

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 12 DECEMBER 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, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Fower, JR Fox, JA Fox, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azhar Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Rush, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Seaton, , Shaheed, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Warren, Walsh, and Whitby.

**42. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Davidson, Goodwin, Elsey, Nadeem and Serluca.

**43. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest announced.

**44. Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 October 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2018 were approved as a true and accurate record subject to the following amendments:

- The addition of Councillors Fower and Shaheed to those present at the meeting.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**45. Mayor's Announcements**

A minute's silence was held in respect for Peter Boizot who had recently passed away and the Mayor paid tribute to the work he had done for the city.

The Mayor announced, that, in accordance with powers set out in Standing Order 3.1, he would re-order the agenda to consider the budget item ahead of other Cabinet and Committee recommendations to ensure the item was sufficiently debated.

The Mayor announced the winners of the employees Reward and Recognition Scheme for 2017 – 2018 and thanked the winners for their hard work. Awards were presented to the Team of the Year, the Children's Information and Analytics Team, for the improvements they had made to children's social care systems and to the Employee of the Year, Ian Robinson from the Trading Standards Team, in recognition of his

commitment displayed throughout an 18 month investigation into Life Comfort Products Ltd.

Members were invited to make nominations for the Employee Award 2019 scheme which opened in January 2019 and to contact the Internal Communications Team for further information.

The Mayor announced that the Council had been presented with the Defence Employer Scheme Silver Award in recognition for their support to the defence and armed forces community.

Members were invited to the Christmas Wreath Laying Ceremony on Thursday 20 December 2018 at 10.00am at the War Memorial.

Staff were invited to attend the Christmas Cake and Mince Pie event on Wednesday 19 December 2018 at 10.00am in Sand Martin House and in the Town Hall on 20 December at 11.30am.

#### **46. Leader's Announcements**

The Leader of the Council expressed regret at the passing of Peter Boizot, acknowledged his contribution to the city and offered his condolences to the family. He confirmed the Council would be paying an appropriate tribute and were currently considering various options. Suggestions on the best way to provide a fitting tribute were welcomed.

The Leader went on to wish Officers and Members a Happy Christmas.

Group Leaders responded with their own tributes to Peter Boizot.

### **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

#### **47. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public**

1. Parking Enforcement Westwood
2. Cuts to Bus Subsidies
3. Choice Based Lettings Procedure
4. Graffiti Problem
5. Speeding on Coneygree Road

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

#### **48. Petitions**

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

A petition was received from Mr Guilfoyle regarding the Number 60 Bus Service, calling on the Council to maintain the existing service.

##### **(b) Presented by Members**

A petition was received from Councillor Fower regarding Illegal Parking in Tudor Close in Gunthorpe and calling on the Council to address issues relating to problematic parking.

A petition was received from Councillor Walsh on behalf of Councillor Elsey regarding the Development of the Gloucester Centre in Orton Longuville, an area which had been identified for 100 dwellings on the Local Plan. It called on the Council to give consideration to the infrastructure and the effect on the local area, road congestion and school capacity. This petition was not in response to a current planning application.

A petition was received from Councillor Cereste from the residents of Vale Drive in Hampton Vale regarding parking on verges and footpaths. The Parish Council were reported to be prepared to share the costs in consideration of the financial difficulties faced by the Council at the present time.

#### **49. Questions on Notice**

**(a) To the Mayor**

**(b) To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet**

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

1. Peterborough Pupil Referral Reaching Capacity
2. Microsoft to Google Transition Costs
3. Removal of SATs exams
4. Rubbish in Gunthorpe and Number of Litter Bins
5. Vista Development Parking
6. Footpath through John Clare Rec
7. Verge and Pavement Parking in Ravensthorpe
8. Medesham Homes Projects in Midland Road
9. Christmas Market
10. Stray Horses
11. Time to Collect Fly Tipping
12. Number of New Solar Panels
13. Apprenticeships
14. Empower Urgency Arrangements
15. Campaign to End Loneliness
16. Affordable Planning Permission
17. Installation of Air Conditioning

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

There were no questions to the Chair of any Committee or Sub-Committee.

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

1. Student Accommodation
2. University of Peterborough Status
3. Budgetary Control and HR Practices Combined Authority
4. Impact of Combined Authority Office Costs

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

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS**

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

**(a) Cabinet Recommendation - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 - Tranche Two**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 3 December 2018, received a report on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche Two.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report, which set out the approach for the delivery of a sustainable budget over the next three years and moved the recommendation. He advised there had been funding cuts that, combined with huge demand from providing good children's services and supporting an aging population, had led to budget pressures. Priority had been given to covering the statutory requirements, school places, and adults and children's social care.

Councillor Seaton further provided local background information including that Peterborough was the fourth largest growing city in the country, had the eighth lowest council tax, a high number of school age residents, an increase in children in care and was caring for an aging population. He also outlined the positive improvements and services delivered over the recent years across the city.

Proposed changes had involved consultation with Joint Scrutiny of the Budget, the Disability Forum, Parish and Youth Councils, and Trade Unions. He also advised that no changes would be implemented until consultation with end users of services had been completed. Progress would be reviewed at Cabinet in 4 February 2019. Should consultation responses indicate a different approach would be required proposals would be brought back to Cabinet and Council as part of Tranche 3 in March.

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

Councillor Sandford introduced an amendment to the recommendation regarding the changes proposed to public transport to defer making a decision on this item. He drew Member's attention to a briefing note published following the Cabinet Budget Working Group which indicated that for evening services on core city routes, the average journey subsidy was 94p and gave further information on subsidies. He also referred to reports issued prior to the joint scrutiny meeting which indicated decisions to reduce services had already been taken and that the report was incomplete as the appendices were missing. He also advised that not all consultations were completed and further information was required before a decision could be made.

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

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

- Cabinet had approved the proposed methodology for reviewing the bus subsidy.
- It was advised that the majority of bus services in Peterborough were sufficiently used to be considered commercial and did not require a subsidy.
- Stagecoach had provided information for the review and had identified routes, timetables and revisions for consideration.
- Comment was made that further information was required before decisions could be made.
- It was noted that a budget saving figure could not be agreed before the review was completed and further meetings would occur before any decisions was made.

- Members advised that the public were concerned that the bus service was not working well and that services may be lost.
- From 1 April 2019 the Combined Authority (CA) would take control of the transport policy and the budget savings would be achieved by the CA rather than Peterborough City Council (PCC).
- Members expressed a lack of confidence in the main provider of bus services in Peterborough.
- It was commented that previous investment into bus services had aimed to increase bus usage at key times which would lead to the subsidy not being required in the future as the services would pay for themselves. However, the anticipated result had not been achieved as no increase in usage and been observed.
- Members felt that there was a monopoly in the city on bus services.
- Members had spoken to residents who felt that services were unreliable, overcrowded and some buses did not stop when requested.
- Peterborough had aspired to be the Environment Capital and therefore, it was felt, should encourage the use of public transport.
- A Community Initiative was suggested to encourage more people to use buses rather than drive cars.
- It was advised that concessionary fares were not the same as bus subsidies.

Councillor Barkham exercised his right to speak and endorsed the recommendation.

Councillor Seaton, as the mover of the original recommendation, responded by reminding Members that the amendment was about bus subsidies and that services were subsidised in two ways, £715,000 pa for subsidies and £3m for concessionary fares. Concessionary fares had been funded by central government in the first year only but by the Council thereafter. He did not feel the council should fund empty buses.

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment to the recommendation from Councillor Sandford (22 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 3 abstained from voting):

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

**Councillors Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fuller, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Smith, Stokes, Walsh, Warren

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

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment to the recommendation was **DEFEATED**.

Following a short break, the debate continued on the original recommendation regarding the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20 to 2021/22 – Tranche Two.

Members debated the original recommendation and in summary the points raised included:

- It was felt that moving elderly and vulnerable residents from one home to another caused undue pressure and stress on residents and their families.

