

**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 7 MARCH 2018  
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, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Nadeem, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh

**75. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sharp, Councillor Azher Iqbal, Councillor Whitby, Councillor Fower, and Councillor Gul Nawaz.

**76. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declaration of interest received.

**77. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 January 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the correction of typographical errors.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**78. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor advised that it was the fourth year of the Civic Award scheme, these being awards which recognised residents, groups, organisations and businesses that had made a difference in their local community. The following nominees had been selected to receive a Civic Award:

Community Involvement Civic Award:

- Mr Mark Asplin
- Community Action Peterborough
- Mr Duncan Davies
- Mrs Margaret Fletcher
- Mrs Kerrie Garner
- Mr Henk and Mrs Felicity Kamminga
- Mrs Sue Lane
- Mrs Karen Oldale
- Mr Silvio Perna
- Mr Robert Randall, Mr Gerard Kirt and Mr Peter Skinner

- Mr David Wait
- Mr David and Mr Jason Watling
- Ms Faustina Yang

Sports Civic Award:

- Mr Steve Thorpe
- Mr Kevin Sanders
- Peterborough Special Olympic Swimming Group

Environment Civic Award:

- The Late Mr William Robertson
- Mr Peter Metzger
- Mr Ivan Hammond

Business Civic Award:

- Dr Tarasum Shah

Young Person Civic Award:

- Miss Princess Adekemi

Contribution to Art and Culture Award:

- Ms Ann Bellamy

The winners were to be presented with their awards at a ceremony, date to be confirmed.

**79. Leader's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Leader.

**QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

**80. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

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

1. Consultation on using the Manor for residential care.
2. Drug paraphernalia on Council land.

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

**81. Petitions**

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

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

**(b) Presented by Members**

Councillor Davidson presented three petitions to Council requesting the following:

- 1) To stop and reconsider the proposed closure of the Manor children and young people's home.
- 2) To improve the outdated play equipment at the John Clare recreation park.
- 3) To repeal the decision not to allow members of the public to sit in the gallery in the Chamber, during meetings of Full Council.

Councillor Rush presented a petition to Council requesting the Council to take action in relation to the damage and safety aspect of cars parked on the grass verges along Southfields Avenue and Southfields Drive.

## **82. Questions on Notice**

- (a) To the Mayor**
- (b) To the Leader or member of the Cabinet**
- (c) To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee**

Questions (b) and (c) to the Leader or Member of the Cabinet and to the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. St Johns Hall, Spinney, the Grange and Stafford Hall.
2. Special Responsibility Allowances to Conservative Members.
3. Vaccinations Sign Up.
4. Manor Drive Access.
5. Green Burials.
6. Noise and Anti-Social Behaviour.
7. Permanency Services and TACT.
8. Collaboration with the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government.
9. Selective Licensing.

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

## **(d) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives**

There were no questions to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

### **83. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council**

#### **(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 - 2020**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 9 February 2018, received a report in relation to the production of a Community Safety Plan. This was a statutory requirement for upper tier councils, and as such Peterborough City Council was required to produce a plan for approval by Full Council.

Councillor Walsh introduced the report and moved the proposal. Councillor Walsh advised that the plan was presented to Cabinet in 2017, however it was put on hold to consider changes that were taking place within the police force. There were significant pressures placed on the police that had resulted in them prioritising high harm issues. The Safer Peterborough Partnership and the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee felt that sufficient focus should be maintained on low harm crimes and, as such, the new priority in relation to anti-social behaviour and environmental crime had been included in the plan. All other aspects remained unchanged.

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

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

- Comment was made that the concerns of residents were not being reflected in the proposed plan and that the Safer Peterborough Partnership were not meeting in public to allow residents to hold them to account.
- Concern was raised that the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee had not had sight of the revised plan.
- The focus on anti-social behaviour and environmental crime was welcome.
- It was questioned why the plan did not include any targets or measures of success.
- Further comment was made that the response to consultation only reflected 0.08 percent on the Peterborough population, so could not be taken as the opinion of the area as a whole.

Councillor Fuller exercised his right to speak and explained that the plan had been fully considered by the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee with a number of issues raised by Members in what was a complex matter.

Councillor Walsh summed up as mover of the proposal and in so doing advised that the plan was not based solely on the outcome of the public consultation, but the responses provided were taken into account. The priorities identified within the plan were areas in which the partnership could make the biggest difference working together; each individual body would still undertake their day to day work. It was felt that deferring the submission of the plan to Council was the right thing to do given the circumstances. Concerns were noted and it was advised that an upcoming restructure of the Safer Peterborough Partnership would allow for greater transparency.

A vote was taken (35 in favour, 17 against, 0 abstaining) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approve the Safer Peterborough Partnership Plan 2017 – 2020, including the new priority added.

