PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2017 COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR JOHN FOX

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Fower, JR Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Murphy, Nadeem, G Nawaz, S Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh, and Whitby

34. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Judy Fox and Councillor Martin.

35. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

36. Minutes of the Meeting held on:

(a) 20 June 2017 – Extraordinary Meeting
The minutes of the Mayor Making meeting held on 20 June 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Goodwin on the list of attendees.

(b) 19 July 2017
The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 19 July 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(c) 26 July 2017 – Reconvened Meeting
The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 26 July 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

37. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor further announced that in 2016, the Council had launched its 2016-2017 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 Team of the Year and the Employee of the Year awards, this being the Trading Standards Team and Karen Boyle respectively. The Trading Standards Team had been chosen to receive the Team of the Year award for providing a centre of excellence for business advice locally, regionally, and nationally.

Karen Boyle had been chosen to receive the Employee of the Year award for her role in leading the 'Going Google' project.

38. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

39. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

Questions from members of the public were raised in respect of the following:

1. The Introduction of Public Space Protection Orders and Fixed Penalty Notices

This question and its response are attached in **APPENDIX A** to these minutes.

40. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

Councillor Lane presented a petition signed by 17 signatories for Roland Court to request that a pedestrian crossing be installed on Goodwin Walk near Rowland Court.

(c) Petition for Debate – 'Lack of Public Engagement and Consultation on LTP4'

A petition had been received by the Council containing over 500 signatures from people who lived, worked, or studied in the city. This had triggered the right to a debate at the meeting of the Full Council in accordance with the Petitions Scheme.

The petition, 'Lack of Public Engagement and Consultation on LTP4,' called on the Council to:

1. Halt plans for pedestrian crossings at Junction 18 / Rhubarb Bridge. Relook at, and be open about, the negative impact of current proposals. Put plans on hold while you seek funding for a replacement pedestrian and cycle bridge.

2. Re-run public engagement and consultation around the Local Transport Plan 4. We don't feel adequate public consultation took place prior to the adoption of this plan. As part of this, provide detailed, costed options for Junction 18 / Rhubarb Bridge and consult people on the alternatives.

3. Debate both these things at a Full Council meeting as soon as possible. Hold a public meeting in 2017 on these issues for the public to share their thoughts with officers and councillors.

Nyree Ambarchian, the lead petitioner, address the Council. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Ms Ambarchian thanked Councillors and officers for their assistance.
- More than 2,000 people use the bridge every day. More than 6,000 people signed a further petition. Many people were affected and were interested.
- The Council's original proposal had been met with public outcry and it was understood that the bridge would now be maintained for 5 to 10 years while looking for a replacement and also working to widen the roads.
- It was not understood why at grade crossing were still being considered, as crossing four lanes of traffic would be both challenging and intimidating.
- Segregating traffic was important and at grade crossing were thought to go against this principle.
- Ms Ambarchian was aware that taking such decisions was difficult, particularly when budgets were tight.
- It was advised that the Combined Authority Mayor, had met with Councillors and was looking to provide £5million towards the Rhubarb Bridge.
- It was considered that Cabinet needed to pause their decision. The at grade crossing should not be implemented, and a commitment should be made to a long term bridge.
- It was suggested that a cross party working group be set up, including relevant stakeholders, to look at the various options available.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and draw the Chamber's attention to the additional information, including a proposed motion to refer the petition to Cabinet to consider all the comments raised by Council and the public.

Members debated the petition and in summary raised points including:

- There had been repeated requests for a full consultation in relation to the plans for Rhubarb Bridge.
- A number of Members were disappointed that a decision had seemed to be made several hours before the consultation was opened.
- Concern was expressed the pedestrians and cyclist were not being given priority, as should be the case.
- Suggestion was made that the bridge be replaced with a single bridge, rather than the two that were currently there.
- Comment was made that the consultation with the public superficial.
- It was acknowledged that the bridge formed part of a key route into the city.
- It was considered unintuitive for the Council to be looking to install at grade crossing when most other authorities were intending to remove these where possible.
- A Member had spoken to the Combined Authority Mayor and believed that

funding may be available.

- It was noted that the Local Transport Plan had been reviewed by Scrutiny and the Cross Party Budget Working Group, where the junction was explicitly mentioned.
- Several Members commented that they had not raised issue at Scrutiny under the impression that a separate consultation would be taking place.
- Concern was expressed that the installation of at grade crossing would result in an increase in accidents. Further suggestion was made that the space provided to pedestrians at the crossing was insufficient.
- It was stated that Ward Councillors for all the impacted wards should be updated on progress.
- Comment was made that the suggested proposal from Councillor Hiller required further options for Cabinet to consider.
- It was noted that the cost of proposals was an important factor and the advice provided to Cabinet had originated from experts in the field.
- A cross party working group was believed to be a key requirement by a number of Members and would assist in ensuring transparency for the public, particularly if stakeholders were also included in the working group.

Councillor Hiller moved a recommendation to refer the petition to Cabinet with a recommendation to set up a cross party working group. This group would examine fully costed options and that would consider the comments made this evening and would ensure that priority was given in line with the transport user hierarchy in the Local Transport Plan.

Councillor Holdich seconded the recommendation.

A recorded vote was taken:

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, King, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Sharp, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, and Whitby

Councillors Against: Ali, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Davidson, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Fower, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Mahabadi, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, and Sylvester Councillors Abstaining: Ash, and John Fox

A vote was taken (34 voted in favour, 22 voted against, 2 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the petition and referred it for further consideration to the Cabinet with a recommendation that they set up a cross party working group to examine fully costed options and that would consider the comments made this evening by the petitioner and Members of this Council, the purpose of that would be to ensure that priority was given to pedestrians and cyclists in line with the transport user hierarchy in the Local Transport Plan.

41. 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

The Legal Officer advised that the order in which questions were asked was determined by ballot.

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

1. The Biodiversity Strategy
2. Speeding Along Gunthorpe Road
3. The Council's Homelessness Duty
4. Crime in Werrington
5. Residents' Parking and Parking Tickets
6. The A605 Whittlesey Road/Pondersbridge Junction
7. School Support Staff
8. Community Groups and Community Centres
9. Peterborough Allotment Representatives Consortium
10. Fletton Quays Hotel Loan and the Combined Authority

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

(d) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives

The Legal Officer advised that the order in which questions were asked was determined by ballot.

Questions (d) to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Pedestrian and Cycle Routes
2. Peterborough Enterprise Partnership
3. Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

42. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Children and Education Scrutiny Committee Recommendation – Corporate Parenting Committee 6 Monthly Report

The Children and Education Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting of 3 July 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to request that Corporate Parenting Committee reports were presented to Scrutiny on an annual basis going forward, and that the Committee's terms of reference be amended to reflect this change.

