

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 25 JULY 2018
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR CHRIS ASH

Present:

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Fuller, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, King, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Warren, Walsh, and Whitby

18. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Seaton, Nadeem, Davidson and Fower.

19. Declarations of Interest

The Mayor announced that the Audit Committee had granted general dispensation to all Members that enables them to debate and vote on the agenda budget item should they have any disclosable interest.

The Mayor invited any member who was more than two months in arrears of council tax payments to declare such, as this affects the rights to vote and speak.

No declarations were forthcoming.

20. Minutes of the Meetings held on 21 May 2018.

(a) Mayor Making – 21 May 2018

The minutes of the Mayor Making meeting held on 21 May 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record.

(b) Annual Council – 21 May 2018

The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 21 May 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

21. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor announced he was pleased the public gallery was now open and welcomed members of the public to the meeting.

Members were reminded to use the microphone and were given guidance on the use of the electronic voting system. Members were asked to limit the use of electronic devices to matters concerning the meeting.

It was announced that Councillor Hemraj was organising an event to celebrate the 70th birthday of the NHS in Central Park on 28 July 2018 which included free family activities.

22. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

23. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

(a) To the Mayor

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

1. Anti-Bullying Policies
2. Cambridgeshire Pension Fund, Fossil Fuels

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

24. 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.

There was a short adjournment to allow the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to remove their ceremonial robes due to the hot weather.

24. Questions on Notice

(a) To the Mayor

(b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet

(c) To the Chair of any Committee of Sub-Committee

Questions (a) to (c) were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Millfield and New England Regeneration Package
2. Verge parking issues
3. Burial spaces
4. Waste skip collections
5. Vista Development
6. Public transport to Sand Martin House

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

(d) To the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Representatives

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

1. Non-Attendance - inquorate Combined Scrutiny Meeting.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

25. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche One

Cabinet, at its meeting of 11 June 2018 received a report to seek approval to recommend that Council adopts the Medium Term Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche One.

Councillor Fitzgerald introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He thanked officers for the preparation of the budget and advised members that the budget aimed to deliver a balanced and sustainable plan over the upcoming three year period. It was recognised that there would be significant government funding changes during this time which would need to be accounted for once known. In Tranche One net savings of £2.4 million had been delivered, leaving a £10.2 million deficit in 2019/20 rising to £22.3 million in 2021/22. Key items noted included increased pension costs, increased savings from work undertaken on homeless prevention and housing, savings achieved in capital finance costs, and additional income achieved from increased performance in collection of council tax and non-domestic rates payments.

Consultation closed on 23 July 2018 and four responses had been received. New responses questioned whether it was possible to investigate new delivery models to save money and if the Council could raise income from those people who came to the city to work or use its facilities.

Following the Joint Scrutiny meeting, further funding information on the percentage of council tax funding other local authorities were reliant upon was being circulated to Members. A report on the progress of the Peterborough Investment Partnership was currently being prepared as requested at that meeting.

Tranches Two and Three would further develop the Council's move towards a fully sustainable budget.

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

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

- Concern was raised that an issue referred to the Interim Director of Finance in 2017 regarding the Peterborough Investment Partnership had not been progressed as no update had been received.

- The change in circumstances since the work on the budget had been prepared was noted. Members highlighted, however, that circumstances constantly changing and the proposal could only be a reflection of a moment in time. Members sought reassurance that assumptions made in preparing the budget were well founded.
- The need for further funding for fostering children was raised. Members were advised that when the budget was set there were 340 children in care, as directed by the court. This number had increased to 395.
- It was commented that additional payments made to Amey were not thought to have been included in this budget. However, Members were directed to page 29 of the agenda, where the items were included.
- Reference was made to decisions going back over two years regarding the savings achievable if contacts were taken away from Amey, the level of capital investment into the research to do so, the extension to the Amey contract, and the move to set up a new company.
- It was suggested that the delay was having a negative impact on council funds and that capital receipts would not be achieved as expected.
- It was considered that there was a need to address the budget shortfall moving forward.
- It was felt that homeless solutions had not been realised in the past but Members were pleased to see that there was a move away from using the Travel Lodge as temporary accommodation. Members also expressed a wish to cease association with Stef and Philips. It was hoped that homelessness could be resolved rather than seen as a cost saving to be included in the budget.
- Support was expressed for the Cross Party Budget Working Group.
- Comment was made that the Stand up for Peterborough Campaign should have asked for additional funding for Peterborough rather than a higher percentage share for Peterborough.
- It was suggested that the need for additional funding for Adult Social Care, the burden for which remained with local authorities, could be funded by small increases in income tax.
- It was considered that the recruitment of additional officers to the Prevention and Enforcement Service (PES) for parking enforcement appeared to move away from the original principle of providing coverage across the whole city with multi skilled officers. Members were advised that multi skilled officers would be placed in local areas and would be supported by enforcement officers. They would work within the priorities set in local areas upon which ward councillors would be consulted.
- 2,000 tickets had been imposed for cycling offences in Bridge Street whilst Members felt that other areas of concern outside the city centre appeared to be less well supported.
- The budget proposals were considered to be working around issues rather than tackling the core problem.
- The use of grass cuttings and tree wastage by Ecotricity to generate gas that could be used in domestic premises was raised. Members requested an update on this idea.
- It was noted that grants were available from the Local Enterprise Partnership and had been granted to neighbouring councils to generate energy from recyclable material. Members were advised that the Council was looking at the future use of aerobic digestion and a business case was being prepared.
- Concern was raised over the transport strategy following the hand-over of responsibility to the Combined Authority. Members requested consideration for a new Metro Service in Peterborough to match that proposed in Cambridge and assurances that subsidies for local bus services would be maintained. Members

were also advised that a review was being undertaken by the Combined Authority in Cambridgeshire which would be published in 2019.

- The difficulty in reading the budget on a Chromebook.
- It was noted that Tranche Two of the budget would contain the more significant items.
- Members were advised that the funds used to enhance Bourges Boulevard originated from Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and could only be used to enhance the city, not for any other purpose.
- The movement of staff to Fletton Quays was highlighted as a measure to kick start the new development. Refurbishment and letting of the Town Hall buildings had allowed the movement of staff to Fletton Quays to proceed at an almost cost neutral level.
- Members were advised that tenants had been secured for both wings of the Town Hall.
- It was commented that the setting of clear goals to generate more income for the Council was vital.

Councillor Hiller exercised his right to speak and advised Members that he was a director of the Peterborough Investment Partnership and had no idea what the comments made earlier were concerning. Private Eye had previously run a story and he suggested that if Members wanted an enquiry further details would need to be provided. Councillor Hiller also advised Members that there was a comprehensive programme in place for road repairs and maintenance and offered to provide further information if needed. He recommend that Council adopted the Medium Term Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche One.