**(b) Cabinet Recommendation – Medium Term Financial Strategy Phase Two 2018/19 to 2020/21**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 26 February 2018, received a report on phase two of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/2019 to 2020/2021 as part of the Council's formal budget process as set out within the constitution and as per legislative requirements to set a balanced and sustainable budget for 2018/19. The Cabinet also received a supplementary report detailing additional responses to the public consultation.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the proposals. Councillor Seaton advised that the proposals had been discussed at the cross party working group and the Joint Scrutiny Committee. In line with a number of petitions received in relation to Bretton Water Park, it had been arranged for Vivacity to take on responsibility for this facility. Alterations to the proposals were outlined in the additional information packs and included the removal of the bin charge and clarity on the proposals for respite care. It was confirmed that the Council would work closely with those families currently using the Manor for overnight respite.

The challenges facing the Council were clear, adult social care, homelessness, additional growth, high deprivation and low property value. The first phase of the budget had focused on tackling homelessness, lobbying central Government for a fairer funding deal, and tasking the Chief Executive with reviewing shared service possibilities. There were some positives to report; the £120 million investment in Fletton Quays had created

3,000 jobs in the last year, a number of schools in the area had been marked as outstanding, the development of a University was progressing, 5,000 new homes had been built and unemployment in the area was below the national average.

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

Councillor Murphy moved amendments to the proposals and advised that he sympathised with the discussions around paying for a second bin and hoped that in the future this service could be brought back in-house. It was suggested that longer term plans around housing were required as Peterborough had the highest number of families in bed and breakfast accommodation in the whole of the east of England. Comment was made that if an additional £300,000 had been added into reserves within the proposals, then funding could be found for a bridge to the Fletton Quays development. Councillor Murphy identified that the special responsibility allowance paid to Conservative Members was in excess of £17,000 and that this could be put towards the £18,000 needed to fund the Bretton Water Park. Suggestion was made to reduce the number of Cabinet Members to decrease special responsibility allowance costs. It was proposed to reduce the communications budget and to remove the payment of terrorism insurance. Councillor Murphy confirmed that the Corporate Management Team had had sight of the Labour group's proposals.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz seconded the amendments and reserved his right to speak.

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

- In relation to the brown bins, the option to bring the service in-house had already been investigated and dismissed, as it was felt the model would not work for Peterborough.
- It was noted that the council tax proposals remained the same under the amendment.
- The amendment proposals in relation to verge parking were welcomed by a number of Members.
- Comment was made that the reason for the increase in council tax was due to severe cuts from central Government and the transfer of responsibilities to local authorities.
- It was suggested that the Stand Up for Peterborough campaign should be extended to ask for further funding, rather than simply fairer funding.
- The work of the cross party Budget Working Group was welcomed, however, it was felt by some Members that they could look at more than simply the fundamental proposals.
- Members were pleased to see that the proposed charges for replacement bins had been removed.
- Discussion was had around the costs of procuring a replacement for the Amey contract.
- Concern was raised in relation to the provision of sustainable transport and the closure of the bus enquiry kiosk.
- Comment was made that the level of special responsibility allowance for Councillors should be determined by an independent panel.
- Members raised verge parking as a persistent problem across the Peterborough area, with petitions raised around the issue. It was clarified that funding had already been set aside to deal with this matter.
- Members felt that cutting the Council's terrorism insurance would be negligent.
- Further comment was made in relation to Members' special responsibility allowances, explaining that all Group Leaders received an additional payment for that position, which all Group Leaders had taken.

- Suggestion was made that if all Members returned part of their allowance, then this would help fund other services.
- Members remarked that more interesting ways to expand housing across the city should be considered.
- It was felt by some Members that the Conservative Group did not properly consider proposals from opposition groups.
- In relation to Bretton Water Park, it was advised that an alternative arrangement had been found so that Vivacity would take on the running of the park, with no financial support from the Council.
- Comment was made in relation to the proposals around the Manor where the human cost of the proposals was highlighted. Concern was raised that cuts would continue to be made until the service was not used at all and that the message had not been properly communicated to the public.
- Explanation was provided that Cherry Lodge offered a more complete service and would increase overall capacity even after moving all the Manor users over.
- The matter of shared services was raised with attention drawn to the complex and wide ranging implications for such a proposal, and the hard work that had already been put into it.
- In relation to comments made around the Manor it was advised that 12 families currently used the service. Two were transitioning to adult services and seven children used the overnight services. Cherry Lodge currently provided for more complex needs and was open for seven nights a week, whereas the Manor was open for four nights. Cherry Lodge was only at 40% capacity.
- Moving over to Cherry Lodge was one option. Other options included improving links with foster carers and day care services. Users would still be able to use the Manor services in the day. The Council were assured that their team were child focused and that the children involved would be provided for.

During the course of the debate Councillor Davidson left the meeting.

Councillor Shaz Nawaz exercised his right to speak and thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for their work. Councillor Shaz Nawaz indicated that he would be willing to sacrifice £10,000 of his allowance if Councillor Fitzgerald would match this, thus providing an additional £20,000 that could be spent on tackling parking on grass verges. It was advised that, having been elected to the Council less than a year ago he was not in a position to present a complete alternative budget. Councillor Shaz Nawaz was pleased to hear that money was being invested in Medesham Homes, but felt that further work was required to generate profit from this to reinvest. This could allow the Council to buy additional land property. It was suggested that the amendments proposed were all sensible, and Councillor Shaz Nawaz hoped that Members would support them.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the original proposals and in so doing noted that the amendments from Councillor Murphy were only circulated to Members on Monday. Support was shown for the statements made around parking, which reflected current practice. It was suggested that proposals to drop terrorism insurance when the country was at its highest terrorism risk level was not sensible. Councillor Seaton supported the move to shared services, however noted that progress needed to be made carefully, as individual jobs would be involved.