- Suggestion was made that the Council should be lobbying central Government to provide funding for council run homes and Members favoured a National Care Service.
- The locations for Assisted Care Suites for vulnerable adults requiring assisted care were not being released, which led Members to question whether their needs would be sufficiently matched. It was suggested that care should be provided on the basis of need and priority rather than cost.
- Commercial information about sites and building costs was commercially sensitive and, therefore, exempt from publication.
- Members were assured that Assisted Care Suites would be located where they were needed and this would be decided by professional officers.
- Members were advised by the Deputy Leader that the statement relating to Assisted Care Schemes on page 309 of the agenda pack, "...if this was the case the council would ensure that the accommodation provided was equal...", which suggested residents would be moved, had now been withdrawn. Members were concerned it had not been removed from the paperwork and asked for confirmation on what they were voting on.
- The Legal Officer confirmed that the Budget Papers were produced for a Cabinet meeting on 3 December 2018 and a verbal amendment had been made since which had been recorded in the minutes of the Cabinet meeting. Members were voting on the basis of the papers from the Cabinet meetings and the verbal or written updates.
- The Joint Scrutiny of the Budget minutes would also reflect the above revision.
- It was commented that altering the criteria for eligibility for services could lead to people in the future not receiving the same level of care as in the past.
- Proposed bus cuts would, it was suggested, affect elderly residents and people working shifts, and make travelling to work difficult for those working limited hours, on low wages relied.
- The Cabinet had received a report that proposed withdrawal of the Saturday service on routes 60, 61, 62 and 63.
- It was noted that the Council was not a bus company and that bus companies themselves could subsidise the routes.
- Comment was made that the budget cut in bus services should not be initiated until the complete information has been reviewed and it was known which services would be affected and complete information or an equality impact assessment was made available.
- Members were concerned other areas of the budget, aside from bus subsidy savings, were being based on incomplete information.
- £11.4m savings, 57% i.e. £6.5m was in the form of capital receipts and the sale of council assets.
- A large number of residents, it was advised, were on below average income. This balanced out the fact that the Council had one of the lowest council tax rates.
- Members noted that budget problems were caused by central Government cuts and action was required to obtain better funding for the city.
- The financial settlement from Central Government had been further delayed and was still unknown.
- Concern was raised that some budget cuts were based on assumptions that the Council would no longer need to spend £200-300,000 per month on temporary accommodation for the homeless. Some initiatives, such as Midland Road, had opened and would have an impact, however the 60-80 other sites had not materialised.
- At the Joint Scrutiny Committee the Cabinet Member had been asked to provide information regarding expenditure of computer equipment unnecessarily.

- Members requested the decision to close the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) reuse facility for recycling white goods be revisited and that further attempts be made to find someone to take this over, possibly in another format with different premises with staff.
- Members were concerned about the savings identified with regard to the Virtual School, as this affected children in care. As yet no confirmation had been received on government funding.
- Members were advised that it had been previously stated by Johnathan Lewis, the Strategic Director for Education, that there were to be no cuts to the virtual schools, but efficiency savings. Arrangements for shared services with Cambridgeshire County Council would assist toward the efficiency services.
- Members were concerned for residents in the city as 5,098 homes were built in the last five years but none by the Council. Approximately 350 families were in temporary accommodation and approximately 3,000 people were on housing register.
- It was considered that Ofstead ratings were a snapshot on a specific day and did not indicate the standard of education, as reflected in the SATs and GCSE results.
- It was noted that Peterborough was currently placed in the bottom 15% for GCSE results.
- Members requested information on the budget savings proposed in Tranche 3 and it was confirmed that Political Groups could appoint a representative to attend the Budget Working Group.
- Comment was made that the current pressures on the public finances were down to a previous Government.
- Questions were raised as to how close the Council was to delivering the statutory minimum on services.
- It was suggested that Members' expectations should fall in line with taxation.
- Members believed that funding for social and healthcare funding should come through taxation.
- Any suggestions for budget savings could be made to Councillor Seaton or the Leader of the Council.

Councillor Fuller confirmed that the Council had requested fairer funding for Peterborough from central Government, however, a balanced budget had to be achieved with the finance available. Suggestions on how this could be achieved were welcomed at the consideration stage rather than left until the budget was being approved. No proposals would move forward until consultations with end users had been completed. He confirmed that the report identified savings and future investments and there would be a budget deficit of over £3 million in year one. Information was still awaited from central Government, however, the Council needed to work towards achieving a balanced budget. As the process stood, the Tranche 3 proposals would go to the Joint Scrutiny Committee in February and return to Full Council in March.

Councillor Seaton summed up and advised Members that the Council was working towards building new homes and made reference to Tenter Hill, Bretton Court and Sugar Way. He confirmed that in previous years, councils have removed the fat from the bones to continue to deliver services despite cuts in the Revenue Support Grant, however, any surplus had now been used up. He believed the Council could close the £3 million deficit and asked Members to support his proposal.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation as originally moved (29 voted in favour, 20 voted against, 3 abstained from voting):

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

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox, Julie Howell

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed:

1. The Tranche Two service proposals, outlined in Appendix E to the report.
2. The updated budget assumptions, to be incorporated within the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2019/20- 2021/22. These are outlined in section 5.4 of the report.
3. The revised capital programme approach outlined in section 5.7 and referencing Appendix D to the report.
4. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2019/20-2021/22 -Tranche Two, as set out in the body of the report and the following appendices:
  - Appendix A – 2019/20-2021/22 MTFS Detailed Budget Position -Tranche Two
  - Appendix B – Local Government Finance Event Timeline
  - Appendix C – Performance Data
  - Appendix D – Capital Programme 2018/19- 2021/22
  - Appendix E – Budget Consultation Document, including Budget Proposals
  - Appendix F – Equality Impact Assessments
  - Appendix G– Budget Consultation Feedback

**(b) Licensing Committee Recommendation - Licensing Act 2003 - Cumulative Impact - Review, Consultation and Responses**

The Licensing Committee, at its meeting on 18 October 2018, considered a report on the Cumulative Impact Policy – Review, Consultation and Responses.

Councillor Ayres, as Chair of the Licensing Committee introduced the report and moved the recommendations. She advised that the policy related to the New England area and was referred to Operation Can-Do (OCD). Recent legislative changes resulted in the policy being reviewed and consulted upon to ensure it remained relevant. Legislation also stated that no policy could be absolute and each case would therefore be judged individually. Councillor Ayres thanked Members from all parties who had helped in the preparation of the report and proposed Members support the recommendation.

Councillor Walsh seconded the recommendation and reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Jamil proposed an amendment to the motion.

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

The amendment was accepted.

A vote was taken on the recommendation as amended (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved retention of the status quo for the Cumulative Impact Policy, taking into account the comments of the Director of Public Health that the Licensing Authority consider the use of cumulative impact policies in other areas where a need was identified, including areas of high alcohol density and high levels of deprivation.

**(c) Licensing Committee Recommendation - Statement of Principles - Gambling Act 2005**

The Licensing Committee, at its meeting on 18 October 2018, considered a report on the Statement of Principles - Gambling Act 2005.

Councillor Ayres introduced the report and moved the recommendations. She advised that the current policy was due for renewal in January 2019 under the Gambling Act 2005 Section 349, which required that a review take place every three years. There were no material changes to the revised policy.

Councillor Walsh seconded the recommendation and reserved her right to speak.

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

- 15 individuals and organisations were part of the consultation process. It was not known how many had responded.
- Members were advised that gambling caused a detriment to public health and problem gamblers were twice as likely to consult their General Practitioner (GP) with mental health conditions, five times as likely to be admitted to hospital and eight times as likely to access psychological counselling. Because of this it was suggested that Public Health consultations were included as part of the next review.
- It was suggested that gambling provision across the city needed to be viewed in a cohesive manner and consideration given to the benefit gambling provision brings to an area. Should the provision appear to be detrimental it should be declined.
- Comment was made that there appeared was a link between alcohol and gambling.

Councillor Walsh exercised her right to speak. She advised members that comments had been noted, however, the Licensing Committee was a regulatory committee and their decisions were based on regulations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council recommended that Council approve and adopt the revised Statement of Principles.

**(d) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Council Meetings - Timings and Standing Orders**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 26 October 2018, considered a report on amendments to the Council's Standing Orders concerning meetings of the Full Council.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report, moved the recommendations and outlined the response of the Constitution and Ethics Committee to the proposals and those that the committee had rejected.