Councillor Fitzgerald summed up as mover of the recommendation and in so doing responded to earlier comments regarding Peterborough Investment Partnership. He noted that, should an enquiry be required, full details should be supplied in writing. He advised that the Health and Social Care funding allocation by the Government had been delayed until the Autumn Statement and it was hoped a clearer picture would emerge at that time. Members were assured that all companies budgeted and forecasted future demands based on historical trends and that the position changed daily. There were always demand lead pressures which would have to be accommodated.

The Council was forever striving to commercialise and seek out opportunities and Councillor Fitzgerald suggested that information on the revenue currently collected by the Council should be made available to everyone. The Invest to Save details were also available within the report.

Councillor Fitzgerald reiterated that the timeframe for Tranche One has passed and by the time Tranche Two and Three were presented to Council, their timeframe would be passed also. He closed by recommending that Council adopted the Medium Term Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche One.

A recorded vote was taken (32 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 21 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Serluca, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Against: Nil

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Bond, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. Approve the Tranche One service proposals, outlined in Appendix D to the report as the basis for public consultation.
2. Approve the updated budget assumptions, to be incorporated within the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20- 2021/22. These are outlined in section 5 of the report.
3. Approve the revised capital programme approach outlined in section 5.8 and referencing Appendix C to the report.
4. Approve the additional resourcing of £1.4m, required to deliver transformation projects, in order to achieve future financial benefits. These are outlined in section 5.6 of the report.
5. Approve Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20-2021/22- Tranche One, as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
 - Appendix A – 2019/20-2021/22 MTFs Detailed Budget Position- Tranche One
 - Appendix B – Performance Data
 - Appendix C – Capital Schemes
 - Appendix D – Budget Consultation Document, including Budget Proposals
 - Appendix E – Equality Impact Assessments
6. Note the future strategic direction for the Council outlined in section 5.7 of the report.
7. Note the forecast reserves position outlined in section 5.9 of the report.

(b) Audit Committee Recommendation – Annual Report 2017/2018

At its final meeting of the year, the Audit Committee considered its Annual Report, outlining the items considered by the Committee. The report demonstrated that the Audit Committee had successfully fulfilled its terms of reference in 2017/18 and had helped to improve the Council's governance and control environments.

Councillor Over introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He thanked the Chair and Committee for their input and advised that the report included key information regarding the committee, its achievements, and key targets going forward. He wished the Constitution and Ethics Committee every success in its quest to improve standards across the Council and recommended that Council noted the report.

Councillor Aitken seconded the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the work carried out by the Audit Committee in improving the governance arrangements across the Council.

(c) Adults and Communities Scrutiny Recommendation – New Council House Provision

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting of 13 March 2018, received a report on New Council House Provision for Peterborough. This report was prepared in response to a motion presented at Council on 24 January 2018 from Councillor Mahabadi as follows:

Council resolves that Scrutiny Committee look into the benefits, social value and business case for new council house provision and report back its conclusions and any recommendations to Full Council.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the report and the Council motion.

Councillor Simons introduced the report on the provision of new council housing in Peterborough and moved the recommendations.

Councillor Hiller seconded the recommendations advised that the recommendation was well debated, balanced, and considered and that the future social house provision should be through the joint venture company, Medesham Homes.

Members debated the recommendations and a summary of the main points raised are as follows:

- Members welcomed any new building of council houses in the city that would make an impact on homelessness and help remove people from housing waiting lists.
- The benefits of Housing Revenue Accounts (HRA) had been considered in the report and their value acknowledged, however Members were disappointed that HRAs had not been recommended.
- Members questioned whether the granting of HRAs would jeopardise any existing arrangements to build new homes as stated in the report.
- It was felt that joint ventures should only be one part of the housing strategy, and Members were advised other housing partners were being considered.
- Members felt the report was biased and based on questionable assumptions.
- Members expressed concerns that there was only one organisation with responsibility for building new council homes.
- Members discussed using an HRA and thought it would involve more staff and may incur further expenditure.
- Members asked if the new company could look into using existing empty accommodation in the city for refurbishment to provide accommodation. It was advised this was indeed the case and suggestions should be put forward.
- Comment was made that fewer council houses were built under Labour governments and that a Labour government took the HRA into negative subsidy.
- It was explained that under the current arrangements, funds were available from other sources, such as the Combined Authority.
- Members commented that the report did not imply that the council would consider alternative ventures other than that with Cross Keys Homes, as had

been suggested and that the recommendation did not refer to housing co-operatives.

- It was suggested that the recommendation would exclude Peterborough from applying for funding for council housing from the Mayor's Office where bids were open for a £1m fund.
- It was advised that 9% of buildings in Peterborough were empty and that the Eastern Region was the worst authority for homelessness.
- Concern was raised that the strategy did not include targets.
- Members suggested that the Council should invest in their own real estate to enjoy the benefits of ownership and retain the rental income themselves rather than having to share with other parties. However, Members were advised that this had been considered and the costs were disproportionate to the benefits when taking into account repairs, maintenance and staffing.
- Members expressed disappointment at the low number of new homes being built.
- Members queried whether, if homes were built using an HRA, the Council would be able to sell the properties for a profit to generate further income.
- It was felt that homeless people were not concerned with who built the homes, only whether they could have one and whether it was affordable.
- Members were reminded that the original motion from Council was to request that the Scrutiny Committee look at the benefits, social value and business case for building new council housing. The report included a detailed breakdown of this and explained significant additional costs to the Council should the council house route be followed.
- It was noted that there had been an influx into the city of 20,000 people who were welcomed into the city, but this had put the housing market under pressure.
- Members were assured that all options to provide housing in Peterborough would be considered.

Councillor Simons summed up as mover of the recommendations and asked Members for their support to make this work, given the time and money accorded to this venture before looking at other opportunities.

A recorded vote was taken (37 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 15 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Bond, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Lillis, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Against: Nil

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed that the focus for delivering social housing should continue to be through the now established joint venture housing company, Medesham Homes, rather than seeking to return to providing council housing in the traditional sense; this vehicle having the flexibility to deliver a range of tenures and to take advantage of the capability of each partner to provide land, funding and capacity and share risk when responding to the challenges of austerity and the housing crisis.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

(d) Constitution and Ethics Committee – Code of Conduct

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 9 July 2018, received a report on updates to the Council's Code of Conduct. The Committee considered the report and recommendations contained within its Terms of Reference No. 2.72.2.

Councillor Allen introduced the report and moved the recommendations on behalf of Councillor Seaton. He advised that the changes included the description of "disclosable pecuniary interests ("DPI")" to reflect the wording of current legislation and the introduction of a section on "Other Disclosable Interests".

Councillor Bashir seconded the recommendations and reserved her right to speak.