A recorded vote was taken on item one of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Okonkowski, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Shaz Nawaz, Sylvester

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Lamb, Lane, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Ash, John Fox, Hussain, Nadeem, Over

The amendment was **DEFEATED** (22 in favour, 27 against, 0 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item two of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Clark, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh

**Councillors Against:** King

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** John Fox, Nadeem

The amendment was **CARRIED** (49 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item three of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bond, Brown, Bull, Cereste, Clark, Dowson, Elsey, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Hiller, Holdich, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Sylvester, Walsh

**Councillors Against:** Bisby, Coles, Fuller, Harper, Rush

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Casey, Ellis, John Fox, Nadeem

The amendment was **CARRIED** (43 in favour, 5 against, 2 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item four of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Khan, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Saltmarsh

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Barkham, Bond, Judy Fox, Lane, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Not Voting:** Ali, Ayres, Bull, Ferris, John Fox, Johnson, Nadeem, Over, Peach, Rush, Sylvester

The amendment was **DEFEATED** (13 in favour, 22 against, 8 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item five of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Sylvester.

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Coles, Elsey, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, King, Lamb, Over, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox, Lane

**Councillors Not Voting:** Bull, Cereste, Fitzgerald, Holdich, John Fox, Peach, Stokes, Nadeem

The amendment was **CARRIED** (22 in favour, 21 against, 3 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item six of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sylvester

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Lane, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Barkham, Bond, Judy Fox, Lillis, Mahabadi, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Not Voting:** Ash, John Fox, Nadeem

The amendment was **DEFEATED** (15 in favour, 29 against, 7 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item seven of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Okonkowski, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Sylvester

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Lane, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Ash, Nadeem, John Fox



The amendment was **DEFEATED** (22 in favour, 29 against, 0 abstaining).

Following the announcement of the voting results a significant number of Members addressed the Mayor to advise that their votes had not been registered on the electronic voting system.

The meeting was adjourned for five minutes for officers to review the electronic voting system software and establish whether votes had not been registered.

\*

The Legal Officer advised that a significant number of votes had not been registered by the electronic voting system. As such, the Mayor announced that voting on items five and six of the amendment to the proposals would be run again.

A number of Members expressed their dissatisfaction with this decision.

A recorded vote was taken on item five of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Sylvester

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, John Fox, Judy Fox, Lane

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED** (21 in favour, 29 against, 4 abstaining).

A recorded vote was taken on item six of an amendment to the proposals:

**Councillors For:** Ali, Clark, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Sylvester

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Barkham, Bond, John Fox, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED** (15 in favour, 31 against, 8 abstaining).

Councillor Khan moved a motion to suspend standing order 14.2 so that the meeting could be extended beyond the four hour guillotine.

Councillor Jamil seconded the motion.

A vote was taken on the motion (17 in favour, 30 against, 1 abstaining) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

At this point Councillor Dowson left the meeting.

Members debated the substantive proposals and in summary the points raised included:

- Comment was made that the proposed budget was not one for the people of Peterborough.
- Concern was expressed in relation to the increase in cost for brown bins.
- Members were pleased to hear that the Manor was not proposed for complete closure. It was noted, however, that the families using the respite services were used to the service and felt safe with it.
- It was highlighted that no money was proposed to be put back into reserves and it was hoped that services would not be cut in future years as a result.
- Suggestion was made that the Council had failed to provide innovatively for housing needs.
- Clarity was provided that funding was being put into social housing in the form of Medesham Homes.

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 formally moved and seconded.

A recorded vote was taken on the substantive proposals:

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bisby, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Seaton, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Bond, Clark, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed, Sylvester

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Barkham, John Fox, Judy Fox

It was **RESOLVED** (30 in favour, 19 against, 4 abstaining) that Council approved:

1. The Phase Two budget proposals, outlined in Appendix H, subject to additional wording to clarify that Vivacity had agreed to take on the running of Bretton Water Park. This includes a 5.99 per cent council tax increase, and a change in service delivery for the 0-25 Provider service.
2. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19-2020/21 as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
  - Appendix A – Budget Context highlighted in Phase One, MTFS for 2018/19-2020/21
  - Appendix B – 2018/19 MTFS detailed position
  - Appendix C – 2018/19 MTFS by department
  - Appendix D – 2018/19 MTFS by Service
  - Appendix E – Capital Schemes
  - Appendix F – Council Grants

- Appendix G – Fees and Charges
- Appendix H – Budget Proposals (consultation document)
- Appendix I – Equality Impact Assessments
- Appendix J – Budget Consultation Feedback
- Appendix K – December 2018 Budgetary Control Report
- Appendix L – Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19-2020/21
- Appendix M – Asset Investment and Acquisition Strategy, Capital Programme 2018/19-2020/21
- Appendix N– Asset Management Plan

subject to:

- the rewording of the Equality Impact Assessment: 0 – 25 Residential/Respite homes for children with disabilities - The Manor & Cherry Lodge in Appendix I, to clarify that overnight care will no longer be provided at The Manor; the building will not be closed and will be used for outreach services;
  - the removal of the charging for replacement bins recommendation set out in Appendix H. A report will be produced for budget working group, looking at mechanisms, including appeals, used by other authorities and allowing time for further discussions with the police.
  - New Proposal - Verge Parking: Have a £40k Capital Budget to deliver/test verge parking measures. Revenue costs of this proposal are detailed in the following table:
- | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 |
|---------|---------|---------|
| £5,000  | £5,000  | £5,000  |
- A Parking review that had been instigated and efficiencies and price changes would be considered as part of the quarterly budget process starting in July.

**(c) Cabinet Recommendation – Rolling Medium Term Financial Strategy Budget Process**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 26 February 2018, received a report that proposed an amendment to the Council’s formal budget setting process.

A vote was taken and it was **RESOLVED** (unanimous) that Council approved the rolling budget and delegated authority to the Interim Director of Law and Governance to approve the amendment of the ‘Budget Framework Procedure Rules’ to follow the revised budget process.

**(d) Cabinet Recommendation – Council Tax Support Scheme 2018-19**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 26 February 2018, received a report following consultation on proposals for the Council Tax Support Scheme 2018/19 including discussion at the cross party Budget Working Group.

A vote was taken and it was **RESOLVED** (36 in favour, 14 against, 0 abstaining) that Council agreed a local Council Tax Support Scheme for Peterborough that contained the following local components:

- a) No change to the existing scheme reduction of 30% for all eligible working age claimants
- b) To keep the scheme mirroring the Housing Benefit scheme as much as possible, the following amendments are also proposed:
  - to limit the award of Council Tax Support based on a maximum of 2 children;
  - to provide protection to existing claims that already include more than 2 children;

- to make provision for more than 2 children in the applicable amount where the child tax credit calculation includes additional children; and
  - to disregard earnings from part-time fire fighters and payments from the infected blood payment scheme.
- c) To amend appropriate rates in line with annual upratings.

**(e) Cabinet Recommendation – Fletton Quays and Office Consolidation Update**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 26 February 2018, received a report in relation to Fletton Quays and the office consolidation process, following a referral from CMT on 31 January 2018.

A vote was taken and it was **RESOLVED** (31 in favour, 6 against, 14 abstaining) that Council approved additional capital investment of £2,636,025 (including a contingency of £500,000), to ensure council office buildings, including Sand Martin House, were able to meet the new and emerging needs of the council and provide opportunities for other organisations to lease parts of the office building to provide the council with additional income streams. It also facilitated the conversion and refurbishments of Bayard Place reception to provide an improved customer experience.

**84. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

A report was received that detailed Executive decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions made at the Cabinet meeting held on 9 February 2018
2. Decisions made at the Budget Cabinet meeting held on 26 February 2018
3. Use of the Urgency, Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provisions on 26 January 2018.
4. Decisions made by Cabinet Members between 25 January 2018 and 21 February 2018.

No questions were asked on questions on the Executive decisions made since the last meeting.

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

A report was received that detailed Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions made by the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 29 January 2018.
2. Decisions made by the Combined Authority Board on 31 January 2018.

No questions were asked on questions on Combined Authority decisions taken since the last meeting.

**COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

**86. Motions on Notice**

**(1) Motion from Councillor Murphy**

A vote was taken on a motion to refer the motion from Councillor Murphy to the relevant scrutiny committee for consideration (21 in favour, 29 against, 0 abstaining) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on an amendment to the motion (6 in favour, 45 against, 0 abstaining) and the amendment was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on the original motion (20 in favour, 30 against, 0 abstaining) and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

**(2) Motion from Councillor Walsh**

The motion from Councillor Walsh was withdrawn.

**(3) Motion from Councillor Coles**

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

Peterborough City Council has had a good record of supporting residents who are in the grip of drug addiction, ensuring those who inject themselves with illegal drugs get access to clean equipment so that they can avoid taking risks to their health through sharing needles.

Public Health estimates that approximately 1,500 addicts inject opiates or crack cocaine in Peterborough. Aspire, who run the Council's drug programmes, report that between 800 to 1,200 individuals are receiving treatment at any one time.

Residents in my ward in Fletton and Woodston have seen a noticeable increase in used needles being found in the streets, along the riverbank, in public toilets and even in children's play areas.

This problem is not seen purely in my own ward, but is becoming very noticeable across the city and members from my own and other political groups have been receiving reports from residents about discarded needles in public spaces.

We need a coordinated response across Council portfolios to ensure that this issue is addressed.

Therefore this Council calls on the Chief Executive to instruct the Directors of Public Health and People and Communities to immediately put the structure in place to examine the issue and to work towards its resolution.

**(4) Motion from Councillor Sandford**

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

Council believes that it is wrong for councillors to have the final say on the allowances that they themselves receive.

