

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2019
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR GUL NAWAZ

Present:

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

32. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Judy Fox, Nadeem, Ayres, Hussain, Cereste and Yurgutene.

33. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Hiller declared a pecuniary interest as he was a director of Medesham Homes. He advised Council he had received dispensation to speak on such items but would leave the Chamber if there was a vote.

There were no other declarations of interest.

34. Minutes of the Meetings held on 24 July 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2019 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

35. Mayor's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Mayor.

36. Leader's Announcements

There were no announcements from the Leader.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

37. Questions with Notice by Members of the Public

There were no questions from members of the public.

38. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by members of the public.

(b) Presented by Members

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Haynes requesting a 20mph zone in the Wootton Avenue area of Peterborough.

A petition was presented to Council by Councillor Iqbal requesting the installation of a barrier at the side of the Allama Iqbal Centre in Cromwell Road.

39. 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. The My Peterborough app.
2. The percentage of affordable homes being built
3. The costs of unused phones in the council in the last twelve months.
4. The protection and encouragement of wildlife.
5. Payments made to Conservative councillors under the current leader.
6. Replacement arena for the East of England Arena and Events Centre.
7. Traffic statistics for Rhubarb Bridge.
8. Tougher sentences for those convicted of fly-tipping.
9. The amount of rent paid to Stef and Philips for St Michael's Gate.
10. The current budget.
11. Speed limit Fulbridge Road Werrington.
12. Road adoption Roman Fields Estate, Gunthorpe.

Questions submitted which were ward related were not read at the meeting however the questions and answers were included in the Additional Information Pack.

There were no questions submitted to the Combined Authority.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

40. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

(a) Cabinet Recommendation - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Proposed Submission

At its meeting on 23 September 2019, the Cabinet received a report in relation to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Proposed Submission for the final consultation.

Councillor Hiller introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He advised that this was the third consultation and all representations received from previous consultations had been considered. The final consultation would commence in November and the plan would be submitted for independent examination in 2020.

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

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

1. Approved the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Minerals and Waste Local Plan as attached at Appendix A, for the purpose of both its final consultation for six weeks (at some point during November 2019 to January 2020 - if the consultation period includes the Christmas week, then consultation will run for eight weeks); AND its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for the purpose of independent examination.
2. Approved the proposed Policies Map (including associated inset maps) as set out at Appendix B, for the purpose of consultation alongside the Local Plan consultation AND for subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for consideration alongside the examination of the Local Plan.
3. Delegated to the Head of Sustainable Growth Strategy any presentational improvements, factual updating, or other inconsequential changes (eg. correcting typographical errors or factual inaccuracies) to the Publication Draft Plan or Policies Map that (taken together) do not materially affect the policies set out in the Local Plan prior to the consultation commencing, or changes necessary to address any minor amendments arising from the Plan's consideration by Cambridgeshire County Council's democratic process.
4. Delegated to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development authority to make more substantive changes to the Plan as attached, prior to consultation, provided he should see fit to do so, but only if it would help to address any more substantive suggested amendments arising from the Plan's consideration by Cambridgeshire County Council's democratic process.
5. Delegated to the Head of Sustainable Growth Strategy the ability to agree and consult upon a set of proposed modifications during the examination process (most likely at the very end of the examination process), if asked by the Inspector to do so.

(b) Cabinet Recommendation - Budget Control Report June 2019

The report received by Cabinet at its meeting on 23 September 2019 contained the forecast for 2019/20 as at June 2019 budgetary control position. The report also outlined a set of revenue and capital virements, to ensure the budget reflected the Council's current financial position accurately and reflected the revised budget assumptions, together with information on the estimated reserves position for 2019/2020.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He reminded Members that he reported regularly on the current year budget at each meeting of the Cabinet and the reports were also presented to Full Council. The reports contained

details of the potential end of year outturn and the financial risks being considered together with plans to increase reserves by £4million. This would help towards raising the level of projected usable fund reserves to £14million, which was close to the best practice recommendation of 5% of gross turnover. All departments had therefore been allocated revised targets.

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

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

- The £9.8million budget reduction in the second half of the year.
- Why budget pressures been not been resolved in previous budgets.
- Concern on discrepancies in the forecasting figures.
- Where the budget savings had been made.
- That savings of £240,000 per week needed to be achieved in order to meet the recommendations.
- The impact of the 1% borrowing requirement received the previous Thursday (*10 October 2019*) on the hotel project.
- The use of Grant Thornton as consultants, the cost of consultancy fees adding to the overspend and why that function could not be provided in house.
- The lack of information on the capital budget virements, which totalled approximately £12million.

As mover of the original motion Councillor Seaton summed up and expressed his concern that Members did not fully understand how local authority funding worked as several areas within the reports had been misunderstood. He explained that some of his figures had been rounded up and some rounded down which could be interpreted as discrepancies although all figures were contained within the agenda reports. The Public Works Loan Board had recently increased the borrowing by 1% which had the potential to impact on the arrangements with the Hilton Hotel. Staff resources had been so reduced that existing staff did not have the resources to objectively analyse every contract and process. The use of Grant Thornton would not impact the proposed in year savings.

Councillor Coles recommended the report to Council and advised Members it was a way to balance the books within the year. He thanked staff for identifying how savings could be made most effectively.

A vote was taken (28 in favour, 24 voted against, 3 abstained from voting).

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

Councillor Against: Ali, Barkham, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin

Councillors Abstaining: Ash, Day, Howell

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that the Council approved:

1. The revenue budget virement to reprofile the budget based on revised assumptions, outlined in section 5, with further detail of the 2019/20 reprofiled Budget contained in Appendix B.
2. The capital budget virements over £0.5m.
3. The addition of the Allia Centre to the disposals schedule.

(c) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Update on Review of Scrutiny Guidance and Functions

At its meeting on 1 October 2019, the Constitution and Ethics Committee received a report in relation to the Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny in Local and Combined Authorities, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in May 2019, with regard to the number of Councillors required to instigate call-in procedures. The report also covered the transfer of specific functions to alternative scrutiny committees.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and in moving the recommendations, outlined the proposals. He also requested that the two elements were voted on separately.

