

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 13 DECEMBER 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, Eley, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, JR Fox, JA Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, S Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stoke, Walsh, and Whitby

50. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Dowson, Ferris, Shaheed, Fower, Sylvester, Sharp, Mahabadi, and Gul Nawaz.

51. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

52. Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 October 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2017 were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the replacement of “throughout” to “threw out” in Councillor Murphy’s supplementary question to Councillor Hiller.

COMMUNICATIONS

53. Mayor’s Announcements

The Mayor advised that he had agreed to add urgent item of business to the meeting’s agenda, in relation to the appointment of an interim Monitoring Officer, due to the statutory requirement to have someone in post.

The Mayor announced that the staff Christmas mince pie reception was due to take place on Wednesday 20 December 2017 at 10.00am and the Christmas wreath laying would be held on Thursday 21 December 2017 at 9.30am.

54. Leader’s Announcements

The Leader took the opportunity to thank Kim Sawyer, who was acting as Legal Officer for the meeting. Following her recent appointment as Monitoring Officer for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority the Leader thanked Ms Sawyer for her advice and guidance during her role as Director of Governance at Peterborough City Council. The Leader presented Ms Sawyer with a gift in recognition of her work.

The Leader invited Councillor Ayres to speak. Councillors Ayres advised that she had attended the Media Awards for the Peterborough region. The Mayor and Mayoress had been awarded a lifetime achievement, which Councillor Ayres presented along with her congratulations on the well-deserved recognition.

The Leader further congratulated the Council's Media Team, who had won the award for Media Team of the year.

Finally, the Mayor passed on his own thanks to Kim Sawyer and presented her with a gift in appreciation for her work in supporting the Council.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

55. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

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

1. Closure of the Public Gallery
2. The Peterborough Local Plan
3. Sheltered Accommodation Parking
4. Divesting of Fossil Fuels

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

56. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members.

57. 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. Dropped kerbs at Pennine Way and Cheviot Avenue T-Junction
2. Tourism Focus Group
3. Stand Up for Peterborough and the National Debt Policy
4. Business Rate Retention
5. Gunthorpe Road Traffic Incident
6. Apprenticeships
7. Provisions for 15% Council Tax Increase
8. Temporary Social Housing and Barnet Council

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. Business Rate Retention
2. Combined Mayoral Precept 2018/19

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

58. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Licensing Committee Recommendation – Draft Byelaws for Hackney Carriages

The Licensing Committee, at its meeting of 12 October 2017, received a report that members of the consultation process carried out, requested members to properly consider the responses received and recommended the adoption of the draft byelaws (subject to any amendment) to Council.

Councillor Ayres introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Ayres advised that following the adoption of the Taxi Policy approval had been given to consult on the Byelaws for Hackney Carriages. Subsequently the proposals and consultation responses had been considered by the Licensing Committee, with a unanimous approval to recommend the Byelaws to Council.

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

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

- Concerns were raised that drivers could receive a licence elsewhere while still operating within Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller exercised his right to speak and explained that concerns in relation to inconsistent cross boundary policies were shared. Huntingdonshire District Council had been approached on the matter before and it was time for the subject to be approached again.

Councillor Ayres summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing advised that discussions were underway with Huntingdonshire District Council to mirror Peterborough City Council policies. This, however, would take some time.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council adopted the draft hackney carriage byelaws.

(b) Executive Recommendation – Proposed Local Plan Submission

Cabinet, at its meeting of 20 November 2017, received a report that enabled Cabinet to consider and recommend to Council the approval of the Proposed Submission Local Plan for public consultation in January 2018 and then submission to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that the Local Plan was an important document for the Council. The proposals had been discussed at both the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee and the Growth, Environment and Resources Committee. The proposed submission was now put before Full Council for approval for consultation.

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

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

- Councillors supported the Local Plan in general, however concern was raised in relation to the level of growth in the area.
- It was suggested that unrestricted growth would negatively impact the city's air quality and residents' health and wellbeing. It was considered that plans needed to be made to stop growing at some point.
- Comment was made in relation to the allocation of land in Eye. It was felt that objections were not unreasonable and that the correct infrastructure must be provided to accompany any major development. This included school places and any necessary bypasses.
- Further concerns were raised around the provision of infrastructure, particularly in light of the Transport Policy, which did not appear to be followed.
- The Transport Policy sought to make foot and cycle travel easier through direct accessible routes, however, it was felt that this had not been done in a number of cases.
- It was noted that some sites lay empty in several wards and questions were raised as to why these were not being built upon.
- It was highlighted that Peterborough's growth was not uncontrolled. The Local Plan was based on forecasts for organic growth, which could not be stopped. If estimates were not put in place, then the area would be short of infrastructure when it was needed.
- Comment was made that revisions could only be made prior to submission. The Local Plan would have to be agreed for submission at some point. The recommendation before Council was to agree the plan for a second round of public consultation, so there was still time to comment on the proposals.
- It was noted that in order to provide substantial infrastructure, a sufficient size of development was required.
- Further comment was made that the Local Plan was a live document that was reviewed on a regular basis to take account of changes in the needs of the area.