Council therefore asks the chief executive to write to the minister for local government requesting that legislation be brought forward to make the recommendations of independent member allowances panels mandatory on councils.

In the absence of such legislation, Council asks the Leader of the Council to work with

opposition group leaders to try to establish a cross party agreement that recommendations of future independent member allowances panels be accepted, other than in the most exceptional circumstances.

**(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford**

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

Council believes that councillors are representatives of the people and therefore members of the public should be able to easily find out how their councillor has voted on any given issue.

In pursuance of this principle, Council resolves that lists of how each councillor has voted in electronic votes taken at Full Council meetings be published on the Council website with the minutes of each meeting.

**87. Reports to Council**

**(a) Council Tax Resolution**

Council received a report as part of the Council's formal budget process as set out within the constitution and as per legislative requirements to set a balanced budget for 2018/19.

A recorded vote was taken:

**Councillors For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Bull, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Elsey, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Nadeem, Okonkowski, Over, Peach, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, Serluca, Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Clark, Ellis, Ferris, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Johnson, Khan, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Sylvester

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, John Fox, Judy Fox

It was **RESOLVED** (36 in favour, 14 against, 3 abstaining) that Council approved the Council Tax Resolution which proposed:

- A rise in general Council Tax of 2.99%
- A rise in Adult Social Care precept of 3.00%

**(b) Allocation of Seats to Political Groups Update**

Council received a report that outlined the impact on the political balance of the Council, following the resignation of two Members from the Labour Group and the Liberal Democrat Group.

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

- (a) Notes that there are 102 seats on committees, as agreed at Annual Council on 22 May 2017;
- (b) Agrees the allocation of seats on those committees subject to the political balance arrangements set out in appendix 1 to the report; and
- (c) Confirms the allocation of seats on those committees not subject to political

balance arrangements remains unchanged.

**(c) Draft Programme of Meetings 2018 - 19**

Council received a report that set out the proposed draft annual programme of meetings for 2018/19.

A vote was taken and it was **RESOLVED** (unanimous) that Council approved, in principle, the draft programme of meetings for 2018/19 attached at appendix 1 to the report.

**(d) Annual Pay Policy Statement 2018/2019**

Council received a report that sought approval of the Pay Policy Statement for 2018/19.

A vote was taken and it was **RESOLVED** (37 in favour, 0 against, 14 abstaining) that Council approved the Pay Policy Statement for 2018/19. The Policy was attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 11.39pm  
7 March 2018

## FULL COUNCIL 7 MARCH 2018

### QUESTIONS

Questions were received under the following categories:

#### 6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

##### Questions from members of the public

#### 1. **Question from Sam Hemraj**

To Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

In the second proposed budget it is set out to stop using the Manor for residential care. What consultation have you done for this to be even proposed to be added in the budget, as there is very limited information in this part of the budget. It states that this will be consulted on as part of the budget consultation, and consultation will take place with effected staff and families. Surely the consultation should have happened before going in the budget so that the public can read the outcome and whether it costs more in the long term to close these services due to knock on affects to carers health.

Why can't Peterborough City Council change the service so that direct payments can be used to fund the service?

#### **Councillor Smith responded**

Thank you for your question.

For background...

Thirteen families currently have the support of The Manor, 7 of these use the centre for overnight stays. Families are given that support based on assessed need, agreed at a panel meeting.

We have two facilities in Peterborough providing short breaks in the form of overnight care, as well as day care and outreach.

The average occupancy over the last six months at both homes is:

- 22.6% at The Manor
- 60.2% at Cherry Lodge

To answer your question, there is one joint budget for both homes with a £500k income target where partners purchase placements. In recent years the requests for placements from health and other local authorities has decreased resulting in a budget pressure of £250k.

A direct payment is a cash payment paid by the council directly to the person needing care services, and they then choose how they spend that money to support themselves, they cannot be redirected to fund the service.



	<p>Families have been engaged by their social workers. Likely needs for replacement services have been thought through, but conversations on <b>actual</b> replacement services cannot happen until a decision on The Manor has been agreed by Full Council. As part of the budget process we review and consider feedback received on the consultation.</p> <p>I can assure you the families who receive overnight care at the Manor are receiving support from their social workers to agree alternative provision;</p> <p>I hope that puts your mind at rest and answers your question.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question from Sam Hemraj:</b></p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member set up a meeting between myself, services users and the manager and the staff of the Manor and social services and take a report to the relevant Scrutiny Committee and allow service users to attend to provide information to the Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p><b>Cllr Smith responded:</b></p> <p>To be honest I would have to check that, but I am happy to have a conversation with you and invite senior offices to that meeting. I'm not sure what the process is through Scrutiny because the budget consultation has already been through the scrutiny panel, but we can certainly meet to discuss further.</p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Nigel North</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>The ward of Fletton and Woodston is beset with drugs paraphernalia being dropped in waste ground, verges, fields and unbelievably even designated play areas. This includes needles (sharps), blood soaked wipes and drug spoons.</p> <p>This is a serious risk to local residents as well as anyone walking dogs enjoying the riverside etc. Parents are afraid to let their children run freely. This occurs in PCC as well as private land.</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member please explain what is being done now and what they are planning to do differently to improve matters?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Firstly, please be absolutely assured that this issue is a top priority one and we intend to address it, both in the area you describe and in other affected areas across Peterborough.</p> <p>Colleagues on the other side of the chamber just this evening joined myself and officers to discuss this very issue and to take the matter forward.</p> <p>Our officers have recently briefed Cabinet Members on the issues, and work to develop and deliver an action plan is being undertaken as we speak. This plan will focus not only on enforcement, but preventative solutions aimed at changing the behaviour of substance misusers.</p> <p>Time would not allow me to elaborate further on the detail of this plan, but I would be</p>

more than happy to share this with you outside of this meeting.

