

<b>COUNCIL</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM No. 14</b>
<b>6 MARCH 2019</b>	<b>PUBLIC REPORT</b>

## **MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

The following notice of motion has been received in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders:

### **1. Motion from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

"This council notes:

- The closure of HMRC's office in Peterborough will result in a significant number of job losses.
- The people made redundant will suffer major personal and career losses including potential financial hardship.

This council believes:

- We should support the staff of HMRC in their campaign to stop the closure of a local office in the City.
- The closure of the Peterborough office will mean a loss of over 200 quality jobs, 63% of which are carried out by female workers.
- The loss of these quality jobs will have a significant adverse impact on the City's economy.
- That action needs to be taken to address the closure of HMRC's office.
- Unless the move is stopped, the closure will mean no HMRC office, or presence, in the whole of the East of England.

This council resolves:

- For the Leader of the Council to write a letter to the appropriate minister of state for HMRC and request that they halt this proposed closure. Unless stopped, the closure will mean no HMRC office, or presence, in the whole of the East of England."

### **2. Motion from Councillor Joseph**

"The emotive issue of verge parking continues as increasing numbers of households becoming multiple car owners, the pressure on limited parking spaces grows. Those against parking on verges cite the displeasing sight of churned up verges, the cyclical and spiralling costs for repair and the deterrent to wildlife of ruined habitat. Those for argue that narrow roads makes parking dangerous, as the roads become impassable to residents but more importantly emergency vehicles. The introduction of the TRO is a step welcomed by many but realistically, with little or no additional resources available to enforce, how much of a deterrent will these prove to be?"

The Council recognises that:

- The preservation of our verges is an important factor aesthetically, environmentally and in the interests of public safety
- Whilst the Council must take measures to avoid abuse, penalising residents with little alternative if they are to park near to their own homes, should be a final resort
- With no additional enforcement resources available to police the policy, it needs to look to other means to protect the verges across the city

- This is a particular problem at schools with parents dropping and collecting their children from school and parking of verges.
- Penalising residents for parking near their homes and parents for parking near schools will be unpopular with those affected

We have a duty to protect the environment, the wellbeing of the residents and the safety of all when making our decisions, and I would argue that a long-term replanting and protection policy is more in keeping with those aims than enforcement.

The Council therefore resolves to:

- Implement a scheme of replanting verges and covering them with a protective matting, specially designed to protect grass from damage by cars parking on it. This will:
  - Provide long term, cost effective protection from damage to the grass and soil underneath
  - Vastly reduce the costs of repairing verges on a regular basis therefore recouping the initial outlay and making annual savings on the costs of repairing the verges going forward
  - Allow the grass to grow through the netting, visually enhancing the roadsides.
  - Protect the habitat of the fauna and flora native to our verges and in accordance with the Council's claim of being an Environmental Capital
  - Allow residents to park near their homes without causing obstruction to other road users."

### **3. Motion from Councillor Sandford**

"This Council:

1. welcomes the Government's current consultation entitled: "Consistency in household and business recycling collections in England "(February 2019) and in particular its proposals to require multi stream recycling of dry waste, weekly food waste collections and possibly also free collection of garden waste.
2. notes that in the consultation paper from DEFRA, at page 12, there is a cost benefit analysis, where it states that the net effect of introducing all these measures (including free garden waste collections) would be a reduction in total local authority waste management costs of £967 million over the period 2023 to 2035 and an increase in the local authority recycling rate from the 2018 figure of 44% to 55.5% by 2025.
3. Also notes that this Council has a target for household recycling and composting of at least 65% by 2020 but it is currently on track to miss this target by a significant margin.
4. Therefore calls upon the Cabinet to take the opportunity of waste management moving to the new Peterborough Limited company to review all current waste collection and processing practices and in particular to consider restoring the free fortnightly collections of garden waste that Peterborough residents enjoyed for a number of years."

