

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 12 OCTOBER 2016  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DAVID SANDERS**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ash, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Amjad Iqbal, Azhar Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sanders, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Sims, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh, and Whitby .

A minute's silence was held at the request of Councillor Holdich, on behalf of the Council, for the late Neville Sanders, former Leader of the Council.

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lane.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Sandford declared an interest in item 13(c), 'Review of Peterborough City Council's Members' Allowances Scheme - Report of the Independent Members' Allowances Panel' and would leave the Chamber on the debate of that item. Councillors Fower, Davidson, Shaheed, Lillis, and Bond declared also declared an interest in this item and would leave the Chamber for debate.

The Legal Officer advised that dispensation had been granted by the Audit Committee in 2012 to all Members to enable them to speak and vote on any matter relating to Members Allowances. Members were therefore permitted to speak and vote on Members Allowances.

Councillor Cereste declared a potential interest in item 9, 'Questions on Notice', regarding a question in relation to landlords in the event it applied to him.

The Legal Officer advised that as there would not be a debate on this question the no declarations were required.

**3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 July 2016**

The Legal Officer clarified that within the minutes amendments to motion were indicated through bolded or drawn through text.

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2016 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 11 July 2016 to 9 October 2015.

The Mayor clarified that 'An Evening with Kevin Keegan' related to a benefit event with Kevin Keegan, which was held at the Holiday Inn to support the charity The Youth Academy.

The Mayor further announced that in 2015, the Council had launched its 2015-16 reward and recognition scheme for council employees. The purpose of the scheme was to recognise the outstanding and consistent performance of individuals and teams in helping to achieve the Council's priorities or in demonstrating the Council's core values.

The Mayor introduced the Employee of the Year and Team of the Year awards, this being Jean Crysell and the Selective Licensing Team respectively. Jean had been chosen to receive the Employee of the Year award for her work to protect the financial affairs of vulnerable members of the community who were unable to act for themselves, either because they have no-one else who could act for them or who were victims of financial abuse.

The Selective Licensing Team had been chosen to receive the Team of the Year award for developing a scheme to regulate and improve the quality of private rented housing in Peterborough.

The Mayor further advised that the next scheme opened on 17 October 2016 for nominations and further information was available from the Communications Team.

### **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 with notice from members of the public.

### **8. Petitions**

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

Becky Sellick presented a petition signed by 50 residents in favour of Better Support for EU Citizens in Peterborough.

**(b) Presented by Members**

Councillor Davidson presented a petition regarding LED lighting in Cissbury Ring and Fulbridge Road.

Councillor Davidson presented a petition with more than 1200 signatures organised by Leah Robb on behalf of the residents of St Michael's Gate regarding the eviction of 74 families from their homes.

Councillor Jamil presented a petition signed by residents of Russell Street and the surrounding area regarding additional street cleansing services in the area.

Councillor Fower presented a petition signed by 94 residents from the Gunthorpe Ridings area regarding road safety measures.

Councillor Walsh presented a petition regarding the effect on the quality of life caused by the increasing volume of traffic on Drake Avenue.

Following a question the Legal Officer explained the process for handling petitions and advised that if a petition had 500 signatures or more, the lead petition had the option to request a debate at Full Council.

**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. Whether four weekly bin collections are to be considered.
2. Annual cost of street cleaning on Lincoln Road.
3. Manor Drive development lack of amenities.
4. Prevention and Enforcement Service officer powers for parking on verges.
5. Traffic on Malvern Road, Gunthorpe.
6. New applications for school places.
7. Publicising new bus services.
8. St Michael's Gate rationale.
9. Idling diesel taxi engines.
10. Concessionary fares 65yrs+ costs per annum.
11. Percentage of families placed in temporary accommodation.
12. Housing benefit to Councillors that are landlords.
13. St Michael's Gate tenants.

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

### 10. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

#### (a) Cabinet Recommendation - Approval of the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2016/17

Cabinet at its meeting on 25 July 2016 received a report on the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2016/2017. The purpose of this report was for Cabinet to consider the Safer Peterborough Plan for 2016/17 and to make a recommendation to Full Council. The plan set out the community safety priorities for the partnership over the coming year.

Cabinet recommended the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan and the priorities contained therein for approval.

Councillor Walsh introduced the report and moved the recommendations contained within. Councillor Walsh advised that the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan was part of the Major Policy Framework and built on the work of the previous Plan. The Plan contained four priorities relating to specific areas of work by the Safer Peterborough Partnership and its delivery board. A longer-term Plan was expected from 2017 onwards.

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

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor John Fox. Councillor John Fox advised that the law surrounding unauthorised traveller encampments required changing. It was proposed that the emphasis in law be altered to require trespassers to prove that they had not broken into property. The amendment requested that the MP be asked to investigate introducing such a law.

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

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- Concern was expressed that the amendment may be unlawful as it referenced a particular group.
- It was further noted that the proposal specified that the matter would be raised with the MP.
- It was recognised that a significant portion of the people in Peterborough were not happy with the ongoing situation and would like it resolved.
- Members felt that legislation was already in place to deal with breaking and entering.
- It was considered that police reacted appropriately upon receipt of notice that land was being occupied without consent.

The Legal Officer confirmed that it was for Parliamentary lawyers to decide how such a law was drafted and it was for Parliament to decide if it wished to make such a law.

Councillor Judy Fox exercised her right to speak and echoed the sentiments of the debate.

Councillor Walsh, as mover of the original motion, advised that Councillor Fox's amendment had been discussed with Safer Peterborough Partnership officers, who were happy to incorporate it. The concerns of residents were appreciated and it was

considered that strengthening the powers of the police was a positive move.

A vote was taken (36 voted in favour, 14 voting against, 9 abstaining from voting) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

Members debated the substantive motion and in summary raised points including:

- It was suggested that the Plan should cover all forms of extremism and hate crime, and span 5 years rather than 3 years.
- It was noted that that local police were involved in the preparation of the Plan.
- Members were advised that all police officers were involved with modern day slavery reports rather than a dedicated few officers.
- Consideration needed to be given to road safety when designing roads, avoiding overgrown shrubbery, and the providing good lighting.
- It was suggested that lamp posts could be used for promoting safer road use.
- Staff were commended for the handling of cases of sexual exploitation in the city.
- It was considered that specific targets needed to be included in the report.

Councillor Walsh summed up as mover of the recommendations and advised that the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan focus on preventing extremism in all its forms.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion (unanimous) and the substantive motion was **CARRIED** with the amendment as follows:

- i. That Council adopt the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2016/17
- ii. That the priorities contained therein, in particular the Anti-Social Behaviour priority should include the need to tackle unauthorised encampments.
- iii. In order to support that priority that the Council is requested to contact our Members of Parliament and ask them to pursue legislation to require any person found on land unlawfully to prove that they have not come onto the land unlawfully (where access has been gained by forcing locks etc.) which will provide for swifter action by the police and also consider creating an appropriate criminal offence to combat such behaviour.