Councillor Harper exercised his right to speak and explained that the proposed Plan was of essential to the Council, was of high quality and had been well written.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing confirmed that he was happy to approve the document for consultation. The Council could not stop growth within the city, however, needed to take account of it. The Local Plan was essential to plan the necessary infrastructure for the future of the area. Public transport had been discussed on a number of occasions and would be fed into the Plan when the final document was published.

A vote was taken (42 voted in favour, 5 voted against, 3 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council adopted the draft hackney carriage byelaws.

1. Approved the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Local Plan as attached at Appendix A, for the purpose of both its final consultation for six weeks (likely during January and February 2018); AND its subsequent submission to the Secretary of

State for the purpose of independent examination.

2. Approved the Policies Map (including associated inset maps) as set out as part of the agenda papers, for the purpose of consultation alongside the Local Plan consultation AND for subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for consideration alongside the examination of the Local Plan.
3. Delegated to the Head of Sustainable Growth Strategy any presentational improvements or other inconsequential changes (eg correcting typographical errors of factual inaccuracies) to the Publication Draft Plan or Policies Map that (taken together) do not materially affect the policies set out in the Local Plan prior to the consultation commencing.
4. Delegated to the Head of Sustainable Growth Strategy the ability to agree and consult upon a set of proposed modifications during the examination process (most likely at the very end of the examination process), if asked by the Inspector to do so.

(c) Executive Recommendation – Adoption of the Castor Neighbourhood Plan

Cabinet, at its meeting of 20 November 2017, received a report that sought Cabinet approval to recommend that Council adopts the Castor Neighbourhood Plan making it part of the Development Plan for Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that many people had worked hard to draft this Neighbourhood Plan and that it would become part of the Council's planning policy.

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

1. Following the successful referendum on 2 November 2017, Castor Neighbourhood Plan, as set out in Appendix A, be 'made' (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purposes of making decisions on relevant planning applications with Castor Parish; *and*
2. Agreed that the decision statement included at Appendix B be published.

(d) Executive Recommendation – Adoption of the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan

Cabinet, at its meeting of 20 November 2017, received a report that sought Cabinet approval to recommend that Council adopts the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan making it part of the Development Plan for Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that, again, a great amount of work had been put into the Neighbourhood Plan. It was further advised that a community did not have to have Parish Council in order to draft a Neighbourhood Plan.

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

1. Following the successful referendum on 2 November 2017, Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan, as set out in Appendix A, be 'made' (which means to all intents and purposes 'adopted') and thereby form part of the Development Plan for Peterborough for the purposes of making decisions on relevant planning applications with Ailsworth Parish; *and*

2. Agreed that the decision statement included at Appendix B be published.

(e) Executive Recommendation – Proposed Changes to the Housing Allocations Policy

Cabinet, at its meeting of 20 November 2017, received a report that sought for Cabinet to consider the proposed changes to the Housing Allocations Policy in order to alleviate pressures to council services caused by higher levels of homelessness in the city.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Hiller advised that the proposed changes to the Policy were small but important. The increase in homelessness in recent times was a challenge nationwide, with demand increasing in Peterborough for the short term. Proactive solutions were being explored by the Council, including using commercial premises, with a cross party working group developing future strategy.

Ahead of the introduction of legislative changes officers would engage with households much earlier than at current. Changes were proposed in relation to household priority in order to help eliminate the need for bed and breakfast accommodation.

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

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

- Concern was raised about reducing the number of accommodation refusals individuals are allowed to make. It was considered that special dispensation should be given in relation to any family issues arising.
- It was suggested that such a reduction may be the thin end of the wedge and that people should be penalised if refusing accommodation for legitimate reasons.

Councillor Walsh exercised her right to speak and explained that a reduction from three to two was not unreasonable and that the changes were meant to streamline the system, making it easier and quicker to be housed safely.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing confirmed that appropriate safety nets were in place.

A vote was taken (46 voted in favour, 5 voted against, 0 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the proposed changes to the Housing Allocations policy as set out in the Cabinet report.

(f) Executive Recommendation – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2020-21

Cabinet, at its meeting of 4 December, received a report as part of the council's Budget and Policy Framework, which enabled Cabinet to consider the feedback from the consultation undertaken to date with residents, partner organisations, businesses and other interested parties, to recommend approval of the budget proposals to set a balanced and sustainable budget for the financial years 2018/19 to 2020/21.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Councillor Seaton thanked all those that had been involved with formulating the first phase of the budget. It was advised that no specific changes had been made to the proposal as a result of the consultation. The Council faced a number of issues, including an increasing population, rising deprivation and low council tax levels. Lobbying was currently underway for the Government to provide fairer funding to Peterborough, and thanks was

extended to Councillors for their cross party support. In order to ensure that front line services were maintained explorations were being made into shared services. Inspiration was taken from Westcomb engineering, owned by the Council, which had succeeded within the Construction and Engineering Parliamentary Review with a focus on delivery.