Members debated the recommendations and the key points raised included:

- It was suggested that the recommendation failed to include investigations into Members found to be acting inappropriately and it was requested that, should a complaint be made against a Member by a member of the public, an investigation should be conducted and the councillor disciplined appropriately.
- The definition of family and friends was felt to be ambiguous. It was questioned whether "Facebook Friends" fell within this definition.
- Members were advised that to make the definition too tight may be dangerous and if Members were in doubt they could always ask the Monitoring Officer.
- The issue of confidentiality was raised.
- It was noted that the change would also include Parish Councillors, however there was uncertainty as to whether they had been consulted.
- It was considered that the Council appeared to be unable to take sanctions against Members.
- Members were reminded of the Nolan Principles, which were at the centre of the Code of Conduct.

Councillor Allen summed up as mover of the recommendations and endorsed the Constitution and Ethics Committee and hoped a framework could be agreed upon.

A recorded vote was taken (29 voted in favour, 6 voted against, 16 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Against: Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Dowson, Ellis, Ferris, John Fox, Hemraj, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed to the changes to the Council's Code of Conduct agreed at the Constitution and Ethics Committee on 9 July 2018, being:

- a) Typographical errors and updating to reflect the role of the Constitution and Ethics Committee
- b) Changes to the description of “disclosable pecuniary interests (“DPI”)” at Part 2 of the Code to fully reflect the wording in the legislation.
- c) The introduction of a section on “Other Disclosable Interests”.

(e) Constitution and Ethics Committee – Member Officer Protocol – Shadow Cabinet

The Constitution and Ethics Committee at its meeting on 9 July 2018, received a report on updates to the Member Officer Protocol in relation to the Shadow Cabinet.

Councillor Allen introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that work was ongoing.

Councillor Bashir seconded the recommendations and reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Sandford moved an amendment to the recommendations as detailed in the additional information pack as follows:

A Shadow Cabinet may be formed by the second largest any group which has ten or more councillors by their nomination from amongst their Members of the Council and they shall notify the Council and the Chief Executive of the names of the Members nominated to form a Shadow Cabinet and of any changes in the membership of the Shadow Cabinet which may occur from time to time.

Members will mirror those of the Cabinet, save that a single member may cover more than one portfolio.

Councillor Sandford advised Members the amendment would allow for more than one Shadow Cabinet that he felt would not increase the workload of officers. A precedent had been set in Parliament in 2005-2010 when the Liberal Democrats were the third largest party and formed a Shadow Cabinet. He also advised Members that a comprehensive review was still to be conducted and it was therefore premature to make a decision at this stage.

Councillor Bond seconded the amendment and explained that the amendment would ensure more democracy and increase the powers of scrutiny.

Councillor Allen summed up as mover of the original recommendation and in so doing explained he would not support the amendment as the administrative burden would be increased and the precedent quoted was obscure.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Sandford (6 voted in favour, 44 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Against: Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Abstaining: Ash

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Members debated the original recommendation and noted that the Shadow Cabinet would provide opportunities to interact with officers at director level to exchange ideas.

Councillor Bashir exercised her right to speak as seconder of the recommendations and explained that parties with a lesser number of members would have been disadvantaged had the amendment been successful.

Councillor Allen summed up and encouraged everyone to support the recommendation.

A recorded vote was taken (44 voted in favour, 6 voted against, 1 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Ferris, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Against: Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Abstaining: Ash

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed the updated Member/Officer Protocol outlining the addition of a Shadow Cabinet agreed at the Constitution and Ethics Committee on 9 July 2018.

26. 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 26 March 2018.
2. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 11 June 2018.
3. Decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 16 July 2018.
4. Use of Urgency, Special Urgency and Waiver of Call-in provisions on 28 February 2018 and 26 June 2018.
5. Decisions made by Cabinet Members between 28 February 2018 and 11 July 2018.

Questions were asked about the following:

Proposal to Explore the Option of Forming a Local Trading Company

Councillor Murphy asked if council tax payers would incur an additional charge of £10.00 per annum.

Councillor Holdich advised they would not.

Adult Social Care Contracts for Placements in Care Homes

Councillor Hemraj asked what would happen after 1 December 2018 as the report implied there were no plans after this date.

Councillor Fitzgerald responded that business would continue as usual and the Council was currently looking at all care home contract placements.

27. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions made since the last meeting

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

1. Decisions from the Combined Authority Board meetings held on 14 February 2018, 28 February 2018, 30 May 2018, and 27 June 2018.
2. Decisions from the Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on 26 March 2018.
3. Decisions from the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 12 February 2018, 26 March 2018, 1 June 2018, and 25 June 2018.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

Committee System

Councillor Sandford asked why a committee system was considered feasible for the Combined Authority and Cambridgeshire County Council, however Members had previously been advised that the system was bureaucratic and inefficient and could not be introduced in Peterborough.

Councillor Over replied that the question was not relevant to the report and declined to go into detail.

Mayoral Interim Transport Strategy Statement

Councillor Sandford asked if and when Members of Peterborough City Council and the Scrutiny Committee would be consulted on the Transport Strategy.

Councillor Holdich advised that consultation would take place and as Peterborough City Council had a right to veto it would have to be consulted.

£100M Affordable Housing Programme

Councillor Murphy asked how many of these homes would be built in Peterborough.

Councillor Holdich advised that he was not aware, but would find out.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

28. Notices of Motion

(1) Motion from Councillor Whitby

In moving the motion, Councillor Whitby advised that there had been problems with the railways over the last few months although the situation had improved in the last few weeks. The franchise holder was planning to introduce a new timetable in December that was the same as the previous one that had failed to work effectively. This required driver training to be carried out around the current timetable in preparation, however the time taken to train a driver, the number of drivers that could be released for training at any one time, and the introduction date of the new timetable implied that all necessary training could not be completed on time.

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

There was no further debate and a vote was taken (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

“This chamber believes that the recent performance of GOvia/GTR/Thameslink on the main route into London from Peterborough has had a huge, negative impact on the city and its residents, both personal and economic.

We therefore request that the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council, make strong representations to the Secretary of State for Transport and the Secretary for Housing, Communities and Local Government to advise them of our concern of the impact that such an occurrence has on the communities who rely on such a major transport link, the economic damage that it does regionally and to this City, and that steps must be taken to ensure that such a disastrous occurrence is avoided in the future by whatever means is necessary.”

(2) Motion from Councillor Murphy

In moving their motion, Councillor Murphy endorsed the spirit of the motion, celebrating the people of Peterborough and he hoped flags would regularly be flown by the Council in the city centre.

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

The Leader advised that the Pride flag was flown outside the Town Hall as appropriate.