**(b) Cabinet Recommendation - Changes to the Constitution to Include the Housing Delivery Joint Venture Company**

Cabinet at its meeting on 25 July 2016 received a report on the creation of a housing delivery joint venture company. The purpose of this report was for Cabinet to consider the creation of a housing joint venture partnership between the Council and Cross Keys, in line with the Council's approved Budget and the recommendations of a cross party task and finish group that considered changes to the Council's strategy with regards to housing in Peterborough.

Cabinet approved the proposal to formally establish the joint venture company, and endorsed the recommendation that Council amend the Constitution 'Appointments to external organisations' to include the joint venture company within the key partnerships category to enable the Leader to make appointments to the housing joint venture board.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations, outlining changes to the council housing strategy.

Councillor Seaton seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed amendments to the Constitution 'Appointments to external organisations' to include the joint venture company within the key partnerships category to enable the Leader to make appointment to the housing joint venture.

**(c) Planning and Environmental Protection Committee Recommendation - Adoption of the Model Council Members' Planning Code**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee, at its meeting of 27 September 2016, received a report which requested it to consider the Model Council Members' Planning Code, produced by Lawyers in Local Government, and to make a recommendation to Full Council.

Councillor Harper introduced the report and moved the recommendations. Councillor Harper advised the Committee he felt the cross party Planning Committee did a good job and worked within the rules of the system.

Councillor Cereste seconded the recommendation.

Members requested a copy of the relevant documents were sent to the local MP.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that the Model Planning Code be adopted to replace the current code in the Constitution.

**(d) Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues Recommendation – Joint Health Scrutiny Committee Arrangements**

The Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues, at its meeting of 15 September 2016, received a report which requested it to consider establishing a joint scrutiny committee between Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to scrutinise proposals to merge Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust with Hinchingbrooke Health Care NHS Trust.

Councillor Cereste introduced the report and moved the recommendations. Councillor Cereste advised that and outlined the advantages of having a joint scrutiny in this instance.

Councillor Holdich seconded the recommendations and advised that the nominations to the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee from the Conservative Group would be Councillors Cereste, Aitken and Rush.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

- i. Agree to the establishment of a joint scrutiny committee with Cambridgeshire County Council to scrutinise proposals for the merger of PSHFT and HHCT;
- ii. Agree the preferred size for the Joint Committee to be five Members each from Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council;
- iii. Authorise the Joint Committee to respond on behalf of the Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues to the public engagement / consultation proposals;
- iv. Require the Joint Committee to scrutinise the implementation and governance arrangements, should the proposed merger be agreed by the two NHS Trust Boards;

- v. Endorse the draft terms of reference, subject to the inclusion of arrangements for a rotating Chair and Vice-Chair between Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council; and
- vi. Amend the Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues terms of reference, in order to delegate powers from Council to the Commission to establish joint health committees in relation to health issues that cross local authority boundaries.

## **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. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting 25 July 2016;
2. Decisions from the Cabinet Meeting 26 September 2016;
3. Special Urgency provision, which had been invoked twice since the previous meeting;
4. Waiver of Call-in provision, which had been invoked once since the previous meeting; and
5. Cabinet Member Decisions taken during the period 5 July 2016 to 30 September 2016.

### **Questions were asked about the following:**

#### Farms Estate Implementation Plan 2016/17

Councillor Murphy noted that he considered the Farms Estate Implementation Plan was a quality piece of work.

Councillor Holdich thanked Councillor Murphy for his comments and agreed that the Plan was a good step forward.

#### A1139 Junction 172 Widening Scheme

Councillor Sandford raised a question regarding the overspend on the project and asked what measures were being put in place to prevent a similar situation in the future.

Councillor Hiller advised that the process had been challenging and was the largest civil engineering project of its kind since the cessation of the Development Corporation. The overspend was largely due to historic methodology. The decisions taken were challenged and considered by a cross party scrutiny committee at the time, who had endorsed the decision. The additional expense was necessary, could not have been anticipated, and had been made to save further expenditure, avoid expensive litigation costs with the contractor, and bring the contract to a close. This stretch of road was due for a multi-million pound upgrade in the next few years.

#### Lease with Stef and Philips Limited for the use of St. Michael's Gate, Parnwell, as interim accommodation for homeless families

Councillor Murphy queried if the decision had been superseded by its call-in to the Strong and Supportive Scrutiny Committee. It was asked that consideration be given to the idea that Stef and Philips had sought vacant possession of the premises, would bring in people from other local authorities, and the costs of alternative accommodation. It was further requested that the case be fully reviewed.

Councillor Holdich advised the Council that expenditure without the use of St. Michael's Gate would be £1.2million. Other local authorities would bring in their own homeless individuals and the associated problems that would entail. Until an alternative plan was put forward, which to date none had, the decision would remain.

Councillor Murphy advised that he had provided all Councillors with an alternative proposal the previous day, which would save the Council money. It was requested that this be given due consideration.

Councillor Holdich replied that this proposal would not change the fact that had been given notice to move out. It was considered that Councillor Murphy's comments would be better made at the Scrutiny call-in meeting, where a full debate could take place.

Councillor Davidson asked if all alternative measures could be considered.

Councillor Walsh responded that this would be the case.

Councillor Cereste queried whether the Leader of the Council was aware that Stef and Philips were looking at other properties in Peterborough.

Councillor Holdich responded that he was not aware and thanked Councillor Cereste for bringing the matter to his attention.

#### Section 113 Agreement For The Role Of Temporary Director Of Children's Services & Adult Social Care Services: Cambridgeshire County Council

Councillor Saltmarsh questioned whether the sharing of services would result in the Council's own services being adequately supported.

Councillor Smith advised that following discussions with various relevant parties it was agreed that as the arrangement was temporary it could be challenged if this was found to be the case.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **12. Motions on Notice**

#### **1. Motion from Councillor Darren Fower**

*The motion requests that this Council notes:*

- 1. The recent news relating to the 5 year old local boy, who as a result of a traffic accident on Gunthorpe Ridings, was described as having "life changing injuries.";*
- 2. That Gunthorpe Ridings is a well-used road, both by those living in the 11 cul-de-sacs that lead off from it and by people using it for its purpose of connecting the well-populated areas of Paston & Gunthorpe, and their relevant amenities.*

*We therefore call on Peterborough City Council to:*

- 1. Acknowledge publicly and provide assurances to local residents that action will be taken to improve road safety measures along Gunthorpe Ridings;*



2. *Agree that the safety of young pupils is still of the utmost importance to this local authority;*
3. *Create a working group, involving local councillors, council officers and other community representatives, to look at the options and develop an action plan to be agreed and implemented by the end of this calendar year.*
4. *Start looking into the possibility and costings of introducing a pedestrian crossing, similar to the one on Gunthorpe Road, along Gunthorpe Ridings, as soon as possible.*

Councillor Fower moved the motion.

Councillor Davidson seconded the motion and reserved her right to speak.

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Ash. It was sought for the proposed working group to be expanded to become less parochial, and become a more city wide group.

Councillor Saltmarsh seconded the amendment and emphasised the importance of road safety throughout the city.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- Cross Ward discussion was suggested in order to identify key areas of concern.
- Reduced speed limits to 20 miles per hour were suggested together with safer routes to school, and pedestrian crossings.
- It was brought to the attention of Members that the matter fell within the remit of the delivery group for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership, and to form a committee to oversee their work would be impractical.
- A report had been assigned to investigate the causes of the above mentioned accident and it was suggested that a decision on this original motion and amendment be postponed until this has been completed.
- It was suggested that the people of Gunthorpe wanted an enquiry to focus on their specific area which had not happened before.