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

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

- Members felt there was a common theme to limit opposition and to hold the executive to account.
- Comment was made that previously there had been a category on the agenda specifically for Ward Councillors to ask Ward related questions which had been removed.
- It was pointed out that there was no need to wait for a Full Council meeting to deal with Ward matters.
- It was noted that the proposal did not prevent Ward matters being asked at Full Council, only that the response would take the form of a written answer as opposed to a verbal response.
- Members felt that Full Council could be used as a public forum to raise a matter when other avenues have been explored without success.
- Whilst the opportunity to ask questions in public was not being removed, it was considered that the opportunity to ask a supplementary question had.
- It was suggested that information promised had not been forthcoming in the past and when a question was asked at Full Council a response was received.
- It was noted that Officers did not stand up to speak and it was questioned why Members should have to do so.
- Suggestion was made that those with a disability and those who felt intimidated would feel more at ease seated.
- Evidence suggested groups work more co-operative and collaboratively when remaining seated.
- It was advised that some Ward questions were answered very quickly at Full Council meetings.
- Should the system of raising Ward matters be abused it was felt that it should be reviewed at that point.
- Full Council meetings should be primarily to discuss important, strategic issues, such as the budget. It was felt that Ward matters could be dealt with in writing as the recommendation suggests.
- Ward issues raised at Full Council were used as part of the election process, which was considered to be inappropriate.
- Members asked if the number of questions could be limited and that a question be withdrawn if the questioner was not present to hear the response.
- Raising a Ward issue at Full Council had previously, in was felt, highlighted that an issue was not confined to one Ward and therefore ceased to be a Ward matter but a Council wide matter.

Councillor Bashir exercised her right to speak and advised Members that elected Councillors should act professionally at all times and lead by example. She reminded Members that the meetings were being live streamed to the public.

Councillor Seaton summed up as mover of the recommendation and acknowledged an earlier comment referring to questioners not being present to hear the answers. Councillor Seaton noted that some Councillors were asking questions and not attending meetings.

A recorded vote was taken (28 voted in favour, 21 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

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

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, John Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council amended the Council's Standing Orders to reflect that questions at Council were to relate to broader council matters. Questions relating to Ward specific issues would receive a written response and be published as part of the minutes.

**(e) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation Scheme - Petitions Scheme - Matters that can be dealt with**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 29 October 2018, considered a report on the Council's Petitions Scheme.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations, outlining the proposed changes to the Council's Petition Scheme. He reminded Members that all areas would remain under review should circumstances change.

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

Councillor Murphy proposed an amendment to the recommendation and introduced the amendment.

The amendment was accepted.

A vote was taken on the recommendation as amended (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. amended the Petitions Scheme and Council Standing Orders to allow urgent petitions to be considered at the Annual Council meeting; and
2. adopted the updated Petitions Scheme as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, subject to the replacement of the words 'If the petition does not contain 20 signatures it can still be considered if the issue relates to a small local area and is signed by the majority of people affected' and replace with 'If the petition does not contain 20 signatures it can still be considered if the issue relates to a small local area' at paragraph 3.2.

**(f) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Whistle Blowing Policy**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 29 October 2018, considered a report to amend the Constitution to pass the delegated responsibility for the Council's whistleblowing policy and oversight from the Constitution & Ethics Committee to the Council's Audit Committee.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council amend the constitution to pass the delegated responsibility for the council's whistleblowing policy and oversight from the Constitution and Ethics Committee to the Council's Audit Committee.

**(g) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Civic Protocols – Update**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 29 October 2018, considered a report on updates to the Civic Protocol.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the updated Civic Protocols as attached at Appendix 2 to the report subject to the correction of typographical errors and the alteration of wording around companions to the Mayor to refer to male companions as 'Consort' and female companions as 'Mayoress'.

**(h) Corporate Parenting Committee Recommendation – Corporate Parenting Champion Proposed New Position**

The Corporate Parenting Committee, at its meeting on 21 November 2018, considered a report on the proposal to appoint Champions within Corporate Parenting.

Councillor Smith introduced the report and moved the recommendations. She advised that as Corporate Parents the Council had a responsibility to children in care to give them the best possible start in life. The proposal was to appoint elected Members to act as champions for key subjects that impact children in care, care leavers and foster carers the most with further champions being added each year. The first of these to be proposed would be Councillor Jones to the post of champion for Effective Care Planning.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed that the Committee's terms of reference was updated to allow the Committee to create and appoint to Corporate Parenting Champion positions on a yearly basis.

**(i) Cabinet Recommendation - Biodiversity Strategy**

Cabinet at its meeting, on 19 November 2018, considered a report on Peterborough City Council's Biodiversity Strategy.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the strategy formed part of the five Sustainable Growth Strategies introduced to Cabinet last January (2018) and were, in a broad sense, supportive strategies to the overarching aim of the Council in supporting growth. The Trees and Woodlands Strategy had already been introduced and the Biodiversity Strategy was the second element to be proposed.

Councillor Smith seconded the recommendation and reserved her right to speak.

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

- Members wanted to know what Positive Management actually meant, what habitat would not be included in the appropriate habitat recommendation, what was planned and what would change at Werrington Meadow.
- Members supported managing Council green spaces to support bio-diversity.
- Members enquired if prohibited herbicides had been withdrawn and if herbicide use would be reduced.

Councillor Hiller summed up as mover of the recommendation and agreed to have the Members questions answered.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the Biodiversity Strategy.

## 51. 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. Cabinet meeting held on 15 October 2018,
2. Cabinet meeting held on 19 November 2018,
3. Cabinet meeting held on 3 December 2018,  
Call-in by Scrutiny Committee of 'Amendment of Loan Facility For Fletton Quays Hotel - OCT18/CMDN/47',
4. Use of Special Urgency and Waiver of Call in for 'Award of Contract to HW Martin Waste Ltd. for the Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre - KEY/12NOV18/08' and 'Amendment of Existing Loan Arrangements to Empower - NOV18/CMDN/57', and
5. Cabinet Member Decisions between 22 October 2018 and 30 November 2018.

### Questions were asked about the following:

#### Extension of the Peterborough Serco Strategic Partnership Services Agreement

Councillor Hogg asked if savings could be found in the negotiating of the SERCO contract that could be used to cover the bus subsidies.

Councillor Seaton replied that any savings from the SERCO contract would be put towards delivering a sustainable budget.

#### Award of Contract to HW Martin Waste Ltd for the Management and Operation of Dogsthorpe Household Recycling Centre

Councillor Saltmarsh asked if all work would be carried out in the timeframe given of 01 November 2018 to 17 February 2019.

Councillor Cereste advised this was a temporary contract extension only.

#### Amendment of Existing Loan Arrangements to Empower

Councillor Hogg asked if the loan interest rate could be increased by 0.5 percent each time it was extended.

Councillor Seaton replied that he would have to check the contract terms.

At this point the guillotine was reached in accordance with Standing Order 14.2 the Mayor announced the meeting would end at 11:15pm.

Councillor Lillis proposed to extend the meeting until all Council business had been attended.

Councillor Hogg seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken and the motion was **DEFEATED**.

#### Closure of the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Reuse Facility

Councillor Murphy asked if the facility would be operated by an alternative company in a different way.

Councillor Cereste replied he was prepared to discuss alternative arrangements.

Councillor Sandford asked, given that the Council had a target of to reuse and recycle 65 percent of waste by 2020, how could the removal of this facility be justified and what was the saving being made?

Councillor Holdich replied that this facility was very little used, as each item that was refurbished had to be given a warranty and this increased the cost. Other organisations were doing similar work.

### **52. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

1. Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 29 October 2018, and
2. Combined Authority Board held on 31 October 2018.

There were no questions asked.

### **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

#### **53. Motions on Notice**

##### **(1) Motion from Councillor Farooq – Motions at Full Council**

Councillor Farooq moved the motion regarding motions presented at Full Council meetings. He suggested that the Constitution and Ethics Committee consider at its next available meeting the introduction of criteria for future motions presented to Full Council and make a recommendation back to Full Council on its findings.

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

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

- It was felt by some Members that the motion should not have been brought to Full Council, but should have been addressed directly to the Constitution and Ethics Committee as the subject falls within that committee's remit.
- It was noted that no specific examples were provided within the motion.
- Members commented that all motions were discussed robustly at group level prior to agreement.
- Motions had to follow a due governance procedure already to be presented at Full Council.

- Comment was made that this motion was directed towards preventing the chamber discussing national, international and human rights issues.
- Some generic issues were irrelevant morally, socially, politically and economically, however, it was felt that even if a motion did not have an immediate impact now on the residents of Peterborough, it might do in the future.
- It was suggested that the Council consider its contribution to matters on a regional, national and international stage.
- The Council should concentrate on what it could reasonably expect to achieve, however, it was recognised that there was always room for improvement.
- Members suggested that a limit on time allowed for debates maybe an advantage.

