

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY 24 JULY 2019  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR GUL NAWAZ**

**Present:**

Councillors Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andrew Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin and Yurgutene.

**16. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lillis.

**17. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**18. Minutes of the Meetings held on 20 May 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2019 Mayor Making Meeting and 20 May 2019 Annual Meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**19. Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced that former Councillor John Knowles and Mr Gordon Ryall Freeman of the City and former Coroner had recently passed away and a one minute silence followed as a mark of respect.

The Mayor further advised Members that changes had been made to the agenda order. Item 12(2) relating to the motion on climate change would now be heard after item 5.

**20. Leader's Announcements**

The Leader drew attention the contributions of the late Councillor John Knowles and Mr Gordon Ryall for the city, and emphasised how the Council appreciated this work. These sentiments were repeated by Group Leaders, who reiterated that they would be greatly missed.

**QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

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

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

1. Building and converting Social Housing
2. Ferry Meadows climbing wall
3. Waste collection contractors overseas
4. Plans to address concerns raised by parents around SEND

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

## **22. Petitions**

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

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

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

A petition with 60 signatures was presented to Council by Councillor Jamil from residents in Cromwell Road requesting the installation of permit only parking outside their homes.

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Sandra Bond requested the provision of a polling station for GUN1 in future elections.

## **23. Questions on Notice**

### **(a) To the Mayor**

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

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

### **(d) To the Combined Authority Representatives**

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

1. Promotion of cricket
2. Thorney/Eye cycle way
3. Street lights
4. HMOs and service accommodation
5. Savings to be made from move to 365
6. Rhubarb Bridge roundabout works
7. Bulky waste free collection
8. Road traffic concerns – Mayor's Walk and Thorpe Park Road
9. Reporting issues to the Council
10. Shared service savings
11. Environment action plan targets
12. Update on pavement parking and obstruction motion
13. Budget deficit for 2020/21 confirmation
14. Residents' concerns in housing developments
15. School budget shortfall
16. My Peterborough App data breaches
17. Mobile telephone contract

Questions (d) to the Combined Authority Representative were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Grant for 2,000 affordable homes
2. Funding for public transport
3. Completion of audit by Ernst & Young

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

#### **24. Motion from Councillor Holdich**

The Mayor advised that an amendment had been received from Councillor Wiggin. This had been accepted by Councillor Holdich and was agreed by Members.

Councillor Holdich moved the substantive motion and urged Members to accept that humans were damaging the planet, wasting resources and contributing to a decline in bio-diversity with average temperatures rising. He stressed that there was a global climate emergency and Peterborough needed to co-operate with other local authorities to make a difference.

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

Councillor Murphy moved an amendment to the motion and advised Members that Peterborough was not a district, but a unitary authority, and he felt that the motion should be corrected to reflect that. He also stated that the changes proposed related to recycling, reusing and addressing larger issues such as the use of public transport and cycling.

Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, and with the agreement of the Mayor, Councillor Murphy revised his amendment to, “Work with, influence and inspire partners across Peterborough, Cambridgeshire and it’s the districts, county and the region ...”

Councillor Holdich accepted the amendment, with the agreement of Members, based on Councillor Murphy’s explanation.

Members debated the substantive motion and raised the following points:

- It was felt that the Council needed to do more and encourage others to change.
- Comment was made that the use of single use plastic needed to be reduced.
- More environmentally friendly forms of transport should be encouraged, it was considered, such as cycling, walking, and public transport.
- It was suggested that bus stops and bus routes needed reorganising to make them more accessible.
- It was noted that a similar plan adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council had a deadline of March.
- Everyone needed to work together within the Council and with other councils to pool resources, talents and ideas.
- Reforestation had been identified as the leading solution to climate change in conjunction with not cutting down trees, however, it was noted that the government was not meeting its own tree planting targets.
- It was suggested that local trees should not be removed unnecessarily.
- Co-operation was required with partners and farmers to ensure wild flowers and trees were not destroyed in rural areas unnecessarily and there needed to be a change in attitude towards wild verges.

- It was considered that action needed to be taken quickly to have an impact on the current crisis.
- The costs and benefits of any proposed actions would have to be carefully considered in view of the current budget challenges.
- Members expressed to Extinction Rebellion Peterborough, Peterborough in Transition and Peterborough Environment City Trust who had contributed to this project.
- Further comment was made that the real danger to the climate was outside of Peterborough and global action was required as the city could only impact a small area.
- 20% of carbon emissions were from transport and it was felt that priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists.
- It was suggested that the Local Plan should include a requirement to introduce renewable energy and good insulation on new buildings.
- Comment was made that speed limits across the city could be reduced.

Councillor Day, as seconder of the amendment, exercised her right to speak. She advised Council that the situation had become an emergency as corporate organisations and governments globally had failed to act. Climate crisis disasters occurred weekly and should the planet's temperature increase by 1.5° most coral reefs would be lost and there would be extreme weather, heatwaves, forest fires and floods. A 2° increase would be catastrophic and lead to drought, famine and mass migrations as climate change made some areas uninhabitable. Members needed to lead by example and work together with both long term strategic planning and minor procurement decisions. Transport and housing policies should be used to promote greener travel and halve the energy use in homes respectively and local initiatives could be introduced to reduce carbon emissions.

Councillor Holdich addressed Members and acknowledged the support the motion had received. He recommended lobbying government to amend policies to incorporate further energy efficiencies into house building on a national scheme. Members could use their Community Led Funding towards energy efficiency projects in their own wards. The Council was a member of UK 100 and Members had been involved in submissions they had made to government.

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Holdich (unanimous) and the motion as **CARRIED** as follows:

"This council noted that the impacts of climate breakdown are already causing serious damage around the world.

that the 'Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C', published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in October 2018, (a) describes the enormous harm that a 2°C average rise in global temperatures is likely to cause compared with a 1.5°C rise, and (b) confirms that limiting Global Warming to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society and the private sector.

That all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to act, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies;

That strong policies to cut emissions also have associated health, wellbeing and economic benefits;

and that, recognising this, a growing number of UK local authorities have already passed 'Climate Emergency' motions.

This council resolved to Declare a 'Climate Emergency' that requires urgent action.

Make the Council's activities net-zero carbon by 2030

Achieve 100% clean energy across the Council's full range of functions by 2030

Ensure that all strategic decisions, budgets and approaches to planning decisions are in line with a shift to zero carbon by 2030.

Support and work with all other relevant agencies towards making the entire area zero carbon within the same timescale;

Ensure that political and chief officer leadership teams embed this work in all areas and take responsibility for reducing, as rapidly as possible, the carbon emissions resulting from the Council's activities, ensuring that any recommendations are fully costed and that the Executive and Scrutiny functions review council activities taking account of production and consumption emissions and produce an action plan within ~~12 months~~ by 31 March 2020, together with budget actions and a measured baseline;

Request that Council Scrutiny Panels consider the impact of climate change and the environment when reviewing Council policies and strategies;

Work with, influence and inspire partners across Peterborough, Cambridgeshire and it's the districts, county and the region to help deliver this goal through all relevant strategies, plans and shared resources by developing a series of meetings, events and partner workshops;

Request that the Council and partners take steps to proactively include young people in the process, ensuring that they have a voice in shaping the future;

Request that the Executive Portfolio holder with responsibility for Climate Change convenes a Citizens' Assembly in 2019 in order to involve the wider population in this process. This group would help develop their own role, identify how the Council's activities might be made net-zero carbon by 2030, consider the latest climate science and expert advice on solutions and to consider systematically the climate change impact of each area of the Council's activities;

Set up a Climate Change Partnership group, involving Councillors, residents, young citizens, climate science and solutions experts, businesses, Citizens Assembly representatives and other relevant parties. Run competition in primary, secondary and other educational establishments to seek young people's views.

~~Over the following 12 months,~~ The Group will consider strategies and actions being developed by the Council and other partner organisations and develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions by 2030. It will also recommend ways to maximise local benefits of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy chaired by Cllr Cereste. When progress has been made consult the wider public at various stages.

To give councillors and members of the public updates on progress on a regular basis

Ensure that all reports in preparation for the 2020/21 budget cycle and investment strategy will take into account the actions the council will take to address this emergency. Seek councils support for budget approval to assist with the co-ordination of this project

Call on the UK Government to provide the powers, resources and help with funding to make this possible, and ask local MPs to do likewise;

Consider other actions that could be implemented, including (but not restricted to): renewable energy generation and storage, providing electric vehicle infrastructure and encouraging alternatives to private car use, increasing the efficiency of buildings, in particular to address fuel poverty; proactively using local planning powers to accelerate the delivery of net-zero carbon new developments and communities, increased tree planting, coordinating a series of information and training events to raise awareness and share good practice, look to replacing all council vehicles with electric or hybrids including the mayors car as soon practical.”

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

### 25. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

#### (a) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Amendments to Council Standing Orders

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting held on 11 March 2019, received a report in relation to amending the Council’s Standing Orders in relation to the amendment debate procedure.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He proposed that deadlines were increased to allow more time to review the validity and legality of motions and amendments and assist Councillors with any refining. Councillor Seaton had accepted the amendment from Councillor Hogg, which aligned the time of day motions were put forward.

Councillor Bashir seconded the recommendation.