Councillor Goodwin introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor

Goodwin advised that the Children and Education Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the Corporate Parenting Committee report back to Scrutiny on an annual basis rather than a six monthly basis. Council agreement was requested to amend the Corporate Parenting Committee's terms of reference to reflect this.

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

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed to amend the Corporate Parenting Committee Terms of Reference so that Corporate Parenting Committee reports are presented to Scrutiny on an annual basis going forward as with other Committees.

(b) Executive Recommendation – Financing Approval for Fletton Quays Hotel

Cabinet, at its meeting of 25 September 2017, received a report, the purpose of which was to consider and approve a lending facility of £15m for 24 months for the development of a hotel on the Fletton Quays site by Norlin Hotels Holdings Limited.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Seaton advised that the Cabinet had agreed to fund the construction of a hotel at Fletton Quays. The report before Council purely sought to amend the Treasury Management Strategy. As no call-in had been submitted on the Cabinet decision, this would be implemented. The load will provide a significant return and would support the Council's budget demands. All risks were being considered and mitigated against, with due diligence being carried on out the loan. The loan was also to be secured against the value of the land. It was noted that a number of other authorities were working with private companies on similar ventures. The developers in question had a proven track record, as set out in the report, and had been involved in a number of other developments.

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

Members debated the recommendations and in summary the points raised included:

- Concern was raised that the Council was using the value of the land as security for the loan, when PIP owned the land that the Council had a 50% stake of.
- A query was raised as to whether this "such as" within the recommendation was appropriate, as this may lead to some uncertainty.
- It was suggested that insufficient consideration had been given to the potential risks of the scheme.
- The question was raised why the Council had chosen to invest £15 million into a hotel rather than, for example, affordable homes.
- Suggestion was made that funding needed to be available to redevelop the old city before expanding into new areas.
- It was noted that in the current economic climate the Council needed to operate more like a business, and invest money to generate funds, as long as due diligence is undertaken.
- It was believed that the high quality of the hotel proposed would encourage growth and create jobs as well as put to use land that had been previously vacant.

- It was advised that funding was being put into house building, however all schemes that would generate an income for the Council needed to be considered.
- Concern was raised that Norlin Hotels Holdings Limited was not an appropriate company for the Council to be investing in, as their accounts were not felt to be up to standard.

Councillor Fuller exercised his right to speak and explained that the decision lend had been taken and that this recommendation was purely in relation to Treasury Management Strategy.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing clarified that arrangements was to lend to generate income and to ensure the delivery of the development.

A vote was taken (34 voted in favour, 13 voted against, 6 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed amend the Treasury Management Strategy to include organisations such as Norlin Hotels Holdings Limited and its subsidiary Fletton Quays Hotel Limited as organisations to which the Council is authorised to make secured loans.

43. 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 reconvened Extraordinary Cabinet meeting held on 26 July 2017.
2. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 25 September 2017.
3. Call-in by Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 29 August 2017.
4. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 17 July 2017 to 3 October 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Passenger Transport Services

Councillor Ferris asked how many passenger transport suppliers used hybrid or electric vehicles.

Councillor Ayres advised that she would find out.

Councillor Shaheed asked whether firms that provided transport to Peterborough residents, but were not based within Peterborough, were subject to the same regulations.

Councillor Holdich advised that they weren't and this was not fair to suppliers. The matter would be discussed by Cabinet to request that the Government look into the matter.

Additional Outside Organisation – Local Government Information Unit

Councillor Fower asked how often the Local Government Information Unit met each year and whether Councillor Holdich was remunerated for his role as representative.

Councillor Holdich moved a motion that Councillor Fower no longer be heard.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the motion.

A vote was taken on the motion (29 voted in favour, 25 voting against, 0 abstained from voting) and the motion was **CARRIED**.

Approval for Westgate Highway Works

Councillor Sylvester asked where the Westgate Highway works started and where they finished and raised concern about the standard of the pavement in the area.

Councillor Hiller advised that the work on Westgate Highway was part of an ongoing programme of works with a fluid schedule, so no specific answer could be provided at this point.

Councillor Whitby asked whether, in light of encroaching budget pressures, it would be sensible to defer the works until after all the building work had been completed in the surrounding area.

Councillor Holdich advised that the work was being undertaken from Midgate to Beales and would take into account the surrounding pavement.

To Approve CCTV Upgrade and 5 Year Maintenance Contract

Councillor Ferris asked whether CCTV would be rolled out to residential areas where anti-social behaviour and crime were widespread.

Councillor Walsh advised that CCTV covered areas of greatest need. If Members or the public had information on where CCTV was required, this should be reported to the Prevention and Enforcement Team.

Child and Adolescent Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing Service

Councillor Murphy asked whether the Council was lobbying for funding from the appropriate agencies.

Councillor Smith advised that the decision was a joint decision of Peterborough City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group, who all had a statutory responsibility to provide the services. The decision was about collaboration.

Approval for Junction 18 (Rhubarb Bridge) Highway Works

Councillor Davidson asked whether this decision would be rescinded in light of the previously agreed petition response.

Councillor Hiller advised that the decision still stood. It may be, however, that no action would be taken.

Councillor Sandford asked for clarification on this response, as it had been previously agreed that Cabinet would consider setting up a working group.

Councillor Hiller advised that the decision was still valid and related to more than just the future of the bridge.

Thomas Deacon Academy – Award of Contract for Building Works

Councillor Ferris asked whether there was an upper limit on the growth of the Academy's footprint.

Councillor Ayres advised that the decision was limited and that the building was limited to 900 square metres. The building needed to be up to standard for those going into secondary education.

Councillor Jamil asked about plans in relation to the infrastructure of the school, specifically around the transport routes into the area, which were already experiencing bottlenecking.

Councillor Holdich advised that this was not relevant to the decision made. School places were required and there were no places to build new schools in the area.

44. Questions on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives Made Since the Last Meeting

The Mayor introduced the report which detailed Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 24 July 2017.
2. Decisions from the Board meeting held on 26 July 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Interview – Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure

Councillor Sandford asked what the Combined Authority representatives thought the prospect was of the Combined Authority using their powers in relation to bus franchising, particularly in relation to the problems around a monopoly of public transport services.

Councillor Murphy advised that he believed there was some possibility of this, similar to the action taken in Devon and Cornwall.

Councillor Over advised that he had some concerns about whether the portfolio holder fully understood the powers available to him.

Councillor Holdich advised that all portfolio holders were supported by officers when making decision about specific areas of expertise.

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

Councillor Jamil seconded the motion.

A vote was taken on the motion (20 voted in favour, 32 voting against, 1 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

Future Local Transport Plan

Councillor Sandford asked whether the Council would still have its own Local Transport Plan, or if this would be overridden by the Combined Authority plan.