In accordance with Standing Order 14 there was no further debate as the meeting guillotine had been reached.

A vote was taken on each remaining item without further discussion. Each motion was deemed to be formally moved and seconded.

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

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

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Judy Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

“I have now had the privilege of sitting on full council meetings and observing the proceedings including questions and motions. I have seen Members passionately debating issues faced by their ward residents and the issues faced by the Peterborough city overall, backed by the professional work of our officers. May I congratulate members and the officers for providing an excellent service to the residents of Peterborough.

On occasions, I have found some of the motions coming to the council, generic, beyond the remit of the council, not achievable and at worse, not relevant to local residents, local issues, or stakeholders.

The discussions on these proposals become lengthy and lose the emphasis on the core points. These motions take valuable time away from the real issues faced by our residents.

I propose that the Constitution and Ethics Committee consider at its next available meeting the introduction of the following criteria for future motions presented to council and make a recommendation back to Council on its findings:

Relevance: Does the motion benefit the residents of specific ward and/or all the residents of Peterborough

Within the remit of the council: Can the council provide the service/product the motion asks for, or is it something for Parliament.

Cost of the proposal and source of funding: How much will it cost to deliver the proposed service/product?

The ultimate test should always be, does it benefit the majority of the residents and does it provide value for money

|  | Fill in details |
|--|-----------------|
| Relevance                                  |                 |
| Within remit of council                    |                 |
| Cost of the proposal and source of funding |                 |

Such a process will have considerable advantages not least, the ability to introduce real policies and probe and discuss current policies, adding considerable value to the work of the council. Overall, making a real difference to the lives of our residents in Peterborough.”

## (2) Motion from Councillor Seaton - Regarding the Code of Conduct

A recorded vote was taken on the motion (29 voted in favour, 19 voted against, 2 abstained from voting):

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

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Barkham, Bond, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash, Lane

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

“Peterborough City Council;

- Notes that the Standards Board was a cumbersome and expensive approach to monitoring the ethics of elected councillors
- Believes that the move to local management of ethics was appropriate
- Notes the commitment of the Council Leader to improving standards and welcomes the establishment of the Constitution and Ethics Committee
- Notes the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) ongoing review of local government ethical standards

However Peterborough City Council is concerned that;

- Current sanctions such as giving an apology or attending training can only be instigated with the agreement of a member and can lead to an extended process with no acceptable final outcome.
- Current available sanctions for breaches, apart from those in relation to disclosable pecuniary interests, are not set down by statute but arise through the common law and are weak and ineffectual.

Peterborough City Council therefore resolves to;

- Ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to review the current Code of Conduct in light of the CSPL review and present a revised Code of Conduct to Full Council for agreement.
- If Full Council accepts the recommendations of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, all members will be expected to abide by and accept the new Code of Conduct under the terms of their Declaration of Acceptance of Office which is signed when they are elected.

Constitution and Ethics Committee will continue to oversee any complaints made and ensure sanctions are abided to.”

### **(3) Motion from Councillor Hogg – Tenter Hill Planning Application**

A recorded vote was taken on the motion (19 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 3 abstained from voting):

**Councillor For:** Ali, Barkham, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Saltmarsh, Sandford, Shaheed

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

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

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

### **(4) Motion from Councillor Seaton – Fossil Fuels Amendment from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

A recorded vote was taken on the amendment to the motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz (20 voted in favour, 26 voted against, 4 abstained from voting):

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

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

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

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment to the motion was **DEFEATED**.

A recorded vote was taken on the motion as originally moved (26 voted in favour, 13 voted against, 11 abstained from voting):

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

**Councillors Against:** Ali, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Martin, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz

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

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED AS FOLLOWS:**

“Peterborough City Council recognises that fossil fuels have played a central role in the past 150 years of social and technological development, but that their continued use poses a serious risk to the stability of the climate upon which our well-being and economy depends.

Climate change endangers the health of local residents in Peterborough, directly through impacts such as heatwaves and indirectly through impacts on food systems and global security.

A rapid large-scale shift away from fossil fuels towards energy efficiency and alternative sources of energy is needed to avert catastrophic climate change. This shift to a zero-carbon economy presents significant opportunities and challenges for Peterborough in meeting its environmental aspirations.

Peterborough City Council notes: - it has introduced an ethical procurement policy - it does not hold any direct or indirect investments in fossil fuel producers - it has proposed and implemented significant energy infrastructure, with an Energy from Waste plant, solar on all council buildings and many schools and has offered free solar power to residents - it has worked to reduce fuel poverty and improve energy efficiency with schemes such as Heataborough and LEAP (which offers a free of charge in-home advice visit that may include installing free simple energy saving measures and finding funding for further energy saving home improvements.

Peterborough City Council also supports the Cambridgeshire Pension Fund, which already has an ethical investment policy, agreed by cross party and employee / union representatives, in using its good offices to persuade companies involved in the production of fossil fuels to seek alternative approaches.

However the Council undertakes to; - work further with councillors, businesses and community groups to support positive investment in local companies and projects, including community energy schemes, which are hastening a rapid shift to a zero-

carbon economy - to undertake such work in the context of a city-wide energy descent plan and energy security policy which will be developed with councillors, businesses and community groups including Peterborough in Transition. - write to the national U.K. government to support the principle of eliminating fossil fuel use, to seek alternative approaches, to stop subsidising the fossil fuel industry and to advocate for all other countries to commit to this in the wake of the Paris Agreement.”

**(5) Motion from Councillor Fower – Christmas Tree Lights**

This motion was not moved.

**(6) Motion from Councillor Barkham – Sale of Animal Fur**

This motion was not moved.

The Mayor

7.00pm – 11:35pm  
12 December 2018

Town Hall  
Bridge Street  
Peterborough

FULL COUNCIL 12 DECEMBER 2018

QUESTIONS

Questions were received under the following categories:

| <b><u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u></b> |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>6.</b>                          | <b><u>Questions from members of the public</u></b>   |
| <b>1.</b>                          | <p><b>Question from Lucinda Robinson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>At a recent Westwood Residents Association meeting it was again reported that there is continued obstruction by some parked vehicles to residents' private parking. It is difficult for residents to know as to whether obstruction in front of their garages or parking bays at the rear of gardens is the remit of the enforcement team or the local police. For example, much seems to be dependent on which spaces constitute as 'dropped-kerb' parking spaces.</p> <p>Residents can be left unsure of which service is relevant to their obstruction case and are frustrated that much nuisance parking is continuing unaddressed.</p> <p>City Council Officers in the Enforcement Team have indicated that they have brought the matter of obstructed garages to the attention of local police however we don't seem to have had a response.</p> <p>Would you be kind enough to offer assistance in moving this matter forward so that this, often disruptive nuisance, does not continue?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The Council operates Civil Parking Enforcement, where contraventions that our officers can enforce are set out by national parking regulations and guidance. Anything falling outside of these regulations must still be dealt with by the police.</p> <p>Most contraventions that the Council can deal with are breaches of restrictions indicated by signs or road markings. However, the Traffic Management Act defines an offence of blocking a dropped kerb. This, however, only applies if a vehicle is on the carriageway adjacent to a kerb that has been dropped to give access, and cannot be applied to off-street parking areas such as those in front of properties or garages in Westwood.</p> <p>Whilst the council do pass on these types of reports to the local police community support officers, we would always strongly encourage residents to report obstructions direct to the police at the time they are occurring.</p> <p>It may be possible for the council to implement a parking prohibition to stop people parking in these areas altogether, however this is likely to be unsupported as it would</p> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>rule out all parking, including by those whose properties or garages the area is in front of.</p> <p><b>Lucinda Robinson asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Due to the lack of response from the police would the Council now write to the Police Commissioner or senior local officers to ask that do participate in this matter, pointing out that in many cases obstruction can lead to escalation of matters resulting in some serious neighbourhood disputes and if things continue unchecked or there is no clear plan to address the route of the problem it just continues.</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>I think it would be far more valuable if residents wrote to him rather than myself. You have the detail on the issue and you know what concerns you better than anyone else. So I would advise residents to write in and if possible, individually.<br/>Thank you.</p>  |
| 2. | <p><b>Question from Sandra Bond</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>What is the message from relevant Cabinet Member to those who will lose vital bus services thanks to Conservative cuts to the bus subsidy?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>You should be aware from your Liberal Democrat colleagues around 10 million bus journeys in Peterborough (97% of the total journeys) are sufficiently used to be considered "commercial" and not needing bus subsidy. These will therefore not be affected by any review.</p> <p>You site vital services being lost and I wonder which ones in particular did you have in mind? Which routes and times?</p> <p><b>Sandra Bond asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Some of the routes will go through Gunthorpe and Werrington. They will be bus services running through the evenings and weekends. I know you mention the buses are underused, but you need to ask why are they under used? Are they too expensive? These bus services are vital for night shift workers, evening college users, late night shoppers and people who enjoy socialising with their family and friends. How do you expect those residents who rely on these vital bus services to continue to get on with their lives if that service is no longer available?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>You were not specific on journey times but you mentioned generic evening services. About 3% of journeys operate with subsidy from the tax payer which you may be aware of. In addition on demand responsive services currently cost the Council over £700,000 a year. It was noted that when an additional £104,000 was invested in the 60s service in 2017 it only resulted in just over 7000 additional journeys averaged to two years prior to it's introduction. A subsidy of nearly £15.00 per additional journey. The journeys that are currently under review as I am sure you have been informed by</p> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>your son, the Liberal Democrat Councillor, are those that are less used, those that may not represent value for money, those which don't in the main support essential journeys and those that are not used by vulnerable groups such as those provided for by on demand services. And those that trundle around empty but still belching out noxious fumes. Any decisions on timetable arrangements will be made in consultation with users and Cross Party Members including Councillor Sandford who is part of the Review Group.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>  |
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Alan Bridger</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member explain how the Choice Based Lettings team operate their allocations system to various social landlords?</p> <p>Once one of the bidders details are passed onto the prospective landlords is there any reason that a landlord could refuse a prospective tenant because of race, religion, etc.? If they do is there anything Choice Based Lettings can do to rectify the matter or do we allow the landlord to continue with their discrimination?</p> <p>I would like to add there is no suggestion of any wrong doing on the part of choice based lettings and the way they allocate the properties, but abuse of the system by certain landlords should not be tolerated.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Applications for housing are considered in accordance with the Peterborough Homes Allocations Policy. Anyone who is in housing need can apply and their application will be assessed and, if accepted, prioritised alongside other applications in the order of their housing need. Once an applicant has received confirmation their application has been accepted and is live on the register they are then able to bid for properties through the Choice Based Lettings Scheme.</p> <p>I hope that is informative Mr Bridger, I am not aware of any particular instances of the type that you site but I am very happy to listen.</p> <p><b>Mr Bridger asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>There is one particular landlord that when I followed that procedure and Choice Based Lettings put me forward but Cross Keys Homes chose to discriminate and refuse to house me in one of their properties.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>This sounds like the type of situation we should take off line. I would be very happy to see any evidence that you have of any wrong doing but I would also confirm that any checks to confirm eligibility are completed prior to an applicant being accepted onto the register and being able to bid for the properties. Unless information comes to light after that application process that would preclude any tenant from being offered property, I can't really comment until I see what you have in your folder and I would be happy to look at that.</p> |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 4. | <p><b>Question from Chris Wiggin (Asked on his behalf by Becki Sellick):</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>Under the current administration graffiti continues to be a huge problem across our city. One of the ways it is being tackled in certain parts of the city in a positive way is by encouraging street art.</p> <p>Could the Councillor Cereste tell me what funds are available to pay for street art on underpasses and other regularly graffitied walls across the city? Perhaps Councillor Holdich could combine this with his concept of a Peter Boizot Memorial proposal.</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>There is no specific budget for painting murals on areas that are subjected to graffiti.</p> <p>We have a contract with Amey that allows for the graffiti to be removed from all Council land and offensive graffiti within 24 hours of Amey receiving the report.</p> <p>We have been working with the prison recently where they painted some art work over three utility boxes near Central Park that were subject to regular graffiti. We also work with the Probation Service to paint out large areas such as underpasses, with both these initiatives we only had to supply the paint.</p> <p><b>Becki Selick asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>The prison engagement with cleaning and the probation service with painting murals is welcome, I wonder given that impact on young people's services of Central Government cuts to local authority funding and the cuts to this Council's budget that are proposed this evening, how will you enable some funds to be found to enable a constructive engagement with young people in the city more widely?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>That is quite interesting because the Cabinet has recently been looking at a completely new strategy which we are calling the Integrated Strategy, where we are going to do our best to bring together all the agencies and services within the area, not just council services, in order to be able to provide a better and more focused service including youths.</p> |
| 5. | <p><b>Question from Terri Haynes</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>Speeding on Coneygree Road remains a big concern for residents living across the North of Stanground. Would the relevant Cabinet Member tell me what work the council has undertaken to reduce speeding on Coneygree Road?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The latest speed data for Coneygree Road shows average speeds for all sections below 30mph, which indicates a good level of compliance with the speed limit. As a result no works to reduce speeding have been undertaken or been proposed. We are in the process of obtaining updated speed data across the authority which will be reviewed in due course. I would like to add that following Conservative Councillors</p>  |

lobbying the Council in the past about their concerns with speeding on Coneygree Road the Council installed speed humps in order to improve road safety however some residents who live near the humps have complained about the noise generated when vans and trailers go over them and would like them removed, so it is not so easy. I do understand Speed watch training sessions have been held for residents and Ward Councillors, I attended a session myself. I understand that Councillor Hogg is to be the Speed watch Co-ordinator but we await further news on this.

**A supplementary question was asked:**

Would the relevant Cabinet Member be willing to meet with me to discuss installing a crossing on Coneygree Road?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

I do believe the best way forward would be talk to the Highways people about that. If you want me to be involved I can be. I do think you should involve your other Ward Councillors as well and I know you are in close contact with them.

**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 Saltmarsh**

To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University

As you are aware the Peterborough Pupil Referral has been rated as outstanding by OFSTED but now it has reached its capacity and is unable to admit new pupils.

What other provision is being made for the rising number of pupils who have been excluded from schools in the city to enable them to continue their education?

**Councillor Ayres responded:**

Peterborough currently spends £55 per pupil supporting children who are excluded from schools or have challenging behaviour. This is nearly three times the average for the East of England and double the level of expenditure for our ten nearest statistical neighbouring authorities. In addition we have the sixth highest density of Pupil Referral places for Local Authorities in England. Continuing to expand our provision for excluded pupils cannot continue as our excellent pupil referral service is now full. We have initiated a review of how behaviour is managed across the city and we need to look at other models of behaviour support to ensure our children are properly supported. However it is useful to note that our rate of permanent and fixed term exclusions remain below the national average. All children that are permanently excluded will receive support from the Pupil Referral Service through supporting study at home whilst we consider the next steps in how best to meet challenging behaviour. Where an appropriate place is available, we will admit as soon as we can.

**Councillor Saltmarsh asked a supplementary question:**

In view of the expected rise in the amount of referrals are there any definite plans to expand the current Pupil Referral Unit?

**Councillor Ayres responded:**

I have had a lengthy meeting as you probably know as a Governor of the Pupil Referral Service yourself, with the Chairman, Councillor Coles and Clair George who is the Head. We had a lengthy meeting on Friday to discuss this particular review and how we could go about trying to get extra places and how to deal with children who have this challenging behaviour. We are having a review by an independent person who has already been engaged to look into this as quickly as we possibly can.