Councillor Fower, as mover of the original motion, advised that the motion specifically referenced Gunthorpe Ridings for a reason and that residents of that particular area had requested that the matter be investigated.

A vote was taken (19 voted in favour, 38 voting against, 2 abstaining from voting) and the amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Members debated the original motion and in summary raised points including:

- It was considered that the Safer Peterborough Partnership considered the issue of road safety sufficiently.
- It was confirmed that there had been 5 slight personal injury incidents in the last 5 years.

Councillor Murphy summed up as mover of the motion and advised that there had been between 3 and 5 accidents in the area in addition to that referenced within the motion.

A vote was taken (21 voted in favour, 33 voting against, 5 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

## 2. Motion from Councillor Richard Ferris

*This Council notes that:*

- 1. In the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commission Group (CCG) area it is estimated that 6,260 people over the age of 65 are living with dementia. 62.1% of those living with dementia have received a formal diagnosis; diagnosis can often be the key to accessing appropriate support services.*
- 2. Two thirds of those living with dementia are living in the community, and nearly 70% of people with dementia feel lonely and trapped in their own homes, with limited or no social networks.*
- 3. A healthy diet, regular physical exercise, and avoiding smoking and drinking can reduce the risk of developing Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia, but 64% of people are not aware of this.*
- 4. The societal cost of dementia in the UK is estimated at an average cost per person of £32,250. Of the total estimated cost of dementia in the UK, it is estimated that £11.6billion is contributed through the work of unpaid carers.*

*This Council resolves to:*

- 1. Through the local Dementia Action Alliance (DAA), earn status as officially working towards making Peterborough 'Dementia Friendly', a status endorsed by Alzheimer's Society;*
- 2. Appoint an elected member to the position of 'Dementia Champion' for the authority;*
- 3. Work towards making Council practices more dementia friendly, encouraging staff and members to become a 'Dementia Friend' through the Dementia Friends Programme and committing to making Council buildings dementia friendly;*
- 4. Run local risk reduction campaigns, including clear messaging in ongoing campaigns regarding exercise, alcohol, smoking or diet that 'what's good for your heart is good for your head'; and*
- 5. Make information about local dementia services as accessible as possible.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Ferris advised that this motion had been requested by the Alzheimer's Society for all Council's to adopt. By 2025 1 million people would be diagnosed with dementia. This figure would be 2 million by 2051. Wonderful work was already being undertaken by the Council in relation to dementia, it was hoped that this motion would keep Peterborough at the fore front of dementia services.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The Council already had a number of objectives in place in relation to Dementia including making Peterborough 'Dementia Friendly', encouraging staff and members to become a 'Dementia Friend', running local risk reduction campaigns, and making local dementia services and information accessible.
- Councillor Lamb had been appointed to the position of 'Dementia Champion', as well as holding the position of Chairman of the Dementia Action Alliance.

- The work undertaken by the Council in relation to dementia extended outwards to include St George's Hydrotherapy Pool, and the Orthopaedic and Spines Specialist hospital with more organisations following suit.
- It was requested that the programme was extend to early onset dementia, specifically with young people, as some patients were as young as 14.
- It was noted that dementia was difficult to diagnose at a young age and generally took several years for an accurate diagnosis.
- Members also recognised previous advances made locally in this field by this Council.

Councillor Jamil exercised his right to speak and noted that the help received by those with dementia and their families was invaluable.

Councillor Ferris summed up as mover of the motion and thanked Members for their support. The inclusion of early onset dementia was welcomed, and it was considered that the Council should always strive to do more to assist those people and communities who required it.

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

### **3. Motion from Councillor Ansar Ali**

*Peterborough City Council is extremely concerned at the escalating tension between India and Pakistan as a result of more recent clashes and violence in Jammu Kashmir, which has resulted in loss of hundreds of innocent lives and causing serious injuries to vast numbers of innocent Kashmiri people.*

*Peterborough City Council recognises that the issue of Kashmir is a matter of concern to a significant number of our residents. The city has around fifteen thousand residents who would describe their heritage as Kashmiri. We also have people of Pakistani and Indian heritage in Peterborough, all of whom play a pivotal role in the wonderful diversity we have in our city.*

*Peterborough City Council wishes to see lasting peace in the region so that people of India, Kashmir and Pakistan can live in harmony, mutual respect and prosperity.*

*The issue of Kashmir remains an outstanding issue on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council since 13 August 1948, which declared the right of the people of Jammu Kashmir to self-determination. Despite this the state remains divided between India and Pakistan, with thousands of Indian Armed Forces present in the Kashmir Valley.*

*This unresolved dispute is costing both countries enormous amounts of money, thus hindering development which would improve the quality of lives of people of both nations. Permanent resolution of the Kashmir dispute will bring considerable benefits to both countries.*

*Peterborough City Council calls upon the British Government to put pressure on the Indian and Pakistani Governments to exercise restraint and to put an immediate stop to these killings, oppression and human rights violations.*

*We urge the British Government to engage with international partners in seeking a permanent resolution on Kashmir through the United Nations, and call upon both the Indian and Pakistani Governments to stop the rhetoric of war mongering.*

*The Council believes the views of the people of Kashmir are paramount in determining how they are governed and who shall govern them; and calls upon the governments of India and Pakistan to recognise that the Kingdom of Kashmir belongs to the people of Kashmir and only they can determine their future.*

*We call on the British Government to play a leading role in bringing about a lasting resolution to this dispute which threatens peace in the region.*

*Recognising that two million people of Kashmiri, Indian and Pakistani heritage live in the UK, this Council therefore resolves to support the right of people of Jammu Kashmir to self-determination and to this end calls upon the British Government to:*

- 1. use its diplomatic channels and intervene to de-escalate the current crisis; and*
- 2. revert to its previous position on Kashmir, supporting a plebiscite as a high priority issue.*

*This Council agrees to:*

- 3. Raise the issue with the Foreign Office to seek a free and fair plebiscite in Kashmir, for a permanent resolution of this long standing conflict that carries the potential of disrupting global peace.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Ali advised that the escalating tension between India and Pakistan was a result of more recent clashes and violence in Jammu Kashmir, which has resulted in loss of hundreds of innocent lives and caused serious injuries to vast numbers of innocent Kashmiri. It was considered that this was a matter of concern to a significant number of Peterborough residents as the city had around fifteen thousand residents who would describe their heritage as Kashmiri. There were also people of Pakistani and Indian heritage in Peterborough. Local residents had asked Councillors to work toward supporting lasting peace in the region.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Walsh moved an Amendment, seconded by Councillor Nadeem for our MPs to raise the issue in Government with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to better achieve the attention it deserves whilst retaining the spirit of the motion.

An amendment to the motion was moved by Councillor Walsh. Councillor Walsh requested for local MPs to raise the issue in Government with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to better achieve the attention it deserved whilst retaining the spirit of the original motion.