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

1. Agreed to amend the Constitution at Part 4 Section 1 Standing Orders:
  - a. To reflect the revised Council motion and amendment deadlines:
    - Draft Motions - ~~4.00am~~ 12 noon, 9 clear working days before the meeting.
    - Final Motions - ~~4.00am~~ 12 noon, 7 clear working days before the meeting.
    - Draft Amendments - 12 noon, 3 clear working days before the meeting.
    - Final Amendments - 12 noon, the day before the meeting.
  - b. To include a section on ‘Scope of Questions’ in relation to questions from Members, as set out in paragraph 4.2.2 of the report.
2. Agreed to amend the Constitution at Part 4 Section 1 Standing Orders to allow for motions and amendments to be debated together, as set out in paragraph 4.3.4 of the report, subject to seconder of motion and seconder of amendment switching order as per 4.3.4.
3. Agreed that training be given if (1) and (2) agreed.

**(b) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Petitions Scheme Update**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee, at its meeting on 11 March 2019, received a report updating the Petition Scheme in relation to the separate Verge and Pavement Parking Petition Scheme.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the proposed changes related to petitions for verge and pavement parking and confirmed he had accepted part of the amendment from Councillor Hogg regarding the publishing of petitions on line, but not his proposed amendment regarding past planning decisions.

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

Councillor Hogg introduced an amendment to the recommendation and advised that when a planning decision had already been taken, there would be no reason why planning committee members would be excluded from any debate.

Councillor Howell seconded the amendment and reserved her right to speak.

Council debated the amendment and the point was made that Members could not understand why the public could not challenge a past planning matter if it concerned certain imposed conditions not being met.

Councillor Howell, as seconder of the amendment, exercised her right to speak. She echoed previous comments made that a petition should be allowed on a planning issue that has already been decided.

Councillor Seaton exercised his right to reply as mover of the original recommendation. He advised Members that a full debate was conducted in public by the Planning and Environment Protection Committee on each application and there was a fair process in place to make appropriate planning decisions. Changes to the system could result in the system being exploited, particularly around election time, and becoming politically driven. This could, in turn, lead to unfair political pressure being exerted on committee members and decisions being pre-determined. All decisions taken were subject to judicial review.

A vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Hogg (28 voted in favour, 30 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Judy Fox, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** John Fox

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

There were no speakers on original recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation (49 voted in favour, 8 voted against, 2 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Case, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Shaz Nawaz, Gul Nawaz, Over, Qayyum Robinson Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Day, Howell

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council approved the updated petition scheme, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report, subject to the following amendment:

9.3 A copy of the response to all paper petitions will be published on the council website.

**(c) Audit Committee Recommendation - Annual Audit Committee Report**

The Audit Committee, at its meeting on 25 March 2019, received a report in relation to the Committee's Annual Audit Report concerning its work and achievements of the municipal year 2018-2019.

Councillor Over introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He thanked members of the committee for their hard work.

Councillor Andy Coles seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council approved the Annual Audit Report, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

**(d) Constitution and Ethics Committee Hearing Panel Recommendation - Determination of Code of Conduct Hearing**

The Constitution and Ethics Committee Hearing Panel sat on 1 April 2019 to consider a Code of Conduct Hearing following the receipt of two complaints and an investigation concluded that the Code of Conduct had been breached.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the Monitoring Officer had received complaints concerning breaches in the Code of Conduct by Councillor Fower who had called Councillor John Fox a fascist in the media. He had also used residents' email addresses without their permissions to generate emails to the Council's Chief Executive, the Leader, and the Mayor in breach of data protection regulations. The results of the enquiry that followed had been presented to the Constitution and Ethics Committee Hearing Panel. To date, Councillor Fower had not co-operated with the recommendations.

Councillor Bashir seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council noted the circumstances, findings and sanctions of determination of a Code of Conduct Hearing process.

**(e) Cabinet Recommendation - Peterborough Local Plan and Development Plan Document (Version for Adoption)**

The Cabinet received a report at its meeting on 17 June 2019 in relation to the Peterborough Local Plan and Development Plan Document (Version for Adoption).

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the Local Plan set a solid framework for the growth and prosperity of the city until 2036 and had been examined by an independent inspector allocated by the government.

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

Council debated the amendment and Members raised the following key points:

- It was noted that residents had expressed concerns regarding the ability of the current infrastructure to support more houses and the resulting increase in traffic.
- It was suggested that the plan helped the Council regain control of the city's housing needs, although didn't address the perceived housing emergency.
- Members recognised that Peterborough received funding for transport schemes to support future development.
- Concern was raised that development seemed to be concentrated in certain villages and land owned by the Council was not being utilised.
- It was noted that the green space land ratio had reduced.
- It was advised that the police did not have the infrastructure in place to accommodate the 20% increase in houses that were built in the West Town area.
- The plan, it was considered by some Members, did not tackle inequality, poverty, the housing emergency, or the climate crisis.
- Some Members objected to the lack of inclusion of any land allocated for a station at Hampton, a station which it was thought could ease traffic congestion in Peterborough.
- Other Members felt it would be misleading and dishonest to leave land in Hampton allocated to a railway station when the rail authorities had stated a station would not be built there.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the declaration of the Climate Emergency had both been announced since the Local Plan was presented to the Planning Inspectorate.
- Any local plan submitted prior to 24 January 2019 was considered by the Planning Inspectorate under the previous NPPF. This plan did not incorporate subsequent changes in the NPPF and the plan would need to be amended in the future.
- It was advised that should the plan be rejected, the process to develop a Local Plan would need to be started again from the beginning. It would therefore be more appropriate to allow the plan to be approved and then revised at an early stage to accommodate the climate change emergency challenges agreed earlier in the meeting.

- Comment was made that no incentives were contained in the Plan for developers to use good insulation in new homes or provide carbon neutral homes which should be encouraged.
- It was suggested that the Local Plan conflicted with Policy LP7 'Health and Wellbeing Facilities', which stated that proposals for health facilities should align with public transport, walking and cycling routes and be easily accessible. As more GP surgeries were encouraged to merge they were becoming less accessible for vulnerable populations and less accessible by public transport.
- As the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), which covered a population of 0.9m people in Peterborough, was looking to decommission services rather than enhance them, there were concerns that the health and wellbeing policies within the Local Plan would not be met.
- Members raised concerns around unauthorised traveller encampments in Peterborough, in light of the Local Plan stating there were sufficient facilities for gypsies, travellers and travelling showmen within the city.
- It was felt that local and district centres needed to be protected in line with Policy LP12, as some Members considered that they were not being well maintained or marketed.
- Members discussed the selling off of local centres, with some Members disputing that this was taking place.
- Comment was made balance was needed between more affordable housing and directing funds towards highways, schools and other infrastructure.
- More social and affordable housing would, it was suggested, result in less people being in Houses of Multiple Occupancy.
- It was noted that the Local Plan identified regeneration opportunities in Orton and Werrington District Centres, and in Millfield.
- Members questioned whether the Council could afford to implement the plan within the given timescales.
- Concern was raised that the Plan did not adequately address issues of climate change.
- It was noted that there was no rapid sustainable transport proposal contained within the Local Plan however, it was advised that a feasibility study would be submitted to the Combined Authority.
- It was advised that the Local Plan was reviewed every five years and could be amended in the interim years.
- Comment was made that healthcare services were working at capacity and were also subject to reducing budgets and medical staff.
- It was felt that a Housing Revenue Account would enable the Council to build a portion of the 17,000 new homes proposed over the next 17 years themselves.

As mover of the recommendation Councillor Hiller exercised his right of reply and advised Members there appeared to be misconceptions about the Local Plan, its uses and the frequency of reviews.

A vote was taken (42 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 16 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Case, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

**Councillor Against:** Nil

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ali, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council:

1. Adopted the Peterborough Local Plan, incorporating modifications as recommended by the Inspector ('Main Modifications') and other minor editorial modifications ('Additional Modifications').
2. Subject to recommendation, endorsed the updated 'Policies Map' in line with draft maps provided via Cabinet report, in order to reflect the policies of the new Local Plan, and the deletion of policies from the above listed revoked documents.

**(f) Health and Wellbeing Board Recommendation - Proposal to Update the Terms of Reference for the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board and to Create two Joint Sub-Committees with the Cambridgeshire Board**

Council received a report to amend the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board Terms of Reference.

At its meeting on 24 June 2019, the Health and Wellbeing Board received a report in relation to proposals to update the Terms of Reference for the Board, and to create two Joint Sub-Committee's with the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

Councillor Holdich introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He explained that the Health and Wellbeing Board brought together leaders from local government and the National Health Service (NHS) to work together to improve the health and quality of life. Recent successes of joint working included reducing the risks of strokes, improvements in the treatment of alcohol services, and a reduction in the delays experienced by older people awaiting discharge from hospital. As many NHS organisations worked across Peterborough and Cambridge, such as the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), joint working would help to maximise the influence of the Board.

Councillor Fitzgerald seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed the updated terms of reference for the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board, attached at Appendix B to the report, subject to the following amendment:

- Paragraph 2.8.3.12 of the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board Terms of Reference to be added to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Board Core Joint Sub-Committee Terms of Reference and to replace the following paragraph:

*“To keep under consideration, the financial and organisational implications of joint and integrated working across health and social care services across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and to make recommendations for ensuring that performance and quality standards for health and social care services to children, families and adults are met and represent value for money across the whole system.”*

**(g) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation – Committee Start Times and Council Meeting Frequency**

Council received a report on the start times of committee meetings and whether these should be determined by the individual committees, as considered by the Constitution and Ethics Committee at its meeting on 8 July 2019.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that the proposal would allow each committee to approve its own regular start time at the beginning of the municipal year. Concern had been expressed about the impact on the meeting schedules of the extra budget meetings and the length of time without meetings around Annual Council. Group Leaders and senior officers had been consulted and their responses would be discussed at the next meeting of the Constitution and Ethics Committee meeting.