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

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

- The scrutiny arrangements being proposed were similar to those in place two years previously.
- There were very few call-ins per year and this proposal would allow more decisions to be called in, resulting in more effectively scrutiny.
- Minority parties were unable to call-in decisions taken under the existing scheme as they were unlikely to have sufficient members sitting on the relevant committee.
- The new proposal would allow the call-in of non-key decisions, those with a value below £500,000.
- Some Members felt unable to support part one of the recommendation as it could allow members to cause the council undue process and delay. However other Members felt this would not happen as call-in could only happen if there was an issue with the consultation or process, or with the backing of Officers, or there was an issue with the decision.
- The existing criteria was in line with the guidance issued by the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS).
- Some Members found the call-in process daunting.
- The proposal made allowances for a given member being unable to attend a meeting unexpectedly at short notice but the call-in could still be presented.
- There was no opposition to the proposals at the meeting of the committee.
- Members expressed concern over the workload the proposals would bring to the Adults & Communities Scrutiny Committee.
- The Arts & Museums portfolio would have an impact on growth by creating an arts economy and should not be considered an area requiring subsidizing.
- By transferring Libraries, Arts & Museums to the Adults & Communities Scrutiny Committee there was a possibility it would be overlooked in favour of other subjects under that committee remit.

As mover of the original motion Councillor Seaton summed up and advised that Members Scrutiny Chairs and officers were in agreement with the proposal. which aligned responsibilities within the scrutiny committees. Should it be proven that the pressure on the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee was too great, further changes could be considered. He agreed that there were few call-ins and advised Members it was the quality of call-ins, backed by good information, that were more relevant than the number of call-ins.

Separate votes would be taken for each recommendation.

A vote was taken on call-in procedures (29 in favour, 26 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council agreed to update the Council's standing orders as attached in Appendix 1 to the report in relation to the Council's Call-in procedure to allow any three Councillors who sit on a Scrutiny Committee to be able to call-in both key and non-key decisions made by the Executive.

A vote was taken on Libraries, Arts & Museums transferring to a different scrutiny committee (53 in favour, 1 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

Councillor Against: Casey

Councillors Abstaining: Ali

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council Agreed to update the current functions of the Scrutiny Committees as detailed below and in Appendix 2 to the report and:

1. Move Libraries, Arts & Museums from the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny committee to the Adults & Communities Scrutiny committee as this now falls under the Service Director Adults Services and Communities.

2. Move Adult Learning & Skills from the Children & Education Scrutiny Committee to the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee.
3. Move Youth Service from Children & Education Scrutiny committee to Adults & Communities Scrutiny Committee.

(d) Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Additional Council Meeting

At its meeting on 1 October 2019, the Constitution and Ethics Committee received a report to consider additional meetings of Full Council.

Councillor Seaton introduced the report and moved the recommendations. He outlined the proposal and advised that Group Leaders and Senior Management had been consulted on the benefit of an additional meeting of Full Council and the consensus was that an additional meeting in the weeks following annual council would be most appropriate.

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

Council debated the amendment and notes that the meetings scheduled in February and May had the potential to coincide with school holidays which could impact the number of Members available to attend meetings.

A vote was taken (unanimous) and it was **RESOLVED** that Council agreed to the introduction of an additional Full Council meeting to be held two weeks following the Annual Council meeting, in order to consider questions, motions and any other business.

41. 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 decisions from the Cabinet meeting held on 23 September 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

Peterborough Housing Strategy

Councillor Murphy asked what the outcome was of the application for a Housing Revenue Account.

Councillor Holdich advised that to date no response had been received.

The Future of the Northminster (Market) Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP)

Councillor Iqbal asked why, if the waive of call-in was revoked in the interests of public safety, why had this concern not been extended to those still occupying the premises and that although the reports carried out stated there had been a lack of maintenance on the car park, no immediate concerns had been raised.

Councillor Holdich referred to Councillor Hiller who advised that the decision centred on immediate public safety concerns due to the poor structural integrity of the building. The recommendation on the report was to cease use of the public car park immediately to relieve the live load impact, the vibration caused by vehicle movement. Discussions regarding current occupiers underneath the car park and were nearing conclusion.

Councillor Ash asked for an update on relocating the existing business.

Councillor Hiller re-assured Council that officers were engaged in consultation with the users of the units and where alternate accommodation was appropriate. Measures were being taken to mitigate any financial implications.

Councillor Wiggin asked why the decision to close the car park was not taken earlier if public safety were such an issue.

Councillor Holdich responded that he was responsible for the delay as, upon receipt of the first report, he had asked for a second opinion.

Councillor Jones asked how many other buildings were built in the city using the same construction to which Councillor Hiller responded there were none.

Councillor Haynes asked why the car park was not demolished earlier, given that previous reports questioned the life span of the car park if remedial works were not carried out and these appeared to cease after 2012. She asked how the life span of the car park had been affected by the lack of remedial maintenance.

Councillor Holdich advised that he was unable to comment at this time as an investigation was currently taking place.

Funding of Inform, Advice and Guidance Services within the Voluntary Sector.

Councillor Murphy asked about the decision to freeze the budget allocated to Kingsgate Community Church and that £25,000 had been added for the supply of white goods. The council had now provided Kingsgate Community Church with a redundant building, relieving them of the burden of paying rent. Why therefore had they been allocated additional money to manage this project and could the decision be revisited or reversed.

Councillor Seaton agreed to investigate and report back to Councillor Murphy.

Award the new contract for Multi-Functional Devices as well as Print equipment across variety of council's sites

Councillor Hogg asked why there was a need for special urgency procedures on the Multi-Function Devices (MDF) printing equipment decision as the renewal date for the contract would have been known well in advance.

Councillor Sandford stated it had been known for a while that the existing contract was due to expire and by invoking the special urgency procedure, the scrutiny function had been removed which was an abuse of the council's constitution.