**2. Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>On 1 October at the budget working group, I asked for a full breakdown of all the costs incurred in the transition of the council's computer systems from Microsoft to Google and the costs likely to be incurred by the transition in the reverse direction. I asked the same question at Full Council in October and then again at the Growth and Environment Scrutiny Committee in November. On 28 November, some eight weeks after first asking the question, I received a two paragraph partial response giving some information on licensing costs but no information on other costs such as training.</p> <p>Could I now have a full answer to my original question?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>You have my apologies for the length of time it has taken to respond.</p> <p>Our Finance Team are doing an excellent job in challenging circumstances after a significant change of leadership and taking on considerable new responsibilities. However Scrutiny is important so a full response will be provided tomorrow. I would just like to remind Members of the central issue. Our ICT Strategy was signed off in 2014 through Scrutiny, Cabinet and at Full Council. Four years later and the operating context to the Council has changed considerably and was set out in the July Cabinet report when we agreed the IT Improvement Plan and potential path for convergence with the county.</p> <p>That plan means investing in the latest Microsoft software product, 365. An investment for the future, not a reverse direction as perhaps inadvertently suggested by the question. That does not mean our previous strategy was wrong but rather that the alignment of systems and processes, and the opportunity for process re-design, means far greater future savings can be achieved and I am sure we all support that.</p> <p><b>Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I accept your apology although I do think eight and a half weeks was a long time to wait for a relatively straightforward answer and then to only get two paragraphs was disappointing.</p> |
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University</p> <p>With a growing voice of parents, throughout the UK, who are worried about the pressures of SATS exams in KS1 and 2, and are calling for these exams to be scrapped can the Cabinet Member for Education please outline what the council's strategy is towards reducing the burden on these pupils is and would it welcome a total scrapping of this system?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p>Undertaking assessment across a pupil's education is critical to ensure that they are progressing well and getting the support they need. Assessments also ensure that schools are being held to account for delivering a high quality education. We consider both teacher and pupil wellbeing as being a key issue we face in Peterborough and the accountability system run by the Department for Education is undeniably creating a significant pressure on both groups.</p>   |

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
|           | <p>We welcome the recent announcement that Key Stage 1 tests will be scrapped by 2023 but there remains a legal obligation on the Local Authority and Schools to undertake the other assessment including Key Stage 2. The recently published workload reduction toolkit from the Department for Education (DfE) will help reduce the burden on both teachers and pupils including advice on marking and assessment. We are currently working with schools to look at how these tools could be implemented in Peterborough.</p>   |
| <p>4.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>In recent weeks, local residents have contacted me regarding the amount of rubbish and litter that is appearing around the Gunthorpe ward. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know what action the Council can take to help alleviate this growing concern, what they have done in their ward to address litter issues and also what the number of wastes bins is for each electoral ward?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Litter picking and mechanical sweeping in the Gunthorpe area is undertaking on a cyclical basis throughout the year. During the Summer months of April to September this takes place approximately every 3 weeks.</p> <p>On a weekly basis some higher frequency areas they are target visited and cleaned, along with all the litter and dogs bins too. Outside of these schedules emergency cleaning requests will be dealt with as an immediate priority and one-off cleaning requests will be investigated and actioned accordingly.</p> <p>We also have several initiatives across the city working with Parish Councils and residents offering litter pickers and bags for their litter picking days through this we have seen some great initiatives and great success.</p> <p>Unfortunately we do not have a list of litter bins per electoral ward.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>How do the Local Authority assess the number of bins in an area, how do they identify as some areas have more than others. Also I am intrigued to find out why do we have such a variety of bin designs?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>I cannot give you an answer on how the Local Authority assess the number of bins needed but I am happy to look into it and come back to you. As far as the bin design is concerned it is a question of history. Each period in history has a different design and they are still there so they are different.</p> |
| <p>5.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Lillis</b></p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader</p> <p>If my fellow residents on the Vista Development opt to introduce a residents parking zone on Hawksbill Way and Beluga Close, will the relevant cabinet member work to</p>  |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>honour the promise made by officers to residents to allow residents with parking permits to park on the Pleasure Fair Meadow Car Park?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>I am pleased to report that following the public meetings the agreed consultation on residents parking commences tomorrow and the letters and plans detailing the proposals should be received next week.</p> <p>The decision to allow the resident parking permits to be used in Pleasure Fair Meadow Car Park is not within the remit of officers but must be taken by Cabinet. If agreed this decision would set a precedent for the future with regards to both income streams and capacity, therefore it is not likely to be supported.</p> <p><b>Councillor Lillis asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>What assessment has been taken on what the impact will be on income streams for what is widely considered an empty car park for most of the year other than on a small number of days?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>I have not specific information on any analysis but I can say if residents do want to avail themselves of parking in a public car park there are set fees they can pay or they can look at public car parks elsewhere. When one buys a property you assess whether there is parking there before you make a decision to put yourself in that residential location.</p> |
| 6. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Fower</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know if there are any plans to fix or rectify the footpath that leads through the John Clare rec. Much of the path is damaged and causes problems for local residents who are wheelchair or mobility scooter users, especially near to the bridge and under the Willow, nearer the Hallfields Lane end?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention, we will arrange for one of our surveyors to inspect the area and carry out any health and safety works required swiftly. We will also look at the path condition for any long term remedial work required and most probably schedule this in to be done at some time in the future, which I will let you know.</p> <p><b>Councillor Fower asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Why does the Administration not introduce tree root barriers to ensure the problem does not reoccur or adopt some other preventative measure?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>There are preventative measures in place and there are regular inspections. With regard to the myriad of footpaths we have across our city you could do this yourself as</p>  |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
|           | <p>a Ward Councillor rather than bring it to Full Council. You can actually look at the root inclusion and if you feel it is damaging a path you could actually let Peterborough Highway Services know yourself by phone or email.</p>   |
| <p>7.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member Communities</p> <p>So far what action has been taken to tackle irresponsible verge and pavement parking in Ravensthorpe? In particular which streets have now got Traffic Regulation Orders? Are there any in the pipe line especially those where damage has and is being caused to the verges and pavements costing the council money to re-instate these?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The Verge and Footway Parking Policy, as published on the Council website, details the process that is followed, to prohibit such parking.</p> <p>Officers have received requests from individuals for two streets in Ravensthorpe (Priory Road and Berkeley Road) and have advised the individuals to demonstrate wider support from the neighbourhood for such measures but nothing further has been received. Therefore no restrictions have progressed to public consultation or subsequently been introduced.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>What is the cost of the verges being damaged and churned up and all the obstruction that is going on and going onto Lou Robinson's really good question which we quite couldn't hear are you still adamant that people should contact the police rather than the council to sort out these ongoing matters? Will you please reconsider your refusal to contact the police on our behalf?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>The supplementary question is not relevant to the original question. We have a policy and as Ward Councillor you can lead on this and encourage your residents to submit their request to implement the Verge Parking Policy and you will get it.</p> |
| <p>8.</p> | <p><b>Question from Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>Does Medesham Homes have a clear plan to build more homes in Peterborough above and beyond its current project in Midland Road?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>The question is do we have a clear plan to build more homes in Peterborough and the answer to that is yes we do.</p> <p><b>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</b></p>  |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>Housing is a key challenge in Peterborough. How many homes is Medesham Homes committed to building in the next 12 months and what assurance can you give us that the commitment will be met?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>You asked about Midland Road, we have 29 properties that are coming on stream now and being occupied as we speak. Meadesham have a further pipeline of 187 homes at various sites in and around Peterborough, most of those will be bought forward over the next 12 – 18 months. There are an additional 60 plus homes at a site we are currently optioning. You will appreciate I would rather be specific when I can specific as there is a degree of confidential information regarding the on the sites we are bidding on currently and as a business person you will appreciate that.</p>  |
| 9. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Coles</b></p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Advisor to the Leader</p> <p>There is no Christmas Market on Cathedral Square this year, and this has been the subject of some comment by local residents. Other cities provide Christmas markets in their centres, which bring in an economic boost to the whole retail and service sectors.</p> <p>Should the Council not be working with our shops, food retailers and hoteliers to provide a Christmas market as part of the City’s Festivities?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>A well-presented Christmas Market would offer great appeal and I believe should be fundamental to the seasonal appeal of the City Centre, adding to the experience not only for those visiting the shops but also frequenting restaurants and bars around Cathedral Square, and St Johns Square.</p> <p>Over the past few years the city has hosted a number of Christmas Markets which have often not matched expectations; indeed I was not happy with our offer last year which I believe was well below the standards we need to achieve.</p> <p>In seeking to engage with the organisers of quality markets we have to deal with the fact that those who are already successful and established in larger Cities or regular locations are understandably are unwilling to relocate.</p> <p>Our efforts to secure a suitable market for this Christmas were unfortunately unsuccessful, and rather than host something inferior it was reluctantly decided to defer for this year and renew our effort for 2019, ensuring that going forward we have something the City can be proud of.</p> <p>Indeed plans have already put in train for negotiations with a range of Christmas Market providers to start early in the New Year and we pre-empted that by having a meeting this week with someone who is looking to bring a market to Peterborough.</p> <p>It’s important to recognise that with consideration of the current financial pressures the City Council is in no position to fund the market. However by engagement with local businesses and thinking of new ideas we can bring something different and exciting to the City for next Christmas.</p> |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>Let's think outside of just tinsel clad wooden sheds and look to create a real festive fun appeal with a seasonal atmosphere attracting the participation of traders offering unusual and interesting items, together with food and drink and rides and activities.</p> <p>Our aspiration should be to endeavour to at least part match the appeal the Christmas Lights Switch on which the City does so well, see the Christmas Market as a revenue driver rather than an unwelcome cost.</p> <p>We do of course need to be mindful of not duplicating what is already on offer at Peterborough City Market and engage with those traders to avoid duplication, or the prospect of taking away much needed business from our established local market.</p> <p>To make this happen with any real chance of success it's essential to establish a compact between the City Council and the City Centre businesses, and I can confirm that engagement with possible promoters has already started in advance of the New Year.</p> <p><b>Councillor Coles asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Big cities like Birmingham make an enormous amount of money from their market which benefits the entire city. What sort of engagement have you got from the local business community who want to support this and might drive forward to help us have a really successful market next year?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>The success of getting a Christmas Market in place is to have a supplier who will put on the right attractions to bring people into the city and be a revenue generator. Also to help with that quest the Business Improvement District, which is out for consultation at the moment, will be one of the drivers to establish a really impressive Christmas Market in the city for next year.</p> |
| 10. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Davidson</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>In my ward of Gunthorpe we have an ongoing problem with stray horses.</p> <p>Despite the excellent efforts of local residents and the PCSO's we are not assured that this council is recognising the risk this problem poses to the community.</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member clarify what policy you have to address this matter?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>I would like to reassure Members that the Local Authority fully understands the risks and impact loose horses can have on communities, particularly when located close to roads or children's play areas.</p> <p>The Prevention and Enforcement Service has established procedures to deal with this when it occurs on council-owned land. This includes our officers attending site to carry out an assessment, which then leads to the posting of an official notice informing owners they need to move the horse. We will also mobilise other agencies such as the Police and Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) if it is</p>  |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | <p>necessary. In the majority of cases, we then follow a legal process which will lead to the removal of the horse or horses if they remain beyond the legal notice period.</p> <p>When on private land, it is not the responsibility of the local authority to remove horses. However, we will provide advice and support to any landowner seeking assistance.</p> <p>In the recent case in Gunthorpe, it was our Council Prevention and Enforcement Service resources who led the actions from start to finish. We notified the RSPCA and Police when there were safety concerns, and we swiftly followed the legal route to remove a total of 7 horses. This included arranging bailiffs, stabling and re-homing.</p>  |
| 11. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, for Waste and Street Scene</p> <p>What is the average time taken to collect fly tipping once it has been reported, please?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Once the fly tip is recorded with Amey they will have it removed within 48 hours for non hazardous and within 24 hours for hazardous, we have a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) to monitor this and it has not failed this financial year to date.</p>   |
| 12. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>How many new solar panels have been installed on council owned buildings for the period 1 December 2017 to 1st December 2018, please?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>No new Solar Panels have been installed on council owned buildings in the timescales mentioned.</p>   |
| 13. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Barkham</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>Although Peterborough has a fast growing economy, it is vital that we as a Council support our young people and help them to find their way into useful and rewarding careers. In furtherance of this aim, could the relevant cabinet member please tell me how many apprentices the council has employed for each of the following academic years 2015-16, 2016 - 17 and 2017-2018?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>The Government Apprenticeship Scheme was launched in 2017 from which point a formal, central record has been maintained. Prior information would require a review across all departments although I will arrange that if Councillor Shaheed requires it.</p> <p>Public sector bodies with 250 or more staff in England have a target to employ an average of at least 2.3% of their staff as new apprentice starts by 2021. We will have achieved 1.4% by the end of 2018 and are improving rapidly. We initiated 19</p> |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | <p>apprenticeships in 2017, have had a further 39 apprenticeships start in 2018 with 29 of those in the last 4 months. Pipeline requests are also rising with approximately 12 - 15 starts anticipated in January 2019.</p> <p>I'm particularly pleased that in October 2018, Westcombe Engineering employed a new apprentice who started a 4-year Engineering Apprenticeship to become an Advanced Machinist and that all level 2 or level 3 apprenticeships across the Council will be offered to Care Leavers in the first instance.</p> <p>Our suppliers were also encouraged to take on apprentices. SERCO have employed 14 and are currently recruiting four new apprentices. Over 30 existing staff are undertaking apprenticeships at all levels with 2 currently studying for degree level.</p> <p>As a Council, we will continue to promote the benefits of apprenticeships for new and existing employees through internal and external communications, roadshows and workshops, including the use of success stories of which we have many.</p> <p><b>Councillor Barkham asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Does the council have plans to expand the number of apprentices it employs in future years?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Yes we do as we are looking at an average of 2.3% of our staff.</p>  |
| 14. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Hogg</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>With regard to the amendment of Existing Loan Arrangements to Empower - NOV18/CMDN/57 decision, can the cabinet member for resources please explain why the Special Urgency and waiver of call-in procedures have been invoked to suspend the requirement to advertise the decision for 28 days, publish the decision for 5 days prior to publication, and to suspend the 3 day call-in period, when this decision has been a regular item that should by now be anticipated well in advance and not be left to the day that the existing arrangement has run out?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>The Council are in negotiations in regards to the finalisation of this agreement. If the decision had been published in the normal way Empower would have had advanced knowledge of the Council's position which would have been to the detriment of the Council.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hogg asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>It seems to be rolling on and Empower are not overly minded to get this to a resolution. Have you considered ramping up the interest payments by ½% every time the decision is made so the Council could make more money and Empower are minded to get this resolved quicker than maybe they have up to now?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> |