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

Council debated the recommendation and Members raised the following key points and comments:

- It was commented that the April Full Council had been removed from the schedule, and now there was no meeting of Full Council from March through to July.
- Suggestion was made that Annual Council could become a Full Council meeting to include motions and questions.
- Some Members felt that more business could be covered if meetings of Full Council started earlier.
- Some Members wished to see the time allowed at Full Council meetings for the discussion of motions to be extended.
- It was felt that additional Council meetings would compensate for the budget, that now dominated three Council meetings per year.
- Council committee meetings should not, it was considered, be held for the convenience of the committee but at a time when members of the public would be able to attend.
- It was noted that, as the meeting schedule was prepared annually in January, the outgoing committee would be agreeing the start time of the incoming committee.

As mover of the recommendation Councillor Seaton exercised his right of reply and advised Members that he would be writing to Group Leaders for their views. He said that members of the public did not attend meetings in high numbers at the existing times, and meetings could be held during the day when officers were more likely to be in the building. Public transport was available during the day when it would also be light enough to cycle to meetings. Further proposals would be presented to the Constitution and Ethics Committee in due course.

A vote was taken (47 voted in favour, 10 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Case, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, Judy Fox, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Murphy, Nadeem, Shaz Nawaz, Gul Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Ash, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lane, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed to amend the Standing Orders and Member Officer Protocol as set out in paragraphs 4.2.8 and 4.2.9 of the report, to allow committees of the Council to determine their own starting times.

## **25. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting**

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed Executive Decisions taken since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the meetings of the Cabinet held on 25 March 2019, 17 June 2019 and 15 July 2019.
2. Decisions by individual Cabinet Members between 29 March 2019 and 10 July 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

### Establishing New Schools Including Faith Schools

Councillor Murphy asked if the establishment of a new faith school in Hampton Waters would benefit all children, as a Catholic school would be selective and children from out of county could also attend. He suggested a comprehensive school would be better for the city.

Councillor Ayres responded, advising that all Members had received information on the procedures for this matter. The Roman Catholic Diocese was entitled to hold a consultation themselves and if they wished to propose a new school the matter would be subject to a statutory representation period, which would start on 21 November 2019. At that stage the Council would become involved.

### Amendment to Loan Facility

Councillor Amjad Iqbal asked why there were issues re-financing the Empower loan and whether the Council's funds were at risk. He asked how this risk was being managed, what mitigation plans were in place, what would happen if the Council did not receive its investment in full, and whether re-financing was likely.

Councillor Seaton confirmed that the decision related to the amendment of the terms and not the original decision. He was confident the matter would be resolved soon.

### Special Urgency and Waive of Call In

Councillor Sandford asked why the renewal of the Amazon contract was considered to qualify for special urgency and waiver of call-in when it had been known in advance that the contract expiry date was 31 March 2019. The Constitution stated that waiver of call-in should only be used in exceptional circumstances where the delay caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the interests of the Council.

Councillor Seaton agreed there had been an oversight and apologised for having to use special arrangements.

#### Transferring Home to School Transport Services from Enterprise Managed Services Limited to Peterborough Limited

Councillor Murphy asked when the school transfer service had been transferred to Peterborough Limited and how it was progressing.

Councillor Seaton advised it had started and Members would have the opportunity to request an update in the future and at scrutiny meetings.

#### Housing Related Support Grant Agreements 2019/2020

Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked if the grant awarded to Housing Related Support would be the same next year.

Councillor Seaton advised that the question did not relate to the listed decision.

#### Approval to Enter Into a S76 Agreement with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group

Councillor Qayyum asked how much of the £250,000 funding for speech and language therapy services would be allocated to Peterborough.

Councillor Ayres advised that, being newly in post, she did not have the information readily available, and would send the answer to Councillor Qayyum in due course.

#### Approval of funding for the provision of accommodation to reduce homelessness

Councillor Murphy asked when and how much the developer in this instance was paid, and by whom. He also questioned how many homeless families had secured tenancies in these properties.

Councillor Hiller advised the question did not relate to the decision listed, however he could supply the relevant information in due course.

Councillor Wiggin asked if the Council were getting value for money with a unit cost of £177,000.

Councillor Hiller stated this was not a relevant question, however he was confident that this was a very successful development.

#### Appointments and Nominations to Outside Bodies Update

Councillor Sandford asked whether the representation on the Peterborough Local Access Forum was being withdrawn, as this was an effective way to ensure easy access to the countryside.

Councillor Holdich responded that he would reply in writing.

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

Councillor Holdich introduced the report which detailed Executive Decisions made by the Combined Authority (CA) since the last meeting including:

1. Decisions from the meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 25 February 2019 25 March 2019 31 May 2019 24 June 2019.
2. Decisions from the meetings of the Combined Authority Board held on 27 February 2019 27 March 2019 29 May 2019 26 June 2019
3. Decisions from the meetings of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 29 March 2019 31 May 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

#### University of Peterborough

Councillor Ash asked if the University of Peterborough would still go ahead given concerns raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, regarding the feasibility of the creation of the University when comparisons were made with former polytechnics. It had been that the Combined Authority should be building on the existing Universities within the area.

Councillor Andy Coles reassured Members that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had held a thorough debate and the concerns expressed were largely due to new committee members not being completely up to date with the current situation. There were some concerns over funding available, which could not be addressed in the meeting as some of the financial decisions were yet to be made.

Councillor Murphy explained that questions were to be raised at the Audit Committee meeting due shortly concerning Anglia Ruskin and University College Peterborough, as there were concerns over the amount of money being spent on reports, bidding exercises, and consultants.

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME**

### **27. Notices of Motion**

The following motions had been received in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders:

#### **(1) Motion from Councillor John Fox**

Councillor Murphy proposed this matter be referred to the Constitution and Ethics Committee in accordance with Standing Order 21.1 and 21.12.

Councillor Ellis seconded Councillor Murphy's motion and advised that he thought the matter should be referred to committee.

A vote was taken on a motion without notice from Councillor Murphy to refer the motion to the Constitution and Ethics Committee (14 voted in favour, 41 voted against, 0 abstained from voted).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Ellis, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg,

Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Azher Iqbal

The motion without notice was **DEFEATED**.

Councillor John Fox introduced the motion and said he felt that the public expected Members to behave in a manner that was professional, polite, understanding, and sympathetic without being misleading, mischievous, or displaying nasty or rude behaviour. Members should also abide by the seven Nolan Principles of Public Life. He did not consider it was acceptable behaviour to use another person's email address to send an email that appeared to come from that person. No-one should disregard the Code of Conduct or insult others, however there were no sanctions in place that could stop this happening and it was felt that the Labour Group Leader had chosen not to resolve the situation. The motion was proposed to help everyone uphold the Principles of Public Life.

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

Councillor Sandford proposed an amendment contained within the additional information pack. He endorsed the first four paragraphs of the motion from Councillor Fox. He explained he wished to wait for a formal response from the Government and Local Government Association before asking the Constitution and Ethics Committee to write to the Local Government Minister.

At this point the guillotine was reached and in accordance with Standing Order 14.2 the Mayor announced the meeting would end at 10:15pm.

Councillor Murphy proposed to suspend standing orders and extend the meeting until all Council business had been concluded.

Councillor Jamil seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken on the motion to suspend standing orders (22 voted in favour, 32 voted against and 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

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

Councillor Murphy proposed that Council move to the vote in accordance standing order 21.12.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was agreed to proceed directly to the vote.

A vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Sandford (22 voted in favour, 32 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ash

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **DEFEATED**.

Council moved to the debate on the original motion from Councillor Sandford and raised the point that Members who broke the Code of Conduct should apologise and should not think themselves above the code.

Councillor Murphy proposed proceeding directly to the vote without further debate. The Mayor considered that the matter had not been sufficiently debated and debate continued:

- It was noted that Councillor Fower had not responded to direct communication from officers on several occasions.
- Members were advised that the hearing had been arranged to suit the working hours of Councillor Fower, who failed to attend and did not offer his apologies.
- Comment was made that Council Fower had not produced evidence to support his views or evidence he had not breached data protection legislation.
- It was advised that no other Members had made complaints.
- Councillor Fower had not, it was highlighted, attended Data Protection training since he was elected in 2004.
- It was felt that the Government should give Councils the authority to make sanctions against offending Members when necessary.
- Some Members were disappointed that this motion had become personal, as other Members were not always morally beyond reproach.
- Comment was made that Members should value the wishes of voters and acknowledge the democratic process that accompanies the role of Member.

In accordance with Standing Order 14, no further items were debated as the guillotine had been reached.

A vote was taken (35 voted in favour, 2 voted against, 18 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayers, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

**Councillor Against:** Andrew Bond, Sandford

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ali, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Ellis, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

“This council notes the decision of the Hearings Panel of the Constitution and Ethics Committee that Cllr Fower has breached the council’s code of conduct.

Cllr Fower has yet to take up the recommendation that he apologise for the comments made about me or attend Data Protection training to ensure he does not misuse the data of residents in the future.