Councillor Ferris exercised his right to speak and advised that the LGBT Community made a vibrant and positive contribution to the city and should be treated as equals, and celebrated. The recent Pride festival had been a huge success. Councillor Ferris thanked Mark Richards, director of Metal Peterborough and fellow organisers for Peterborough Pride. He asked that Members ensured the LGBT community was included as an integral part of the city.

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

“Council notes there have been a number of events in the city over recent years to celebrate our diversity and bring groups together as well as campaign against ignorance.

This year we had a successful International women’s event at the Town Hall and at the end of June and beginning of July there were a whole series of Pride events in the city. Many organisation and residents participated in events in a proud and positive way. Initiative was taken to join in and the pride flag was flown by the council this year.

Council welcomes these activities that help us bring communities together and celebrate our diversity and Council resolves to support similar events in the future.”

(3) Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz, amended by Councillor Holdich

In moving their motion, Councillor Nawaz outlined the recommendation and advised that having British citizenship would give children a sense of identity and belonging.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal seconded the motion and exercised his right to speak, advising Members that this interest was related to his profession. He was aware of the financial difficulties incurred by the fees and had known one mother forced to choose between food and saving money for the child's registration fee. Unregistered children could be excluded from education, work and health services and may be removed from the country. The impact of the fee passes across the generations as the child could pass on their citizenship to their own children. The Home Office made a profit on each application and it was failing its duty to children under Section 55 of the UK Border Act 2009. The Home Office had a duty of care to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and to act in their best interest unless those interests clearly outweighed by other public interest factors.

Councillor Holdich advised members that if children in care were affected, as the corporate parent, the Council would be paying.

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

"In the UK today, there are significant numbers of children who do not currently have British citizenship but have rights to register as British citizens. Many of these children were born in the UK, and others have lived here from a young age, been raised here, educated here, and have never known any other home.

Without access to their citizenship rights, children may find themselves denied opportunities extended to their peers, such as the chance to participate in a school trip or to be eligible for funding so they can undertake higher education.

There are a number of barriers to children registering their citizenship. Registration can be a complex process of prohibitive cost.

Children are charged £1,012 for a process whose administrative cost is published at £372, meaning government is making a profit of £640 from every child who claims their rights.

Where a child is in the care of Peterborough City Council this fee, if it is to be paid, would have to be paid by the Council.

No child should be denied their citizenship rights by reason of a fee. There is no substitute for citizenship, which is vital to future security and sense of belonging.

This Council recognises:

- That the profit-making element of the fee to register citizenship discourages the best outcomes for many of the UK's children
- Because of their duties as corporate parents, the fee for children to register will fall on Councils in the many cases where looked after children qualify for citizenship
- The fee puts Councils in the unacceptable position of having to weigh the benefits of citizenship to a child in their care against the cost to the Council of assisting a child in claiming that right

This Council therefore resolves:

- To write to the minister of immigration requesting that the fee for children to register as British citizens is reduced to the administrative cost; and requesting that looked after children are exempted from the fee in its entirety
- To identify children in their care who are entitled to citizenship, and make sure they are aware of their rights and supported to claim them.”

(4) Motion from Councillor Joseph, amended by Councillor Sandford

In moving the motion as amended by Councillor Sandford, Councillor Joseph outlined the report and advised that fly tipping had for some years been a major problem for residents and the council.

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

Councillor Cereste moved a further amendment to the recommendations contained within the additional information pack and advised that the Council were continuing to be environmentally friendly and helpful towards the community with regard to fly tipping. The fly tipping was not because of the Council but people not acting as they should. He advised that the Council provided free bags to help people recycle their food waste and he had been advised that 55,000 MWh of energy from recycled food waste was produced at the recycling plant in Fengate. The new programme for redistributing furniture was about to be launched.

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

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

- The problem is ongoing and is not down to the residents.
- There is no room for complacency.
- Fly tipping was epidemic in some areas.
- Peterborough once had one of the highest recycling rates in the country however that was no longer the case.
- In 2009, a waste management policy was passed that concluded doing nothing was not an option and aimed for 65% recycling and composting by 2020 and we were failing this target.
- Discussion took place on whether the incinerator that produced electricity also produced carbon dioxide or not.
- The heat that generated was not being used effectively.
- The original recommendation had been diluted by the amendment.
- Fly tipping was occasionally the result of poorly made purchasing decisions and people would like to buy products that would last longer. Members would welcome the better use of language around purchasing to prevent bad purchasing decisions.

Councillor Holdich exercised their right to speak and explained that he felt the original motion was a case of putting the cart before the horse. At Council, it was agreed an All Party Working Group would be set up to look into this as there are several options with the new recycling facility being introduced and when they have completed their report policies can be changed to assist with the problem. He advised that when a bulky waste test was conducted and made free the number of customers decreased. He also commented that there were restrictions on what could be tipped at Dogsthorpe and what vehicles could be used and when neighbouring authorities close their tips there is an increase in fly-tipping in bordering areas.

Councillor Joseph replied as mover of the original recommendation and agreed that much has and is being done and her motion is about focusing on how to do things better.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Cereste (28 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warrn

Councillors Against: Ali, Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Ferris, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Whitby

Councillors Abstaining: Ash, Lane

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

Members debated the substantive motion as amended and in summary the points raised included:

- That this demonstrates the administration is insecure and is using this to promote themselves.
- The state of the city was down to funding and it is hoped to improve neighbourhoods going forward.
- The motion was a little weak and the amendment put more substance to the recommendation.

Councillor Jones exercised their right to speak and asked the administration to consider both education and negligence amongst members of the public.

Councillor Joseph summed up as mover of the motion and advised members her recommendation was focused and should concentrate on moving forward rather than the past.

A recorded vote was taken on the substantive motion (30 voted in favour, 6 voted against, 14 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whibty

Councillors Against: Barkham, Bond, Hogg, Lillis, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Ellis, Ferris, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS**:

“Waste continues to be an issue that affects every one of us, whether it is the frequency of our bin collections, what we should recycle or perhaps the most emotive issue of all, flytipping, and most of us will have an opinion on waste in this city.

Following a recommendation from Councillor Holdich and the decision of the Growth, Resources and Environment Scrutiny Committee, a council task and finish group is to be set up to look at the issue of fly-tipping and possible remedies to what is a sickness which has a very negative impact on our Peterborough.

However, let us give credit where it is due to the many, many residents who responsibly dispose of their waste, either by taking it to the household waste site at Welland Road or paying £23 for a bulky waste collection.

Waste management is part of a larger picture of resource efficiency that could also have a positive impact on flytipping.

The larger picture must focus on reducing the amount of waste we produce in the first place through our buy, use and dispose lifestyles. As a city we are leading the way in moving away from this linear approach by encouraging and supporting more “circular” activities such as re-use, repair and re-manufacture. Let us also, therefore, give credit to the considerable circular economy work that the Council, in partnership with Opportunity Peterborough, has undertaken to date.