Councillor Holdich advised that Peterborough and Cambridge would have their Local Transport Plans, then a new Plan would be launched by the Combined Authority, which Peterborough would have the chance to veto.

Housing Strategy

Councillor Whitby asked how the Housing Strategy had been affected by the Peterborough City Council Local Plan being deferred.

Councillor Holdich advised that there was nothing relevant in the Housing Strategy to the Local Plan. By the time the Local Plan was agreed, the funding on the Housing Strategy would be spent.

Investment Strategy and Fund

Councillor Davidson asked whether the figure of £25,000 was accurate.

Councillor Holdich confirmed that it was.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

45. Notices of Motion

1. Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz

In moving his motion Councillor Shaz Nawaz advised that those growing up in the United Kingdom had opportunities and education. They were permitted freedom of expression and freedom from discrimination. They were brought up in a society that valued fairness and justice. The people of Myanmar had none of these freedoms, with crimes against humanity taking place on a daily basis. Councillor Shaz Nawaz had meet with the local

MP to take matters further,t o provide financial and medical aid. Council was urged to support the motion to put pressure on the Government, amongst other things, allow human rights organisations access into Myanmar to provide relief.

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 (34 voted in favour, 21 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) and an amendment to Councillor Shaz Nawaz's motion was **CARRIED**.

A vote was taken (36 voted in favour, 6 voted against, 12 abstained from voting) and the motion as amended was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Many ~~A number of~~ people from Peterborough have expressed grave concern over the crisis in Myanmar Burma. With regard to the humanitarian disaster, persecution, suffering and displacement of the Rohingya people ~~in Myanmar, this council urges the UK government to~~ the United Kingdom has a proud history of being a leading example for reacting appropriately to such crisis and human rights violations around the globe. The residents of Peterborough are urging this to be continued and shown in this crisis. Indeed H.M. Government has already raised this matter at the united nations and we understand that either the Foreign Secretary or Minister in the Foreign Office will try to talk to the Burma Government and/or visit soon.

Both Peterborough's members of Parliament have written to the Foreign office and Shailesh Vara MP attended a packed meeting at Gladstone Park Community Centre on this subject recently. Therefore Peterborough City Council calls upon Council Leader to write a letter to the Prime Minister urging her to work with the international community to put pressure on the Burmese government to achieve the following:

1) Supply medical and financial aid to the victims of these appalling acts of violence.

2) Put pressure on the government of Burma ~~Myanmar~~, both directly and indirectly, through the UN, to ensure that violence against the Rohingya people comes to an end.

3) Stop giving aid to the Burma ~~Myanmar~~ Administration until its Government officially recognises the Rohingya people.

4) Allow International observers human rights organisations and media unhindered access to all areas in Rakhine Province.

5) Support the Bangladeshi government in their endeavours to support the Rohingya People.

6) Take the necessary steps to ensure that the Burmese government allows the safe return of the refugees back to their homes and accepts them as their citizens.

7) Rebuild their homes and infrastructure and provide enough medical facilities to enable the victims to overcome the trauma.

8) Bring the perpetrators to justice to ensure that this not happen again.

9) Furthermore, Peterborough calls upon all residents of the UK to support the call for the revocation of the Nobel Peace Prize that was awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi in 1991 on the grounds that she is no longer worthy of holding it.

2. Motion from Councillor Murphy

A vote was taken (27 voted in favour, 25 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and the motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Council notes the distress caused to animals and residents from the use of fireworks in an inconsiderate manner, and the dangers to individuals and the general public.

Council believes that fireworks should be used primarily at controlled events and that the further restriction of sale and use benefit public safety, community cohesion, reduce casualties and such a policy receives support from the Fire Service, animal welfare charities and the NHS.

Council resolves to call upon the government to introduce further legislation on this matter and do all we can locally to encourage people not to use fireworks themselves and take actions to educate and prosecute those using fireworks in an antisocial or dangerous manner. Council also requests a review by Government as to the types of fireworks available for general public sale to remove firework types that result in the most public disturbance due to noise.

3. Motion from Councillor Peach

A vote was taken (31 voted in favour, 10 voted against, 11 abstained from voting) and the motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Many citizens of Peterborough were extremely worried and horrified by the events happening in Burma against the residents of Rohingya state in Myanmar.

As we have seen horrific, graphic scenes of continuous violence on social and mainstream media and also confirmed reports by the United Nations, Human Rights organisations as well as many countries worldwide. There are reports of ethnic cleansing taking place by the Myanmar army and extremist Buddhists who are brutally killing the Rohingya people using severe acts of bloody violence by beheading, burning, chopping limbs and dishonouring women. Consequently, over 400,000 people have been displaced and the number is growing.

These people are taking refuge on the border of Myanmar and Bangladesh. The situation is chaotic, people are starving and children are severely affected. This is a serious humanitarian crisis which is beyond description.

The United Kingdom has a proud history of being a leading example for reacting

appropriately to such crisis and human rights violations around the globe. The residents of Peterborough are urging this to be continued and shown in this crisis. Indeed H.M. Government has already raised this matter at the united nations and we understand that either the Foreign Secretary or Minister in the Foreign Office will try to talk to the Burma Government and/or visit soon.

Both Peterborough's members of Parliament have written to the Foreign office and Shailesh Vara MP attended a packed meeting at Gladstone Park Community Centre on this subject recently.

Therefore Peterborough City Council calls upon Council Leader to write a letter to the Prime Minister urging her to work with the international community to put pressure on the Burmese government to achieve the following:

- Take necessary steps to stop the violence and genocide in Burma against the Rohingya people.
- Provide sufficient support and humanitarian aid to the refugees.
- Take the necessary steps to ensure that the Burmese government allows the safe return of the refugees back to their homes and accepts them as their citizens.
- Rebuild their homes and infrastructure and provide enough medical facilities to enable the victims to overcome the trauma.
- Bring the perpetrators to justice to ensure that this not happen again.
- Strip the Honorary title held by the Prime Minister Aung San Suu Kyi as she is clearly not worthy of this.

I urge members to support this to demonstrate that we are against any violence and violations of human rights.

4. Motion from Councillor Mahabadi

A vote was taken (15 voted in favour, 40 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

46. Reports to Council

(a) Report of the Returning Officer

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council received and noted the results of the Local Park Ward By-Election held on Thursday 17 August 2017 and the Local Eye, Thorny, and Newborough Ward By-Election held on Thursday 7 September 2017.

(b) Allocation of Seats to Political Groups Following By-Elections

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

1) Noted that there were 102 seats on committees, as agreed at Annual Council on 22 May 2017;

2) Agreed the allocation of seats on those committees subject to the political balance arrangements;

3) Confirmed the allocation of seats on those committees not subject to political balance arrangements remained unchanged.