The Council would like to express its disappointment with Cllr Fower for his failure to do so and with his political group leader for not ensuring that this has happened.

The Committee on Standards in Public Life has scrutinised existing arrangements in local government and made a number of recommendations, many of which will require legislative change before they can be put in place.

I understand that the Government aims to issue a formal response to the Committee's recommendations in September.

The Council now has an opportunity to write to the Local Government Minister to endorse the Committee's recommendations, in particular regarding introducing stronger sanctions for breaches of the code of conduct, and I would urge the Leader and the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee to do this.”

## **(2) Motion from Councillor Joseph**

A vote on the motion from Councillor Joseph, including the agreed amendments, regarding grass verges was taken (23 voted in favour, 29 voted against, 2 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Ali, Ash, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Andrew Bond, Ellis, Judy Fox, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller,

Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillors Abstaining:** John Fox, Seaton

**Councillors Not Voting:** Amjad Iqbal

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

**(3) Motion from Councillor Hemraj**

A vote was taken on the motion from Councillor Hemraj in relation to World Mental Health Day (54 voted in favour, 0 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Nil

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

“World Mental Health Day is the 10th of October. Every year one in four adults and one in ten children are diagnosed with a mental health condition. The subject of mental health is a vast one with significant impacts upon those it affects.

The council recognises

- Mental health issues can profoundly affect millions of lives.
- Reports as recent as January 2019 significant to Peterborough highlighted that at least one in eight of five to nineteen year olds had at least one form of mental illness, this equates to an average figure of 13 percent of youngsters living in this city.
- Mental health is the largest cause of disability within the UK representing 23 percent of the burden of illness. Many of the recognised factors for poor mental health are significantly higher within the Peterborough unitary authority area compared to England, the East of England and Cambridgeshire.
- This has a knock on effect on patients and their ability to sustain relationships, maintain employment and focus on schooling.
- Statistics demonstrate that diverse groups of people within Peterborough refrain from seeking help due to the stigma attached with mental health and the ability to open up about their predicament. Going to a GP can be seen as arduous, with the lack of appointments and access across the city, with many patients suffering in silence.

#### The council resolves

- To recognise the stigma associated with mental health, the difficulty in accessing services, and the lengthy waiting times to see a mental health professional.
- To acknowledge the dwindling funding to the NHS and subsequent knock on effect it could have on the current mental health service.
- To work with other partner agencies through Public Health to provide a one day event in the city centre that is open to the public to seek information regarding mental health, signposting to relevant agencies and organisations, give access to resources of information, leaflets, telephone numbers and to access help in an informal non objectifying atmosphere.
- To seek assistance from Public Health, delegates from agencies, and other organisations to deliver this event.
- To promote via Social media and other media outlets to create awareness of such an event,
- To ensure that the costing for an event of this scale remain minimal with many volunteering their time for the purpose of awareness of such an important, yet increasing matter within Peterborough.”

#### **(4) Motion from Councillor Murphy**

A vote was taken on the amendment from Councillor Murphy on the Fair Tax Declaration (37 voted in favour, 3 voted against, 14 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

**Councillor Against:** Ash, John Fox, Judy Fox

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ali, Ellis, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Hones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

A vote was taken on the amended motion (52 voted in favour, 2 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Judy Fox, John Fox

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

“Council notes the recent launch of the Council for Fair Tax Declaration from the Fair Tax Mark-~~W~~ which commits cities, towns and districts to pursuing exemplary tax conduct in their affairs, requires greater transparency from suppliers’ and calls on the EU and UK governments to review legislation and support greater powers for the exclusion of tax dodgers from public procurement.

Council believes that we should seek to ensure that Peterborough City Council consider the companies ethics and how they pay the tax (as well as value for money and quality of service provided) when undertaking procurement.

Council notes:

- The UK Government has taken steps to tackle the issue of tax avoidance and evasion by issuing Procurement Policy Note 03/14 which applies to all government contracts over £5m.
- New regulations issued in 2015 required public bodies, including councils, to ask procurement qualification questions for tenders over £173,000 for service contracts and £4m for works contracts.

~~Council resolves to approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration~~ and pledges to lead by example and demonstrate good practice. Further Council calls for urgent reform of law to enable municipalities to revise their procurement policies and better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct.

Council undertakes to:

- Approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration.
- Revise procurement policy to ask bidders for Council contracts to account for their past tax record and to self-certify that they are fully tax-compliant in line with central Government practise, applying to contracts of the size specified above.
- Ask Cabinet to publicise this policy and to report on its implementation annually for the next three years to Audit Committee.  
Formally report back to Council after that period to seek renewal or revisal of the policy."

**(5) Motion from Councillor Ellis**

A vote was taken (53 voted in favour, 1 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Judy Fox, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lamb, Murphy, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Shaz Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillor Against:** Lane

**Councillors Abstaining:** Nil

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"This Council agrees that the number of houses of multiple occupation which require permission to be converted from single houses in some areas of Peterborough, including Bretton, has been high for many years.

Whilst there is a significant need for housing, especially for single people or small households due to extremely poor supply and affordability of housing, there does seem to have been a large number of HMOs granted permission. This has impacted upon the amenity of many areas and has especially exasperated the problem of lack of car parking.

City Council Officers are investigating bringing in Article 4 which would also require small HMOs of 6 separate households or less to require planning permission.

This power would help the City Council assess the impact a new HMO would have in the area proposed.

Council resolves that officers investigate using this power and submit a report to Council before the end of the 2019/2020 municipal year to consider whether to implement this power across the whole city."

## **28. Reports and Recommendations**

### **(a) Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) Budget Process for 2020/21 - 2022/23**

A vote was taken (32 voted in favour, 8 voted against, 14 abstained from voting).

**Councillor For:** Aitken, Allen, Ash, Ayres, Bashir, Bisby, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Andy Coles, Louise Coles, Day, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Lamb, Lane, Nadeem, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Seaton, Simons, Walsh, Warren

**Councillor Against:** Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

**Councillors Abstaining:** Ali, Ellis, Hemraj, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Skibsted, Yasin, Yurgutene

**Councillors Not Voting:** Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council approved the proposed approach to the 2020/21 budget setting process.

The Mayor  
7.00pm – 10.39pm  
24 July 2019  
Town Hall  
Bridge Street  
Peterborough

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

**Questions from members of the public**

1. **Question from Hazel Perry**

To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation

It is 100 years since the 1919 Housing Act meant that Town Councils were expected to provide Council Houses for those in need. 100 years on and the housing crisis seems worse than ever.

So the first part of my question is: when does Peterborough City Council intend to start building council (or social) houses again?

The second part involves the conversion of city centre office blocks into housing such as, Clifton House and Bayard Place (the second of which alone will hold 115 flats) which I believe are exempt from planning regulations. When the Peterborough New Town was created in the 1970s, new housing was built around central services so considering we already have this experience in Peterborough, I would like to ask how can the City Council ensure these office blocks of flats are of a decent size for people to live in and what provision is there going to be for extra facilities for city centre residents like schools and access to health care.

**Councillor Allen responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. Thank you Hazel for your question. I stand as someone with a proud council housing background. My youth and early 20s were spent on the Dogsthorpe Estate. So therefore I answer this question with some kind of understanding for your thoughts that we need council housing.

The Council's former stock of over 10,500 housing units was transferred to Cross Keys Homes in 2004. Cross Keys and other Registered Providers of housing are the primary route through which new affordable homes are delivered in the city. In the current year we expect 281 affordable homes to be delivered by Registered Providers. The Council has also invested historic right to buy receipts to provide affordable homes for rent through Medesham Homes, a joint venture with Cross Keys. Medesham Homes delivered 29 new homes at Midland Road last year and are currently progressing affordable housing schemes at Bretton Court and at Crowland

	<p>Road, Eye Green. The Council has also been buying homes off the open market following a £10m invest to save programme agreed in 2018. 48 homes are now occupied by households that were under threat of homelessness and a further 9 homes will be occupied shortly. The Council has also been leasing properties from private landlords and to date has agreed 48 five year lease arrangements to provide housing that can be let at or close to local housing allowance rates.</p> <p>In relation to former offices, office to resi as they call it, converted to residential accommodation under permitted development rights the Council has no direct statutory levers it can use. However, where the Council itself has a freehold of an office development as is the case with Northminster House where the current leaseholder is exploring such a conversion then we can clearly use our freehold position to influence the design and space standards.</p> <p>The Council's local plan anticipates the need to build around 17,600 new homes in the next 17 years to meet objectively assessed housing need and it will be important to ensure a broad mix of tenure types with a satisfactory quantum of affordable homes. The question of the wider impact of population growth in the city on our education, health and social services infrastructure is an important one and I am sure that all elected members will want to see that there is adequate investment by the Government in our local services to deal both with the city's forecast population growth of around 30,000 residents over the next 17 years and also the consequences of population ageing. This Administration will continue to press the Government for sufficient investment to ensure such services remain accessible and sustainable.</p>
2.	<p><b>Question from Lynn Walton (asked by Ms Lindley)</b></p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation</p> <p>Good evening Mr Mayor, Councillors, Ladies and Gentleman in the gallery.</p> <p>Bearing in mind Extinction Rebellion's call to Peterborough City Council to DEBATE and ACT on Climate Emergency, will councillors be OPPOSING the destruction of Ferry Meadows as a Country Park with loss of green natural open space and Oak Meadow, and threat to Wildlife, as Nene Park Trust purposely turns this area into a Sporting Activity Hub with 34.25m Climbing Wall and giant car park on Oak Meadow?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I am delighted to respond and I do agree that the location in question is fantastic recreational resource bringing health and wellbeing to the community.</p> <p>However the proposal is currently, that you are talking about, the proposal of the climbing was is currently the subject of a planning application which is expected to go to our Planning and Environment Committee in October 2019 this year. The applicant is due to submit revised information in August, covering a number of topics including landscape, drainage, lighting and ecology. This revised information will be made available for public consultation for a longer period than normal to reflect that it is school holiday time and give the public additional time to comment on the proposals. This application will be determined in accordance with national planning policy &amp; guidance and the Council's local plan and associated policies. Be assured,</p>