Councillor Farooq advised that the contract was changed as it was cheaper and better value for money.

The Future of the Northminster (Market) Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP)

Councillor Barkham enquired after the future plans for the market.

Councillor Hiller advised this information was contained in the Local Plan.

National Child Measurement Programme Contract - delegation of function to Cambridgeshire County Council

Councillor Qayyum asked if there would be equal division of funding between Peterborough and Cambridgeshire, given the diverse health needs and would service be equally delivered.

Councillor Fitzgerald advised that the council had to fulfil its statutory obligation to public health in both regions and he would be happy to go into more detail together with the Director of Public Health if there were specific matters causing concern.

Discretionary Rate Relief for charities and similar organisations not established for profit and rural business.

Councillor Murphy asked why 100% discretionary rate relief had been given to the Community Radio in Orton when no-one else was entitled to this level of relief.

Councillor Seaton disputed that no-one else had 100% relief and gave Railworld and Salem Radio as examples. He advised that all charities were automatically entitled to 80% relief and could then apply for an additional 20%. Councillor Seaton offered to meet with Councillor Murphy and discuss this particular case if required.

Later in the meeting, Councillor Seaton advised council that there were two occasions where 100% rate relief had been granted to not for profit organisations, two received 100% relief and one received 50%. Many community associations also received full rate relief.

42. 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 meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 29 July 2019.
2. Decisions from the meeting of the Combined Authority Board held on 31 July 2019.
3. Decisions from the meeting of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 19 July 2019.

Questions were asked regarding the following:

Overview & Scrutiny Committee - 29th July 2019

Councillor Wiggin asked if Peterborough was fully represented at the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 29th July 2019 as Councillor Murphy had sent his apologies.

Councillor Cole advised Council he attended the meeting.

Cambridge Autonomous Metro - July 2019

Councillor Sandford asked what benefit the Cambridge Autonomous Metro would bring to the people of Peterborough and would the network would be extended to Peterborough and if so, when that would be.

Councillor Holdich advised that this scheme would be privately funded and as the business plan showed it was commercially viable, the costs would be redeemed. Councillor Holdich also advised that the Combined Authority (CA) Mayor had announced he was considering extending the metro to the new offices at Alconbury and through the villages to Peterborough. Another transport scheme under consideration to provide a light rail, rapid transport system had been included in the Transport Plan. The feasibility study for that would be funded by the CA.

Councillor Wiggin asked when plans for the extension to the network would be available and when would Ward Councillors be advised.

Councillor Holdich replied that once the Transport Plan had been agreed, the proposal would be open to scrutiny.

Reports

Councillor Murphy expressed concern that the latest reports from the CA on Thomas Cook and the Housing Revenue Account, Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Audit Committee meetings had not been received. He asked if committee reports would be shared with Members now the decision had been taken to devolve budgets and decisions to committees.

Councillor Holdich agreed to find out the new process. The Monitoring Officer advised Council that the papers referred to had not arrived in time to be included for this meeting and would form part of the next agenda.

Peterborough University

Councillor Murphy also asked for an update on the bidding process for the university and who would be providing the university in Peterborough.

Councillor Holdich responded that the plans for the university were proceeding well and on time and the update meeting was scheduled for 17 October 2019.

COUNCIL BUSINESS TIME

43. Notices of Motion

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

1. Motion from Councillor Walsh

Councillor Walsh did not move her motion regarding the adoption of the definition of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) and made a short statement advising members that the Council would work to find a way to comply which respects the rights and dignities of the whole community.

2. Motion from Councillor Murphy

Councillor Murphy presented an altered motion relating to pay for local government workers, details of which were included in the additional information pack.

A vote was taken on whether to permit Councillor Murphy to move his altered motion (28 voted in favour, 27 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

It was **RESOLVED** that Councillor Murphy would be permitted to move his altered motion.

Councillor Murphy moved his motion to support the pay claim submitted by Unite, GMB and Unison on behalf of council and school workers for a £10 per hour minimum hourly rate along with a 10% uplift across all pay points in 2020-21. The amendment was to add that the increase should be wholly funded by central government. He advised Council that those who provided public services and those working for private companies on behalf of the local authority should be paid a reasonable wage. Wages paid in Peterborough were considered low in comparison to neighbouring areas and those on lower pay would benefit the most. The proposed increase was in alignment with the anti-poverty strategy. Funding would come from Central Government avoiding further strain on local financial resources.

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

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

- Peterborough City Council (PCC) operated under national joint terms and conditions and were bound by national negotiation.
- Staff were supported in non-monetary ways such as consideration to their wellbeing and work life balance and were provided with access to a pension scheme.
- Higher than average pay awards had been granted to the lowest paid within the council and the lowest hourly rate currently was £9.00 for all ages.
- Pay increases would impact on schools and other services.
- All councillors had been asked to work with the Local Government Association (LGA) and not pre-empt the outcome of such discussions and it would be wrong to discuss this motion and undermine the LGA national negotiations.
- The cost of this motion would be about £4.4million and would use all the funding expected from central government.
- Should central government receive a request to fund a pay award it would be considered alongside other claims such as those for community care and adult social care.
- Councillors expressed sympathy for an increase in the minimum wage to £10.00 per hour however they were less inclined to support a 10% uplift across all pay levels. This would be four times the recent award granted to the Police Force.

- A reduction in frontline services would be required in order to finance the pay award.
- Pay awards granted to local authority workers would also include teachers and NHS staff.
- Residents would not consider a staff pay rise as a priority over social care, the elderly and looked after children.
- The motion was asking for central government to fund the pay award, not the local authority.
- The motion was aimed to support local government workers and recognise they should receive more pay.
- Members would like to pay staff more however the only way to fund this would be to increase taxation which would not be popular.
- High increases in taxation could result in highly qualified people leaving this country as has happened in the past.
- Members stated several times that staff worked hard and were much appreciated.
- Members would like to support the motion but felt it was unachievable and unlikely to be supported by the government and time spent on this idea would be time lost which could have been spent on other matters.
- Public sector workers have had wage rises below inflation over several years resulting in the use of food banks and struggling to pay bills and claim benefits and having more than one job.
- Members would not want to see council staff using food banks.
- Some people had two or three jobs and were still struggling to make ends meet.
- Members were advised by the Leader that historically, a wage increase explosion lead to inflation, which then lead to job cuts.