(c) Creation of New Polling District in Stanground South Ward

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

1) create a new polling district named STS4 in the Stanground South ward; and

2) designate the new polling district STS4 as the polling place,

to take effect from the publication of the revised register of electors on 1 December 2017.

(d) Treasury Management Mid-Year Update

Following the vote (unanimous) it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1) Noted current performance against the Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) set in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS);

2) Approved the use of Loans as a form of Investment to organisations delivering services for the Council.

The Mayor
7.00pm – 11:09pm

APPENDIX A

FULL COUNCIL 11 OCTOBER 2017

QUESTIONS

Questions were received under the following categories:

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

6. Questions from members of the public

1. **Question from Mr Steve Dines**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Can the Cabinet Member explain why the Public Space Protection Orders and the Fixed Penalty Notices were introduced on 12th of June 2017?

Councillor Walsh responded:

Public Space Protection Orders are contained in new legislation brought in by the government. They replace Designated Public Place Orders (DPPO's), and also give additional powers to councils to manage anti-social behaviour and other issues that affect our communities.

Eleven DPPO's have been in existence across the city since 2004, including in the city centre. Whilst this allowed certain issues to be addressed, the powers could be exercised by police officers only. PSPOs are different because they can specify a broader range of restrictions and can be enforced by authorised council staff.

DPPOs automatically convert to PSPOs in October. However, the decision to convert to PSPO earlier than this in the city centre and the Millfield area was to address high reported levels of anti-social behaviour and environmental issues. It was also planned to coincide with the formation of the Prevention and Enforcement Service, giving the Council and its' authorised officers the power to deal with the issues most affecting the public.

A period of public consultation overwhelmingly supported the introduction of the PSPO in both the city centre and the Millfield area. Enforcement commenced on June 12th, and up to the end of September almost 3,000 fixed penalty notices have been issued, demonstrating a high level of need for this level of enforcement activity.

Mr Steve Dines asked a supplementary question:

Back in 2014 the Government introduced CPMs and DogBOs, a Community Protection Notice and Anti Social Dog Behaviour e.g. harmful dog on dog attack. This has recently

	been addressed in the media due to dog incidents. Local authorities are not using the available community Protection Notices and DogBOs given by the government and I would like to take this opportunity to thank Councillor Julia Davidson for raising this matter in the last council meeting which was actually my dog that got attacked and also inviting me to raise awareness on the BBC Radio Cambridgeshire where I am not alone on this matter. Councillor Julia Davidson and myself would like the opportunity to meet with you and discuss this matter further. **Councillor Walsh responded:** I would be more than happy to meet with you personally and discuss it further and we can be joined with the responsible officer who is in fact taking work forward in this respect.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

8. Questions on notice to:

a) The Mayor
b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

1. **Question from Councillor Lillis**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development

The Council's current Biodiversity Strategy states that the council aims to minimise its use of herbicides. Could the Cabinet Member tell me the volume of herbicides that the council and all council contractors - working on behalf of the council - has distributed (sprayed, spread or dispersed) for each of the last 3 years?

Councillor Hiller responded:

The Council and its contractors (principally Amey) seek to minimise and wherever possible avoid the use of herbicides. Where it is used, this is in strict accordance with best practice COSHH guidelines which for people that are not aware is an acronym that means Control of Substances Hazard to Health Regulations.

During the last three years the volume of herbicides used was:
2015: 779 litres
2016: 853 litres
2017: 1267 litres (to date) and is likely to be fairly similar to previous years.

Councillor Lillis asked a supplementary question:

Could you tell me what plans the council in conjunction with Amey has to actually minimise and reduce our use of herbicides across Peterborough. As the numbers suggest we have had almost a 40% increase in use over the last 3 years and obviously many of us have concerns about herbicide use across the city and we would like to reduce rather than increase their use.

Councillor Hiller responded:

To gauge whether this amount currently use is good or bad or ugly you might want to do some research with similar size cities other local authorities to see what their usage is. I also suggest it might be expedient to have a word with my colleague Cllr Elsey regarding ongoing herbicide use by Amey and his directives in this area. I am not in a position to give you a comprehensive answer on that.

2.	**Question from Councillor Fower** To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development I have been contacted by local residents about the issue of speeding along Gunthorpe Road. Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me if a) we can introduce 30 mph painted markings on the road as you come off the Paston Parkway, b) why there are no double yellow lines on the corners at the Gunthorpe Road / Gunthorpe Ridings junction, c) if the vehicle activated sign outside the Harrier Pub could be moved to a more appropriate location, and d) is it feasible for a mini round-about at the Gunthorpe Road / Gunthorpe Ridings/ Coniston Road Junction to be introduced? **Councillor Hiller responded:** With actually recorded average speeds along the Gunthorpe Road from the A15 roundabout at 17.52 mph and towards the A15 roundabout 17.89 mph. There is not much of a case to spend tax payer's money to attempt to reduce the speeds at this location any further. I have spoken to the ward councillor, Councillor Davidson recently and she is well informed about this stretch of road. **Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:** This year we witnessed the death of yet another individual along this stretch of road. And I am mindful there have been at least two or three over the years. I wonder if you could let me know how many people actually have to die on a stretch of road in order for this local authority to properly introduce those road safety measures perhaps like those expensive looking ones located in Glinton? **Councillor Hiller responded:** As I understand that poor chap died on his moped when he hit the bus stop. How has that got anything to do with roundabouts and double yellow lines? That's ridiculous.
3.	**Question from Councillor Murphy** To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that Councils should discharge homelessness duty by providing accommodation in the local authority area in which the applicants live, whilst this may be difficult for some metropolitan authorities will he nevertheless join me in condemning the actions of Conservative Barnet Council in using dwellings in Peterborough raise the matter with the Local Government Association if he has not done so already and call for the government to introduce appropriate legislation as is happening in Scotland to prohibit this. **Councillor Hiller responded:**

This complex issue has been much publicised recently and I am sure most Members here tonight will agree that this incursion by Barnet council buying properties in Peterborough worrying for us and many other local authorities where property prices are much lower than London areas generally. At this junction there is nothing we or any other local authority of any political control can do to legally stop this. Cllr Whitby has echoed my own thoughts on social media recently to this effect citing how we as a local authority can't just buy every lower priced property or house coming on to the market in our city. It both distorts and inflates the market. It prevents our first time buyers getting on the housing ladder and effectively decimates the lower end of the rental market availability.