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

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

- The continued involvement of the cross party working group in formulating the budget was welcomed.
- It was commented that while local authorities had been provided with additional powers, no additional funding had been provided alongside these.
- Suggestion was made that Peterborough should be campaigning for additional funding, not just a fairer distribution.
- It was raised that in the past not all proposed savings had been implemented, and it was hoped that all the savings set out in the current proposals were completed.
- The termination of the Amey contract was discussed and it noted that £500,000 would be used from the Council's reserve funds to procure replacement contracts.
- Concern was raised at the continued trend for shared services, and that this was carried out mainly with Cambridgeshire County Council.
- The desire for Parish Council to take on landscaping management functions was raised and pursuit encouraged.
- Suggestion was made that consideration of the budget be deferred until after the expected announcement on adult social care funding.
- It was queried why money had been spent on borrowing, investment, and replacement contracts when the financial pressure on the Council was so great.
- Concern was expressed that proposals were being considered at the last minute and that mistakes in saving projections were being made.
- Further comment was made that those making decisions had a clear understanding of the Council landscape.
- It was noted that Peterborough was facing issues in relation to homelessness, education and social housing.
- Suggestion was made in relation to grass cutting and whether proposals to use cuttings to generate gas could be explored in greater detail.

Councillor Fuller exercised his right to speak and noted that many of the issues raised during the course of debate were or should have been raised at the cross party working group meetings. Councillor Fuller endorsed the Medium Term Financial Strategy, suggesting that it was an expeditious way to achieve the necessary outcomes.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing clarified that the fairer funding for Peterborough campaign was not requesting additional funding from Government, but a fairer distribution of the funds already provided. Councillor Seaton advised that Cambridgeshire County Council did not have desires to absorb Peterborough City Council. Plans were already being developed in relation to the second phase of the budget.

A recorded vote was taken:

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, JA Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, King, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith,

Stokes, Walsh, Whitby

Councillors Against: Nil

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Davidson, Ellis, JR Fox, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford

A vote was taken (33 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 19 abstained from voting) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council, having had regard to feedback, approve the phase one budget proposals to enable implementation of these budget proposals to commence.

59. 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 held on 20 November 2017.
2. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 4 December 2017.
3. Cabinet Member Decision taken during the period 6 October 2017 to 4 December 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2020-21 Consultation

Councillor Davidson asked what assurances could be made that sharing front line services would not place Peterborough in a secondary position.

Councillor Holdich advised that Peterborough had experienced such a situation in the past and did not intend to revisit it.

Junction 18 (Rhubarb Bridge) Cross Party Working Group Proposal

Councillor Sandford asked when the Cross Party Working Group would meet and why the first meeting was so far away.

Councillor Holdich advised that the funding had been set out by the Combined Authority and that more information would be available in the new year.

Councillor Murphy asked how much money was to be made available for the bridge.

Councillor Holdich advised that no definite figures were available, however it was believed that sufficient resources were accessible to repair the bridge for a further five years.

Award of Contract For Remodelling South Side Town Hall - OCT17/CMDN/47

Councillor Sandford asked why the budget for this contract had increased by 100% since March, where he was told the budget was £1,250,000.

Councillor Seaton advised that the additional budget had been utilised to bring the building to a rentable standard and have that part of the building let earlier than expected.

60. 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 Audit and Governance Committee held on 21 September 2017.
2. Decision from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 21 September 2017.
3. Decisions from the Combined Authority Board held on 27 September 2017.
4. Decision from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 23 October 2017.
5. Decisions from the Combined Authority Board held on 25 October 2017.

Questions were asked about the following:

Amendment to Standing Orders for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Public Question Scheme

Councillor Sandford asked how Peterborough City Council's Combined Authority Representatives on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee voted on this item. If they opposed the amendment, could they clarify why?

Councillor Over advised that he supported the proposed for public questioning at Combined Authority Scrutiny meetings, as long as the questions were provided in advance of the meeting.

Councillor Murphy advised that he had submitted his apologies for that particular meeting.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

61. Motions on Notice

(1) Motion from Councillor Martin

In moving his motion Councillor Martin advised that Unison had been campaigning to lift the 1% cap on public sector pay. Other public bodies had agreed to sign up to the campaign, and local authorities were now being called upon. Employees of the Council had been subject to a pay restriction for a long time. It was noted that most of these employees were also Peterborough Council Tax payers, which had risen at a higher rate than their pay. In real terms wages for public sector employees had fallen by 20% since 2010. Some employees relied on benefits or food banks. Councillor Martin urged the Council to call upon the Local Government Association to make a representation to the Government.

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

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

- It was acknowledged that recent years had been difficult for staff in terms of workload and pay.
- It was suggested that the motion was out of line with recent events. In December the Local Government Association (LGA) had made a new offer to the Trade Unions in relation to the remodelling of the pay spine. The Trade Unions will be considering this offer.
- It was suggested that to interfere at this stage would be seen to be supporting

the unions against the LGA.

- Comment was made that the Council paid living wage plus 10% and that the matter should have been raised that the cross party budget working group.
- Sympathy was expressed for the pressure on council worker, however, it was felt that not enough information had been provided to support the motion.

Councillor Ali exercised his right to speak and thanked Members for the acknowledgment of the pressure on staff. He urged Members to show that they valued the staff that made a difference in communities.