Councillor Nadeem seconded the amendment to the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Members debated the amendment and in summary raised points including:

- This issue had been left unresolved following independence from the British in 1947 and several resolutions with the support of the United Nations had not brought peace to the area.
- It was unlikely this was an issue the Council could solve.
- Members discussed the atrocities which continued to take place with no aid or relief work allowed into the country.
- There was a fear of the situation escalating further, and it would be in this country's best interest to see peace.
- It was suggested that the amendment diluted the motion and questioned whether the MPs had time to address this matter.

- It was suggested that Councillors write individually to the Government to express their support of work towards peace in Kashmir.
- It was considered that the Council must not be seen to favour either side of the conflict, as the city was home to a multi-cultural local population from all regions involved in the dispute.

Councillor Nadeem exercised his right to speak and explained the impact the conflict was having on citizens. Relations were considered to be at an all-time low, presenting a threat to global peace. It was hoped that the UK Government could intervene.

Councillor Ali, as mover of the original motion, considered that the amendment removed the request for real action to be undertaken away from the original motion.

A vote was taken (34 voted in favour, 22 voting against, 2 abstaining from voting) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

A vote was taken on the substantive motion (unanimous) and the substantive motion was **CARRIED** with the amendment as follows:

Peterborough City Council is extremely concerned at the ongoing tensions between India and Pakistan and offers our deepest condolences to the victims, families and friends of those who have tragically lost their lives.

Peterborough City Council recognises that the issue of Kashmir is a matter of concern to a significant number of our residents and across the UK. The city has around fifteen thousand residents who would describe their heritage as Kashmiri. We also have people of Pakistani and Indian heritage in Peterborough, all of whom play a pivotal role in the wonderful diversity we have in our city.

Peterborough City Council condemns all forms of violence wherever they occur throughout the world, including Kashmir. The council implores the Indian and Pakistani Governments to exercise restraint and to put an immediate stop to violence, oppression and human rights violations. We urge all parties to resolve their differences and bring lasting peace in the region so that people of India, Kashmir and Pakistan can live in harmony, mutual respect and prosperity.

The issue of Kashmir remains an outstanding issue on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council since 13<sup>th</sup> August 1948, which declared the right of the people of Jammu Kashmir to self-determination. Despite this the state remains divided between India and Pakistan.

This unresolved dispute is costing both countries enormous amounts of money, thus hindering development which would improve the quality of lives of people of both nations. Permanent resolution of the Kashmir dispute will bring considerable benefits to both countries and the people of Kashmir.

The Council believes the views of the people of Kashmir are paramount in determining how they are governed and who shall govern them; and calls upon the governments of India and Pakistan, the UK Government, and International partners to play a leading role in bringing about a lasting resolution to this dispute which threatens peace in the region.

Recognising that two million people of Kashmiri, Indian and Pakistani heritage live in the UK, Peterborough City Council therefore resolves to support the right of people of Jammu Kashmir to self-determination and to this end calls upon the UK Government to:

1. use its diplomatic channels and intervene to de-escalate the current crisis; and
2. Support the Indian and Pakistani Governments and the people of Kashmir to explore all options in determining a peaceful and long lasting solution to the problems.

This Council agrees to:

3. Call upon our MP to raise the issue with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to seek a free and fair plebiscite in Kashmir, for a permanent resolution of this long standing conflict that carries the potential of disrupting global peace.

#### **4. Motion from Councillor Nick Sandford**

*This Council notes:*

1. *The results of the consultation on a devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough;*
2. *That during the consultation the public were consulted on the basis that a devolution deal was only possible with an elected mayor, and that, despite being told about the insistence on an elected mayor, the majority of respondents to the online survey opposed an elected mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough; and*
3. *That the new prime minister, appointed since the devolution deal was agreed by the leaders of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils, has indicated that under her government elected mayors are not as central to devolution deals as was the policy of the previous government.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Sandford advised that the motion reflected particular concerns with the Elected Mayor aspect of the devolution proposals. It was considered that this aspect was opposed by a majority of the public and it was questioned why the Council was insisting on a system that the public did not support.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- Within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Devolution deal the Mayor would act as the Government's representative to the Council.
- The Elected Mayor would not be making decisions, as that function will remain with Council.
- Members were concerned that the deal would be lost entirely, including the related funding, if the Elected Mayor aspect of the deal was refused.
- Discussions also took place around the natural partners of Peterborough being towards the Midlands and Northampton rather than Cambridge.

Councillor Fower exercised his right to speak and advised that the matter was an issue of fairness. The Elected Mayor would have the power to veto decisions, on which Peterborough have only one vote out of nine. Peterborough was to pay 20% of the cost of the combined authority, but received on 10% of the funding.

Councillor Sandford summed up as mover of the motion and advised that it was of fundamental importance not to concentrate power into the hands of one individual.

Public consultation had provided a clear conclusion as to the concerns surrounding the Elected Mayor. During previously discussion to reject a devolution deal with Norfolk and Suffolk it was suggested that no alternative could be found, yet an alternative deal was put forward. The same could happen with the Elected Mayor.

A vote was taken on the motion (22 voted in favour, 35 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor John Fox moved a motion to suspend standing order 14.2 so that the meeting be extending beyond the 11:00pm guillotine.

Councillor Judy Fox seconded the motion.

A vote was taken on the motion (8 voted in favour, 43 voting against, 1 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

## 5. Motion from Councillor Nick Sandford

*This Council notes:*

- 1. The announcement by the Prime Minister of her intention to allow secondary schools to introduce academic selection and existing grammar schools to expand;*
- 2. The strong evidence that the presence of grammar schools in an area has a detrimental impact on the educational outcomes of the majority of pupils;*

*Council calls upon the Cabinet member for Education, Skills, University and Communications to write to governing bodies of all secondary schools in Peterborough pointing out the compelling academic evidence against grammar schools as a way of raising academic standards, and inviting them to work together and with the City Council to build for further improvement within the strong tradition of comprehensive education in Peterborough.*

*This Council also calls upon the Cabinet member to write to the Secretary of State for Education pointing out the clear benefits of the comprehensive education system for the majority of pupils.*

In moving his motion, Councillor Sandford and advised that the announcement by the Prime Minister would move the school arrangements back to the past. Evidence has identified that Grammar Schools did not help social mobility.

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

Members debated the motion and in summary raised points including:

- The educational outcomes were discussed both in favour and against grammar schools.
- Members were unable to locate evidence that grammar schools were detrimental to the overall county standard.
- The ethos of grammar schools which allow for individual progression rather than treating all the same was discussed as well as parental preference.

At this point the guillotine was reached and in line with standing order 14.2 all debate was ceased Members were directed to move to the vote on the remaining agenda items,

where all motions, amendments and recommendations would be deemed formerly moved and seconded.

A vote was taken on the motion (19 voted in favour, 35 voting against, 3 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

## 6. Motion from Councillor John Peach

*In recognition of the historic importance of the building to Peterborough, particularly the Art Deco front and inside features of The Broadway Theatre we ask the council to consider placing a preservation order on this magnificent building. We also ask that the council does whatever it can to facilitate its continued use as a quality entertainment venue by whatever means possible.*

Councillor Murphy moved that consideration of the motion be delegated to the Corporate Director of Finance.