Our Circular Peterborough initiative, part of our Environment Action Plan, is leading the way nationally and internationally on this, including, but not limited to:

- Increasing the recycling or recovery of household waste at the Household Recycling Centre at Dogsthorpe to over 90% as a contribution to the ‘Zero Waste’ target.
- The ‘Love Peterborough: love your Community’ recycling message and the provision of free food waste bags to residents has increased participation also as a contribution to the ‘Zero Waste’ target
- Our Energy Recovery Facility is generating around 55,000MWh of renewable energy each year supporting the ‘Zero Carbon Energy’ target.
- Launching our ‘Share Peterborough’ platform enabling businesses to find new homes for furniture, equipment and other useful items including underused spaces.
- Publishing our draft Circular Peterborough Roadmap which builds on all of these achievements and more as it sets out how we plan to be a truly circular city by 2050.

We are one of only two UK and eleven international cities in the Ellen MacArthur Foundation Circular Cities Network and was awarded the accolade of World Smart City in 2015 with significant recognition for our pioneering Circular Economy work.

This Council recognises:

- The considerable cost of addressing fly-tipping and the damage it causes to our environment

- The fact that fly-tipping needs to be considered as part of a much broader waste management picture and is a key part of Peterborough's ambition to move from linear to more circular approaches to how we live our lives.
- Currently, waste that could have been reused, repaired or recycled is, instead, being taken to the Energy Recovery Facility. Whilst energy is, of course, recovered from the material, opportunities to avoid such items becoming waste in the first place are being lost.
- It takes many people to report and deal with each incident of fly tipping, and it would be an improvement to the lives of many if the incidents of fly tipping can be significantly reduced if not eliminated.

The Council therefore resolves to continue to build upon its waste minimisation, re-use, recycling, recovery work as part of its Circular Peterborough initiative and its commitment to creating the UK's Environment Capital by asking the fly tipping task and finish group to:

- Highlight the opportunities for the involvement of repair, reuse, remanufacture and recycling companies and/or charities in making use of goods which would otherwise be disposed of. This should include promoting and increasing the use of our ground breaking Share Peterborough platform.
- Leading the way for our residents by considering opportunities for recycling and upcycling such as the Council's current practice of using old tyres as 'Jungle Mulch' that is used where appropriate in children's play areas as soft landing areas.
- Encouraging the reduction of single use plastics from shops in the city, through engagement in national schemes and local partnerships with PECT and Opportunity Peterborough.
- To continue to drive the city's internationally recognised programme of circular economy work through the Circular Peterborough initiative to ensure that economic growth, waste reduction and environmental benefits can be achieved in the medium to long term."

(5) Motion from Councillor Sandford

"This Council notes that figures produced by the National Nursing and Midwifery Council in April 2018 showed a dramatic drop in those joining their register from the EU, with 805 EU nurses and midwives joining compared with 6,382 the year before – a reduction of 87 percent.

Council also notes that the economy of the UK has become heavily reliant on EU migration, with (according to figures from Mercer Workforce Monitor) 143,000 UK born people leaving the workforce for various reasons in the year up to March 2017 and 147,000 EU migrants from other EU countries joining the workforce.

Council believes that, whatever Brexit deal is agreed between the UK and the EU, there could be significant impacts on Peterborough's economy and the services used by Peterborough people, such as the NHS.

Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to commission work by the Council and its partner organisations to assess the likely impacts of Brexit and, when full details of the

Brexit deal (or no deal) are known, to submit a report to Full Council setting out the likely impacts and to recommend any mitigation measures or further actions considered necessary”

In moving his motion, Councillor Sandford advised that it was still unclear what the Brexit deal would entail. Many people remained confused as there could be damage to the country if free and fair trade was not continued. Whilst the Liberal Democrats preferred to stay within the EU they recognised the vote of the people. The motion proposed formalised how the Council would exploit opportunities and limit the risks for the various Brexit scenarios.

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

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

- Members felt that once the Brexit deal was known, the full implications would become clear and assessments could then be made.
- Comment was made that the people of Peterborough had voted to leave the EU and that was what would happen.
- Members were assured that the motion was not about the result of the referendum or the Liberal Democrats.
- It was noted that the motion did not reference the fear that existed among residents, particularly those from Eastern Europe, as to whether they would have the right to remain in Great Britain or whether they would have a vote in elections unless primary legislation was introduced.

Members were reminded that the meeting was due to finish at 11:10pm and that should Members wish the meeting to continue past this time, a motion would need to be moved to extend the guillotine. This was not required.

Councillor Murphy proposed that Council moved to the vote on the motion without further discussion as per Council Standing Order 20.12(a) (ii).

Councillor Ellis seconded the motion, which was agreed unanimously.

A recorded vote was taken (21 voted in favour, 26 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Ali, Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Ferris, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Whitby

Councillors Against: Aitken, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Abstaining: Allen, Ash

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

28. Reports to Council

(a) Allocation of Seats to Political Groups and Committee Chairmanship.

Council received a report to advise that on the 12 June 2018 Councillor June Bull resigned her position as an Elected Member. This reduced the total number of Elected Members from 60 to 59. The number of Conservative Members decreased from 31 to 30 and the political proportionality was therefore recalculated.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that positions on various committees had changed and that following Councillor Over's resignation from the Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Stokes would be appointed in his place.

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

Councillor Bond moved an amendment to the recommendations as contained in the additional information pack to propose that Councillor Saltmarsh take on the role as Vice Chair of the Corporate Parenting Committee. He explained to Members that Councillor Saltmarsh had been highly committed to ensuring the children of the city received the support they require and deserved and saw no reason why she should not continue in her role on a committee that had remained outside party politics.

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

Councillor Holdich summed up as mover of the original recommendation and in so doing explained he felt Councillor Lane was a good member of the committee and wished to stand by his decision to appoint Councillor Lane.