I am asking the new MP for Peterborough to help us prevent this happening ongoing by joining with her Westminster colleagues to make this financially unattractive for London boroughs to continue this practice. By looking closely at what is being paid for the homelessness provision in London compared with us and others in the regions, and reducing that London rate if the problem is mitigated. It is all about money. It currently costs Barnet £3400.00 pa for each homeless household housed in a two bedroomed property in London. They have nearly 3,000 households in temporary accommodation. If Barnet council places households temporarily in properties outside London this reduces to £1,900.00 net. They also gain an appreciating asset as the house value increases. During 2015-16 they places 233 households outside London using their special purpose vehicle Barnet Homes. It is difficult for Cllr Murphy not to politicise this issue but he and all the other naysayers should recognise what this latest move has proven. Comprehensively and unequivocally, is that the positive and decisive action taken by Cllr Walsh and Cllr Seaton over St Michael's Gate was absolutely the right thing to do for our homeless issues not London's as we predicted would be happening then and is clearly happening now with Barnet council's latest purchases. As Paul Stainton wrote in his penultimate column for the PT it is ethnic cleansing for the homeless. And what Barnet council are perpetrating is both sordid and obscene.

Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:

Many of your comments I agree with. You haven't addressed the part of the question members of the public listening tonight or in the other room probably now probably know this is about Barnet conservative council purchasing properties in Peterborough. To raise St Michael's Gate is really the wrong thing to do. You were wrong to evict 70 people from there. The two people I represented in court the judge throughout those evictions so the rationale was wrong. But will you or the council Leader join with me in calling for the Local Government Association ensure that people stick to the letter of the Homeless Persons Act and people should only be rehoused in their borough otherwise you are right, it is ethnic cleansing and if you've seen I, Daniel Blake you'll know about that poor women that was sent up north from a London borough.

Councillor Hiller responded:

At the last Full Council meeting I said I would answer questions about this new social housing area within my portfolio. Factually, without political spin or indeed unintended bias. I was absolutely right to mention St Michael's Gate because there were plenty of

	naysayers and it was proven without doubt in my opinion, that we took the right decision then. Cllr Murphy has clumsily attempted a cheap political point at the expense of very serious cross party issue which affects our cities critically stretched front line services, its residents, its first time buyers, and the more affordable end of the property rental market. During 2016-17 the London borough council shipping out the highest number of homeless people into temporary accommodation outside London is Southwark. Labour controlled by a huge margin. A Labour run council which moved a staggering 1,143 households out of their borough to rid themselves of a social and economic inconvenience. Barnet council's decision to buy Peterborough property was taken unanimously by their Assets Regeneration Growth Committee. Labour councillor Philip Cohen approved it, Labour councillor Pauline Cokely-Webb approved it, Labour councillor Alison Moore approved it, Labour councillor Jeff Cook approved it. Those Labour committee members approved the purchase of 50 properties in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northants and Cambridgeshire with a capital investment of £8million. The decision taken by those Labour councillors was ratified and agreed by Barnet's Policy and Resources Committee. Sitting on that committee on 16th of May this year and agreeing to buy properties in Peterborough was Labour Councillor Paul Edwards, Labour Councillor Ross Huston, Labour Councillor Alison Moore, Labour Councillor Alan Allback, Labour Councillor Barry Rawlings, Labour Councillors deciding that buying investment properties in Peterborough to make money and shipping out their vulnerable people to save money was a really good idea. At this point the Mayor called time.
4.	**Question from Councillor Davidson** To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities What assurances can we have from this administration to address recent concerns of Crime in Werrington and our neighbouring wards? **Councillor Walsh responded:** Reported crime in Werrington and the surrounding wards is not unusually high statistically. However, there have been a number of incidents recently that have caused concern in the community. We are also aware of increased reports to Ward Councillors of anti-social behaviour around the skate park. As a direct response to a recent violent crime, the Police have confirmed to us that they have a reassurance patrol plan in place which will increase visibility and reassure the public. This particular crime is still under investigation and it is hoped it will be resolved in the near future. My latest update is that they are making great progress in that regard. Additionally, a site meeting at the skate park took place in September with officers from the Prevention and Enforcement Service and Amey, along with Ward Councillors. A number of actions were agreed. These included improved linkages between CCTV and the Police to respond in a timely manner to incidents, increased patrols and the potential to put up a gate at the car park. These proposals will continue to be worked up over the coming weeks.

	If Gunthorpe Ward Councillors wish, they could be invited to link in with officers and follow future developments. **Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:** I'm impressed there is going to be some CCTV put in these areas and also increased control by the police. However, my supplementary question is why are councillors reliant on the goodwill and competence of local residence and some reputable media sites when we have well budgeted organisation such as the city council and the police who failed to communicate such information on reliant update. **Councillor Walsh responded:** I'm very sorry but I didn't understand the question, partly because of the way it was read and this is obviously not Councillor Davidson's fault, she obviously has a cold. But I didn't really understand what it was she wanted from that. What I would recommend is that she puts it in writing to me and I will make sure she gets a proper response in due course.
5.	**Question from Councillor Lillis** To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities Residents living outside of "Residents Parking Zones" in polling district FLS1 and the northern part of FLS2 are becoming increasingly concerned by the number people who are causing problems when they park their cars to attend events at ABAX stadium (also known as London Road). Could the Cabinet Member tell me how many parking tickets have been issued in the last 12 months for dangerous or inconsiderate parking, such as parking too close to junctions, blocking the highway or parking in front of dropped curbs, in the above mentioned areas on days when Peterborough United are playing at the ABAX stadium? **Councillor Walsh responded:** I would like to thank Councillor Lillis for his question. I am glad that, having represented the Fletton & Stanground Ward for well over a year now, he has finally become concerned about the issue of parking in the Vista Development. In fact, it's right outside his front door. I became aware of the issue when a Conservative Party champion working in the neighbourhood brought it to my attention. I have visited the area, spoken with residents, and brought the matter to the attention of both Communities and Highways officers, who are actively seeking ways to address this. Cllr Lillis may, or may not, know that the difficulty is that the roads in question have not yet been adopted. This means that the Council cannot take any enforcement action in the "Residents Only" parking areas because there is no legal order underpinning them. The signs were erected by the developer, and are advisory only.