It should be mentioned that officers have already met with a number of local residents to hear their concerns and update them on the efforts we are putting in place to tackle this serious issue. The Police and the Public Health team also attended the meeting.

Some immediate actions have taken place including urgent clean-up activity carried out by both Amey and Community Payback. This will also now be an ongoing regular activity, in addition to the existing ad-hoc call out arrangements, but there is much more to be developed in the action plan and I will certainly be pleased to keep you updated Mr North, thank you.

**Supplementary question from Nigel North:**

I did mention private land and one of the concerns raise at a residents meetings I went to the other day is that drugs paraphernalia can be picked up on PCC land and then two yards at the other side its left there because it is on private land and then there is a dispute between the Council and the land owner. Can I have reassurance that this is going to be dealt with and that in some manner perhaps the land owner can be charged afterwards, but we must get these needles off the ground for the safety of our children as well as every other resident

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

The issue of paraphernalia on private land is being picked up as part of the scope of the action plan that is being developed at this moment and we will find a way to deal with both public and private land, thank you.

## 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 Murphy**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Concerning asset transfers in Ravensthorpe and community facilities, can you let me know what, if anything, is being done to replace St Johns Hall and how are the plans going concerning the Spinney, The Grange and Stafford Hall?

#### **Councillor Walsh responded:**

Having reviewed all aspects of the three locations Cllr Murphy has referred to, I would say that matters are proceeding satisfactorily. Time does not allow, within this response, to set out in detail the various considerations and detail of each location. I am sure that, as a responsible Ward Councillor, Cllr Murphy has followed developments closely. However, if that is not the case, I would be happy to arrange for him to meet with officers involved in Community Asset Transfer to give him a thorough briefing.

#### **Supplementary question from Cllr Murphy**

Thank you very much for your answer Could I ask that the closure of St Johns the issues around the Grange and the Spinney and its management are referred to the relevant Scrutiny Committee so we can get to the bottom of this matter.

#### **Councillor Walsh responded:**

Thank you I doubt that there is any bottom to any matter to get to, however I can refer the matter onto officers and I will invite Councillor Murphy to speak to them because I do believe that there is an issue with regard to his turning up to meetings. It is important that he gets to know the detail first, thank you.

### 2. **Question from Councillor Murphy**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

What was the total amount paid in special responsibility allowances to Conservative Councillors when Councillor Holdich became leader, what is the total increase over the period since he has been leader, what currently is the total annual figure, and who gets paid what?

#### **Councillor Seaton responded:**

Councillors may be interested to know that the cost of special responsibility allowances has reduced by about 20% since 2009-10. Subsequently of course specific allowances

were frozen. Councillor Holdich became leader in 2015 and in 2015-16, the SRAs amounted to £182,818.42. SRAs increased by a total of £17,616.25 as the cost in 2016/2017 was £200, 434.67, still £50,000 below where they were seven years earlier. The current total from 1 April 2017 - 31 December 2017 is £172,168.43.

It's interesting to note Members that the Cabinet Member SRA allowance increased in 2017 £14,331 to £15,150 that was around 6%, but was over a seven year period, so well under 1%. For comparison over the same period, basic allowance for Councillors increased by 27%, from £7960 to £10,100 and I believe of course Councillor Murphy and all our Labour colleagues accepted that. I will of course arrange a link for this information, which is available to view on line to be sent to all Councillors after this meeting to respond to the final part of your question Councillor Murphy, which appear to be a list of names that is all available on line as I said.

**Supplementary question from Councillor Murphy:**

For the benefit of those people watching or listening in I was asking how much special responsibility allowances Conservative Councillors get, how much it is and who gets paid it because of the increase. Does the Cabinet Member not recall the media last year of 30% hikes in the leader and deputy leader national newspapers and local newspapers £180,000 additionally was spent on Councillors allowances does he think he and his fellow Conservatives get paid too much for what they do and he will look with me at trying to reduce it.

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Councillor Murphy seems to be forgetting his own SRA as group leader although I'm not surprised as it's not like he earns it. Just to answer those specific points I actually, in the reply I gave, gave full details and answered the questions. You are incorrect in that I do not believe that the deputy leader received 30% increases, that's untrue, but I do agree with you that there is a question of councillors giving value. So I know that Councillor Murphy you've got 2 labour councillors that turn up at 75% of meetings giving value, but also you've also got two who struggle to attend half the meetings, is that giving value? Thank you Councillor Murphy.