Councillor Lillis seconded this motion.

A vote was taken on the motion (20 voted in favour, 36 voting against, 1 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on the original motion (44 voted in favour, 0 voting against, 8 abstaining from voting) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

## 13. Reports to Council

### (a) Review of Constitution - Report of the Committee Review Group

A vote was taken on recommendation 1 of the motion (47 voted in favour, 7 voting against, 1 abstaining from voting) and recommendation 1 of the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

1. That the Council notes the stage 2 report of the Committee Review Group at **Appendix 1** and endorses the recommendations in their report.

A vote was taken on recommendations 2 and 3 of the motion (36 voted in favour, 21 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and recommendations 2 and 3 of the motion were **CARRIED** as follows:

2. That from 1 January 2017, the Council establishes the following Scrutiny Committees:
  - (a) Children and Education Scrutiny Committee
  - (b) Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee
  - (c) Health Scrutiny Committee
  - (d) Growth, Environment & Resources Scrutiny Committee
3. Subject to 2 above, that Council approves the following changes to the Constitution to take effect from 1 January 2017:
  - (a) Overview and Scrutiny Article 7 (Part 2:Section 7) – **Appendix 2**
  - (b) Overview and Scrutiny Functions (Part 3:Section 4) – **Appendix 3**



A vote was taken on recommendations 3, 4, and 5 of the motion (unanimous) and recommendations 3, 4, and 5 of the motion were **CARRIED** as follows:

4. That Council approves the changes to the Budget & Policy Framework Procedure Rules (Part 4: Section 6 of the Constitution) to take immediate effect - **Appendix 4**.
5. That the terms of reference of the Member Officer Working Group be approved for implementation from 1 January 2017 - **Appendix 1 (Annex 3)**.
6. That from 1 January 2017 Audit Committee's terms of reference be amended as follows:

To maintain an overview of the Council's constitution with the exception of those matters under the remit of the Executive or a regulatory committee.

A vote was taken on recommendation 7 of the motion (41 voted in favour, 7 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and recommendation 7 of the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

7. That the Scrutiny Procedure rules should be reviewed to incorporate the recommendations of the Committee Review Group and reported to the next meeting of Council.

#### **(b) Political Balance, Allocation of Seats on Scrutiny Committees and Appointments**

A vote was taken on recommendation 1 of the motion (unanimous) and recommendation 1 of the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

1. The Council agrees the number of seats on the newly established scrutiny committees;

An amendment was received from the Liberal Democrat Group on recommendation 2 of the motion. A vote was taken on the amendment to recommendation 2 of the motion (19 voted in favour, 38 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the amendment to recommendation to of the motion was **DEFEATED**.

An amendment was received from the Liberal Group on recommendation 2 of the motion. A vote was taken on the amendment to recommendation 2 of the motion (38 voted in favour, 19 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the amendment to recommendation to of the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

2. The Council agrees the allocation of seats on the scrutiny committees in accordance with the political balance arrangements (**Amendment 13(b) Liberal Group**);

A vote was taken on recommendations 3 to 6 of the motion (unanimous) and recommendations 3 to 6 of the motion were **CARRIED** as follows:

3. That Council agrees the appointments to those committees, and the Chair and Vice-Chair of those committees. (**Appendix 2**);
4. The non-elected membership of the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee, as described at paragraph 4.3 is confirmed;

5. Authorise the Monitoring Officer as Proper Officer to carry out the wishes of the Leaders of the Political Groups in allocating members to these committees, and appoints those Members with effect from the date at which the Proper Officer is advised of the names of such Members; and
6. That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any necessary consequential changes to the Constitution.

**(c) Review of Peterborough City Council's Members' Allowances Scheme - Report of the Independent Members' Allowances Panel**

An amendment was received from the Liberal Group. A vote was taken on the amendment (16 voted in favour, 31 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken the original motion (31 voted in favour, 19 voting against, 0 abstaining from voting) and the original motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

1. Consider the report and recommendations of the Independent Members' Allowances Panel, as set out in **Appendix 1** and summarised in paragraph 3 below; and
2. Decide whether to adopt the recommendations of the panel in relation to the Member Allowance Scheme for 2017/2018.

**(d) The 2018 Parliamentary Constituency Boundary Review Working Group**

A vote was taken the motion as amended (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

That the Council:

1. Agrees the formation and terms of reference as amended of a 2018 Parliamentary Constituency Boundary Review Cross Party Working Group; and
2. Agrees that the draft response of the Working Group should be referred back to Council in December for approval.

**(e) Notification of Changes to the Executive Delegations**

A vote was taken the motion (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

That Council notes the changes made by the Leader to the Executive Delegations.

**(f) Variation to Standing Orders**

A vote was taken the motion (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

That Council agree:

1. To retain the Mayor's verbal announcements, but to remove the Mayor's announcements report from future agendas;
2. To suspend Standing Order 29.2 so that a decision to amend standing orders can be made at this meeting; and

3. To amend the Council's Standing Orders to remove the announcements from the Head of
4. Paid Service (the Chief Executive) (Part 4, Section 1 of the Council's Constitution).

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 11:35pm

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories and questions 1 – 9 inclusive were answered by Members at the meeting.

<b><u>COUNCIL BUSINESS</u></b>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b><u>Questions on notice to:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The Mayor</li> <li>ii) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet</li> <li>iii) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee</li> </ul>
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Residents living in Malvern Road Gunthorpe, tell me they have recently noticed an increase in the amount of traffic travelling down their road, much of which is speeding. Given there are a number of elderly residents and children who live along this stretch of road, the fact that there are shops and amenities on the Hallfields Road junction, that is to quote one resident, “is totally unacceptable.” I wonder if the relevant Cabinet Member could therefore please inform me as to when this road last had a speed assessment undertaken, whether there are any plans in the proverbial pipeline to introduce road safety measures, and what solutions they can suggest to help address this important issue?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Fower for your question. Road safety is extremely important to the Council so I am glad you have brought this issue to my attention. Officers have recently analysed 3 months of speed data along Malvern Road and have informed me that the average speed is under 30mph. We also analyse accidents throughout the city and investigate areas that have a cluster of accidents to see if speed or the construction of the road was a factor at all and what solutions could be implemented. Malvern Road does not feature on the current accident cluster list and nor have the police highlighted it as an issue to the Council.</p> <p>We can only put in speed reduction measures where there is a need to do so and we need to have a consistent approach across the whole of Peterborough. As such there are currently no plans for speed reduction measures on this road.</p> <p>However, I will ask officers to go out to investigate whether some form of pedestrian crossing is required in the area. As I am sure you can appreciate we get a lot of requests for new crossing, crossings so the Council uses an assessment process, which is in line with national best practice, to score each request. If this request scores highly enough to warrant a crossing then it will be programmed into a future capital works programme. I will ask an officer to contact you directly once the assessment has been undertaken. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</b></p>