Councillor Jamil exercised his right to speak and stated that the people who would be affected by the proposed pay award were those who were finding it difficult to make ends meet. He considered the motion an extension of the campaign Stand Up for Peterborough and felt the Council should be able to write to the government to make this request.

Councillor Murphy summed up and thanked Members for their contributions to the debate. He congratulated PCC for being the third fairest tax council in the county. He explained that school performance was decreasing, at 11 or 12 children were underperforming by a year and this was due to there being more poor children going to school hungry and this motion was about avoiding people living in poverty by increasing wages. If the pay award was funded centrally there would be no requirement to reduce local services .

A vote was taken on the altered motion relating to local government workers (17 voted in favour, 36 voted against, 2 abstained from voting).

Councillor For: Ali, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Hemraj, Howell, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Skibsted, Yasin

Councillor Against: Aitken, Allen, Barkham, Bashir, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Farooq, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Haynes, Hiller, Hogg, Holdich, Howard, Azher Iqbal, Lamb, Lane, Gul Nawaz, Over, Rush, Sandford, Seaton, Shaheed, Simons, Walsh, Warren, Wiggin

Councillors Abstaining: Ash, Lillis

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

3. Motion from Councillor Sandford

In moving the motion on leaving the European Union without a deal, Councillor Sandford advised that a no-deal Brexit would not be in the best interests for the people and business of Peterborough and those across the UK. A recent study had shown that the movement of people and goods between the UK and EU had declined by more than 12% and hospitals were already seeing a shortage of nursing staff as EU nationals returned to their original countries and there could also be disruptions in goods and services. He felt that a no deal Brexit must be avoided at all costs.

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

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

- Various updates were being forecast by the media on when the Brexit deal will be signed.
- Members of Parliament should have been voting in the best interests of the country.
- It appeared that, should a deal which was in the best interests of the EU and the UK be forthcoming, it was unlikely opposition parties would vote in support
- It was suggested that the Opposition should be writing to their own leaders to ask for them to support the Brexit deal.
- The motion was unnecessary as the request was already enforceable by an Act of Parliament.
- There was no risk associated with Brexit, only opportunity.
- Brexit had been disruptive to families and friendships across political parties however the country should honour the results of the referendum and it was not a decision that PCC should be involved in.
- 62.1% of voters in Peterborough voted to leave the EU.
- The Peterborough MP appeared to have sought to thwart the majority view of the people in this city who elected her.
- The economies in other European countries had improved and could be the reason why Europeans are returning to their own country.
- Discussion took place on which flags had been on display in the Chamber.

Council Barkham exercised his right to speak and advised Members the letter was about getting a deal finalised.

Councillor Sandford summed up and responded to some of the points made. He explained the motion did not mention stopping Brexit or having a people's vote but concerned a no deal Brexit. There was no certainty that any decision made regarding leaving or staying within the European Union (EU) would be taken soon but the only way to find out what the people want was to hold another referendum in the interests of democracy.

A vote was taken on the motion relating to Brexit negotiations (25 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 1 abstained from voting).

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

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

4. Motion from Councillor Sandford

Councillor Sandford addressed the Council to explain his motion on the draft Combined Authority Local Transport Plan in relation to the Council's commitment earlier this year to the climate change emergency. He advised that transport was one way the local authority could influence climate change however he had been unable to find reference within the report to meeting the carbon emissions targets within the councils adopted time frame. Most elements of the plan associated with Peterborough concerned road schemes while those for Cambridgeshire related more to sustainable transport systems.

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

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

- Travelling by train from Peterborough to Wisbech would be via the Cambridge line, changing at March.
- The current LTP is still in draft form.
- PCC's response to the draft LTP had included most of the items contained within the motion and promoted the Council's view on climate change.
- Local residents wanted to improve traffic movement around the city.
- Road repairs and improvements were carried out to meet traffic demand.
- Well maintained roads reduced traffic congestion thereby reducing CO² emissions and other particulates.
- Members were advised that Peterborough had the fastest commute time of any city in the UK.
- Group Leaders could influence a shift towards sustainable transport and lead by example.
- The Council has already submitted a response and recommendations to the CA draft LTP.
- The public transport within the city was inadequate.
- Members welcomed the idea that the Cambridge Autonomous Metro could be extended to Peterborough however it was not included in the LTP and no proposed routes were yet available.
- Cambridge city needed to reduce the current significant level of pollution which was worse than that in Peterborough.
- Traffic flow through Cambridge was extremely difficult.
- Peterborough was designed around as a vehicle city with parkways around and through the city.

- The phasing out of diesel cars and a greater prominence of electric cars would have a significant impact on CO² emissions.
- As a combined authority, the most serious problems needed to be addressed first.
- Discussions took place on which reports had been sent to Group Leaders and in what time frame.
- Improved public transport was needed in Peterborough in conjunction with new housing developments to support growth to prevent future problems. The new development for Haddon was cited as being close to the A1 which could influence the use of cars rather than public transport.
- There was only one station within Peterborough and re-opening the old stations could be considered. Although the East Coast Line was busy, there existed another line alongside.
- Lincolnshire Council had sponsored the re-opening of the Peterborough / Spalding line.
- A park and ride facility to the station could be considered.
- The improvements made in rail services would help residents commuting outside Peterborough but would not help movement within the city..
- The Strategic Bus Review could include bus franchising to provide an un-privatised bus service such as in London to improve the current service
- The current bus service was considered to be lacking.
- All bus journeys made crossing the city passed through the city centre.
- Discussions took place on the time taken to cross the city by bus and car.
- The motion did not include specific requirements for Peterborough and Members were invited to put forward significant proposals to either to officers or Councillor Hiller which could then be considered for inclusion in the final report.
- Although alternative transport proposals had been prepared, those not shared with the Leader could not be supported by him.
- To call Peterborough a car city was seen as demonstrating a lack of vision and drive for improvement.
- Changed made in driving habits in Peterborough would have little significance on the changes that needed to be made.
- With 82% of the population living in cities, some members felt that climate change measures should start in the cities.
- As national government was not doing enough to address climate change, it was up to the cities themselves to make a start.
- It would be difficult to stop people driving cars and if that were to happen there would be a heavy impact of employment.
- Green energy and electric cars should be encouraged in the city, making it easier for people to convert from petrol and diesel.
- Of the cities in the UK, Peterborough had the highest number of solar panels and this could be increased on homes and car parks.
- 3.5MW of electricity were being produced in the city from green waste and this maybe increased an additional green power plant being located in the city.