|            |  |
|------------|--|
|            | <p>In effect that happens as we receive a fee for each months but it is not resolved. I want to emphasise to Empower that we both want the right outcome for a community interest company whether that is a lender coming in or an equity investor. But when we make a decision to end the arrangement that's what it means and it has now gone on for some months. We don't just keep signing decision notice after decision notice. I was going to emphasise we are receiving that income and interest fee so there is a balance to this.</p>  |
| <p>15.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Lillis</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p> <p>The Campaign to End Loneliness specifically highlights good access to public transport as key to preventing social isolation. Could the relevant cabin member please tell me what assessments have been undertaken to understand how the administrations planned bus cuts will impact on social isolation across the city?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Loneliness and isolation are something of course that we take very seriously and consider in many of our policies and procedures.</p> <p>The process to inform which services are reduced or changed will include analysis to determine the user profile and reasons for which a journey is undertaken. This will be achieved by reviewing the type of ticket purchased and/or undertaking surveys on routes likely to be affected. At this stage the review is focusing on journeys that have particularly low levels of patronage and there are no plans nor proposals to stop any route in its entirety, just revisions to the timetable itself.</p> <p><b>Councillor Lillis asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Does the plans have any proposals for complete days when we are going to lose services?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>I believe that is not the case but this will all be confirmed at a later date.</p> |
| <p>16.</p> | <p><b>Question from Councillor Barkham</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development</p> <p>There is an acute shortage of affordable rented homes in Peterborough and an ongoing homelessness crisis. In view of this could the relevant cabinet member tell me what percentage of homes that have been given planning permission since 5th May 2016 are classed as affordable (owned or rented)?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Since the 5th May 2015:</p> <p>12.2% of dwellings granted full permission have been affordable homes (this excludes permitted development which does not qualify for affordable provision)</p>  |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | <p>15% of dwellings granted outline permission have been affordable homes.</p> <p>Of the affordable dwellings with full permission 60% are rented and 40% are shared ownership.</p> <p>Of the affordable dwellings with outline permission 61% are rented 39% are shared ownership.</p> <p><i>It should be noted that these figures relate to granted permissions and do not necessarily reflect delivery because in some instances Registered Providers take on delivery of a site that was granted permission for a mix of market and affordable provision and can 'over deliver' the percentage of affordable.</i></p>  |
| 17. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources</p> <p>With the Council Leader's office being closed recently for installation of an air conditioning unit, could the relevant Cabinet Member please inform us of the cost of these works?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>The Council Leader's Office was not closed for this purpose. Rather I think the question relates to the next door office.</p> <p>The staff who occupy that office had felt that no air conditioning or heating was needed. However day to day experience has shown temperature and humidity to be an issue. The cost was £6,000.</p> <p>The Town Hall has always been a problem building to keep at any sort of constant temperature. That is one more reason why our move to Sand Martin House has been so beneficial. The Council has fit for purpose, future proofed offices and the move has allowed the Town Hall to be renovated to provide extra space and make it more suitable for future tenants.</p> <p><b>Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Would he agree with me that the Council has spent £2.7m on refurbishing the Town Hall which is not fit for purpose? If there is a heating problem in one particular office, how can he justify, when he is preaching a gospel about budget stringency, spending £6,000 in order to solve that problem?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>The problem was we were spending money on heaters, which were more expensive, to keep the staff comfortable during the Winter than we will spend on the air conditioning. Councillor Sandford needs to remember the money we invested in the Town Hall has meant we have received substantial rent back from the occupants which was the purpose of what we were doing.</p> |

