from out of area in vans, thus increasing waste disposal costs.</p> <p>All policies and guidelines remain under constant review to ensure the service provided is fair and meets the needs of Peterborough's residents, the HRC permit policy does not appear to be in need of review at this time.</p> <p>Councillor John Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I applied for the permit on the 12th January. It is now the 27th; some 15 days later. I still haven't got the permit and I still have a load of rubbish outside my house so the system somewhere is failing. It could be the reason why people are giving up. Hopefully it's not, but fly tipping, without a shadow of a doubt, is going up in the rural areas and this may be an example of somewhere along the line where something needs to be sorted out. It's just not working and you know, people are very tempted to do other things.</p> <p>Councillor Elsey responded:</p> <p>I'm happy to take this away and look at it. Clearly, it's outside the time frame. I do understand there was an issue with the permit but I'm happy to take it offline and make sure that Councillor Fox gets his permit.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member consider the introduction of a mini roundabout at Gunthorpe Ridings, Gunthorpe Road and Coniston Road at the Harrier Pub? This would alleviate traffic congestion and road safety issues.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>It is nationally recognised and supported that Peterborough has the fastest rush hour commute of any city in the UK which supports our ambitious but achievable economy and growth aspirations. We're not complacent. We recognise that we need to continue to improve our excellent highway network to be even better for our commuting residents and visitors to our city.</p> <p>The Council therefore prioritises its capital programme of works to enhance the network for all forms of transport at locations where there are safety or congestion issues.</p> <p>Whilst I'm sure that it may be disappointing, our highways engineer's initial assessment at this location is that it is not suited to the introduction of a mini-roundabout. The</p>

	<p>existing alignment of the junction and the difficulty in providing sufficient deflection to reduce vehicle speeds would, as a result, create greater conflict than occurs at present. This, I'm afraid, is a key consideration given the absence of collisions at this location resulting in personal injury over the last five years. Nevertheless due to your obvious and very genuine concern Councillor Davidson, I have requested that our officers will undertake a full assessment and advice of their recommendations in due course. Naturally, I will share these with you.</p> <p>Councillor Davidson did not have a supplementary question.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Judy Fox</p> <p>To Councillor North, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member look into the feasibility of turning over the small wooded area near Sobrite Spring, Werrington to be managed by The Open Awards Centre, Werrington, headed by Steve Milford of the Princes Trust.</p> <p>This would be a project that this group could spend valued time on and help to enhance the work that has already being done in this area.</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>I welcome community based approaches such as this to work with the Council to help manage its assets, in particular those involving environmental stewardship. In the first instance Officers from the Strategic Projects team will make contact with The Open Awards Centre, Werrington representative via Councillor Judy Fox. The initial discussion will involve seeking an understanding of the proposal and how a feasibility study would be progressed. The Council is also aware that other groups have been working to restore the Sobrite Springs so will need to check what role if any they would seek to have and how this too may be supported/ included as part of the feasibility study.</p> <p>Councillor Judy Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillor North for his reply. I am very grateful for this and could you please keep me updated? Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor North responded:</p> <p>It would be a pleasure to do so.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please inform me whether or not there are plans to build any new schools in what will become the Gunthorpe Ward, as it has been suggested there could be some around Manor Drive, how many pupils each school will hold and when they will be built by?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>These are the current plans for which we are on target :</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paston Primary : 1 Form of Entry (i.e. 210 pupils) – Estimated opening: September 2018 • Paston Secondary : Maximum of 8 Forms of Entry (1200 pupils + a 6th form) – Estimated opening: September 2019 <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Holdich for providing those figures. I wondered whether or not you would agree with myself and my colleague, Councillor Davidson, that with these additional numbers, the area of Manor Drive could certainly benefit from a bus service being provided?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>I have to say that I find tonight quite amusing actually because they're not Ward Councillors for this area, there was a planning application yesterday of 400 houses on that piece of land which everybody had the opportunity to go to Planning Committee and put their views. I have to say that the Ward Councillors, Councillor Yonga and Councillor Fox did turn up and put their views and if you had gone to that meeting, you would have found out about the busses, schools and everything else that's gone on.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Martin</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>The street lighting on Bretton Way, between junctions 17 and 58, has not been working for several months. This has left the area in darkness during the darkest months of the year and many residents are asking why nothing is being done to rectify the problem. Some residents see the lack of lighting as a risk to health and safety.</p> <p>I fully realise that there are serious cabling issues involved here and that major works are involved to achieve a long term solution to this problem. I welcome the news that, in the interim, temporary lighting is to be provided at the four bus stop areas along that part of Bretton Way.</p> <p>Is the cabinet member able to give Bretton residents any indication as to when full lighting will be restored in the affected areas? The problem appears due to the deterioration of aging cables so this issue is likely to arise in other areas over coming years. What plans are in place to replace aging cabling before they cause the same problem in other areas?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>The design work for the new lighting for Bretton Way is an essential requirement to ensure that the new columns and their locations attain the recommended lighting standards and that there are no issues with the positions of the new cabling. Very detailed and accurate design of the cabling is vital when moving cables from the central reservation to the verges. We want to get it right first time. I'm pleased to report this design work is progressing well and we anticipate installation of the new lighting on Bretton Way, commencing at Junction 17 of the A47 and Gresley Way, in the late Spring this year.</p> <p>I have asked our highways teams to keep you personally updated, Councillor Martin, as this work progresses. In the meantime, I'm also pleased to tell you, work has</p>