	<p>written representations will be considered by the committee and the public will have the opportunity to attend and speak at the meeting Details of the arrangements are sent to those that have commented on the application closer to the time so of you apply then if you are invited to attend the hearing. Your question will be treated as a comment on the application and will be appropriately considered by committee in the determination of the application.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Question from Simon Kail</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene, and Environment</p> <p>Good evening everyone. Simon Kail Chair of Peterborough &amp; Fenland Liberal Democrats and I'd like to ask this question on my behalf and also on behalf of other concerned residents of Peterborough who raised this issue with us. Many of you will have seen the BBC documentary War on Waste which highlighted in particular the growth in single use plastic packaging in the United Kingdom. In 2017 about half of all plastic packaging sent for recycling in the United Kingdom was exported overseas for processing including significant quantities to Malaysia and Indonesia. The War on Waste documentary found several sites in Malaysia where plastic waste had been dumped illegally and identified the waste as originating from several UK local authorities. As Peterborough is aiming to be the UKs Environment Capital I am sure it will keep good records of where waste recycling is being sent for processing and how much of this is being exported. My question is. has Peterborough City Council (or its contractors) sent any waste it has collected overseas for processing in the past, if so when, of what type and what quantity, and are there any plans to do so in the future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. The short answer is no but I'll give you the details which is what you really want. Peterborough City Council has never exported residual waste overseas ever and of course as you know in 2007 it would have become illegal anyway so we have never done it.</p> <p>All residual waste is sent to our energy plant and produces about 3.5MGw every year and at the moment we are even looking at new systems in waste to actually be able to use that in the city rather than exporting it out to the grid.</p> <p>Quantities of sorted recycling are exported and they do fulfil the legislation. The sort of thing we are sending abroad is PET plastic went to Latvia and I am in negotiation with someone at the moment with the possibility of building a plant in Peterborough to make that unnecessary as well, and 1,398 tonnes of cardboard went to various countries and we do intend to continue exporting cardboard in the future unless things change and one of the countries that wants to take our cardboard is The Netherlands. I hope that answers your question.</p> <p><b>Mr Kail asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Thank you for the response. I think what I would ask is can the council make this very clearly public to everyone in Peterborough so that they can actually consider this whether this is a correct thing to be doing, and whether perhaps we need to make a further decision on whether we should be doing this as a country, particularly exporting waste for recycling processing outside of Europe.</p>

	<p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>As I said we are not sending any residual waste outside to anybody and we certainly don't send even the recycling stuff outside Europe. So I hope that clears that up. And we are looking constantly at whether we can get better value in doing by doing it ourselves or looking at systems that bring value into the city.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Nazreen Bibi</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education, Skills, and the University</p> <p>Good evening. My name is Naz and I am here on behalf of myself and parents and teachers. Our question is about funding for children with Special Educational Needs (SEND). I understand that children who needs education and care plans in Peterborough is increased but funding has been a real issue and lots of parents and teachers have raised their concerns.</p> <p>I want to know what action plan has the council got or are putting forward to address his issue.</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, I would. Within Peterborough, the Local Authority is clear that SEND should never be a reason for exclusion. Peterborough sits in line with the national position for exclusions using the Department for Education dataset. However, for children with SEND there is a more positive picture. In both primary and secondary schools, our rate of fixed term and permanent exclusion are below both national levels and our statistical neighbours for both children with Education Health and Care Plans and for those children recorded as SEND support. The only area we are above national is for fixed term exclusions for pupils in special schools. We are working with our special school heads to look at this area.</p> <p>We believe our rates of exclusions are low because we use annual reviews to look at the situation if there is danger of exclusion related to SEN. The reviews will consider whether there is the need for additional specialist services, further assessment of the child's plan or consider a change of placement with the family.</p> <p>We have recently tightened our guidance on the use of part time timetables including notifying the LA of all such agreements with parents.</p> <p><b>Mrs Bibi asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Stand Up for Peterborough was a campaign launched to access extra funding from Central Government. How successful was that campaign?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p>I believe that was a question about our campaign to get more funding from government Mr Mayor and the answer is I have sent off a letter this week as instructed, not only by this Council but by the Children &amp; Education Scrutiny Committee in March.</p>

## **COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **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 Sandford**

To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation

It has been predicted in the press that England's victory in the Cricket World Cup final will lead to significantly increased interest in cricket in Peterborough and across the country. Yet if someone living in Peterborough wants to watch live First Class or List A (one day) county cricket, they currently have to travel to Leicester, Northampton, Nottingham or even London. I am told that in the 1960s there used to be First Class cricket played in Peterborough at the Stanley Recreation Ground. So what can the cabinet do to encourage more top class cricket to be played in Peterborough?

#### **Councillor Allen responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Sandford for a timely question. I am long enough in the tooth to remember county cricket at Crawthorne Road and later Baker Perkins Alma Road pitches. In fact the Crawthorne Road one as a young lad we used to try and sneak in or sneak a view over the fence and I am sure the one day series and in the victory for England generated a real injection and enthusiasm for the game. With that in mind I can assure you, as part of our recently approved Active Lifestyles Strategy work, the Council has been in talks with Cricket East, our regional cricket body, for some time to explore the opportunities cricket can provide to individuals and whole communities.

We have established an Active Lifestyles and Sports Steering group, who are now working closely working with Cricket East to explore funding opportunities for the next financial year to improve current cricket wickets and to install new wickets, both artificial and grass. The steering group comprises membership from the Council as well as Vivacity, education services, disability organisations and parks, and is chaired by the CEO of Living Sport.

Although Cricket East have confirmed they have no plans to develop first class cricket locally, the Council is also working with them on more wickets to be installed as part of the Hampton developments which will also include changing facilities which are key for clubs to have access for matches.

#### **Councillor Sandford asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Allen for that response. When first class cricket was played in Peterborough it was actually Northamptonshire who used to play some games here. I understand that the England and Wales Cricket Board from the

	<p>year 2020 when they bring in the 100 tournament are also going to be running the one day cup tournament at the same time and one of things they have asked the clubs to do is to look at holding some of those games at smaller grounds other than the ones that they normally play at. So would the Cabinet Member consider making representations to Northamptonshire County Cricket Club and maybe some of the other first class counties to see if in these circumstances they would agree to consider playing at least one game in Peterborough?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>Indeed I will and thank you very much for the supplementary Councillor Sandford. I think it something we could certainly take forward. I sit on that committee and we can take forward to Sport East to see if we can include the kind of games you are looking for. But I think what we want to do is actually raise the participation in cricket locally and we have very successful crickets clubs, with Town Cricket Club, Orton Cricket Club, Park Cricket Club, Hampton, Newborough and further afield with Nassington, Wansford and Oundle. So cricket is alive in Peterborough but let's see if we can get what you are looking for and we'll take that forward.</p>
2.	<p><b>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Simons</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>Question not asked or answered in the meeting as ward related and a written answer will be provided.</p> <p>Thorney has the classification of a large village with around 2000 residents and growing. Can I please ask the responsible Cabinet Member to look into the possibility of a feasibility study with regard to a cycle/footpath directly to Eye?</p> <p>At present the cycle way only goes as far as Willow Hall Lane from Thorney and Thorney Road from Eye. The route down Willow Hall Lane is a long circular route into Fengate taking you away from Eye.</p> <p>Thorney Parish Council have been lobbying for a number of years for this direct route.</p> <p>As the only route is via the very busy A47, we look forward to bringing this well overdue link into the green wheel.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller's response:</b></p> <p>Creating a better and safer pedestrian and cycle link is important for these two villages. This route is next to the A47 which is managed by Highways England who now have a Designated Funds programme. One of the funding categories is for new walking and cycling improvements near their network. I have asked Officers to look into this to see whether it is feasible and if so whether we can submit a bid to Highways England to fund this new section of cycleway.</p>

3. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments

Could the relevant Cabinet Member tell me how many street lights are on permanently 24 hours a day in Peterborough and how much is this costing the Council financially and how much is it damaging the environment in terms of unnecessary carbon emissions?

I know of some lights on the Rhubarb Bridge that have been burning constantly for over two years. Also I have noticed that all over Paston, Bretton and Ravensthorpe (and possibly other areas) there are old style lights under archways in housing estates that have not been replaced by LED lights but have been left on permanently for many months.

What is being done to remedy this unfortunate situation?

**Councillor Hiller responded:**

Yes I would Mr Mayor thank you and I thank you Councillor Sandford for his question. I think actually Mr Mayor, Councillor Sandford highlights an issue of communications. Let me explain and this might be of interest to other Members too.