At this point, the Director of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer reminded Members of the meeting protocols and requested they abide by them.

Councillor Holdich then moved to proceed directly to the vote without further debate which was seconded by Councillor Fitzgerald.

Councillor Day exercised her right to speak in support of the motion. She explained that she felt the LTP should be aligned with the Council's commitment to be net zero carbon by 2030 which it currently does not although she acknowledged that this was only the

draft and could be subject to change. Increased road building would lead to increased car use and in the future people would have to forgo their cars to protect the children. The car should not remain the key mode of transport and the LTP should be working towards fewer cars on the roads and cited Amsterdam as an example of how transports modes can be changed. Key projects within the LTP included 10 / 11 major road schemes but only 3 cycling / walking schemes. Electric cars needed to be powered by green energy to be effective in reducing emissions.

Councillor Sandford summed as mover of the motion. He expressed that it was his wish that people should have a choice in which method of transport they used and excellent public transport and cycleway systems would support this. He reminded Members that the Council had, at it's meeting in July, voted to accept the target of zero carbon by 2030 rather than adopt the government target of 2050. He advised Members that electric cars were only as green as the energy used to power them and over 50% of energy was generated from fossils fuels. There had been an increase in the number of people cycling in Cambridge.

A vote was taken on the motion relating to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan consultation (26 voted in favour, 28 voted against, 0 abstained from voting).

Councillor For: Ali, Ash, Barkham, Sandra Bond, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Fower, Haynes, Hemraj, Hogg, Howell, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Jones, Joseph, Lillis, Murphy, Shaz Nawaz, Qayyum, Robinson, Sandford, Shaheed, Skibsted, Wiggin, Yasin

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

Councillors Abstaining: Nil

Councillors Not Voting: Nil

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

The Mayor announced that, in accordance with Council Standing Order 14.2, the Meeting would end in 15 minutes and invited members to propose a motion to extend the Meeting.

The motion was proposed by Councillor Hogg and seconded by Councillor Haynes.

The vote was taken on whether the meeting should be extended and the results were 8 in favour, 44 against and 1 abstentions. The motion was therefore **DEFEATED**.

Councillor For: Barkham, Sandra Bond, Haynes, Hogg, Lillis, Sandford, Shaheed, Wiggin

Councillor Against: Aitken, Ali, Allen, Ash, Bashir, Bisby, Brown, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Louise Coles, Andy Coles, Day, Dowson, Ellis, Farooq, Fitzgerald, Fower, John Fox, Goodwin, Harper, Hemraj, Hiller, Holdich, Howard, Howell, Amjad Iqbal, Azher Iqbal, Jamil, Joseph, Lamb, Lane, Shaz Nawaz, Gul Nawaz, Over, Qayyum, Robinson, Seaton, Simons, Skibsted, Walsh, Warren, Yasin

Councillors Abstaining: Jones

Councillors Not Voting: Murphy

5. Motion from Councillor Qayyum

This motion was not moved and there was no debate.

6. Motion from Councillor Hogg

Councillor Hogg moved his motion regarding the use of the land known as Tenter Hill Meadows. He explained that residents wanted security over the future of this open land which had been reviewed by the planning committee and the planning inspector and both had agreed that the open space provision in Stanground was such that building should not be allowed on this site. There was high density housing in Stanground and a shortage of open spaces. The area was used by many including local scout groups.

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

Council debated the motion and expressed support for keeping the open space protected for public enjoyment, to support local residents and take note of their views and petitions.

Councillor Haynes exercised her right to speak and advised Members that Stanground had a deficit of 13.8 acres of open space and to ignore the benefits on mental and physical health and improved well-being was short-sighted. Although it was unlikely a new planning application could meet the requirements to allow building, local residents felt they had been ignored and she urged members to support this motion to retain the land, which had been gifted to the people of Peterborough, as an open space.

Councillor Hogg summed up and thanked colleagues for support. He felt that Ward Councillors had supported the residents and he felt that this motion would provide the protection the residents had requested.

A vote was taken on the motion relating to the protection of Tenter Hill from development (unanimous) and the motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

“Council notes:

Medesham Homes applied for planning permission to build 20 homes on Tenter Hill Meadows. Residents in Stanground and across the wider area of Peterborough came together to fight this development. The application was called in by local ward councillors and the Planning Committee came to the conclusion to reject the planning application.

Medesham Homes then sought to appeal this decision with the Planning Inspectorate. Residents put together a petition of over 3,500 signatures to get the Council to use their co-ownership of Medesham Homes to withdraw this appeal. This showed the depth and breadth of feeling that Tenter Hill should be protected and continued to be enjoyed by the people of Peterborough. This land had previously been common land for the enjoyment of the people of Stanground, but was transferred into the ownership of Peterborough City Council due to changes in the Land Registry.

The planning inspectorate has now delivered their decision in this regard and has rejected the appeal. This land had been in the Local Plan for possible development but now the new Local Plan has been adopted this is no longer the case. So there is now even less likelihood of an alternative development being allowed going forward.

The people of Stanground, however, need firm assurance for Peterborough City Council that Tenter Hill Meadows is now safe from the threat of development.

This council, therefore, resolves to:

Consider all suitable mechanisms, such as designation as a town/village green or as an area of local green space, which would protect this land from development in order to ensure that the residents of Peterborough are able to enjoy the open space provided by the land for all generations to come.”