Councillor Martin summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing suggested that there had been no real opposition to the motion raise. The Trade Unions would consider the offer of the LGA, but this would still be less than inflation and had not yet been agreed. Funding was required from the Government, just as it was for NHS workers.

A vote was taken (12 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 10 abstained from voting) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

(2) Motion from Councillor Hussain

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS**:

Peterborough City Council notes that Queensgate have recently removed some of the benches that were popular with Peterborough's elderly population and introduced new modern seating, which many feel that they cannot use.

The council believes that it would be better for Queensgate to retain some seating that is more suitable for older people and those with mobility issues or disabilities.

The council understands that Queensgate management has listened to resident and has arranged for more appropriate seating to be installed and passes on its thanks for this.

(3) Motion from Councillor Khan

On behalf of Councillor Khan, Councillor Ali sought approval from the Council to move an altered motion.

A vote was taken (19 voted in favour, 31 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) and the alteration was **DEFEATED**.

The motion was subsequently withdrawn.

(4) Motion from Councillor Ali

In moving the motion on behalf of Councillor Ali, Councillor Shaz Nawaz advised that many residents did not feel comfortable reporting crime, and felt that nobody was listening when they did. It was acknowledged that the police provided the services they could while faced with resource cuts. It was believed that hate crime was an increasingly prevalent issue for the area. Crime had increase by around 20%, without a comparable increase in resource. Councillor Ali was happy to see an increase in in officer numbers in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, but did not consider this to be sufficient to tackle to the issues being faced by residents.

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

Councillor Walsh moved an amendment to the motion and advised that she did not

disagree with Councillor Nawaz, but did not think he went far enough. It was suggested that work was already underway in Peterborough with the Prevention and Enforcement Service, and the Safer Peterborough Partnership. It was felt that fairer funding was needed and that a strategy to cover the various levels of crime was needed to work with local officers.

Councillor Coles seconded the amendment and reserved his right to speak.

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

- Concern was raised around knife culture.
- It was raised that the police being under resourced was an important issue. Problems such as drugs, theft and breaching traffic regulations were not being dealt with properly.
- It was commented that the Safer Peterborough Partnership did not meet in public and as such their work was not widely known.
- Discussion was had in relation to requests to alter the amendment to make it more agreeable to the original mover of the motion, which had not been successful.
- It was felt by some Councillors that the promotion of the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) within the amendment did not add to the motion and was unnecessary.
- Concern was expressed at the focus of the PES on the city centre.
- It was further noted that some confusion lay in the distinction between PES and Kingdom.
- It was advised that the manner in which crime figures were recorded had recently been changed. For example, if several people were involved in an assault on an individual, where previously this would have been recorded as one crime, it would now be recorded as several.
- It was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner had made a request for fair funding for Cambridgeshire police, who were one of the lowest funding constabularies in the country.

Councillor Coles exercised his right to speak and explained that a number of police activities had been transferred to the PES, so to not include the PES in the motion would be factually incorrect.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz summed up as mover of the original motion and in so doing explained that his motion had requested adequate resources for the police. It was not clear how the amended motion went any further than this. It was the role of the Police and Crime and Commissioner to hold the police to account and set strategic direction, which was the intention of the motion. Councillor Shaz Nawaz stated that he would like to work with Councillor Walsh to pursue this issue.

A vote was taken (31 voted in favour, 17 voted against, 3 abstained from voting) and the amendment was **CARRIED**.

Councillor Murphy exercised his right to speak and explained that the it was felt the Police and Crime Commissioner was not currently aligning with Peterborough City Council's priorities. Crime was a serious matter in Peterborough and Councillors were encouraged to support the motion.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz summed up as mover of the motion and in so doing expressed his welcoming of the comments in support for additional resources for the police.

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

The Council notes with concern that some types of crime, particularly victim-based crime, in our city is rising. there appears to be no answer to the rising crime figures in our city. This is making many communities in parts of our city feel unsafe and does not bode well for the city.

Many residents complain of open drug dealing on our streets, with the perpetrators having no fear of getting caught.

Recent figures show sharp rise in violent crime and domestic abuse.

Council notes that in recent months the Prevention and Enforcement Service – a collaboration between the council, police and fire service – has made significant progress in tackling low harm crime, and that we are working closely with the police to support their redesign of policing in Peterborough to better meet demand.

Council also notes the statements already made by the Chief Constable and Police and Crime Commissioner that resources are not at the level required to meet demand for services, and that the council has itself started its Stand Up for Peterborough campaign for fairer funding.

The Council resolves to ask the Police and Crime Commissioner to provide a clear plan that demonstrates how adequate resources to stem this rise in crime will be stemmed and bring the perpetrators to justice.

(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford

A vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

Council notes the increasing evidence that diesel engines are a source of particulates and other noxious substances that can cause significant damage to human health.

Council recognises that Stagecoach have a policy of progressively modernising their fleet of buses in Peterborough but in other parts of the country there has been much more progress on introducing electric, hybrid and other ultra-low emission buses. For example, at 30 June 2017, Transport for London was running 2,729 hybrid buses and 71 fully electric ones, out of a total bus fleet of 9,590.