### **4. Motion from Councillor Lillis**

"Full Council notes that due to huge cuts by Central Government of the Council's Revenue Support Grant (of about 80% over the last 7 years) that the Council has been forced to reduce the range and level of services it offers - which in turn has materially impacted on the lives of Peterborough residents.

We welcome the efforts by the Council before the 2018 local elections to argue that the Government is not giving Peterborough City Council a fair deal.

We also note that:

- according to Freedom of Information Act request number CRN1811589828 submitted on 14 November 2018, the number of emails or other communications sent out by PCC cabinet members and directors in the previous 4 months referring to the Stand Up For Peterborough Campaign was 0.
- and that according to Freedom of Information Act request number CRN1811590503 submitted on 14 November 2018 the total cost for the Stand Up For Peterborough campaign was £21,650 including on banners which are still proudly hanging across the city, giving the impression that the campaign is still active and ongoing.

This council acknowledges that residents from every corner of the city are rightly demanding better of both the political leadership of Peterborough City Council and the Government, and that this council will no longer tolerate tax payer money being wasted on promotional materials without action being taken to back up the rhetoric.

However we also acknowledge that the funding crisis local government faces is set to get worse, with Peterborough City Council needing to find an additional £18 million of budget savings in the year 2020-21, and there is still an urgent need to fight for a better funding deal from the Government.

Therefore this council recommends that:

- The council formally ends its "Stand up for Peterborough" campaign and ensures that all banners and other promotional material are removed as soon as possible.
- The Cabinet set up a cross party campaign group, which regularly meets in public, to involve Peterborough residents, businesses and others in making the urgent case that Peterborough City Council needs to be better funded.
- This group actively supports the Local Government Association #councilscan Campaign to help secure a fairer deal from Central Government for Councils.
- No public money should be spent on promotional materials - such as agency hire, banners and flyers - by the new cross-party led campaign so that we don't repeat the waste of the Stand-up for Peterborough Campaign."

## **5. Motion from Councillor Hogg**

"Council notes that:

At the last full council meeting there was a debate following the submission by a Conservative councillor of a petition of over 500 signatures relating to a potential development of the Gloucester Centre.

Council further notes that:

At the last full council meeting a petition was submitted by a Liberal Democrat councillor of a petition of over 3000 signatures relating to a proposed development of the area know locally as Tenter Hill Meadow.

This petition has been refused the right to a debate on the grounds that it relates to a current planning application.

This situation does not reflect the interests of the residents of Peterborough and effectively removes their rights to have a debate on the way forward.

Council resolves to:

Ask the Constitution and Ethics Committee to review the petition procedures so that the residents of Peterborough are able to get a voice on decisions being made by Peterborough Council regarding the selling off of Council owned land for development.”

## **6. Motion from Councillor Hogg**

“Council notes that:

1. Medesham Homes is a joint venture between Peterborough City Council and Cross Keys Homes, to work towards reducing the number of homeless families having to use temporary accommodation by increasing the number of affordable homes available in the City.
2. Medesham Homes failed to get planning permission approved on a proposed development at Bretton Court. It has now decided to scale back the plans and continue on under the rules of permitted development, where planning permission is not required.
3. Medesham Homes failed to get planning permission approved on a proposed development at Tenter Hill Meadow. It has now decided to appeal this decision with the planning inspectorate

Council believes that:

This shows that Medesham Homes is not listening to the democratic process of listening to residents of Peterborough and their elected representatives and is looking to find ways of pushing through their agenda regardless of the cost to the local taxpayers.

Council resolves to:

Establish a cross party working group to look at the council's relationship with Medesham Homes with a view to the following:

1. Look at the current strategy of Medesham Homes and see if it is in the best interest of the residents of Peterborough
2. Look at the procedures in place at Medesham Homes that have led to two high profile planning refusals and review if lessons can be learned going forward.
3. Present proposals to full council as to any changes to the current relationship with Medesham Homes.”