The only lights that burn intentionally Mr Mayor the only lights that burn intentionally 24 hours a day are those in underpasses. The apparent problem is actually a deliberate safety action. That said of course there may be occasions when there are faults with power supplies and it is at those times where our lighting engineers have to make the decision whether to leave a light on or indeed off continually until a repair is undertaken. In this situation, Mr Mayor they generally opt to leave a light on. We are not currently in a position to remotely identify day burning lights Mr Mayor but as part of the successful city wide LED project this should be the case in about a month or so.

When this happens, our team will be receiving daily reports notifying of unusual behaviour which will then generate fault tickets for the engineers' investigation. I might also add that the vast majority of our city's lighting is powered on an unmetered energy supply so we pay for calculated night time hours and not actual burning hours of those lights that are left on, Thank you Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Sandford ask a supplementary question:**

Could I offer to take the Cabinet Member, out to my ward in Paston, or I could take him to Ravensthorpe, I could take him to Bretton where there are literally hundreds of street lights on permanently. They are not in underpasses. They are actually in areas where you have a flat goes across a footpath and there is a street light under it. I was told it was due to asbestos but some of these have been burning for over 12 months or so. Could I also ask him if he could reconsider his answer about it not mattering if the lights are on permanently because we pay a flat rate for the electricity? Is he not aware of climate change, we are going to be debating that a bit later on.

**Councillor Hiller answered the supplementary question:**

	<p>I didn't actually say it didn't matter lights were left on so that's a misrepresentation of what I said. I was just explaining that we didn't pay for any extra energy. I didn't actually say it didn't matter. I am aware of climate change of course, as we are all aware of climate change Councillor Sandford but you'll have to appreciate as perhaps you don't appreciate</p> <p>Is that a lot of these lights are not the responsibility of Peterborough City Council. There are a number of housing associations that look after these lights as well so in response to your offer, it's a very kind offer, and I'll give that due consideration.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Warren</b></p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for House, Culture, and Recreation</p> <p>I have become aware of the upward trend of HMOs in Peterborough, and also of a rise in 'Service Accommodation' where properties are being let out on a short term basis to multiple persons. This transient population is placing great pressure on our already stretched local services, including a strain on provision for parking in urban areas.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member update me of how HMOs and Service Accommodation is being regulated across Peterborough, and can they advise what further plans are in place to control unacceptable growth of these areas over the coming years?</p> <p><b>Councillor Allen responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and delighted to answer the question from my colleague Scott Warren. Houses of multiple occupation or HMO's form a significant part of the rented sector in Peterborough however I fully understand and greatly sympathise with the concerns of residents whose streets and neighbourhoods are impacted by some examples of HMOs and serviced accommodation and the affect they can have on local communities.</p> <p>The city however already benefits from a Selective Licensing Scheme in designated areas of Peterborough which requires all private landlords to apply for a licence for each of their properties, including HMOs. This includes demonstrating compliance with a range of statutory and broader obligations. Failure to do so results in enforcement action being taken which can lead to an unlimited fine.</p> <p>From October 21<sup>st</sup> the law regarding mandatory licensing of HMOs changed, such that now any HMO that is occupied by five or more persons who form two or more households and who share basic amenities such as a kitchen, bathroom or toilet will require a licence no matter where they are in the city. Housing Enforcement Officers are currently working to identify unlicensed mandatory HMOs across the city with an initial focus on the Hamptons, Ortons and Bretton where our intelligence suggests there is the greatest need. This work has recently included street surveys and engagement with the communities. Our officers are encouraging people, anyone with information relating to an unlicensed property to report it to us.</p> <p>In addition, research is being undertaken into the feasibility of introducing Article 4 directives within the City which, if introduced, will enable some control over the density of HMO's in the future. Good move I would say. The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee also asked officers to prepare a report to explore the potential for new</p>

	<p>selective licensing schemes to supplement the work I've already set out in this response.</p> <p>Finally, it is currently the case that local authorities unfortunately do not have any powers to regulate or enforce against short term serviced accommodation, generally known as 'air b and b' although I am sure there are other brands.</p>
5.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Wiggin</b></p> <p>To Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation</p> <p>Following the decision to move the council's systems from Microsoft to Google in 2016 at a cost of £3m, and with a reported cost of £1.12m transition cost to now move to Microsoft 365 this August, can the relevant Cabinet Member please confirm that this figure or inform us about the expected cost as it stands now. Can we also be appraised of how long it will be for the savings made by this decision reach a point where the transition costs are matched?</p> <p><b>Councillor Farooq responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Wiggin for your question. The move from Microsoft to Google was at a total cost of £1m. The £3m cost Councillor Wiggin you are referring to included other initiatives to support the move to agile working within Council, e.g. the purchase and rollout of Chromebooks and such other hardware. These are still in use within the council.</p> <p>The cost of transition from Google to Office 365 is £250k and will be recovered within just over one year when measured against the predicted cost of remaining with a mixed estate of Google and Microsoft.</p> <p>Google licences at £200k per annum will stop being paid in October when the licences expire although there will be a net increase of £60k extra for Microsoft 365 licences. There is an active programme to exploit products within the 365 subscription to remove other systems in use within the council i.e. document storage, intranet, programme management etc.</p>

There are distinct benefits of using 365, there is only one platform and supplier relationship to support, there are the efficiencies brought to PCC (*Peterborough City Council*) staff in both collaboration and line of business system and integration. It'll massively improve collaboration with partners outside of city council. At some point, the MS Office licences will have to upgrade to 365 and to take this duplication. Staff work a lot better with MS products, we are all familiar with MS products, we use them at home and we use them here.

**Councillor Wiggin asked a supplementary question:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Farooq for your answer and welcome to your place as a Cabinet Member, being newly appointed.

Could you confirm how much money it would have cost the council or how much we would have saved had we not transferred from Microsoft to Google in the first instance and then back again and whether we had continued just as we are. I appreciate what you are saying about agile working but I suspect that kind of move would have happened anyway in light of the council's situation. So do you have a figure for that please?

**Councillor Farooq responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Wiggin and welcome to you to as well. We are both from the same ward and we have only been here almost a year or you been here just this month so we are both looking at the historical stuff. But you are absolutely right, IT is something which underpins everything we do. And whenever we look at it and we think whatever is suitable we employ that, to make best practice for work. IT enables us to provide service to residents more efficiently and give our tax payers a tremendous value for money. In fact we are looking at the IT strategy now to make sure we have got proper investment and it saves money for our residents. A good IT system with a good infrastructure can take out a lot of duplications, free up resources which can be used on providing other vital services and provide the opportunity to grow and explore business outside council. A good IT strategy will always give us a good return on investment, we can take advantage of automation, available through the systems and take the manual processes out. I hope that answers your supplementary. Thank you.

<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaheed</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>As all of us who reside in the north of the city are patently aware, work on installing a pedestrian crossing on the A47/A15 (Rhubarb Bridge) roundabout is pressing ahead at a leisurely pace, causing major disruption during peak work travel times.</p> <p>I am somewhat bemused that the decision was taken to incorporate the actual roundabout into the scheme, as opposed to a straight crossing at the parkway junctions and am also concerned that no safety barriers have been installed to separate pedestrians from cars circumnavigating the roundabout, and vice versa.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member responsible please advise me if there is any intention to erect the said barriers?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Shaheed for his question and the succinct response is there is every intention to erect suitable safety barriers before the crossings are commissioned. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste Street Scene and the Environment</p> <p>When will we bring back the free bulky waste collection service in Ravensthorpe and elsewhere in Peterborough and re-introduce some free collections helping to clean up our environment and save money on the cost of clearing fly tips?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. As Councillor Murphy is probably we aware, the subject of Fly Tipping is very much in focus, in particular through the work of the cross party Task and Finish Group. They have made some very interesting recommendations on the very subject of Bulky Waste Collections was brought up. I was at Cabinet on Monday 15th July and a number of proposals were presented on the development of the Bulky Waste Collection Service, including making a number of items that could be collected free within any year as well as restructuring the prices so as to make the service more accessible.</p> <p>Cabinet have now requested business cases to be developed for the proposals which will examine the financial and service implications of the policies for consideration by Cabinet within the wider financial and budgetary process.</p> <p><b>Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor. I'll be very brief. I had some difficulty hearing over here. But did you say that you didn't know when the Bulky Waste was going to come back as a free service?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p>