Council therefore asks the Cabinet and our officers to work with Stagecoach and with the Cambs/Peterborough Mayor and the Combined Authority to investigate the feasibility of introducing more hybrid, electric and other ultra-low emission buses in Peterborough.

62. URGENT REPORT: Appointment of the Interim Monitoring Officer

In response to a question raised, Councillor Holdich advised that Fiona McMillan had been loaned to the Council from the Local Government Shared Services at a rate of £8,750 a month. This was half the cost of hiring a consultant.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council appointed Ms Fiona McMillan Interim Monitoring Officer for Peterborough City Council.

FULL COUNCIL 13 DECEMBER 2017

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

| <u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u> | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 6. | <u>Questions from members of the public</u> |
| 1. | <p>Question from Hazel Perry</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Combined Authority</p> <p>Could you please explain why the public gallery has been closed for the last two council meetings? Why did you feel the need to stop the people of Peterborough holding their democratically elected Council to account for two, now three meetings in a row and how much is it costing to police these closure?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>First and foremost, Council meetings are meetings that are held in public; they are not public meetings. The public gallery is for the public to observe the meeting. Members of the public can get involved through the submission of petitions or by asking questions to Cabinet Members and Chairmen.</p> <p>The public gallery was closed for the Council meetings on 26 July and 11 October 2017, and is again closed this evening because of concerns about the safety of the public, councillors, and officers should it be open. We have been advised by the police that if the public gallery were open and a disruption take place, it would be immensely difficult to clear the gallery and resume the meeting.</p> <p>As such, the gallery is closed until we feel that no disruption which would impede the democratic process of Council.</p> <p>The provision for security at the past two Council meetings has cost, in total, £3,000. Tonight we are using our own staff and it won't costs anywhere near that amount. If we started a meeting, which was disrupted and required reconvening, a reconvened meeting would cost in excess of £1,000.</p> <p>We have, however, put in place arrangements to ensure that the rights of the public are not significantly impacted. The meeting is still available to view live online and is streamed to another room in the Town Hall, which the public can access. I would therefore suggest that this is, in fact, an improvement for public access, as the meetings have now received thousands of views online.</p> <p>Should the public wish to submit a petition or ask a question, as you will have experienced asking your question this evening, they are permitted into the Council Chamber to do so.</p> <p>Of course my fellow Councillors and I would like to have the public gallery open as</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>usual. As such, in order to get the gallery arrangements back to normal as soon as possible, our officers will be undertaking a review of the safety arrangements around the gallery. If there is something that we can do to make the gallery safer, then this will be explored.</p> <p>Supplementary question asked:</p> <p>Do you have any idea when we will have access to the public gallery again please? And I have been told that the video link in the other part of the Town Hall is not very good for watching this on.</p> <p>Cllr Holdich responded:</p> <p>There are so many thousands of people keep watching us. No, I don't know when it will be available. Officers are investigating that; whether we decide to put up glass panels, it will be in the new year sometime.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Question from Paul Apthorpe</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing, and Economic Development</p> <p>464 Eye residents objected to any more growth for the village of Eye during the last Local Plan public consultation in February 2017. Over the last 9 years a significant number of Eye residents, the Parish Council and Ward Councillors have consistently objected to Members and Council Officers for no more growth in Eye.</p> <p>Castor also objected in February 2017 and that growth has been removed from the plan, yet the plan for Eye has stayed the same.</p> <p>Can you please tell the residents of Eye why they have not been listened to once again and the growth for Eye has not been removed from the new local plan?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>The overall growth strategy is to continue to focus the majority of growth in our city in the urban area, and urban extensions. The 'rural' area, including all villages, is expected to accommodate approximately 5% of all planned growth. That rural growth is focused on large villages and to a lesser extent on medium and small villages.</p> <p>Eye is classified as a large village and is at the top of the Settlement Hierarchy. This is because the village has a relatively wide range of services and facilities including shops, a doctor's surgery and a dentist. It has a regular bus service to Peterborough and also within close proximity to the city. It has historically been seen as a sustainable location for growth and is still seen as a suitable location for growth in the emerging new Local Plan.</p> <p>The council is aware of the issues raised by Eye residents, similar issues to what you raised this evening. The Local Plan includes a specific policy relating to the proposed site (LP40) which sets out a number of key principles that must be demonstrated through a site wide master plan. The council must be satisfied that the policy requirements can be addressed. If not, any planning application could quite legitimately be refused.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p>If the Proposed Submission Local Plan is not approved by Full Council, then the council will be in a position going forward where it will be at significant risk of not being able to robustly defend its supply of housing sites, and would likely be subject to speculative applications (especially in and around villages such as Eye) and likely successful challenges at appeal.</p> |
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Question from Kenneth Baker</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Why can I not park in my sheltered accommodation (Bifield, Orton Goldhay)? Is it because other people are parking there from elsewhere? If I go at the weekend I cannot park there.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:</p> <p>I would like to thank Mr Baker for his question, and for his explanatory letter which I have also received.</p> <p>My response to him is as follows:</p> <p>Yesterday I visited the site, supported by PES officers, they are Prevention and Enforcement Officers who would be in a position to know what sort of enforcement action could be taken against anyone who was wrongly parked. However, they do have a wide range of skills as well. We spoke to a number of your neighbours, took photos and took sufficient time to understand the concerns that were raised, particularly with respect to lack of parking spaces but there were other concerns as well which we have noted. I do completely sympathise with residents, particularly those in the sheltered housing accommodation.</p> <p>This was the first step of a complete review and fresh look at the situation. I will be doing further work with officers in an effort to resolve the matter and will be in touch with Mr Baker in the near future.</p> |
| <p>4.</p> | <p>Question from Danette O'Hara</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Given the city's Environment Capital aspirations and the dangers of fossil fuel investments becoming stranded assets, as highlighted by the likes of Mark Carney and others, will the council join Cambridge City Council, and a growing number of local authorities across the country, in calling on their pension fund committee to seriously consider divesting from fossil fuels?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Did we meet a while back about this? I do owe you an apology about this because we exchanged a couple of emails and I have been a bit remiss in updating you on what's going on.</p> <p>Just so Members are aware Cambridge city actually passed a motion in 2015 which talked about divesting themselves of any direct investment in fossil fuels; it wasn't related to the pension fund and Peterborough City Council, as you can imagine, has ethical policies and doesn't hold any direct investments in fossil fuel producers.</p> |