	Our Highways Team are currently working hard with the developer to put in place phased agreements that would enable the Council to introduce parking restrictions. In fact, our Legal Services are currently working on the first of these. In conclusion, I feel sure that our Highways Officers would be more than pleased to update Cllr Lillis on progress, should he show an ongoing interest. **Councillor Lillis asked a supplementary question:** Thank you Councillor Walsh for completely misunderstanding my question. In fact what I was talking about was the roads outside the ones that aren't private at the minute. So the roads I was talking about are Gloucester Road, St John's Road, Queens Road all the roads and Berrystead. So if you actually read my question you would understand that I was referring to the roads that are not covered by controlled parking zones FLS1 and the northern part FLS2. If you could revisit and answer my question, in the areas outside residents controlled parking zones could you tell me how many tickets have been issued to those areas. In those two polling districts the roads that are covered – the Mayor called time up. **Councillor Walsh responded:** I would suggest as a way forward that Councillor Lillis writes to me and actually names the roads in question and clarifies his particular concern in relation to those locations and I will ensure a proper response is given.
6.	**Question from Councillor Rush** To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development On many occasions Stanground South ward councillors have been lobbying the Highways Department to improve the A605 Whittlesey Road/Pondersbridge Junction. Because of the road layout, at busy times, traffic is held up and backs up into Stanground and along the Stanground bypass and it is made worse when the North Bank road is closed. At a LTP briefing session last year we were told that improvements to this junction would be made within 3 years. Could the cabinet member give an update on the progress that has been made to implement improvement works at this junction? **Councillor Hiller responded:** I would just suggest that officers would probably have said that we were bidding for monies to improve the junction within three years not that the work would actually be started within that time not that the work would actually be started. But I will take advice on that. Our Highways Team are aware of the traffic issues at the junction of the A605 and B1095 Milk and Water junction caused by vehicles turning right delaying the traffic

	travelling between Peterborough and Whittlesey, particularly exasabated when North Bank is closed due to flooding, and for this reason we submitted a National Investment Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) bid earlier this year to the DfT for £2.8m for funding towards improving this particular junction. We are currently awaiting the outcome of the bid. In addition, we are also submitting a parallel bid to the Combined Authority for monies to improve the junction during the 2019/20 financial year, with design being undertaken in 2018/19. It is hoped that the Combined Authority will consider our bid for funding at its next Board meeting later this month and I will certainly let you know the outcome Councillor Rush. **Point of Information from Councillor Holdich:** On 25th October that is point of discussion on the Combined Authority Board and today it was approved by Members of the Cabinet to go forward to 25th so there is pretty good hope that that will happen.
7.	**Question from Councillor Saltmarsh** To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University It has recently come to my attention that several schools in the city are reducing the numbers of their support staff. This has an impact on teaching staff who are already coping with large class sizes. How can this be helping in the standard of education the children in our city are receiving and enabling progress to be made in obtaining better stats results? **Councillor Ayres responded:** Many schools in the city are academies and these are independent of the local authority. The Academies Programme has been supported by all three main political parties that have been part of the last three national governments as a means to further develop schools' autonomy and give them the freedoms and flexibilities to develop their curriculum and staffing structures in order to improve standards. There are still maintained schools as we know, but under local management of schools (also supported by all three main political parties), responsibility for staffing structures is devolved to governing bodies. Governors have a responsibility to set budgets that do not take the school into deficit. By far the largest percentage of a school's budget is staff costs. Where a school cannot set a balanced budget, governors may, through following the appropriate legal processes, seek to reduce staff costs. It has been well-documented that school budgets are under considerable pressure nationally. The government has recently announced indicative funding for local authorities as it moves towards a national funding formula (NFF) that will over time equalise the funding for different authorities and give higher funding to disadvantaged pupils. Overall for Peterborough this will mean an increase in funding of £5.23m for

	the three years beginning in 2018. There will be significant additional investment in deprivation and low prior attainment factors which will benefit a significant number of schools in Peterborough. Individual schools' allocations vary depending on the pupil characteristics, but some schools with high levels of deprivation and low prior attainment will receive budget increases of up to 11% across the three years. There is a wide variety of support staff in schools, ranging from office staff, through kitchen staff and to staff supporting pupils. These staff supporting pupils may be teaching assistants employed to work specifically with a child with additional needs according to the requirements of the child's Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Schools cannot remove these posts unless the child's needs are assessed as no longer requiring this support, or the child leaves the school. They may be general teaching assistants. Some, such as Higher Level Teaching Assistants, have been shown by research published by the Education Endowment Foundation, to be effective in promoting children's learning. But the research also showed that often teaching assistants are not well used and have little impact on children's learning. The Mayor then called time on the reply. **Councillor Saltmarsh asked a supplementary question:** Surely you would agree that we do need to sort out some sort of agreement how we can have authority over these academies trust as, as a local authority we are still surely responsible for education of children in the city. The bad results do reflect very badly on us as a city council. **Councillor Ayres responded:** Academies are independent. They are run by the head teachers there as indeed are our local authority schools now who do have control over their own budgets and curriculum. What we can do as a local authority is champion the children who attend those schools and that is what we intend to do. I think that was mentioned and definitely spoken by me at the scrutiny committee you attended as did several other councillors here the other night and we are looking into that in great depth know following my Education Review.
8.	**Question from Councillor Saltmarsh** To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities We currently have 33 successful community centres within the unitary authority. A project was started 3 years ago about asset transferring these centres to enable community groups to run them. What is the current situation regarding transfers and do you envisage any closures of any of the centres? **Councillor Walsh responded:** We currently have a dedicated Community Officer working on the programme, together with support from our Property Team. I refer to the Asset Transfer programme of course. The aim is to ensure a tailored solution is found for each centre. As a local authority, we do not want to take the same action that others have taken, which is to

	sell off the freehold of community assets. We attach far more importance to our community centres than that. As an update, all 33 centres have been visited, surveys undertaken and meetings held with their managing bodies. Community Action Peterborough (CAP) have participated in this work and have provided a huge amount of support and expertise, for which we are extremely grateful. As you will know, the Community Asset Transfer Programme aims to support centres into taking on the full management of their facilities. Having completed a huge volume of work, we feel we can now commit to end of the current year as the time that a clear future plan can be finalized for those centres where some doubt still remains. Closure of centres is not part of the current strategy, but may become an option in specific individual circumstances as a very last resort; for instance if the building was in a very poor state of repair, or if the community association no longer wishes to run the building. If this were to happen, assurances are given that the Council will do all it can to ensure alternative accommodation is located for any services which the local community wish to retain. **Councillor Saltmarsh asked a supplementary question:** Repairs to the centres are currently undertaken by Amey. Would it be possible to look at some alternative contractors as I understand charges from Amey are rather excessive? **Councillor Walsh responded:** Yes I will look into this possibility and I will come back to you on that.
9.	**Question from Councillor Sharp** To Councillor Elsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene Over six years ago with the help of the Peterborough City council the allotments formed a working group the Peterborough Allotment Representatives Consortium. It has during this time worked with the Council to promote, to protect and to help with the day to day running of the Council controlled sites. This has resulted in your site representatives and their respective working groups spending many hundreds of hours if not thousands of hours working to bring your allotments back into 21st century after the years leaving the sites in a poor condition. This has resulted in the infrastructure on the sites being allowed to deteriorate to the extent that they are now in a very bad way, Roadways, Security fencing, Taps and the water system with only patch up work being done where it is necessary. During the last decade or so the allotments of Peterborough have seen their size and numbers decreased, this maybe as it seems that people were discouraged from taking up an allotment which resulted in large areas of allotment land sold off namely Westwood Grange, Fane Road and Wesleyan Road which it is understood that many millions of pounds maybe over 10 million were paid to the Council coffers.