The Mayor
6:30pm – 10:40pm
16 October 2019
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough

FULL COUNCIL 16 OCTOBER 2019

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	None received.

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 Hogg

To Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation

Regarding the council's decision to stop using the My Peterborough app, has the council taken steps to contact users of the app to:

- 1) Explain that the app was no longer being used.
- 2) What plans the council have for replacement of the app.
- 3) What options are available to residents wanting to report issues to the council going forward.

Councillor Farooq responded:

Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank Councillor Hogg for asking the question. In April we made members of the public aware that the Peterborough reporting app was no longer in use and we communicated this by using other social media and our website.

We also advised that whilst a replacement tool was being developed, reports that people would have made using the app could be made on the council's website on www.peterborough.gov.uk/report

I am pleased to inform you today that the final phase of user acceptance test on Fix My Street is going live soon. The functionality test has been taken place on highways within a matter of weeks, further functionality on tree maintenance and fly-tipping will take place.

This new app is much more efficient than the former MyPeterborough app as it will link directly to the council's reporting systems and negate the need of the same information to be input into the system twice which was a drawback of the functionality of the MyPeterborough app. Thank you.

Councillor Hogg asked a follow up question:

Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you very much for your answer. I understand that people's email address' were reported in the App, so why did we not email users to give them this information?

Councillor Farooq responded:

	<p>Thank you, Councillor Hogg, for the question. We tend to use the normal communication channels to report back to other residents which are the social media and our website. Thank you.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Joseph</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>We are told that that planning applications by developers should contain a minimum of 30% affordable homes, and yet latest figures provided to us by officers indicate that the average is around 14%. Why is the council consistently failing to deliver on these numbers?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Yes, Mr Mayor and I thank Councillor Joseph for the question. The reality Councillor Joseph is the headline percentage you cite for the provision of affordable housing is not actually the blanket requirement for all housing development applications in Peterborough. As a valued former member of the planning committee your Group Leader Councillor Nawaz will be aware that we are virtually compliant with all of our delivery of affordable housing as a percentage of eligible consents. The default position of this Council is that we can and will seek the delivery of policy compliant 30% levels of affordable housing but of course only on those developments where the policy takes effect. You might not be aware Councillor Joseph that the Planning Policy of seeking 30% affordable housing provision can't be applied to all housing developments we approve as your group's current, long standing and experienced planning committee member Councillor Iqbal I am sure would have told you if indeed asked him.</p> <p>The 14% figure you cite doesn't take into account these and other limitations, so it is simply not true for you to suggest that this council is somehow failing in its duty to endeavour to provide the correct level of affordable housing. Indeed, albeit with a far worse temporary accommodation and homelessness situation than Peterborough, Labour and Liberal democrat-controlled Milton Keynes has a virtually identical approach as you'll find if you read there Affordable Housing DPD (<i>Development Plan Document</i>) 2019.</p> <p>Looking at sites that have come forward Councillor Joseph, in Peterborough where the affordable housing policy can be applied, since 2014 and 15 we have in fact achieved nearly 30% affordable provision in a very challenging housing market.</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Joseph asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you Councillor Hiller for your in-depth response as always. Can you tell me how often it is we are falling short on certain developments of the affordable homes target as in outside developers not in the ones for joint venture with people such as Medesham Homes?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you for the follow you question. I am not sure you listened to my original answer. Actually. But what I can tell you is that for example we can't seek affordable houses in cases where the development is under 15 units or the site benefits from the government's vacant building credit regime or the development has come forward under the government's prior notification system. I have to say to both you and all members that those few and far between sites where we have been unable to deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing due and proper regard had to be and indeed was given to the development viability and of course the council's general housing delivery target as both you labour group policy aware colleagues I mentioned before will surely agree and indeed I'm sure you yourself will agree Councillor Joseph it is far better to have some affordable housing than none at all which would certainly be the case if planning consent was refused on those few occasions. Thank you.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</p> <p>To Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm how much it has cost the taxpayer for unused phones in the council over the last twelve months?</p> <p>Councillor Farooq responded:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you Councillor Nawaz.</p> <p>To allow staff to work in a different way, without dedicated desks or offices following the relocation to Sand Martin House, in the process releasing £300,000 worth of savings, they were supplied with necessary equipment to work more flexibly, including laptops and mobile phones. This August, a year on from the move, we have carried out the stocktake and identified further savings.</p> <p>The council has now completed its review - contacting 199 Peterborough City Council staff who had been allocated phones, identified as being unused or rarely used in the past two months. Out of this, 128 of these phone numbers are confirmed as no longer needed, and contracts have been cancelled at no cost to the city council. 59 staff who used phones very infrequently have been asked if a phone remains essential to their job, or if their number could be reallocated to new staff as they join the organisation, or cancelled. 12 phones are needed for emergency purposes, for staff members on long term sick or maternity leave. 38 phones were identified as allocated to other organisations such as Serco, Vivacity or Aragon. As their costs are recharged in full, Peterborough City Council has passed this information on to the partners concerned.</p> <p>The cost of 128 phone contracts is £1,755.89 per month. I hope that is useful information, thank you.</p> <p>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a follow up question:</p> <p>I do and thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Farooq for your response. In view of the fact that we have a large number of unused phones, what changes have you implemented to our systems and process' to ensure we are making best use of taxpayer's monies?</p> <p>Councillor Farooq responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you, Councillor Nawaz. As far as the telephones is concerned, as a businessman Councillor Nawaz, you are fully aware that for a business and individual to function efficiently, they need all the tools to achieve this. But coming away from that we are reviewing all the process', all the resources whether it is human resources or whether it's IT and ensuring they're used optimally and get full benefit out of them.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene, and the Environment</p> <p>According to the State of Nature 2019 report produced in the past few weeks by the National Biodiversity Network., the UK's wildlife continues to decline with many species of animals and plants facing serious declines in numbers and some facing imminent extinction.</p> <p>The latest findings show that since rigorous scientific monitoring began in the 1970s there has been a 13% decline in average abundance across wildlife studied and that the declines continue unabated. Notably, the 2019 report found that no real improvements had been made since the equivalent 2016 report.</p> <p>Many councils across the country (including in our area Cambridge City Council) have recently declared a biodiversity emergency but, so far, Peterborough has not. However, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough combined has one of the lowest percentages in the country of land classed as priority habitats (only 6.5% of the land area) and one of the lowest percentages of woodland cover in the country (less than 5% of land area).</p> <p>Given that Peterborough aspires to be the Environment Capital of the UK, could the relevant cabinet member tell me what our Council is doing to protect and encourage wildlife in Peterborough?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you for the question Councillor Sandford. Very important issue.</p> <p>I also note with concern the recent State of Nature 2019 report, and welcome the report being brought to the attention of Full Council. I recommend to all Councillors that they find the time to read it.</p> <p>I would like to remind Members, however, that this Council has for many years recognised the value of a healthy and biodiverse environment.</p> <p>For example, unlike many of our neighbouring councils, Peterborough has both a Biodiversity Strategy and a Tree and Woodland Strategy, both adopted by this Council only a matter of months ago, as Councillor Sandford knows. These play a fundamental role in decision making and delivery of our services. In addition, the Council has recently adopted a Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document which provide detailed guidance for developers to maximise ecological gain.</p> <p>Only in July, the Leader of this Council in his role at the Combined Authority endorsed the Local Nature Partnership vision of 'doubling land for nature'.</p>