Rather than focus on the general points about global warming / climate change which I've got a lot of sympathy with, I will respond specifically with regards to the Pension Fund.

To set the scene, the pension assets of past and present employees are held as part of the wider Cambridgeshire County Council Pension Fund. This covers not just the County, Cambridge and Peterborough but also numerous other small employers. It is a "pool" rather than separate entities and is run with a cross-party, cross-council board including union representatives.

For some time I have been engaged with members and officers who run the fund day to day on the environmental, social governance, ESG issue. I can give you the assurance that fossil fuels are a very small part of the pension fund portfolio. The current position, and this is, I quote from the fund, is;

"The Fund recognises that effective management of ESG issues can enhance long-term financial performance of investments, and therefore ESG factors should be a feature of investment analysis and management. This aligns with the best interests of the Fund's beneficiaries and is consistent with fiduciary duty. The Pension Fund Committee believes that engagement is key in relation to strong corporate governance, which in turn will enhance returns."

The Fund has a specific ESG policy. ESG factors are an integrated part of the decision-making process that each investment manager will go through when picking a stock. The Fund does not have a policy on divestment but rather prefer to "engage with companies through regulated investment managers" to deliver change.

There was actually a very interesting case just yesterday. The Church of England has a large holding in Exxon, an American company and there have been a lot of calls over the years for the Church of England to get rid of that investment. But they preferred engagement and were central yesterday in getting Exxon to improve the disclosure of the impact they have on climate change.

The Fund regularly review their responsible investment policy and will shortly be considering it again. As a Board Member I can give you my assurance I will again be raising the issue of fossil fuels for discussion.

Supplementary question asked:

So even the most progressive companies are only committing to reducing their emissions by a small proportion within substantial timeframes showing clearly they have no plans to change their core business process from drilling for oil and gas. Therefore, if the Pension Fund Committee truly believe in engagement to be the way forward will you not call upon them to set targets for their engagement process with divestment as the outcome should the targets not be met and also, if you do have a follow up can you send it to me quite promptly.

Councillor Seaton responded:

I am very happy to raise that particular point.

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 Fower**

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

Could the Cabinet Member please let me know when residents living in and around Chiltern Rise, in Gunthorpe, can look forward to the introduction of dropped kerbs at the T-Junctions with both, Pennine Way and Cheviot Avenue?

Councillor Hiller responded:

You can actually do this sort of thing yourselves. Our Highway Services has a schedule of works which details improvements across the city, as they are happening, when they are happening and what is scheduled in. If anyone wants to know what is going on in their ward or need highways work doing in their ward have a look at the schedule of works. If it is not on the schedule of works then talk to the Highways and they can look at the feasibility and see if it can be included in the schedule of works and then you can tell your ward residents all about it.

2. **Question from Councillor Bull**

To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader

Since the formation of the Peterborough Tourism Focus Group - do we know if the overall tourism figures have increased and if so by how much, and how does Peterborough compare with data collected by Visit England?

Councillor Allen responded:

Since the creation the Tourism Forum Group we have no up to date figures from Visit Britain. However, as a general trend the total number of visitors has remained reasonably consistent over the last ten years, although the number of overnight stays has increased from 78 thousand during 2011-13 to 110 thousand 2014-16.

3. **Question from Councillor Rush**

To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Combined Authority

As a Council we have set up a cross-party campaign to "Stand Up For Peterborough". Could the Leader confirm that the campaign is not an attack on Government policy to address the national debt caused by a profligate previous Labour government, but a request for the current funding to be applied more fairly to areas such as Peterborough with particular demands on statutory services?

Councillor Holdich responded:

Fairness is at the heart of the "Stand Up for Peterborough" campaign, which will lobby government to look again at the formulae it uses for calculating how Revenue Support Grants are awarded. The campaign isn't looking for the Government to increase the total pot of funds, merely distribute it more fairly.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is responsible for deciding who gets what, but much of the data it uses to calculate the levels of Revenue Support Grant is out-dated. They are still working on figures from 2010 but in that time we have had a significant population increase, so the figures don't really reflect the city as it is today.