A recorded vote was taken on the amended recommendation from Councillor Bond (19 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 3 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Ali, Barkham, Bond, Ferris, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Mahabadi, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Against: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Abstaining: Ash, Ellis, Lane

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

There was no debate on the original motion on Allocation of Seats to Political Groups and Committee Chairmanship and a recorded vote was taken (29 voted in favour, 11 voted against, 9 abstained from voting):

Councillor For: Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren, Whitby

Councillors Against: Barkham, Bond, Ferris, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford

Councillors Abstaining: Ali, Ash, Ellis, Hemraj, Hussain, Jones, Joseph, Mahabadi, Martin

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. Agreed the updated allocation of seats on those council committees subject to political balance arrangements (Appendix 1 to the report).
2. Agreed the appointment of the following positions:
 - Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Chris Harper,
 - Vice Chairman of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Graham Casey,
 - Vice Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Committee – Councillor Stephen Lane,
 - Vice Chairman of the Audit Committee – Councillor Kim Aitken, and
 - Vice Chairman of the Constitutional and Ethics Committee – Councillor Shazir Bashir.
3. Agreed that Councillor June Stokes would replace Councillor David Over on the Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Mayor

7.00pm – 11.10pm
25 July 2018

Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough

QUESTIONS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
6. <u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Dr Shabina Asad Qayyum:-</p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>I'd like to ask the Cabinet Member for Education as to how effective Anti-Bullying policies devised individually by local schools, have been effective in mitigating the effects of Bullying. Are there are statistics to demonstrate how effective these policies have been?</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:-</p> <p>Although there is no statutory requirement for schools to gather data on the subject of bullying, all schools are advised to maintain their own records, which will be monitored and challenged by the governing body to ensure that both policies and actions are appropriate and effective. The local authorities does not hold such statistics. Incidents of bullying, and the effectiveness of how they are dealt with, will also be addressed during an Ofsted inspection.</p> <p>Schools will be best placed to address incidents of bullying when they understand the nature of what is taking place, and use this information to inform anti-bullying measures and assess the effectiveness of their initiatives.</p> <p>A strong anti-bullying policy recognises different protected characteristics and sets out clear expectations about behaviour. It sets out how to report incidents, how information will be collected and used to prevent and tackle bullying, and also to inform regular reviews of policy.</p> <p>Dr Shabina Asad Qayyum asked a supplementary question:-</p> <p>In my inner city practice of 5,000 patients, I have seen a sharp increase in the number of referrals to the Child & Adolescent Mental Health teams for children suffering from the repercussions of bullying within schools. From 2017 to 2018 a total of 25 referrals were made to CAMS by my practice alone for children suffering from bullying within the school setting which demonstrates the ineffectiveness and dire need to implement urgent stringent policies governed and monitored by the local education authority rather than conferring the responsibility to schools alone. What has the cabinet member done so far to resolve such matters, and will do and what are ongoing measures that may be in place to eliminate bullying as I fear we will lose a generation of able bodied children to increasing mental health problems suffered as a result of mental bullying.</p>

	<p>Councillor Ayres responded:-</p> <p>We have actually only recently asked Ofsted to look into these matters because I do repeat that the local authority does not hold such statistics and as all council know and are often informed about, many of the schools are academies and not maintained schools and consequently although we have a duty to look after our children of course as a local authority, Ofsted have a power to do something about any bullying. I am hoping that is sufficient answer for you Dr Qayyum. I think you mentioned there were 25 referrals to CAMS, I am not sure whether you meant Cambs County Council or the Peterborough authority but if you could explain that to me afterwards I should be very grateful.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Danette O'Hara</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Deputy Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority</p> <p>Further to the question raised in December in relation to the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund investments in fossil fuel, estimated to be over £100 million, I would like to know why Peterborough City Council cannot make a stand and put a motion to the committee to divest. Although the City do not hold any direct investments, putting the motion forward will signify the importance of the issue and show they truly are aspiring to be an environment capital.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:-</p> <p>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 entity and is run with a cross-party, cross-Council Board including Union representatives.</p> <p>As the representative for all non-County Council employers, Cllr Seaton has been regularly engaged with members and officers who run the fund day to day basis on the ESG issue.</p> <p>However the key point in your question is do they divest of investments or do they have a policy of positive engagement. The current policy, which was recently reviewed and re-confirmed, is the latter. This has been discussed extensively and agreed by all representatives as being the best way forward. This aligns with the best interests of the Fund's beneficiaries.</p> <p>As I have said, the Pension Fund Committee, which is cross-party, cross-council and includes Union Representatives, believes that engagement is key in relation to strong corporate governance, which in turn will enhance returns.</p> <p>I believe that, as they have the direct day to day engagement and expertise, and they hold the legal duty to employers and employees, it is right that we reply on their judgement.</p>

Shareholder Activism is becoming increasingly important, especially in areas such as fossil fuels, Environmental, Social and Governance matters, and Executive Pay. It is right that as large shareholders we take that responsibility seriously.

Danette O'Hara asked a supplementary question:-

The Church of England and others have been engaging with oil and gas companies formerly a quarter of a century and the latter has is still spending billions finding new reserves when they already have enough fossil fuel to heat the planet many degrees above safe limits. While also spending relatively small amounts on renewable energy. So for example, asking fossil fuels companies to engage in divestment discussions is like walking into a pizza parlour, buying a slice as you tuck in you tell the owner "you really should stop selling pizza, it is bad for the environment".

We would like to ask is it not the responsibility of the city council to reflect the views of the people they represent. For those who live in the city who truly are aspiring to make it an environment capital can you not represent them and make a stand calling on the share of their investments to be divested from the fossil fuel industry?

Councillor Holdich responded:-

I think our first duty is to our staff to get the best deal for their pension. It is a cross party, nobody has a problem with what your suggesting. Also the unions are well involved in this, and they have not got a problem with the investment in this so I really don't know see the problem so I don't see that we should, as a council, get further involved.

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 Nadeem

To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities

Early last year, the Council had an approval of £7.5M regeneration package in respect of the Millfield and New England area. Subsequently, several meetings and discussions have taken place between local elected members and officers to consider how this money should be spent.

My question to the cabinet is that when is the Council due to make a final decision on where exactly this money will be spent?

Councillor Walsh responded:-

The capital funding of £7.5million for the Millfield and New England area is allocated under three main themes: Parks and Open Spaces (£0.5million); Public Realm (£3million); and Community Assets (£4million). Ward Councillors are updated