	We understand that money makes these trying times but with the vast amount made from the sale of this land, why after all these years have the Council allowed this to happen and not spent some of this money on correcting what their years of neglect have allowed to happen. **Councillor Elsey responded:** Thank you for the question. As a member of the Allotment Consortium along with Councillor Ferris, Councillor Sharp will be aware I have on two occasions attended the allotment consortium to update the groups on various matters around allotments in Peterborough including the budget available to maintain the sites and capital gains from the sale of allotment sites including how these funds are spent. As I have said on both of these occasions, I thank all the allotment representatives for the work that they do across Peterborough, however we do not have large funds to change fencing and install new road ways etc. I am aware that officers work closely with the consortium to carry out repairs where possible and that they are looking at options to repair the road ways at certain sites. They will continue to do this and continue to work with the consortium wherever possible to try and effect the best changes we can under the current climate.
10.	**Question from Councillor Davidson** To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources Can the Cabinet Member clarify if the proposed lend of £15million for the funding of the hotel at Fletton Quays is a joint arrangement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, or whether the Council is the sole decision maker? **Councillor Seaton responded:** The council is the sole decision maker. (Councillor Seaton was asked to repeat the answer) **Councillor Davidson asked a supplementary question:** Will Peterborough Council implement safeguards to protect this authority and this proposal £15million to develop Norlin Developments who in their own words are players in the property, hospitality and leisure in the UK who have already stated in the Irish News which already includes a portfolio to include Exeter, Peterborough and Norwich. Has this council not learnt any lessons from the Icelandic bank investment, £3million to be precise, this local authority has not recovered from that debacle. Isn't that another example of property developers exploiting planning authorities. Please can this administration confirm, did Norlin Ventures are incorrect with their claims and that the proposed lend has been approved. If so when was this decided and agreed? **Councillor Seaton responded:** It was decided and agreed at Cabinet. The protections are in the Cabinet report which

	was published some time ago. I just touch very briefly on the point that Councillor Davidson made, about the Icelandic Bank investment, it was always a favourite of Councillor Fower who has raised it time and time again over the years, we are practically at the point where we have recovered every single pound that was saved with the Icelandic banks. I'm sure Councillor Fower and Councillor Davidson will be pleased about that. It does give me the opportunity to touch on the track record of the people who we are dealing with here. One of them was a Director of the Northern Ireland Property Team at Price Waterhouse Cooper for six years and then he became a specialist in investment funds and fund management at Schroders. He was a founder partner of the Black Pearl Group, real estate development company, focused on various European opportunities. The other had five years experience in the PWC Northern Ireland Property Team, was founding managing director of Expedia capital and Corporate Finance Company and then he became director of Corporate Finance at the Black Pearl Group. A couple of examples. Maybe I'll give more than two. These people run the Hampton-by-Hilton at Exeter airport. They own and operate that hotel. It is ranked as one of the top Hampton-by-Hilton hotels across the world with very high occupancy. They are also shortly to complete the Holiday Inn Express in County Londonderry, an important project, a £12million hotel. Just to give one or two other examples of the sorts of things that these people have done - **This was the end of the question section and the Mayor moved to the next item**.
11.	**Question from Councillor Bull** To Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services What is being done to mainstream children and young people policies within Cabinet, at Full Council, and as part of the various committee meetings? **Councillor Smith may have responded:** Thank you for your question, which raises some interesting issues that are worth exploring further. As a Council we have got better at ensuring that we consider the views of our looked after children. We now have a formal corporate parenting committee and a number of Members are champions for looked after children. Our reports now often ask for authors to comment specifically on how any proposals might affect children and young people in care. But I am sure that we can do more; we are all corporate parents, of course, and we should all be considering the impact of any policy developments we are leading on children and young people in care, as well as care leavers, who are, of course, our children. I would welcome suggestions as to how we can be even better at considering the interests of children in care. I would be happy to meet with Councillor Bull and any other Councillors outside this meeting who would be interested to explore how we can improve the visibility of children in care in the decisions made by the Council. Can interested Members contact me if they are interested?
12.	**Question from Councillor Fower:**

	To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities Could the relevant Cabinet Member let me know how much it costs this local authority each and every time clearance of fly-tipping is undertaken at Norwood Lane, how many times clearance operations have occurred in the last two years, and how much has been spent? **Councillor Walsh may have responded:** I would like to thank Cllr Fower for his question and am pleased to see that, having been elected to the Gunthorpe Ward over a year ago, he is at last taking an interest in this very difficult issue. To bring him up-to-date, the problem of fly-tipping at Norwood Lane has existed for many years and many attempts have been made to deal with it, including lighting, gating, bunding and placing a warden on site, etc, etc. All of these attempts have not resolved the problem. Since 1st January, 2016 to-date the Council has been forced to clear the Lane on 10 occasions, spending just under £50,000 to remove waste and £96,000 to dispose of it. And aside from the costs, we are also mindful of the impact this is having on nearby residents. The sad fact is that the problem will only be resolved permanently with the development of Paston Reserve, and this may still be some time away. However, in a further attempt, to resolve the issue in the short- to medium-term, and following discussions with nearby residents, we are drafting plans to narrow the Lane to a single carriageway, with passing places for vehicles. I am sure that Cllr Fower will agree that the Council has put a huge amount of effort into dealing with this issue and I hope that, going forward, he will actively engage with officers and residents and work towards a common goal.
13.	**Question from Councillor Sandford** To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources Could Cabinet Member tell me how much money has been spent on partitioning and refurbishing various parts of the Town Hall in preparation for the move the Fletton Quays and the hiring out of sections of the building to external organisations? And how much more does he anticipate being spent before the move and reallocation of space in the Town Hall is complete? **Councillor Seaton may have responded:** The "Council Office Consolidation" report to Council on 7 March 2016 (Appendix 3) set out the budgets for the following elements of Town Hall capital works: Town Hall Civic £ 500,000 Town Hall North £1,342,000 Town Hall South £1,250,000 Town Hall **total** £3,092,000