It would be handy for me to say to Members your grant figures will be out next Tuesday. You won't see any difference from those what we expect, only a few minor differences, We then have a few weeks to put our case, and I don't expect in this year that will have much of an effect. There are a lot of councils that are doing this fairness campaign, not just Conservative Peterborough, but others across the country. What will happen then as I see this as a three-year project as this is a three-year budget problem we have. Therefore I don't think you will see any improvement, I don't expect any improvement until next years financial settlement and then I would hope we will see some reflection of our campaign.

Supplementary question asked.

Could the Leader say if the Secretary of State has responded to this council's request for a review of the funding formulae so that the current budget is allocated fairly?

Councillor Holdich responded:

All we have had in response is a letter saying our spending power is more than it was last year. But that doesn't reflect the needs of this city. So the response is irrelevant and quite ingenuous in my opinion.

4. Question from Councillor Murphy

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

How much business rate retention would come to Peterborough Council if we got to keep it all and how much are we likely to get under the current proposal of the Combined Authority.

Councillor Seaton responded:

The first point to make is that we have applied, through the Combined Authority, to be a National Non-Domestic Rating Pooling Pilot. We will hear if we are successful shortly.

Councillor Murphy's question asks how much if we got to keep it all.

That option was not available, as the maximum level was 75% direct to the Council and 25% to the Combined Authority.

The final proposal submitted was 50% Council's, 25% Growth Fund and 25% Public

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Sector Reform Fund. Both the 75% and 50% proposals were debated. It is impossible to say how much we will receive under this proposal and it depends on our bidding for Growth and Public-Sector Reform funding.</p> <p>The final figure may therefore be just as much or indeed more than under the 75% scenario.</p> <p>Supplementary question asked:</p> <p>Could you please agree with me that 50% is less than 75% and the 25% we won't be getting is over a £1million in most probability?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>As I explained in my answer it is impossible to speculate on that, because there is 25% in the Growth Fund, there is 25% in a Public-Sector Reform Fund. If we received fully those monies and we got 50% you'd actually have more than the 75% scenario. So, we are speculating on that. If we got absolutely none of the Growth Fund and absolutely none of the Public-Sector Reform Fund and I think we are very well placed on both, we only got 50% which is very clearly less than 75%. I have already explained it.</p> |
| 5. | <p>Question from Councillor Davidson</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing, and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether or not the recent and sad incident that resulted in a fatality of a motor cyclist along the Gunthorpe Road was a result of speeding?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>For clarity, the question asked relates to the causes of this particular accident which we are not able to say anything about at this juncture because the inquest has not been held yet.</p> <p>Supplementary question asked:</p> <p>I would be interested to know the outcome of that report in due course.</p> <p>Can you confirm if the local authority's record how road users lose their lives and what amount of injuries, deaths will produce road safety measures to address the concerns and prevent further loss of lives along busy roads and in this instance along Gunthorpe Road?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>All road traffic accidents that are reported are recorded and the severity of those accidents are recorded too. I did answer a similar question regarding speed mitigation In that particular area. The perception that we have is that speed is an issue in that particular road but the average speed is something like 19 miles an hour recorded on that particular road.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 6. | <p>Question from Councillor Bull</p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills, and University</p> <p>Apprenticeships are vitally important for this city in order that we offer the right skills sets to existing and new employers. Apprenticeships play a crucial part in upskilling our workforce – how are we ensuring that local businesses don't lose out on any talent that cannot or does not want to go to university; as well as broadening the diversity of our workforce?</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>Secondary schools are working with the Careers and Enterprise Company to strategically plan apprenticeships as a credible route into work with training with educational senior leaders. Local businesses have been recruited as apprenticeship ambassadors to visit schools to offer inspiration to students and support the credible apprenticeship pathway.</p> <p>The regional training providers strategically plan provision to meet skills and employment gaps with employers and the local enterprise partnership to encourage full employer participation.</p> <p>The first statistical release data published by the Education Skills Funding Agency in November 2017 tells us that c.1500 apprentices are employed by Peterborough companies.</p> <p>Providers of Apprenticeships in Peterborough run marketing campaigns, speak at business to business events, hold roadshows and breakfast events to educate employers of the benefits of taking on an apprentice or using the apprenticeship training as a vehicle to upskill their existing workforce.</p> <p>City College Peterborough has a dedicated section on their website to inform employers of the features and benefits of taking on an apprentice and have created an "everything you need to know about apprenticeships" employer guide in co-production with the employers they work with.</p> |
| 7. | <p>Question from Councillor Peach</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>The Labour leader recently suggested a 15% increase in council tax. How much extra income would this provide? Over how many years would this be needed to close the budget gap in 2020/21?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>A 1% increase in council tax provides an additional £714k of funding. As such, a 15% increase in council tax as a basic figure would result in an additional £10.7m.</p> <p>If the Labour Leader's advice was taken, we would need to increase council tax by 15% in each of the next three years to get anywhere near the £35m budget gap in 2020/21.</p> <p>It should be noted that our present plans assume that council tax will rise by 1.99% each year and that in 2018/19 there will be an additional 3% levied for Adult Social Care. The 15% increase would be in addition to these figures.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>An increase of 15% would require a referendum costing upwards of £0.25m with the outcome debatable.</p> <p>Such an increase would have a significant impact on those on low incomes when we have always sought to keep council tax as low as possible. I know that, after the proposal from Councillor Murphy that there be 15% annual increases, Cllr Ferris tweeted that perhaps Councillor Murphy believes that people in Ravensthorpe can afford that but others can't.</p> <p>Supplementary question asked in summary:</p> <p>Was this option considered within budget proposals?</p> <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>People in Peterborough often work very hard, very long hours, and most are not on huge salaries, and many people could not afford the 15% rise even if Councillor Murphy could.</p> <p>Yes, Councillor Peach we considered it, it was a very short discussion.</p> |
| 8. | <p>Question from Councillor Fower</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing, and Economic Development</p> <p>In September this year, we discovered, not from the Council, but care of the Peterborough Telegraph, that Barnet Council had bought a number of homes in Peterborough to let and manage as temporary social housing for their homeless families.</p> <p>At the time Cllr John Holdich stated in his weekly article, that he would be "contacting Barnet Council about its intentions", the "additional pressure on our services" and "asking our MPs to raise the matter in Parliament."</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please let me and the chamber know whether a) Have you contacted Barnet Council and discovered why they failed to forewarn us, b) What additional pressures have we seen on our services and c) Have you got a date for when the matter will be raised by our MPs in Parliament, and does this administration have further concerns that another local London Authority might undertake a similar manoeuvre?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>We were contact by Barnet Homes latterly who purchased the properties on behalf of Barnet Council. They were apologetic as it was their intention to notify us, as was stated in their council's business case, but they accepted that they had failed to do so. That said, there is no requirement for any council to notify us they had intended to purchase property in the city however they do have a duty to notify us of any households they move to our city accommodation and the discharge of their homelessness duties.</p> <p>Barnet Homes confirmed that to date they have not placed any households into the accommodation they now own but have assured us that they will notify us when they do. As a result, we have not seen any additional pressure on services as yet, but we</p> |