**8. Questions on notice to:**

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

**1. Question from Councillor Hogg**

To Councillor Holdich, Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Following the removal of the item on the University for Peterborough at a recent combined authority meeting, can we be given an update on whether the funding is now in jeopardy and what steps are being taken to protect this “jewel in the crown” for Peterborough?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

The removal of the item on the University for Peterborough at the recent Combined Authority meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> November was a result of the item being considered by the Skills Committee on the 21<sup>st</sup> November, at which there were no specific decisions made by the Skills Committee which would require Combined Authority endorsement at this stage. This was the first meeting of the Skills Committee, which is now the responsible Committee for leading the development of the University Project. The Skills Committee will make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board as appropriate.

The report described plans by the Combined Authority to perform a technical and financial review on the University Project to provide the evidence base and insight to inform the development of a full business case to release all of the Combined Authority funding to progress the development of the university. The Combined Authority made a provisional budget allocation within its accounts for the University Project, of £3.83m of revenue in September 2017 and a further £9.7m of capital in March 2018. To date, £668,604 of the revenue funding has been released to University Campus.

However, a full business case is required to release the bulk of the funds against a firm and comprehensive plan to realise a university on the embankment site. The Combined Authority plans to release this funding by Summer 2019 to enable procurement and contracts to be laid for the construction of the site.

**Councillor Murphy made a point of personal explanation:**

As I was at the meeting referred to, the CA scrutiny Committee actually agreed with the Skills Committee report and we agreed for that to go forward to your board meeting on the Wednesday. I was there.

**Councillor Hogg asked a supplementary question:**

Are the funds for the university ring-fenced in some way? Or are we going to get to a situation where we come to do things and the cupboard is bare because the Mayor has spent money in other ways.

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

It is well documented and as in the ET last week, the Mayor himself has guaranteed that the funds are safe for our university.

2.

**Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Holdich, Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Could the leader of the council tell us whether he is happy with the budgetary control and HR practices of the Mayor and the Combined Authority?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

Yes. The Combined Authority (CA) is expecting to spend within its budget for the current year and has set a balanced budget for the four years ahead.

The Combined Authority agreed its four year Medium Term Financial Strategy for consultation at the Board meeting of 28 November. This set out a balanced budget for four years and was based on an expectation that the 2018 budget will be underspent compared to the May Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

When the joint interim chief executives were appointed in September, one of them was asked to conduct a review of the organisation. The focus of that review is the budget, staffing, performance management and governance processes. The review was asked to report by the year end and is ongoing. The Mayor has said that he expects the review to identify savings on the Combined Authority's running costs.

CA running costs are higher than originally anticipated. It is important to understand that the CA's budget now includes the costs of running the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) functions transferred in during the year.

The CA has standard HR processes in place. Contracts and other arrangements are largely modelled on Peterborough's. The HR team is being strengthened with the recruitment of a new HR manager.

Obviously, it would be inappropriate of me to comment on HR issues or cases involving individuals in open council.

**Councillor Murphy rose on a statement of accuracy:**

The budget was not balanced and at 7.30 two days later the Interim Director was sacked.

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

I was not at that meeting but I was at the board meeting on 28 November when the budget was put to the CA and it did balance.

**Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:**

I was not at the meetings but I do read about what goes on at the CA and what I read about is at least two senior officers at the CA having their contract terminated in slightly mysterious circumstances I have seen reports that some level of financial compensation has been paid and I hear about the £600,000 spent on consultants for a metro for Cambridge, £150,000 spent on consultants for a bus service review that we have not even been consulted on. Out of all of this and the seeming explosion in the number of employees at the CA and bearing in mind we can be precepted for the costs of the CA does he really think we are getting good value from the CA?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

There was no notice of that question, but yes I do.

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 3. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority</p> <p>Will there be an impact on the projects in Peterborough, from James Palmer’s funding, in view of the spiralling costs to run his office?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p>The Mayor’s Office is a separate budget that the Mayor seeks Board approval for to run his Office. It covers the Mayoral Allowance, costs of the salaries of his staff based at Ely, the costs of the office accommodation and an element of expenses to enables the Mayor to operate as leader of the Combined Authority. The <i>Medium Term Financial Plan</i> (MTFP) of the Combined Authority identified the 2018/19 budget as £331,000 and forecast outturn is predicted as £349,400 due to some properly authorised additional expenses. The proposed budget for 2019/20 identified at the Board on 28<sup>th</sup> November is £352,200. This hardly reflects a budget out of control and will have no impact upon Peterborough City Council.</p> <p>However, I think Councillor Nawaz might be referring to the wider budget of the Combined Authority and some of the sensational press on the subject. The Combined Authority Board received a draft budget report at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> November that identified clearly the revenue and capital programmes for the next few years. That budget was thoroughly discussed and agreed to go forward for consultation with the wider Cambridge and Peterborough community. It is on the CA website.</p> <p>The budget presented is balanced over the next 4 years and the CA which is not out of control. There is an ambitious programme of spend that includes key Peterborough projects such as the university.</p> <p>The Board reflected upon the detail of the budget and specifically on the salary element. A structure was approved in June that reflected what was required to deliver the ambition. We absorbed of the <i>Local Enterprise Partnerships</i> (LEP), managing the South East Energy Hub and accepting the new devolution package of running Adult Education. Since September a review of the structure and use of interims has been undertaken. The draft budget for 2020 reflects these savings. All Board Members agreed that there needs to be constant review of the staffing levels and have asked the interim CEO’s to look further at the report and report back in January 2019.</p> <p><b>Councillor Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>How much intangible funding do are we actually receiving in the next 12 months? And which projects would this be spent on?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p>I gave these figures in full two councils ago, I haven’t got them with me but I am happy to send the Member those figures again.</p> |
| 4. | <p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority</p>   |

Last year we were told Bayard Place may be used for the University of Peterborough, later you put out a press statement saying student accommodation would be built on the embankment. Neither of these have happened and there were never any proposals that were funded for student halls of residence on the embankment as you incorrectly inferred. Recently you have stated in a report in the PT that an additional £9 million has been achieved for the University, is this really true and where has this money come from, is it in the bank and has it been agreed and committed. What funding if any has been secured for student halls or other student accommodation?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

Early planning for a University of Peterborough included options for student accommodation at Bayard Place. However, proposals co-developed between Peterborough Regional College and the Combined Authority, and subsequently approved by the Combined Authority's Board, were made for a budget provision of £9.7m in its accounts, to March 2018, for buildings to house the University. These included an accommodation block with learning facilities on the embankment.

Due diligence on a project of this size and nature, required the Combined Authority to perform a technical and financial review on the University Project to provide the evidence base and insight information the development of a Full Business Case to release Combined Authority funding to progress the development of the University. The outcome of the technical review will recommend options for student accommodation and associated costs and the Combined Authority have appointed Gleeds (a well-respected company) to carry out this work.

**Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:**

The other Monday at Joint Scrutiny we had the Director of Finance give a presentation on the rag and put the university project on red, on hold. On the Wednesday that went to the board but the report to go ahead to the consultant to look at the future of the university and what had been going on with the money that had been spent so far to date was pulled, although you told me you had proposed it and it was unanimously accepted. Could you bring us up to date on where we are? Is the university on hold until the next board meeting?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

No it is not. I met Gleeds this morning, the review is underway and should come out towards the middle to end of January.

This page is intentionally left blank