	<p>thoroughly through a monthly highlight report setting out the programme plan, as well as monthly meetings with the programme team.</p> <p>In relation to the Parks and Open Spaces theme, a new play and social area is being created at Dyson Close / Bourges Boulevard and is due for installation in early spring 2019, with improvements to other existing facilities and play areas taking place from Autumn 2018.</p> <p>In relation to the Public Realm theme, the main focus is the main spine of Lincoln Road in Millfield. LDA Design and Skanska are currently working up design proposals which we hope will be available for public engagement in Autumn 2018 ready for delivery in the 2019/2020 financial year.</p> <p>In relation to the Community Assets theme, the existing facilities are being identified and mapped, alongside discussions with local people to gather information about what facilities may be needed. The outcomes of this work should be ready by November 2018, and resulting delivery will take place from early 2019.</p> <p>If any of the ward councillors would like a more detailed briefing, do please let me know and I will be happy to make arrangements for that to happen.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Saltmarsh</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>At the Council meeting on the 7th March it was agreed that £40 K from Capital Budget would be spent to deliver / test verge parking measures throughout the city.</p> <p>This is needed to tackle the blight of anti-social parking in housing estates, inconsiderate parking close to schools and the practice of parking advertising vans on the side of arterial roads around the city.</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member please update council of the measures so far agreed and the timing and scoping of the plan?</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:-</p> <p>The Council receives numerous complaints relating to verge parking each year and the impact this has on communities and individuals is well documented.</p> <p>Due to these concerns the new Verge Parking Scheme came into effect in April this year.</p> <p>To enable officers to enforce the scheme, I am pleased to inform Members that a new citywide Traffic Regulation Order is now in place. Prevention and Enforcement Service Officers will commence enforcement action by the middle of August, following installation of local signage, in the first twelve locations identified for action. Vehicles found parked at these locations will be liable for a penalty charge notice should they not be removed by their owners. Council has provided the PES with additional capacity to enforce the new scheme.</p> <p>In addition to these first locations, the Council has also received twenty additional individual requests for action, five of which are to be formally consulted upon, or are already being consulted upon. Members will be notified if a consultation is planned in their Ward. Members can assist and support the process by encouraging participation</p>

	<p>in the consultation, or by letting officers know where the scheme may be required. To date, there has been no requirement to fund capital works.</p> <p>Councillor Saltmarsh asked a supplementary question:-</p> <p>I was extremely pleased to read the answer to my question at 7.30 this morning, it does sound rather complicated but I am sure we shall all read through it and get our heads around it, thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:-</p> <p>I am happy to help in any way I can.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Ali</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Many community members are concerned at the decreasing burial spaces at Eastfield Road Cemetery, can I please ask as to where we are in terms of securing additional long term provision for burial to reassure our communities who are rightly concerned?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:-</p> <p>I am very pleased to be able to answer this question because I'd like to provide reassurance to all communities in Peterborough with regards to current and future burial provision in our City.</p> <p>Firstly I can confirm that substantial work has been undertaken over the last 5 years to better map available spaces at both Eastfield and Fletton cemeteries. This work has significantly increased the number of grave spaces previously thought to remain at both cemeteries. Our latest estimate is that we now have 20 years burial provision, based upon current demand that is assuming we do not get an influx of people dying.</p> <p>When the need for a new cemetery was first flagged over 10 years ago, you will recall that it was believed that current provision only existed for up to 5 years so I can fully understand the concern that has existed in some of our communities.</p> <p>Given the latest projections, our search for a new cemetery is not as critical as it was, although in saying this we are still looking to acquire land to build the new cemetery before burial space is exhausted at either Eastfield or Fletton. If suitable land is identified at the right price for us to be able to purchase it we will or the land could be leased until we are ready to build the cemetery.</p> <p>Bereavement Services colleagues have identified a number of potential sites for a new cemetery in the past but all have been rejected for a number of reasons including the archaeological value, access or being already included in the council's development plan for other uses.</p> <p>Following a review last year it was agreed to split the project into two distinct parts with Growth and Regeneration colleagues taking responsibility to acquire the land and obtain planning consent for the cemetery and Resources (Bereavement Service) to then take responsibility to build and open the new facility.</p>

	<p>In summary, at this time the burial space available at Fletton and Cemetery is actually increasing as a result of the ongoing grave audits and I trust my answer has provided you with the response that you required.</p> <p>Councillor Ali asked a supplementary question:-</p> <p>I thank Councillor Cereste for his detailed response. Certainly a lot of people have expressed their concern, that information has not been readily available, passed on to the communities, that we haven't got an immediate issue in terms of burial space but certainly at Eastfield cemetery it looks as though there is not sufficient space so I would like to be reassured that Eastfield cemetery, which is quite heavily used by many members of the community I represent in North ward there is still about a considerable amount of concern that there isn't sufficient space. But I thank Councillor Cereste for the response but I would like to be kept informed. Thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:-</p> <p>I can only tell you what I believe to be true, and that is there is enough space for the next twenty years. Clearly if things change, we will be monitoring the situation on a regular basis because we will see what is happening and will keep you informed if the situation were to change dramatically.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>I have received a request from residents in Ravensthorpe and Westwood for skips to help with clearing up the area. Our Member of Parliament has recently provided a service at Westwood Centre. Will the cabinet member give consideration to provision of bulky waste collection initiatives in Westwood, Ravensthorpe, West Town and Netherton.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:-</p> <p>The introduction of a free bulky waste service was not included as part of this year's budget so we do not have the funds to offer this to residents at the present time.</p> <p>However residents can dispose of their waste free of charge at the household recycling centre or alternatively if they pay £23.50 they can have a bulky collection from their houses which covers a variety of items that can be taken away. Again, at this present time. All these things are in review.</p> <p>We would also urge residents that have bulky items that could be re used or recycled to contact local charities or use sites such a Freecycle so the items can be reused.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:-</p> <p>Thank you councillor for your response and emphasising the need to reuse, recycle and reduce and being very honest and saying there is nothing in the budget for these bulky wasters. We did have the one from the MP recently and residents asked for others. We did have a trial. Councillor Elsey bought in a trial that lasted for a few weeks but I don't really know the outcome of that but that was helpful. Yes, the £23.50 is a pretty good service actually however I would ask you to have a look at if we could use the extension of the Amey contract to do something better.</p>

	<p>We know pay them an extra £100,000 a month so hopefully we can get a better service and perhaps we can have a word with Cross Keys Homes who take up to 28 days to shift stuff when we do it in 24 and try and get some synergy between us and cross keys Homes and finally I would like to ask if you could have a word with officers to see if we can speed up the permit at the tip. I had to wait recently for a week to get the permit.</p> <p>I know we use second class post but the person dealing with it said we will put a late date on it as it may take a week. Some people if they have to wait a week may not deal with their bulky waste sensibly.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:-</p> <p>I sympathise with many of the things you say. All I can say is absolutely for you is there will be a working group looking at all these issues and so will I. There are a lot of things we could make more user friendly and that will probably help.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Hogg</p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for Communities please update us on the progress that has been made since the meeting with residents of the Vista Development, which occurred on Monday 15th January 2018? Can she also tell us when we can expect the follow up meeting, which was promised some six weeks later and hasn't even been arranged six months later? Quite understandably the residents of the Vista development are feeling let down and ignored, can she account for the delay and what is being done to resolve this issue.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:-</p> <p>I would like to take this opportunity to reassure Members and residents of the Vista Development that they have not been ignored and work has been taking place to address the issues raised.</p> <p>Since the last meeting I can confirm that Morris Homes have undertaken numerous follow up meetings with residents and have progressed a number of actions raised at the initial meeting. A management company has now been appointed to oversee the maintenance of the open spaces and informal areas of the development, and the outstanding highway remedial works have also been completed. I understand that parking is still a major concern for residents, and the Council, via our Highways Department, is due to launch a formal consultation in relation to parking restrictions in the Autumn.</p> <p>It is timely now to reconvene a follow-up public meeting to inform all residents of the good work already delivered and that which is in progress, and officers are in the process of arranging this. Mr Mayor, Councillors Hogg and Lillis were fully aware of the above prior to this evenings meeting and quite frankly I do feel the question was unnecessary.</p> <p>Councillor Hogg asked a supplementary question:-</p> <p>Thank you for your answer. I was at the meeting and you said quite clearly that there was going to be a follow up meeting in six weeks from that meeting and we are now</p>