	<p>It was just to say thank you very much for that response and just that in future would it be possible if local ward Councillors are notified if any particular assessments are taking place in their Ward and if I could simple ask as well if the data that has been secured to date could be shared with the Ward Councillors that would be appreciated Mr Mayor, thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Yes I'll take care of those requests thank you.</p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Allen</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>In the light of potential harm caused by idling diesel engines, could I ask that we as a Local Authority engage with Taxi Companies, Taxi Drivers, and their representative bodies to establish a code of practice on the issue?</p> <p>It should be noted the Road Traffic (Vehicles and Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002, makes it an offence to idle engines unnecessarily when stationary. This applies equally to busses, taxis and private cars.</p> <p>Exhaust emissions contain a range of air pollutants such as carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter, all of course detrimental to the health of those nearby.</p> <p>An idling engine can produce <i>up to</i> twice as many exhaust emissions as an engine in motion; however the simple exercise of turning off an engine and restarting it again after a short time causes less pollution AND uses less fuel, thus offering a cost saving for drivers and operators.</p> <p>With this common sense option in mind can I urge an initial approach of voluntary engagement; education and persuasion, but backed up with enforcement if necessary to ensure full co-operation of the drivers to curtail the practice?</p> <p>Certainly when walking along Broadway opposite our own Council offices and outside the O'Neil's pub one needs to make a quick dash with covered mouth and nose or be subjected to a lung full of toxic air from the nearby idling taxis.</p> <p>Whist recognising we can all do our bit by avoiding idling when waiting in car parks, petrol stations and when setting down or waiting for children outside the school gates I believe it is the cooperation of the taxi drivers which will really set an example and help make a real difference.</p> <p>Several Local Authorities have now adopted powers of control with this issue and can I urge Peterborough City Council to get on board with a similarly robust approach?</p> <p>As an authority do we not owe it to the health of all residents, and of course particularly pedestrians and children who are passing by the ranks in the City Centre to work towards a Greener Peterborough with this issue.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. In response to Councillor Allen thank you for your question. The Road Traffic (Vehicles and Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002 provide sanctions primarily aimed at dealing with</p>

	<p>vehicle emissions in localities where it has been necessary to declare an air quality management area, due to an exceedance of an air quality standard. I am pleased to advise that it has not been necessary to introduce one in Peterborough to help regulate vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the council have undertaken a number of measures to reduce air pollution from taxi vehicles. All vehicles are required to meet the relevant emission standards, and are regularly tested at the council's designated test centre.</p> <p>Keen to promote greener vehicles, the council's licensing committee adopted changes to the vehicle licencing conditions to enable this. There are as a result licenced electric private hire vehicles in the city. The council has also been proactive in bidding for government funding to incentivise and promote the use of greener vehicles. The hackney carriage federation in the city are keen to see electrical, electric vehicles entering the fleet, and once the price point is right this is likely to happen.</p> <p>Only hackney carriages are able to use a rank, and due to the nature of the ranks, vehicles are frequently moving. It is inevitable however that there will be a degree of idling, though it is a reasonable to expect that engines are switched off if a vehicle is likely to remain in situ for more than a short period of time.</p> <p>I have had a discussion with relevant officers and been assured that we will be engaging with the established Hackney Carriage Federation, as well as private operators with a view to getting a voluntary agreement on this issue. I have been advised that establishing a formal code of practice would have no impact, though, enforcement would be difficult, but the matter can and will be taken forward by education. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I am somewhat reassured by what has just been said but can I ask if we could consider as a council adopting the policy that many other councils are taking the course off is to stop purchasing or leasing diesel engine vehicles in an attempt to cut down on pollution that the vehicles do emit.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Yes thank you. We will look into that possibility yes. Thank you.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>How much is the total amount of housing benefit paid each year to private landlords who are also Peterborough City Councillors, and where known their spouses and partners.</p> <p>Do you believe that there is a public perception that there is a conflict of interest with a number of City Councillors also being private landlords when the Council has a duty to provide housing for homeless people in Peterborough, investigate environmental conditions in private rented dwellings, investigate and prosecute landlords under the provisions of the Protection From Eviction and Harassment Act and is the responsible authority for paying housing benefit.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p>

	<p>Yes thank you Mr Mayor. I didn't get much exercise today I'm making up for it now thank you.</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillor Murphy for his question, which however is rather ambiguous. So I have chosen, therefore to re-phrase the first part of his question to reflect the two possible interpretations.</p> <p>The first of these is: How much housing benefit is paid direct to councillors who are private landlords because they fall within the income threshold level and their income is therefore supplemented by housing benefit.</p> <p><u>The Response to this is:</u> That the housing benefit records has confirmed that no housing benefit was paid to Councillors as a result of a personnel claim during 2015-16.</p> <p><u>Interpretation Two:</u> How much is paid to them as a result of their tenants' rights to housing benefit and this comes in the form of direct payments from the Council to cover their tenants' rent?</p> <p><u>The Response to this is:</u> A review of housing benefit payments made direct to landlords has identified £7,248.06 was paid to current Councillors during 2015/16. The payments search was undertaken against the Councillors name and would not therefore include payments made to partners or companies with different names.</p> <p>Moving onto the second part of Cllr Murphy's Question regarding public perception, I can assure all members that the integrity, professionalism and training of our officers ensures that they treat everybody in the same manner, regardless of whether or not they are a city councillor. If a councillor is found to be in breach of housing legislation or guidance, they will be dealt with by our officers in exactly the same way as a member of the public. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Councillor Walsh for your answer and your interpretations. So you've decided not to give us the figure for housing benefit rent allowances paid to tenants whose landlords are Councillors which runs into tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds. Will you undertake to do so?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Excuse me Councillor Murphy, I have tried very hard to interpret your question I've done it two ways. I can't think of a third way. I stick with my answer. If you wish to challenge it you then may do so through the correct procedure.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sylvester</b></p> <p>To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>A concerned resident recently contacted me following an item on the Anglia News about changing to 4 weekly bin collections. Please can the Cabinet Member concerned confirm to the Council whether this is likely to happen in Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Elsey responded with:</b></p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I'd like to thank Councillor Sylvester for her question. The article and the news item in which she refers to is generic and local authorities in general who are looking at four weekly collections of refuse in respect to the stringent cuts we all have to make to services but I can confirm that at this moment in time this authority is not considering any plans to revert to four weekly collections of any refuse. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Sylvester asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Yes do, thank you for that answer. Would you agree that as of now many bins are full to overflowing and bags of rubbish are fly tipped along with unwanted household items leading to residential areas becoming quite an eyesore in some places and that any tinkering with collection times should be with regard to improving bin collection rather than reducing this essential service.</p> <p><b>Councillor Elsey responded with:</b></p> <p>Mr Mayor I believe I answered the question that was put forward. That had nothing to do with the original question. I made it quite clear at this moment in time we are not as Councillor Sylvester put it tinkering with the services in order to go to four weekly collections. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member, please explain to me the rationale and reasoning around the decision to temporarily house homeless people at St Michaels Gate, which has caused the existing residents to be turfed out of their homes?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Yes I would like to respond to Councillor Fower.</p> <p>By now all Councillors will have received a letter from me, laying out in detail our position and the consequences of either accepting or rejecting the offer to take up the leases on properties, as offered to us by Stef &amp; Philips. I believe it would not be good use of Council time to repeat all of this information now.</p> <p>It has been a difficult decision to make. We simply chose the best option available.</p> <p>The property in question, St. Michael's Gate, is under the control of Stef &amp; Philips. It is they who make the decision with regard to who may hold the leases on them. It is they who sought, as is their legal right to do so, vacant possession from prior and current residents. And I challenge the word evictions but that's for another day.</p> <p>The position we are in requires us to house a significant number of homeless people. We are doing this at huge cost. An offer made to us by Stef &amp; Philips to lease the accommodation at St. Michael's Gate. This was accepted on the grounds that it would hugely reduce these costs and be in the interests of our taxpayers, as well as the homeless families currently as you all know in bed and breakfast accommodation.</p> <p>There is no denying that families have been obliged to leave their homes. It was, however, not of our doing. They would have been instructed by Stef &amp; Philips to leave anyway.</p>