	<p>commenced to install semi-permanent lighting at the four bus stops affected by the lighting failure on Bretton Way.</p> <p>Councillor Martin asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you for that. I was extremely pleased to see the press release that went out last week. When we don't tell people what we're doing, they tend to assume that we're not doing anything. Can I ask that we keep residents fully informed on what is happening in the future?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>As Ward Councillor perhaps, it would befall on you, as it does with me, if there are major works going on in my ward, I make sure the effected residents are informed fully with information that I get from the Council. We do issue press releases; you've cited the press release that you've read. It's terribly difficult for Officers to knock on every door and inform every resident but as a Ward Councillor myself, of some ten years, I do tend to inform my Ward Councillors if there is anything that I think is going to affect them.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>With the planned new ability to raise tax, will PCC raise the Business rates of known Tax Avoiders, Amazon, Boots, Next, Vodafone and Starbucks, etc. to a high enough rate that no further cuts need be imposed and indeed that we can return to delivering the full portfolio of services to the standard the public (aka voters, taxpayers) deserve?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>You won't be surprised to hear that I think we already provide a portfolio of services to an excellent standard. Now, for example, our library services and Premier Fitness. I'm pleased that you have mentioned in here, although it is slightly wrong, about cuts to services because as you'll know, Councillor Fower, this Council isn't making any cuts to services at all.</p> <p>It will only be elected city-wide metro mayors who will be able to add a premium to pay for new infrastructure, and only then when they have the support of a majority of the business members of the Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>Even if the Council were able to increase business rates in the manner Councillor Fower believes we can, these organisations would need to pay more than eight times more than they currently do to deliver his proposal.</p> <p>How long does he think a company like that would remain in Peterborough in those circumstances, and what message would such an approach send to any other business who were interested in coming to Peterborough.</p> <p>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>First and foremost what I would like to say is thank you very much Councillor Seaton for providing that response but I can't take the credit, I'm afraid, for this particular question because it was presented to me by a local person – a local taxpayer – called Luke Payne. The question was actually from a local resident so it was his suggestion</p>

	<p>and I said that I would be happy to present it so that we could get a nice informed response but I'm not sure if I got that. The question was, is this actually going to be something that they look at introducing or not?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>I think there's several points there. I looked at this list of companies and I thought that Councillor Fower is going to have to stop eating Cadbury's chocolate bars, because Cadbury's was bought by Nestlé specifically for the tax advantages it had. So it goes across all sorts of things. We could tax these companies more but we could stop eating all sorts of things because of this. I must admit, I think I have been asleep for the last 18 years, we had a Labour government from 1997 to 2010 we then had a coalition with the Liberal Democrats from 2010 to 2015. We had 18 years to sort out taxation.</p> <p>I think a bit less talking on tax. We've had 18 years to sort out tax.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Werrington Centre seems to be at a standstill with regards to proposals for its future regeneration by the owners. Of the main district centres Werrington falls sadly behind the others with regards to redevelopment. Please could the Cabinet Member confirm whether Officers are liaising with the owners to see if there are any funding opportunities to improve the area or to help to find a way forward?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>The Werrington Centre is privately owned and it is certainly disappointing that the regeneration scheme plan previously approved by the local planning authority has not been implemented. Councillor Fox will also know, because we've spoken about it on many occasions, that this authority has endeavoured to facilitate action here. Indeed, one of the first aspects of the proposed new Tesco store work was to create the new road safety scheme at the Davids Lane junction and this authority has delivered on that on time and on budget, as I promised it would. At about that time, the centre plan was due to be started. Members will perhaps recall that Tesco fell on well-publicised relatively hard times and their Werrington store replacement – the hub of the scheme – was indeed shelved.</p> <p>That said, Councillor Fox is aware that Peterborough's Local Plan is currently being reviewed and it would be possible for the centre owners to use this as an opportunity to reshape planning policy for the area.</p> <p>I will ensure that our officers continue to liaise with the centre owners and support them in bringing forward any alternative investment proposals with, when appropriate, the involvement and input of the Ward Councillors.</p> <p>Councillor Fox asked the following supplementary question:</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillor Hiller for all of the support he has given the Ward Councillors for Werrington North over the Tesco's situation. I'm not asking for my bread to be buttered on both sides but if you look at Orton and also Bretton, it is sadly lacking and hopefully the future will be bright.</p>