	<p>I therefore can confidentially say that this Council, and our Leader, is at the forefront of activity putting in place measures to boost biodiversity in our area. Thank you Councillor, thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Sandford asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes, I do Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Cereste for that reply. I think most people accept that there is a biodiversity emergency in Britain and the planet and the general recognition that it is only by adopting a landscape scale approach can that be addressed effectively. He refers to the biodiversity strategy that actually goes back to 2002 and it designated eight areas of council land that would be managed for biodiversity, but it also said that that was supposed to be an approach that would be rolled out across Peterborough. Now since then nothing has happened in respect of council property so would he accept that we don't just need a to have strategies, we need to have actions to ensure those strategies are actually implemented.</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor. No, I wouldn't.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Holdich, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Deputy Mayor for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority</p> <p>Will you please provide names and details of how much has been paid to Conservative councillors in special responsibility allowance as Cabinet Members, advisers and any other payments including as representatives on outside bodies and can you tell Council today what does this grand total amount to since you became council leader</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>Mr Mayor, all this information is readily available on the website and is published by this authority every year. So, I suggest, that instead of wasting officers time, you look it up Councillor Murphy.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yeah. Is over £1.6m you've paid your cronies since you became Leader, in allowances?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>I think that's quite a disgraceful thing and it's not true.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Day</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Growth Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>The East of England Arena and Events Centre, which is situated in my ward of Orton Waterville, is a regional events and exhibitions venue which attracts 800,000 visitors every year. It hosts over 400 events, including national trade shows, exhibitions,</p>

	<p>conferences, and meetings. B2B event organisers choose the venue because of the regional market opportunities on offer, as well as the venue's strategic position at the gateway to the eastern region of the UK. In addition, the venue hosts a high number of B2C events including music concerts, festivals and comedy.</p> <p>The venue generates a significant amount of revenue for the city and for local businesses and offers employment to local people. It is home to some of the UK's largest events including: Truckfest (40,000 visitors), Motorhomes (20,000 visitors), New Wine (24,000 visitors), Plantworx /Railworx (13,000 visitors).</p> <p>The venue has quadrupled the number of events held and annually since 2017 - 2019 and generates a turnover of circa £3million. The profits from the events business are gifted back to the charity that owns it, the East of England Agricultural Society. The arena team works in partnership with the NEC in Birmingham and possesses the skills, knowledge and capacity to run large scale events.</p> <p>If the current Showground site is redeveloped (in accordance with policy LP36 of the Local Plan) will the Cabinet Member confirm that Peterborough City Council would support the provision of an equivalent arena in Peterborough?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>I would be happy to. Thank for the question Councillor Day and without wishing to be anything but helpful, you quote lots of facts and figures but appear to have misinterpreted the Local Plan in this regard.</p> <p>The Council's cross party Approved Local Plan does not envisage or indeed promote the showground moving from its present location as your question implies, though some redevelopment for housing and other matters on surplus parts of the site is, the Local Plan confirms, considered acceptable. Mr Mayor, it would be inappropriate I think, for either myself Councillor Day, or indeed this Full Council, to speculate on what proposals will come forward, and whether any such proposals require consideration of any relocation of the showground. Any such proposals will no doubt be carefully considered in due course by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee. Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Day.</p> <p>There was no follow up question.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor Ash</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>The roadworks throughout the city particularly at rhubarb bridge are having an impact on road safety and ease of movement and from what I hear is deterring people from wanting to enter the city. Is the cabinet member aware of any adverse impact on trading and is he able to tell us when the tremendous delays at Rhubarb bridge will ease. We are often told that the average peak hour speed on our roads is quite good however we have been quoted figures for the entire authority area does he have figures which show traffic density and average speed within the central part of the city?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p>