	<p>The consequences of not accepting the offer made to us by Stef &amp; Philips would mean the Council would be responsible for our present homeless residents, plus any families in need of our services who have vacated St. Michael's Gate, plus the new residents who would be moving into the houses from another authority. And this would be on a rolling basis. Now what do I mean by that? Many of the families that arrive in the city to use the temporary accommodation may then stay in the city longer term, whilst more residents from other council areas arrive to use the homes they have vacated. This would provide the opportunity for other councils to send their homeless residents to Peterborough in a continuous never-ending stream.</p> <p>The question that we must ask ourselves is: Is St Michael's Gate going to be under our control, or the control of another Council? If we choose the latter, then make no mistake - we have opened our city doors to the Trojan Horse. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fower asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know and the Chamber whether or not Stef and Philips bought the properties and then approached the city council or whether there was some sort of scenario where the city council prompted Stef and Philips to undertake what we consider to be quite unhealthy unfair exercise because I think it's important that we as a city or those people that are interested in local politics grasp exactly what's happened, why it happened because we obviously think it's an atrocious scenario we think its wholly wrong, we're not the only ones, and we're happy as Liberal Democrats to make sure these types of issues are addressed in this Council Chamber because we are talking about people's lives which is very very serious and this whole thing about the Trojan horse thing I mean it's classic scaremongering. It's a real shame because we need to be taking this type of thing seriously rather than dealing like children in a playground and treating it like a political football. You know. I think the people in St Michael's Gate deserve that. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>I think the supplementary was a little bit on the long winded side. I think the question goes back to how did this start? It started by Stef and Philips acquiring the properties. Whether or not we chose to take them they would have acquired the properties. They offered those properties to us as temporary accommodation for the homeless families we have in Peterborough. They made it quite clear and we have seen this happen to other authorities that if we did not accept that if we did not accept there were plenty of other authorities who would be willing to take it. No I'm not scaremongering. It would have been a Trojan horse. We would have in our city in some years' time many families from another authority who had come through this vehicle. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
6.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member provide an explanation as to why the Manor Drive development does not yet have any amenity provisions in place? For example, GP facilities or a bus service.</p> <p>Although residents have welcomed the introduction of bus shelters, they are now waiting for a bus service to make use of these shelters. At the current time, residents are still required to walk hundreds of metres to use the number 2 route.</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Hiller responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Davidson for the question. Having done a little research on this I have to tell you Councillor Davidson that the Manor Drive Scheme has never actually included a proposal for a GP facility. And I also have to inform you that a bus service can't essentially happen here until there is a provision for the buses to turn around. Which there isn't at the moment so any bus journey at this point in time Mr Mayor would be fairly brief it would probably a scenic ride and I suspect a very short one. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Davidson asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hiller for that response though I have to say I am very disappointed. And I do listen to all of your information provided and I do actually try to take it on board. However this does again highlight the situation we have got going on at Manor Grove. The situation there is I think the development started in 2006 and here we are in 2016 and we still haven't made any progress. Now I appreciate what you are saying about the developers but it still does highlight the question which is why is there no provisions such as GPs, a school, a playground, amenities and also on the up note of that I'd like to thank you for providing this administration, providing the bus shelters, however there is no bus service in use and again the bus shelters are there and the buses have not got no space in which to turn round in order for the community over there to access to either get on or get off. So can I please ask you as an officer can you please look into this matter further for me and come back with some action with regard to this matter? Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Davidson for the supplementary. I have to correct her, I'm not an officer. But I will endeavour to answer the supplementary. I understand our officers have been in discussion with a bus operator regarding the diversion of an existing service and there are section 106 funds available to provide support for a service. However until such time as the development has progressed to the stage when the planned round about is built a bus service I said before a bus service can't be provided as the buses won't have a place to turn around. Once there is certainty about the completion date of the roundabout and the costs have been determined officers will be in a position to progress it. In addition Mr Mayor Councillor Davidson will I hope be aware that primary and secondary schools are planned for the site providing valuable community and recreational facilities in the future. Councillor Davidson will I'm sure also be aware that there is an equipped play area to complement the existing open areas of space and Mr Mayor if she is as in touch with the Manor Drive residents as she reports to be she'll be aware that further play areas were firmly rejected by those very same residents so unfortunately were not carried forward. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>I understand that 600 new applications for school places in the city were received during the summer school holiday period this year.</p>

At the beginning of the new term a large number of children were not in school as parents had not been advised which school their children would be attending.

Can you please advice of the steps being taken to ensure this situation, which causes a lot of stress to both parents and children, will not happen again in September 2017?

**Councillor Holdich responded with:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I rise to respond to the question from Councillor Bella Saltmarsh and thank her for the question.

This response relates to the process of In Year applications to schools. It is a fortnightly process whereby in week 1 we remove the details of children who have left schools, as notified by each school. In week 2 we then process the allocations to allocate school places. This cycle continues throughout the year during term time.

The last allocation notifying parents of their children's' school took place in September prior to the school holidays were run on 18 July. Thereafter and throughout the summer holidays we received applications for an In Year school places. Between 18 July and Friday 10 September we received 600 applications for an In Year school places. Please note that 52% of these applications were for children from outside this country.

Schools returned in May in September Monday September 5<sup>th</sup> and that week we received notification of 250 children who were not returning to school and were therefore were "school leavers". These "leavers" were removed from the system and w/c 12 September and then the allocation of the 600 requested took place on 19 September.

It is vital that "leavers" are moved from the system first so that we have the best position possible to allocate children to schools and meet as many of the preferences as possible and enable children to be allocated to their local school also to avoid having to direct children to schools more than 3 miles away from their home and incurring transport costs. There are also various processes associated with the allocation that requires school input. The schools are not there during the holidays (e.g. those schools who are their own admission authority and have to rank the applications)

Hence a parent who applies for a place for their child at the end of July does have to wait until the process has taken place. This does mean that those children who applied for a school places during the summer holidays will not be in in the first 2 weeks of September.

This process would be adopted by all authorities. Our situation is accentuated however by the sheer volume of applications we are receive. In addition to the 600 applications we received over the summer holiday in the subsequent 2 weeks we received a further 250 allocations of which 42% were new to this country.

**Councillor Saltmarsh asked the following supplementary question:**

Thank you Councillor Holdich for your extremely comprehensive I'm sure you would agree that noting our poor stats results for primary schools this is in a fairly important issue because a settled start at a school at the correct time would surely help improve the performance of some of the children. Thank you.