	The Town Hall capital budget was increased by £660,000 to £3,752,000 in the 2017/18 budget as a result of securing additional rental income compared with the initial estimates in the business case, reflecting the development of an enhanced design for the Town Hall South to meet the standards and requirements of the prospective tenant. (The increased rental income and earlier letting pays back the additional capital budget in 6 years). The contract award recently finalised for the Town Hall South Main works identifies a pressure of £300,000 for the reasons set out in that report. Spend to date against this budget is £504,212 and Members will see that extensive works are ongoing. The final capital costs of the Town Hall component of the project will depend to some degree on the final configuration and occupancy of the further areas to be let. Any adjustment to the budget will be subject to the normal governance and approval processes. Those areas that have recently been refurbished for the Council's own use have been designed so that we have the flexibility to either use them differently or let them out commercially in the future should that be necessary.
14.	**Question from Councillor Bull** To Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health How do Youth Health Champions (YHCs) help increase the accessibility of health services for Young People including sexual health; emotional wellbeing; weight management; smoking; alcohol and drug awareness/prevention and have we enough volunteer YHCs? **Councillor Lamb may have responded:** Before becoming a Youth Health Champion volunteers, aged between 14 and 19 years old, receive accredited Royal Society of Public Health training. Once trained, Youth Health Champions work with young people across the local area, helping them develop healthier, more active lifestyles. Currently, Youth Health Champions are active in a number of local schools including Ormiston Bushfield; Jack Hunt; Thomas Deacon; Voyager; Nene Park; Kings and the Peterborough School in addition to the Regional College and the City College. The Youth Health Champions promote and inform peers of the risks of unhealthy practices; the personal and social consequences of such involvement; and signpost peers who are engaged in health damaging activities to health services. They also support consultations with young people about the relevance and accessibility of health services. Volunteer Youth Health Champions continue to be recruited through the Healthy Schools Peterborough programme and there are currently 13 volunteers involved in the programme. However, we continually aim to recruit more volunteers by engaging with all secondary schools, referral units and special schools.

8.	**Questions on notice to:** d) The Combined Authority Representatives
1.	**Question from Councillor Murphy** To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Is there scope for infrastructure funding for pedestrian and cycle routes, if so can these be pursued especially for cycle and footbridges in Peterborough? **Councillor Holdich responded:** This is an infrastructure funding for pedestrian and cycle routes within the funding passed to the Combined Authority. As with any funding, it is spent on schemes which are aligned to the wider strategic objectives of the Combined Authority. Funding will therefore be spent, first and foremost, on pedestrian and cycle routes which provide access to new jobs or housing, and reduces congestion through mode shift to more sustainable forms of transport. The Combined Authority's transport priorities are set out in its Local Transport Plan, which includes consideration of walking and cycling. The next tranche of priority transport schemes will be presented to the Combined Authority Board on the 25 October. **Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:** As I recall, at the last council meeting I asked if you would ask the Mayor for money for a footbridge over the Nene and the reply was "No". I would like to ask you tonight, when did you become aware of the Combined Authorities Mayor's offer for £5million to replace the Rhubarb Bridge? **Councillor Holdich responded:** Can I just ask Councillor Fitzgerald to repeat what the Mayor has told us tonight? **Councillor Fitzgerald responded:** Thank you Mr Mayor. I asked specifically to James Palmer - interrupted by Councillor Murphy with a point of order and reference to the earlier discussion on the petitioner comments regarding the Combined Authorities Mayor's offer of £5million, followed by an exchange between several councillors regarding who should answer the question and Councillor Holdich eventually continued with the question. **Councillor Holdich replied:** Funding has to be for infrastructure funding for pedestrian or cycle routes within the

	public past Combined Authority as with any funding spent on schemes which are aligned to the wider strategic objectives of the Combined Authority. Funding will therefore be spent first and foremost on pedestrian and cycle routes which combine the access to new jobs and housing and reduce congestion through the ownership of more sustainable transport. And that's quite clear and this doesn't, Rhubarb Bridge doesn't, and the bridge over the Nene doesn't.
2.	**Question from Councillor Murphy** To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Can our representative inform Council of his and the Combined Authorities position concerning the Peterborough Enterprise Partnership's future arrangements and current spending ability? **Councillor Holdich responded:** As Deputy Mayor of the Combined Authority and a Member of the Combined Authority Board I support the Mayor in his written proposals to the Local Enterprise Partnership which are available and can be read on the Combined Authority website. It has been widely reported that the Local Enterprise Partnership are not receiving funding from Government. For the Combined Authority, that means that plans for growth in our area might be impeded. The Mayor, leading the Combined Authority, has therefore offered to provide the necessary leadership to develop a new governance model. I am also a member of the Local Enterprise Partnership and I am nominated by this Council as a public sector member of that Board. I look forward to the debate which will take place next week. **Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:** So you support the Combined Authorities move on Peterborough Enterprise Partnership. Could you tell us what funds have been frozen, what's going on and why Peterborough isn't getting any money, it's all going to Wisbech, Alconbury and Cambridge? **Councillor Holdich responded:** I don't that is relevant to his first question.
3.	**Question from Councillor Sandford** To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Will the Council's representative on the Combined Authority comment on the news that

	the Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership is under investigation by the National Audit Office and is having funding from Central Government withheld pending the results of the investigation? **Councillor Holdich responded:** It has been reported that the GCGP LEP is under investigation by the National Audit Office and that funding is currently being withheld by the Government pending response of the National Audit office (NAO) on current position. I can only reiterate what has already been said in my earlier response: that the Mayor and the Combined Authority are acting decisively to respond to the solution to the issues currently faced by the Local Enterprise Partnership and we are doing that in order to ensure that the growth ambitions of Peterborough and Cambridgeshire can be delivered as the Combined Authority expects. That's all I can say at this point in time. They haven't come back. To add my personal comments to that: Councillor Count and myself have lead and moved a matter for the record that we don't like to governance of it although that has been corrected. I pay tribute to Mrs Sawyer who helped us correct that. I believe it has lost its' credibility and therefore I think the Mayor's offer is a good one. **Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:** This is of great concern as Councillor Murphy said because of the amount of money from Peterborough growth projects which are implemented by this particular organisation. I have raised in this council chamber previously the issue of the lack of transparency for the Local Enterprise Partnership, the fact that it hold its' meetings in private. Doesn't this investigation, I don't know what its' specific aspects it's looking into, doesn't it illustrate that this organisation needs to be much more open and transparent about its' activities, operations and finances? And will the Leader use his opportunity of being on the Combined Authority Board much greater openness and transparency in Local Enterprise Partnership? **Councillor Holdich responded:** That's exactly what we are trying to achieve. You are absolutely right. There is no transparency, most of the board members don't know what decisions have been made. That's not right and Councillor Count and myself led that to get along with one of the MPs. I think you are absolutely right. Yes we will, if they are going to remain we will flush it out and make it more transparent. If not we will take it to the Combined Authority one way or another.

This page is intentionally left blank