	<p>six months from that meeting. I feel an apology is required for the residents of the Vista Development.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh responded:-</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. I don't think an apology is necessary as I did say in my first answer to your question a lot of engagement has occurred between officers and residents and you are fully aware of it. The issues are many and complex and it would quite frankly have been a waste of time to have convened a meeting before having resolutions to tell residents. Residents fully understand that they will be invited when we have substantial things to tell them all. That said many of them already know, so I am sorry, No, I wouldn't like our hard working officers to be blamed for not having convened a meeting in the timescale that you say, it would have made no sense. And furthermore, I would like to refer the councillors to page – [interruption]</p> <p>Councillor Hogg raised a point of accuracy:-</p> <p>At no point did I blame the officers and I would like to make that very clear.</p> <p>Councillor Walsh continued:-</p> <p>I will respond to that too. I am simply chairing the meeting. This is my area and my portfolio as you know and the operational work is carried out by my officers. And so therefore the implication is if you are blaming me you are actually blaming them because they are working on this. On page 80 of our agenda book Part 5 Section 3 Member Officer Protocol says "Ward members are entitled to briefing about local issues to help them represent the council to the community and vice versa. You can make full use of this right that you have to be briefed and I would urge you as ward councillors to let the community know. There are not that many houses on Vista, put out a leaflet, you are very good at doing it at election time. Do it when it really counts, during the year.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>The Peterborough City Council Local Transport Plan contains a Transport User Hierarchy which states that in all aspects of transport planning priority will be given to road users in the following order: pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, with private cars at the bottom of the list. In view of this could the relevant cabinet member tell me what measures are being taken to encourage members of staff to use public transport to access the new Council building Sand Martin House?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:-</p> <p>We run an annual staff survey to ascertain how staff travel to work and why they travel the way they do. This information is then used to run targeted initiatives for staff generally, but specifically, in the run up to staff moving over to Sand Martin House, information will be put on the internal intranet system to help encourage staff to travel sustainably including details about bus services. Speaking to members of the Transformation Team over the months leading up to this exciting move I am encouraged to learn just how many and intending to use buses and walk to the superb new offices this administration has enabled.</p>

Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:-

Round about a week ago a number of councillors went on a tour of Sand Martin House and what we were told was then was that no bus services are actually proposed to go down the road that leads to Sand Martin House.

What we were also told is that there is no prospect of any bus going down there in the future because the council has not insisted on a turning circle being put in. Can I also point out to him that on London Road, which is the main road at the end of the road leading to Sand Martin House there is a bus stop on the South side but no bus stop on the Northbound side. Given the fact that the council is both a joint owner of the Peterborough Investment Partnership that is responsible for this development and given the council is the planning authority isn't it a neglect of the duty imposed on them in the Local Transport Plan to promote sustainable transport? They are not achieving that.

Councillor Hiller responded:-

I really appreciate the follow up question from Councillor Sandford. It is not actually that far from the Town Hall so I imagine a number of staff will continue to commute as they do currently. But as I said before, help and assistance is always there to inform better about travelling around our great city. I personally spent a significant amount of time in both the Town hall and the Allia Business centre on the other side of Fletton Quays and always walk the relatively short distance between the two. It is actually a very pleasant walk over the river. An example of how convenient it is to use public transport to Sand Martin House there is a southbound route stop opposite KFC, which is about seven minutes easy walk to the Engine Shed and there are two northbound route stops south of the river at Queensgate Hotel on Fletton Avenue about nine minutes' walk to the Engine Shed and a northbound route stop North of the river outside TK Max / Asda, again about a nine minute walk. If anyone has a specific questions about the city's bus services they can email buses@Peterborough.gov.uk

You are absolutely right about no buses into Fletton Quays. They can't turn round so what would be the point of putting a bus into Fletton Quays and having it backing out onto the busy main road bridge. That is just nonsense and even Councillor Sandford would appreciate that.

8. Questions on notice to:

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

1. Question from Councillor Hogg

To Councillor Over and Councillor Murphy

Can the representatives of the Combined Authority scrutiny committee please explain the reason for non-attendance that meant that the meeting of 15th June 2018 couldn't go ahead due to not being quorate?

Councillor Murphy may responded:-

Councillor Over is no longer on the joint scrutiny, he has gone onto another committee elsewhere.

The meeting on the 15th June was an extra meeting called to deal with a call in over Cambridge Transport, an issue I remember from many, many years ago being very important in Cambridge. By law, we have limited time to arrange that meeting so the officer set about arranging it and consulted with the Chair, and members of Overview & Scrutiny, and went for Friday 15th June at 9am in Cambridge. That does it itself present some logistical problems because of the very poor transport infrastructure which was what the whole issue was about. I can tell you that the board today have agreed as a temporary measure whereby that the Park & Ride will now go ahead and be temporarily.

The Mayor wanted to have a moratorium over any transport initiatives that are underway. The Overview & Scrutiny called that in as it thought it was wrong and could put jobs at jeopardy. That Friday morning at 9am, it was actually Eid that day as well presented some real problems and I do believe it has been reported that a whip was put on Tory members of the Overview & Scrutiny meeting not to attend to effectively make it inquorate. That really is an abuse of the system and we will now be making representation to see if we can have the quorum reduced from ten, which is quite high for that committee.

Councillor Over addressed the council:-

Councillor Murphy was exactly right I am no longer on the O & S Committee, I am on the Combined Authority as a member of the Fire Service of the county of Peterborough. But I must emphasis everything said I would agree with except the last bit about being a Whip, if there was a Whip, they missed me out of it but then again I am Peterborough and so probably would get missed out of it because the point I really want to make is that nobody came to me and asked is the meeting was OK for the 5th June, I would have said no, it's Friday, it's 9 o'clock, and it is going to take about two and a half hours to get there, three hours by train and no guarantee I would get there by 9 o'clock. So I asked them to change the date and time and they refused. So in my case if I was going to go along it would have taken something in the region of three hours to three and a half hours to get there and I have no idea about getting back. It was inconsiderate. It just reinforces my concern about that committee that it really does seem to have a Cambridge bias to it.