**3. Question from Councillor Mahabadi**

To Councillor Lamb, Cabinet Member for Public Health

What is the percentage level of uptake for vaccinations per the "Childhood vaccines timeline" published on NHS.uk in Peterborough, what steps are being taken to ensure that Herd Immunity is being maintained against the diseases vaccinated against, and what messaging is being provided by PCC to counter 'anti-vaccination' propaganda?

**Councillor Lamb responded:**

The main responsibility for childhood vaccinations sits with NHS England and not with the Council. NHS England fund and commission the national childhood vaccination programme.

Vaccinations are delivered by GP surgeries and in some cases by NHS vaccination teams who visit schools. The City Council public health office and communications team work with NHS England, to encourage local residents to take up the offer of vaccination.

The latest published percentage uptake for each childhood vaccination in Peterborough, is available on the national 'Public Health Outcomes Framework'

	<p>website. This information is also included in the 'Annual Health Protection Report,' which will be reviewed at the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board next week.</p> <p>The aim for all childhood programmes is to achieve at least 95% uptake; the level which ensures Herd Immunity and makes spread of the disease in the community unlikely. However, the target uptake, as outlined in the Public Health Outcomes Frameworks is 90%.</p> <p>In Peterborough we achieved over 90% for most childhood vaccinations in the year 2016 to 2017, but the five year booster vaccination for Hib/Men C and the second dose of MMR vaccine were below this level.</p> <p>The current Healthy Peterborough campaign is promoting the uptake of childhood vaccinations, including HPV vaccine. The key messages are, 'Childhood vaccinations can protect your child against 7 serious diseases,' and 'Arm against cervical cancer with the HPV vaccine'. These messages counter anti-vaccination propaganda.</p> <p>Further messages are being provided on posters and lamp post banners, along with social media, magazines advertorial, a radio Cambridgeshire 'Health Matters' interview, and the Healthy Peterborough website. I hope that gives you some idea and there is quite a lot about vaccinations that I put in my cabinet report to all of you in February. So if there is anything further I'm sure it will come up.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please advise me as to what support the Council can provide to residents of the Manor Drive development in Gunthorpe who are facing noise and access issues due to construction vehicles entering and leaving the site on a regular basis?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>I thank Councillor Bond for his question. I have some good news which you may wish to pass on to anybody concerned with construction traffic on this development. Planning Permission for Phase 2 of the Paston Reserve Development whilst initially using Manor Drive as the construction traffic route will change so that Newborough Road is used instead.</p> <p>A planning application for the construction access on Newborough Road has been received by the City Council to make this change and consent is expected to be issued in about two weeks' time, with construction following very soon afterwards. Thank you Mr. Mayor.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Gavin Eelsey, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Some years ago, the Council used to promote a "green burial" scheme at the Fletton Cemetery. This was a popular scheme and strongly supported the Council's environment city agenda.</p> <p>Given the upsurge in interest in green burials across the country and the Council's pressing need for increased revenue, this would be an ideal time to start promoting this concept to Peterborough people and those in surrounding areas.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me what has happened to the Green Burial scheme, is</p>

it still operating and, if so, why is it hardly ever mentioned in City Council publicity materials?

**Councillor Elsey responded:**

Thank you Mr. Mayor and thank you to Councillor Sandford for his question.

The Green Burial scheme is still operating and information is available on the Council's website, in Bereavement Services literature and locally to residents via their funeral directors. It was opened in January 1998 and in the first year 7 burials took place. This number has stayed fairly consistent over the last 20 years with 136 burials to date.

As Green Burial became popular nationally several Green Burial sites have opened in Cambridgeshire in quiet countryside or woodland settings. Our scheme at Fletton is sited within an existing traditional cemetery in a residential area close to the noise of Fletton Parkway. This puts our scheme at a disadvantage compared to the peaceful countryside habitats the other sites can offer and their fees are lower. Therefore it is not likely that further promotion of the scheme to those in the surrounding area is likely to generate further interest in this burial option we offer at Fletton cemetery.

**Supplementary question asked by Cllr Sandford:**

Yes, I do and I'm grateful to Councillor Elsey for that response. The reason I asked the question was that I was approached by a member of the public who said they had got a plot reserved at Fletton cemetery for a green burial but they heard that there was a shortage of space. Would Cllr Elsey agree that if we could ensure that burial sites are available it would be a good way of enhancing the Council's environmental credentials but also perhaps bringing in a much needed source of income for the Council.

**Councillor Elsey responded:**

The short answer is yes and yes, the total burial space of the scheme is 247, remaining spaces for burial are 72 excluding reserved graves. Therefore I am somewhat concerned that the person who has spoken to you has suggested that there isn't space because if it is a reserve grave then it should be there. If you would like to give me the details, I will look into it for you.

**6. Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

What action is the Cabinet Member taking to address issues of noise and anti-social behaviour across the city?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Tackling anti-social behaviour is one of the agreed priorities for the Safer Peterborough Partnership, which comprises a number of statutory agencies including the council and the police.