**Councillor Holdich responded with:**

	<p>I don't think that was a question but I think I'll get to the gist of the answer. The point is this. Until the schools come back from their Summer Holidays we don't know how many children are in the schools because people disappear, move away from the city or what for whatever reason. Therefore we can't allocate the place and the schools have seven days to find out from the people who are not in school whether they are actually coming back so you can't allocate a place for at least seven days.</p>
8.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>What percentage of homeless families placed in temporary accommodation by Peterborough City Council have been waiting for more than two weeks for section 184 homeless decisions.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Murphy once again. There is no requirement to reach a decision on a homelessness declaration within two weeks of a homelessness presentation.</p> <p>The Homelessness Code of Guidance for local authorities (2006) states:</p> <p><i>Wherever possible, it is recommended that housing authorities aim to complete their inquiries and notify the applicant of their decision within 33 working days of accepting a duty to make inquiries under section.184.</i></p> <p>Homelessness cases can often be complex and require extensive investigation. Additionally, officers are not always able to make decisions swiftly as there are occasions where applicants do not make contact after initially presenting to the council.</p> <p>The average waiting time for applicants is currently 27.2 working days. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked the following supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you very much for your answer. So no decisions are made within two weeks. Isn't that remarkable bearing in mind most people now who are homeless are homeless because they have been evicted. So they have been served with a notice seeking possession we've insisted they've gone to court. I've asked for those that are in temporary accommodation so they've not gone away. You said some have gone away. Is the reasons for this because we are not very good or we haven't got enough staff or what?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded with:</b></p> <p>Thank you for your supplementary question. No you've got it wrong and you didn't understand what I said. I did not say that none had been made within two weeks I said that there is no requirement to make it within two weeks. If you want that exact figure of within two weeks I will get it to you Councillor Murphy. Thank you.</p>
9.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Johnson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p>

	<p>Whilst we are aware of the problem of homeless people staying in the Travel Lodge does the Cabinet member think it is morally right for the City Council to be negotiating with a developer who is evicting tenants from their homes in St Michaels Gate and thereby potentially making more families homeless?</p> <p>Why did Council officers not check the different type of tenancies granted to the residents as some have security of tenure beyond Christmas?</p> <p>Surely the Cabinet Member would agree that tenants in St Michaels Gate should be allowed to conduct their tenancies, which some have held without problems for a number of years, without this harassment and worry about their future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh may have responded with:</b></p> <p>I believe that I have already answered some of the concerns raised in Cllr Johnson's question in my response to Cllr Fower.</p> <p>On the matter of morals, I will simply say that we, as a Council, were faced with a difficult decision. We chose the option that would result in the best value for our residents and taxpayers. I have already given a detailed explanation of this.</p> <p>Our officers have been in constant touch with Stef &amp; Philips on the issue of tenure with respect to residents of St. Michael's Gate. I can confirm that we will ensure that all residents are treated properly and in accordance with the law.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Ferris</b></p> <p>To Councillor Eley, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>What is the annual cost of street cleansing in the city centre, and how much would it cost to deploy a dedicated team to the Lincoln Road 'corridor' (to include the adjacent Millfield and Gladstone areas) for a 12month period?</p> <p><b>Councillor Eley may have responded with:</b></p> <p>The annual cost of street cleansing in the city centre is £251,000. This figure includes associated costs such as chewing gum removal, hot washing and graffiti removal. The city centre is cleansed by a dedicated team 7 days a week utilising gluttons and mechanical sweepers.</p> <p>There are various options and associated costs to deploy a team in the Lincoln Road corridor and these are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £93,000 driver and 2 operatives with a caged vehicle;</li> <li>• £86,000 mechanical sweeper, driver and supporting operative; and</li> <li>• £29,000 1 barrow sweeper / lengthsman.</li> </ul>
11.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please confirm if, "powers available to Prevention and Enforcement Service officers," includes enforcing against car or van owners for parking on grass verges?</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Walsh may have responded with:</b></p> <p>The Home Office prescribe the powers that can be accredited to non-police personnel. At present this list does not include powers to deal with verge parking. However, Police Constables within the Prevention and Enforcement Service are able to utilise other legislation where the correct circumstances are met (for example, where vehicles are parked on the pavement or are causing an unnecessary obstruction).</p> <p>As I am aware of the impact this issue has on communities, I have however asked officers to explore other options including new byelaws to specifically deal with this issue. This work is being taken forward within the Prevention and Enforcement Service and will be overseen by the officer working group that has been established following a discussion at Full Council earlier this year.</p>
12.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Amjad Iqbal</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>What would be the costs per annum associated with making concessionary fares available to everyone in Peterborough over the age of 65? Would there be any tangible financial benefits in assisting with sustainable transportation plans, which are promoting inclusion through helping older people participate in more activities?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh may have responded with:</b></p> <p>Concessionary fares are part of the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme which is a national scheme by the Department for Transport. Currently all residents in Peterborough are entitled to a concessionary bus pass if they were born before 6 May 1953. This means any resident who is approximately 63 and a half years old is already entitled to a pass.</p> <p>The scheme allows free travel throughout England. Residents who have attained the state pension age for women, which is gradually being increased from 60 to 65, as well as eligible disabled residents, are entitled to free off-peak bus travel on weekdays and all day at weekends and Bank Holidays. Furthermore, in 2010 Government announced that the pensionable age for both men and women will now rise to 66 by 2020. The age of eligibility for concessionary travel will increase in line with these and any other future changes to the pensionable age for women.</p> <p>Local authorities can offer additional benefits which are not funded by the Department for Transport and here in Peterborough we allow blind and partially sight holders to travel before 09.30 on weekdays as well as allowing free travel on the two council funded dial-a-ride services.</p>
13.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital</p> <p>I welcome the new improved bus services being implemented from 3 October and in particular the restoration after many years of an evening bus service to the Fengate area including the Showcase Cinema and the Peterborough Greyhound Stadium.</p> <p>Would the relevant Cabinet Member agree with me that it is vital that these new services are adequately publicised to help encourage people to use them? Could he outline what the Council and Stagecoach are doing to publicise the new services?</p>

**Councillor Walsh may have responded with:**

The Council has recently invested £100k per annum on improving the fully subsidised routes 20, 21 + 22. As a result of these changes, the services have been renumbered 60,61,62 + 63. This is due to a split of the service 21. The investment has seen some timetable changes to enable the new services to work closely with the existing bus network in allowing the residents of Peterborough to access employment and social activities, particularly in the Fengate area.

To promote these new services we have made information available via our social media streams (twitter and facebook) as well as running a press release via the Peterborough Telegraph. Stagecoach also publicised the changes via their website.

The Travelchoice team contacted businesses in the Fengate area to make them aware of enhancements to the bus service, in particular to make their staff aware. We contacted the Greyhound stadium and Showcase cinema who in turn are going to update their websites and also encourage staff to use the new bus services...

Information was made available at the Travelchoice Centre at Queensgate Bus Station alongside posters detailing the changes to the services at the Bays affected by the changes.

Members were also made aware of the forthcoming improvements to the bus services via our member services team.

This page is intentionally left blank