maintain the view that this is bound to be one of the consequences.

Reassuringly Barnet Homes did confirm that they do not intend to purchase any further property in Peterborough but we are all concerned that other council's may seek to purchase property in our city as I'm sure all councils within an hour or so of the capital are, but there is nothing that we can do to stop it. We continue to lobby via the LGA in the hope that this practice can be better controlled despite the financial indications of the Communications Workers Union the city's new Labour MP is rapidly gaining a reputation for being somewhat tardy in her communications. I've heard nothing from the MP on this matter or whether it might be raised in the Commons in the near future.

8. Questions on notice to:

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

1. Question from Councillor Murphy

To Councillor Seaton, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee Representative

How much business rate retention will come to Peterborough Council if we got to keep it all and how much are we likely to get under the current proposal of the Combined Authority. At the meeting was a case put for more than 50% of the business rates retention coming to Peterborough Unitary Authority and how did you vote on this matter?

Councillor Seaton responded:

I would refer Councillor Murphy to the answer I gave to a question I answered previously.

Councillor Holdich also responded:

In answer to the question on which way I voted, I voted in the best interests of Peterborough and while I have the microphone I hear a lot of people say Peterborough is not getting it's fair share. I can assure you that it is. And up to now it has had an investment bid of up to £6.5m, £2.8m funding for improvements to the junction of A605 & 1095, £3.85m improvements to junction 18, £4.9m for A47 junction 18, £3.6m for the A605 Whittlesey Access Phase 2, £0.72m for Oundle Road widening, £6.3m Nene Park junction 15, £8.55m for Eastern Industry Access Phase 1 off Parnwell Way, £4.05m for the A1260 Nene Park, £9.7m for the A16 Norwood duelling. We have also had £6.5m for Eastern Industries Access Phase 2 and £0.25m for detailed assessment costs for that famous bridge at junction 18.

Economic development has had £1m commitment. There is priority transport schemes and a list of Future Improve Peterborough and £2.65m funding for Skills Opportunity Peterborough, £6.53m to support the project for the new university, it has had £1.85m which has produced 95 new rented affordable homes.

Supplementary question asked:

You said you had voted on this in the best interests for Peterborough. Yet earlier today I clarified with Kim Sawyer who is the officer responsible for the Combined Authority decision making, no vote has been taken. So where on earth was it you voted on the Business Rate Retention for Peterborough?

My understanding is there have been private discussions within the Conservatives of the Combined Authority whereby Peterborough will lose up to £1m plus.

Councillor Holdich responded:

The Mayor voted with me for the benefit of Peterborough.

We did make a formal vote on the submission to go to Government. What hasn't come back yet because it hasn't been approved by Government is

| | |
|----|--|
| | whether that is accepted in the way it has gone in. |
| 2. | <p>Question from Councillor Bull</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board Representative</p> <p>Will Mayor James Palmer be taking the new alternative notional amount for the combined authority i.e. the new Mayoral Precept in 2018/19?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>I am not aware of any plans to do so at this point time.</p> |