The council, via the Prevention and Enforcement Service, responds to reports of ASB regardless of their nature, ranging from neighbour disputes through to community-wide ASB issues. Following a risk assessment, those that present the highest risks are dealt with in a robust and timely manner.

Since 1st April 2016, more than 1,000 ASB incidents have been reported and

	<p>responded to by the PES. Incidents of ASB can be reported through to the service either by phone or via the council website.</p> <p>With regard to noise nuisance the Council, through its development control function, apply conditions to help mitigate against noise disturbance. In addition, complaints are investigated to determine whether they meet the threshold to be classified as a 'statutory nuisance'. In such cases the Council serves an abatement notice, and follows this up, if breached, with legal proceedings.</p> <p><b>Supplementary question asked by Shaz Nawaz:</b></p> <p>Thank you Councillor Walsh for your extensive response. I have received a number of complaints from residents round central park and they are keen to meet with you so I was hoping that you and I could meet with them to discuss some of their issues in person, would that be a possibility?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Yes of course it would be. Just get in touch and we'll arrange it.</p>
7.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bull</b></p> <p>To Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p> <p>On 31 January there was a formal launch of the Permanency Service. Whilst it is good to hear from staff and foster carers about how the transition process has been managed, can the Cabinet Member let us know more about this smooth transition over to TACT (The Adolescent and Children's Trust) and what significant changes in support have resulted?</p> <p><b>Councillor Smith responded:</b></p> <p>Many of you know that TACT took over our permanency service from the first of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017, let me correct that, it's not a takeover it's a partnership, apologies. Since then, TACT has invested in enhanced training for our foster carers, and our foster carers also now benefit from 24/7 support in terms of a call line they can ring if they need any emergency help. Foster carers are also now able to access improved consultation services, and that has helped them in turn to support some of our more complex children who have got certain needs that a foster carer may not have been able to address and that as a result has stopped many foster children going into residential places or us paying more to send them to independent foster caring agencies.</p> <p>TACT are actively recruiting more fostering households for us including link foster carers which will take some of the children from the manor. They are tasked in 2018/19 with 30 new households in 2018/19 and it's always better that our kids are in Peterborough than outside of the area, so that will benefit our children.</p> <p>The really nice thing that we have seen is different type of carer groups coming together, so in the past foster carers met together, adoption carers met together and special guardianship orders were out on the peripheries. The foster carers are now bringing those under their wings and really all supporting each other so that is also a real benefit for the carers and they can share experiences and help each other.</p> <p>It is still early days, but TACT are really making a difference to the quality of our fostering and adoption services, so I am pleased with how things are going.</p>

<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Bull</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>The government is committed to bringing forward a new strategy to help achieve integrated communities. Peterborough is one of five councils invited to take part in implementing the strategy in collaboration with the Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government. How is this important work progressing?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Integrated Communities is one of two important programmes which we have been invited to participate in as a city</p> <p>Work on both of these programmes is progressing very well and the two projects have the capacity to impact significantly on all of our communities. Once procedural matters allow, I will be able to share the detail with all Members and I look forward to hearing their views on these two very important programmes.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>How well is selective licensing working and was there a net cost to the Council for 2017/18?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Peterborough's selective licensing schemes are working very effectively. We have received in excess of 7,100 applications, with more than 3,600 inspections of properties already carried out. Of those inspections, 670 enforcement cases have been opened relating to non-completion of works identified as being needed at the initial inspection. We have also taken 10 enforcement cases to court because of non-compliance, with a positive court outcome in every case.</p> <p>Landlords in the licensed areas must satisfy a wide range of basic conditions, which result in swathes of privately rented properties being maintained in a safe and appropriate manner.</p> <p>In order not to penalise good landlords, we offered a heavily discounted licence fee in the first three months of the schemes being launched, in return for certain criteria being met. We received far more applications in this category than we had envisaged which, whilst causing a financial pressure in the first year, has resulted, very positively, in far more properties being licensed willingly than we had anticipated.</p> <p>However, Council must remember that the Selective Licensing schemes are five-year schemes, and that they need to cover their own costs without generating any surplus at the end of that period. We are aware of some 1,600 properties that remain unlicensed in the regulated areas, and these will now be subject to the higher fee of £900 per property. The schemes will therefore deliver a financially neutral outcome to the Council at the end of the five-year period.</p> <p>Council Nawaz: I don't believe my question has been fully answered. The second part of my question was what was the net cost to the Council for 2017/18?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh: I will get the exact figure sent to Councillor Nawaz. I think the</p>



important thing is that the scheme is meeting its objectives and so therefore honing in on one year is not representative of the scheme. Thank you.

**Councillor Nawaz asked a supplementary question:**

I am pleased to hear the scheme is working very effectively and I understand that there may be other areas in Peterborough that meet the criteria for selective licensing. Is there a plan to extend the scheme to those particular areas?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

A regulated area depends on the conditions prevailing in that area. It has to be very strongly evidenced based. If you have any particular areas that you would like us to have a look at we will certainly do that. We do keep a close watch, a watching brief on all areas of the City and if any of those do meet the criteria, then yes, selective licensing could be rolled out to them, but as I say it is important that we meet the criteria.

This page is intentionally left blank