	<p>No, that's not what I said. In fact that was the truth. I don't know when it's going to come back into service because what I said was that we had asked for a business case to be made and to explore the cost and implications of changing the policy. So, no I don't know when the Bulky Waste Service is likely to come back in but as soon as we get a business case we will know whether it is feasible to introduce or not.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Amjad Iqbal</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>There have been ongoing concerns about the speed of traffic and the number of accidents occurring on Mayors Walk and Thorpe Park Road. Could the Cabinet Member let me know what plans are in place or are being developed to mitigate these issues, such as introducing traffic calming or a citywide 20 mph limit for areas such as this? Thorpe Park Road and Mayors Walk form the main road sitting in the middle of Ravensthorpe and Central ward, and the problems observed there need to be addressed.</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Iqbal for the question. There are no current plans to introduce engineering measures or indeed reduce the speed limit to 20mph in the areas that he has mentioned Mr Mayor. They don't appear on the current accident cluster sites lists and average vehicle speeds under the free flow conditions range don't support a perceived significant speed problem. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Question from Councillor Wiggin</b></p> <p>To Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation</p> <p>Local residents have reported delays in responses when they have reported problems to the council. Service directors and officers assure me their performance targets are met when reports are received, so it looks like the delay is between the resident sending the report and the issue being logged. Can the relevant cabinet member please provide details as to how the council is performing with regards to service delivery targets for the time taken to log resident reports from receipt of written correspondence during the first 6 months of 2019?</p> <p><b>Councillor Farooq responded:</b></p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor. And thank you Councillor Wiggin for your question. We could have had this conversation in Hampton you know. Although there is no specific delivery target for the time taken to log issues raised by residents, the council's performance standard states that the council aims to deal with written correspondence including emails within 10 working days of receipt. Local residents report issues in writing to the council via email to ask@peterborough.gov.uk and via a number of web forms. These are received by the Customer Services Team who either resolve at this point or forwarded to the service departments to action.</p> <p>A number of these reports are given a higher priority as you will understand, such as discarded needles etc. All issues are generally resolved or acknowledged (if forwarded to service departments) by the customer services team within 1-2 working days.</p> <p>Residents also write to service departments who will liaise directly with the resident to resolve.</p> <p>Finally, I would be happy to investigate any specific examples Councillor Wiggin may have where he has been advised that delays have occurred. Thank you.</p>
10.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Amjad Iqbal</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Why does there continue to be an issue with Shared Service / 'working with partners' savings? This was an issue last year and detailed plans were promised. If there are no detailed saving plans how can a robust budget be built based on such savings?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you very much Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Amjad Iqbal for the question. I have highlighted, and explained, this issue in past Budget Monitoring Reports to Cabinet as well as to Scrutiny of the Budget Committee.</p> <p>They have to understand that any Shared Services tie up is complex, carries risk, requires both main parties to move in tandem and it involves close working with LGSS and suppliers. We therefore need to proceed cautiously. In particular as this may impact staff and appropriate consultation is required.</p> <p>The work will include closer Back Office as well as rationalisation and automation of services.</p> <p>It is important that the solutions implemented are sustainable. Initiatives being worked on include rationalisation of business support, review of the Contact Centre, and closer / amalgamated professional working arrangements with the County Council.</p> <p>Both Councils, as you all know, now have a Joint Management Team which has delivered savings and efficiencies. Indeed the only Executive Officers who do not now represent both Councils are the two Directors of Finance. Clearly they need to ensure appropriate cost and benefit allocations for each council. There is also significant joint work taking place in the Peoples and Communities directorate at all levels and with the arrival of Steve Cox as the New Director of Place and Economy we aim to accelerate in that area.</p>

Over the past year significant numbers of procurements have been delivered which are joint in nature and cover both Peterborough and Cambridgeshire and have taken advantage of larger "economies of scale".

As part of the preparation process both Councils are ensuring that their core systems are congruent. We are moving as Councillor Farooq has just been talking about, to Windows 365 over the next 2 months and core People and Communities systems covering Education, Children's Services and Adults Services will be delivered by the end of the financial year. This will then allow processes to be amended and rationalised. Thank you Mr Mayor.

**Councillor Amjad Iqbal asked a supplementary question:**

Yes Mr Mayor, I do have a supplementary questions. Why does there continue to be an issue with shared service working with partner savings? This was an issue last year and detailed plans were promised. If there are no detailed savings plans, how can a robust budget be built based on such savings? Last year I twice raised questions in Council on the savings levied to Peterborough Serco Statutory Partnership. The savings target is against listed as part of the reason for forecast overspent. If there are no detailed savings plans how can a robust budget be built based on such savings? Do you think that overall the Council can manage this forecast, overspend position down? How is the Administration

Developing new savings proposals when they appear to be lacking in the delivery of current financial year savings. We were promised throughout the last year MTF tranches the capital programmes would be at £100million. The capital programme is shown to be at £135million. What is Cabinet doing to ensure.....*Speaking time expired.*

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

Thank you Mr Mayor. I must admit that question from Councillor Iqbal appeared to be repeating the same question that he originally asked. But several times over. So I think I've already addressed that. I had one other point though. We shouldn't be hung up on shared services. What we should be hung up on is the right operating model for this council, whether that is shared services or its things that we do ourselves, in house and not with the county. That is the important thing. And that will be part of what we will be bringing forward later this year. Thank you Mr Mayor.

11.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene, and Environment</p> <p>The council has a citywide environment action plan with clear targets to 2020. How many of those targets have been met to date and will we meet all the targets by 2020?</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. The Council produces an annual report detailing progress made against each of the targets in the Environment Action Plans. The last report was published earlier this year and predominantly covered the period to December 2018. Of the targets in the Environment Action Plans, 65 have a status of 'green' which means that they are on track to be achieved, 12 are 'amber' which indicates that they will be partially achieved and 2 are 'red' which means they may not be achieved by 2020. There are 5 targets where the data is at the present time unavailable. Officers are undertaking activity to ensure that, where feasible, mitigating action is being taken to get these targets back on track and that we try and achieve all of them. The report can be viewed on the Council's website, and I'm sure you don't want me to read it the address out I'm happy to give it to anyone who wants it.</p> <p><a href="https://www.peterborough.gov.uk/council/campaigns/environment-capital/">https://www.peterborough.gov.uk/council/campaigns/environment-capital/</a></p> <p><b>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I do Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Cereste for your response. Seeing that we are a laggard and not a leader of the environment do you think we should continue to claim to be the UKs Environment Capital? If you think we should can you give me date when you think we will really and truly become the UKs Environment Capital.</p> <p><b>Councillor Cereste responded:</b></p> <p>Well, fortunately I don't happen to share Councillor Nawaz's views and I'm not really sure he is up to speed on exactly how much good work is going on in the city and has gone on in the city, and we are doing a tremendous amount of work on the environment which will become public as we are sure about what can be done and what can be reasonably achieved. So whilst I fully accept that the name, the Environment Capital, has gone by the wayside a little bit, I still think it should be the ambition of this city to be able to hold its head up high and say we are very much environmentally focused. And when Councillor Nawaz has got about half an hour to spare I'll tell him about all the good things that are going on and all the good things we've achieved and does Councillor Nawaz know that there is about to be a £400m investment in this city. It is the biggest investment in the history of Peterborough, to produce a renewable energy plant which will produce 54MW of green energy for the local people. That's just one thing, there are lots and lots of other really good things going on in our city so get your facts right next time please councillor.</p>
12.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Murphy</b></p> <p>To Councillor Walsh, Cabinet Member for Communities</p>

Previously I presented a motion to the city council about how and why we need to tackle pavement parking and obstruction in Peterborough.

“i. Council notes difficulties, obstruction, inconvenience and cases of damage because of vehicles parked on pavements and verges.

ii. Council believes that inconvenience caused to residents and pedestrians and damage being caused to verges can be mitigated by introducing regulations to prohibit parking on pavements and by protecting verges.

iii. Council instructs the administration, or the Corporate Director Growth and Regeneration, to prohibit vehicles parking on pavements, to introduce some designated parking sections and to protect verges throughout the authority’s area.”

I understand some action has been taken and there have been media reports concerning verges however I have had residents contact me asking what’s actually been done concerning pavement parking in Peterborough, can you tell me which pavements have been protected by traffic regulation orders and how many vehicles have had action taken as a result of council adopting transport regulation orders and taking action to clear vehicles obstructing pavements in the last 12 months?

**Councillor Walsh responded:**

Yes Mr Mayor, thank you. Yes Councillor Murphy, I’ll take you on a trip down Memory Lane. In response to the many complaints the Council receives each year relating to verge parking and the impact this has on communities and individuals, the Verge Parking Scheme was introduced. It came into effect in June 2018 and an update on the scheme was presented to Growth and Environment Scrutiny Committee at the beginning of this month. The Scheme has resulted in a fair and consistent approach to dealing with queries and requests for enforcement in relation to verge and pavement parking. A decision was taken not to introduce a citywide ban as it would not differentiate between where an obstruction is caused and where it is not. For example, there are some areas of the city where parking slightly on the pavement can benefit the local area by increasing parking provision for residents and maintaining safe traffic flow.

The Council has received 77 individual requests from residents to activate a scheme locally to them since the scheme launched, and there has been sufficient support in 12 of those areas to warrant an informal consultation. As a result, six schemes have been activated, and another is due to be activated shortly. In addition to the seven successful resident-backed schemes, the scheme has also been introduced at a further 20 locations due to vehicles parking for advertising. Since July 2018, The Prevention and Enforcement Service has issued 103 penalty charge notices (*PCNs*) for parking in contravention of a verge or pavement parking restriction, where previously these would have gone unpunished. Many more vehicles will have been issued *PCNs* for parking on pavements adjacent to double yellow lines on the road.

Councillors and residents can request and support the introduction of the scheme in their local areas. Full details can be found on the Council’s website or alternatively residents and Members can contact the Prevention and Enforcement Services who will be able to assist. Thank you.

**Councillor Murphy asked a supplementary question:**

	<p>Yes Mr Mayor, it is very quick. Thank you for your answer which was comprehensive. Did you say 103 vehicles received tickets because they parked on the pavement since we bought his in?</p> <p><b>Councillor Walsh responded:</b></p> <p>Correct, thank you.</p>
13.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</b></p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Could you please confirm the updated budget deficit for 2020/2021 alongside your initial plan as to how you intend to balance the books?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Can I first just say, hello to my friend Fiona Radic who is in the gallery. I think she just posted that I am boring. I was just going to say Fiona, that's a cross we both carry isn't it. But thank you Councillor Nawaz for your question. The budget gap is set out in Agenda item 13 a) It is a long agenda, you may not have made it to there. As regards the potential actions involved, I set those out at Full Council in March as Councillor Nawaz may recall. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a supplementary question:</b></p> <p>I do Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Seaton for your question, answer sorry. I believe we have established there is an additional £5m or thereabouts of an additional deficit. I'd just like to know why that wasn't picked up in the original forecasts as the Administration has many years of preparing such budgets. Is it that we've had to pay Grant Thornton hundreds of thousands of pounds to establish this for us or is there another reason?</p> <p><b>Councillor Seaton responded:</b></p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Yeah, I'm really pleased that Councillor Nawaz is taking an interest in this matter. No doubt that will mean his group re-joins the cross party, cross party, budget working group and then we can have these discussions in a bit more detail. We have a current forecast that by the end of the current financial year, by March 2020, if we do not take action we could face a deficit of £5m. Now I think that has been incorrectly reported in certain areas as we've got a current issue that is over the full year. We're taking action over that, for example we are being very careful about recruitment, all recruitment is going through the Chief Executive at the current time, any new spend that people want to do has to be subject to a very specific business case. So we are actually being very careful about expenditure during the current year and we are confident that we can bring that down. If you look at the last financial year we had an issue with tax, it was £4m we came in £2m over budget. So actually we would have delivered without that particular issue a very good end of year picture. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p><b>The time allowed for answering questions was reached at this time and the Mayor announced all other questions would be answered in writing.</b></p>

14.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Skibsted</b></p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>In matters of planning for new housing developments, what assurance can you give local residents that their concerns will be adequately addressed before the details of the planned developments are finalised and how will this be carried out in practice?</p> <p><b>Councillor Hiller responded:</b></p> <p>In the case that I think Cllr Skibsted is referring to, the applicant recently met with a number of representatives from the community and will now be familiar with their concerns. In terms of any refinement of the draft proposals prior to submission as a planning application, this will be for the applicant to determine and not the City Council.</p>
15.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Day</b></p> <p>To Councillor Ayres, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services, Education, Skills and the University</p> <p>Peterborough's schools are facing unprecedented budget shortfalls. What steps has the Cabinet Member taken to tackle this and what additional steps will she be taking in the future?</p> <p><b>Councillor Ayres responded:</b></p> <p>As you would have seen, there has been significant coverage in the media of the challenges our schools are facing as a result of pressures on funding. Officers have collated information from schools on the impact of these pressures as a result of an agreed action from the Children and Education scrutiny committee on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2019.</p> <p>It is our intention to share these with our local MPs and also write to the Secretary of State for Education to request a meeting to outline the impact funding is having on children in the City.</p> <p>We hope our narrative which includes issues such as reduced curriculum offers, larger class sizes and less training for teachers are heard by Ministers as part of the comprehensive spending review due in the Autumn.</p>

16. **Question from Councillor Hogg**

To Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation

In April this year a decision was taken to stop using the My Peterborough app for residents reporting issues to the council in favour of adopting the FixMyStreet Pro solution offered by My Society, this was framed as a cost-saving measure through better functionality.

Can the relevant cabinet member, please assure us that there have been no data breaches with the My Peterborough App and that had there been councillors would have been informed?

**Councillor Farooq responded:**

We were made aware of occasional issues with the app where the user experienced issues in relation to the way they had configured their own privacy settings in the account such as using their email address as a username and that was displayed. On hearing about this issue, the council included clearer instructions on the website. After closing the app, a resident did contact the council after trying to access the app through a link from third party site and experiencing an issue however this did not appear to be an issue affecting any data pertaining to the resident. If it were appropriate to inform Members about a data breach then we would do so. Due to these risks around data security and the fact that there is an improved product available to us the decision was taken to make this change.

Context: we did have an issue where people were using their own email addresses as a username and not checking the box to not display this on the map. Stephen Barker improved the instructions. The issue was that a resident tried to log into it via Facebook and got to someone else's data. Their data did not appear to have been compromised. We only had some screen shots and Jason Dalby investigated. The company could only find that the resident had tied their name to an account during the access. The company did not provide any more information however it did not appear that our data which was deleted had been compromised.

17. **Question from Councillor Hogg**

To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance

At the full council meeting of 23rd January Cllr Seaton stated that

“ ...the Council’s mobile telephone contract which current contract was let in September 2015 for 3 years. So we actually reviewed it in September last year and we would have gone out to tender again but we were aware that Cambridgeshire are also going out to tender so we have joined the two tenders together.

I believe it’s the end of this month that those tenders are due to be received so we should be able to get a saving on the joint contract and that will be reviewed over the next month or two.”

We are now some months passed that prediction, could Cllr Seaton please update us on the current status of the mobile telephone supply and the tender process.

**Councillor Seaton responded:**

The existing EE contract expired in September 2018. It was agreed to allow the contract to run on a month by month basis while discussions were held with CCC on a potential joint procurement. CCC were not due to go out to procurement until December 2018 and in fact it was January 2019 in the end.

The procurement process via CCC has proved to be very protracted and to date we have not yet been advised of the outcome. Due to the delays Serco Ltd were requested to tender just for PCC under the existing managed service contact. The contract to be maximum 2 years.

The process was completed and EE were successful. The new EE contract brings a simpler pool based contract along with unlimited calls and texts. The new contract saves PCC £191k over the two years compared to what we paid under the old contract. There is also a tech fund of £70k from EE that in effect means that PCC can supply mobile phones and associated peripherals without recourse to PCC funds and amongst other things can be used to update the fleet (some devices are 4 years old now). Again this amounts to a saving of £70k on mobile phone hardware that PCC would have paid. In addition, the Council has also avoided any costs of moving supplier.

To remain with EE also allows both councils to explore the capabilities of Microsoft/Office 365 and other vendors in the communications arena and to look at the possibilities of a joint "unified communications" solution combining fixed and mobile telecoms into one so eliciting improved working and increased savings once the Microsoft 365 migration has taken place for both Councils.

**Questions on notice to:**

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

**1. Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz**

To Councillor Holdich, Combined Authority Board Representative

The Combined Authority has a central government grant of £100 million for providing 2,000 affordable homes in our region – how much of this grant do you expect to receive for our city?

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

Whilst there is no fixed allocation it was envisage that Peterborough's share would be around 24%

Currently the Combined Authority has to achieve 2000 properties it currently has funding approved for 962 properties after this month's allocation with two years to go.

Peterborough's allocation of the 962 is 237 properties which is around 24%, had the legislation been correct from the start we would have had another 100 homes, however they were not lost to the city as they were funded elsewhere.

In terms of cash allocated to Peterborough this has been 9.85 million plus the 3 million we were unable to spend of Combined Authority money for which was funded by other grants and would have put us more than halfway with 2yrs to go and we have other schemes in the pipeline.

The council built 185 affordable homes last year and are geared up to deliver 285 affordable homes this year.

**2. Question from Councillor Wiggin**

To Councillor Holdich, Combined Authority Board Representative

Can the city council's representatives to the Combined Authority advise what representations they made to ensure Peterborough gets a fair share of funding for public transport from the proposals in the Combined Authority transport plan, given most of the proposed public transport schemes seem to be in the Greater Cambridge area with Peterborough given only a little bit for more roads.

**Councillor Holdich responded:**

Firstly, the Combined Authority's draft Local Transport Plan is out to consultation so I would encourage everyone to read it and respond. Secondly, regarding your point, the Combined Authority has undertaken an area wide bus service review and has laid out a series of options for the future of bus services in Peterborough as well as

	<p>Cambridgeshire. A group has been set-up with senior staff from the Combined Authority, Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to explore and develop these options further.</p> <p>I have also secured Combined Authority funding to undertake a Peterborough wide mass rapid transit review which is looking at what future public transport provisions will be needed as Peterborough grows - be it bus, light rail or any other form of public transport. Buses play an important role in Peterborough and I will ensure that we get a fair settlement should any future budget be allocated to public transport.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Councillor Sandford</b></p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Combined Authority Board Representative</p> <p>At the Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee on Friday it was revealed that the Combined Authority's external auditors Ernst and Young had failed to complete the audit of the Combined Authority accounts by the required date, allegedly due to "resourcing issues". As a result the Combined Authority will have to publish a highly embarrassing note on its website explaining that its accounts have not yet been audited. However, it was also revealed that the terms of the Combined Authority's contract with the auditors (which involves tens of thousands of pounds of taxpayers money being paid to them) contains no facility for the Combined Authority to claim or be paid any compensation, in the event of a failure of the auditors to fulfil their duties.</p> <p>Would the leader raise this matter with the board of the Combined Authority to ensure that this situation is not repeated in future and that authority and the taxpayers are properly compensated if it does?</p> <p><b>Councillor Holdich responded:</b></p> <p>There are a number of authorities across the Country that will not have their audits completed by the 31st July 2019, many it seems due to "resourcing issues". Authorities have challenged both their external auditors and the Public Sector Audit Appointment panel for guidance as if the dates are not met a note does have to be published on the Authorities website. Presently there is no recourse in these agreements (which are standard) for compensation because of the late delivery of the audit. This is a sector wide issue this year that must be addressed at higher levels.</p>