	<p>Yes Mr Mayor of course I would and I thank Councillor Ash for his question. We accept that these network improvement works have been disruptive to motorists and local businesses, but I have to say this isn't unusual on a scheme of this size, complexity and indeed location. What I don't accept however Mr Mayor is Councillor Ash's assertion that the capacity increase works here have had an impact on road safety. I have seen no evidence to support that. Although the public liaison officer working on this project has received several informal and anecdotal complaints from the business at the retail park I am not aware of any formal complaints received by the council directly from either by members of the public or indeed business. Be aware Councillor Ash, that we have taken the decision to suspend the works from mid-November in advance of the Christmas trading period, with works recommencing in the New Year.</p> <p>Turning to your last point, traffic density data is indeed regularly collected across our city using three different sources and I can provide you with information specifically relating to Junction 18 for the duration of the scheme if you want me to.</p> <p>Councillor Ash asked a supplementary question:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, yes. I thank him for agreeing to give me information, that'll be very interesting. But I have tried to find out the travel speed within the city centre and I've yet been able to find out those figures from various sources within the council. But he tells me that there have been no traffic safety issues but I have witnessed, or I won't say witnessed, seen people try and dodge in and out of various lanes and change over at quite dangerous places and there have been delays due to rear shunts which I have seen the aftermath of. So that does happen so can I ask him, is he able to obtain any information on that score?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you for that follow up question Councillor Ash. Unfortunately, as you'll be well aware as an experienced councillor, road traffic accident information isn't available unless it's a road traffic accident and it's been reported. Anecdotal, lane dogging, weaving to be fair Councillor Ash I guess that happens in most cities across the UK but I'm not making light of any issues we may very well have at the Junction 18 Rhubarb Bridge enlargement work, capacity increase works but I don't see it myself and I've travelled round that roundabout many times and I think lane discipline is something we have to adhere to. If people don't then they do create the potential hazard. With regard to the traffic data I mentioned in my first response that we do have three sources of traffic data. We have the TomTom data set, this provides information on average speeds in every road within the Peterborough unitary area, and this data has informed various studies over the years and identified congestion hotspots and future transport schemes, we use it regularly at Peterborough Highway Services, we have the traffic master data, which is similar to the TomTom dataset, but it is predominantly delivered to fleet vehicle operators and this is updated on a quarterly basis and is used for similar purposes and we have the PTM4 surveys which we use a lot here and we've regularly undertaken a very comprehensive program of traffic surveys, over 140 locations within Peterborough. As I say any of that information I'm sure can be passed on to you if you can be specific I would endeavour to do my best to make sure that you get it. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Howell</p> <p>To Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene, and the Environment</p>

Fly-tipping is a criminal offence punishable by a fine of up to £50,000 or 12 months' imprisonment if convicted in a Magistrates' Court. On Tuesday 8th October it was reported in the Peterborough Telegraph that a Peterborough man who pleaded guilty to fly-tipping household and builders' waste at three sites around the city was ordered to pay compensation of a mere £212.53, costs of £400, and to carry out 150 hours of unpaid work. Following sentencing the individual has apparently taken to social media to make remarks that suggest a lack of remorse. Keep Britain Tidy claims that low fines act as a financial incentive to criminal fly-tippers. Furthermore, fly-tipping in our city comes at a great cost to the council, not just in terms of clearing up the mess, but in pursuing cases of criminal fly-tipping. This is an unfair financial burden on the council that comes at a time when savings are urgently needed. Will Peterborough City Council do as the Local Government Association has done and make a representation to the Government to review its guidance to the courts to ensure that tougher sentences are imposed that will actually deter this form of environmental crime?

Councillor Cereste responded:

Thank you, Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Howell. I think that fly-tipping is an awful thing to do. I was driving, I came out of my nursery car park the other day, driving to Bamber Street there on the right hand side in a parking bay somebody in a van was unloading all of their rubbish onto the grass verge by the side of the car parking. And, when I, you imagine of course, I stopped, and went back and started taking photographs, and that person got out of the van, back onto the grass verge and loaded his van up again and then drove off. What I should have done was passed those photographs on to the enforcement team but unfortunately, I didn't get the cars, the vans registration number. But you know, it's not just a question of you know, of wide reaching economic, social and environmental consequences. It is actually illegal. And what is even worse, we all know as good councillors, whatever side you happen to be on, we all have the community as our best interest and that's why we serve as councillors, if this fly-tipping costs us and the cross party group said some numbers in their report, between (£)1/4million and (£)3/4million a year, just think about it, never mind the money, the money is bad enough but just think of all the care packages for people who are vulnerable and needy, extra care packages that we can provide if we've got the extra money. So they're not just doing the environment in, they're doing our friends in, they're doing the people that we have responsibility and we as a council have got absolutely got to do everything we possibly can to promote the idea that fly-tipping is anti-social as well as illegal. Now, as a council, we've got to thank the government for giving us the powers now so that we can start fining people, but again, the maximum we can fine on the spot is £300.00. It probably costs us £500.00 or more to remove the rubbish. I've just had it done to me, it's a property that I own, and it's cost me £4500.00 to get it moved. Imagine what it's costing a lot of the other private people in the city, never mind the council as well. So, you know, fine that the courts are allowed to fine up to £50,000 and they can give them, I think it's a year imprisonment, and they can actually confiscate the vehicle I believe, so we should be pushing for all of this to happen. Now the legal people have told me I shouldn't comment on individual cases or the rationale behind the sentence that you....(following an interjection by the Mayor) I've run out of time, never mind, I thought I would make it interesting Mr Mayor. I'll sit down.

Councillor Howell asked a follow up question:

Thank you very much Councillor Cereste. I'm sorry you were cut short as I was enjoying what you were saying, so thank you for that. Yes, I guess what I would like to ask is

	<p>them is there anything further we can do as ward councillors to support our colleagues in enforcement so that they can issue more of those fines I think a really are needed?</p> <p>Councillor Cereste responded:</p> <p>I can finish now can I Mr Mayor. Thank you very much for the supplementary. Yes, I mean, all of us should be doing it. The council itself will be hoping to organise various meetings with the judiciary and see if we can explain how difficult it is for our community and perhaps the fines should actually tally with the crimes. Now I was told I wasn't supposed to mention the individual case or the rationale behind the sentencing, I won't. But if I was the judge, they would have been a lot higher than they got. How can you find somebody whatever it is when the costs are even more than the fine, it doesn't make sense? Thank you very much.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</p> <p>To Councillor Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation</p> <p>How much rent in total has the council paid Stef and Phillips for St Michael's Gate during their ownership of the properties?</p> <p>Councillor Allen responded:</p> <p>Yes indeed, thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Nawaz for the question. The council, what was that? Bells ringing near me, sorry. The council made the difficult decision almost 3 years ago to lease accommodation at St Michael's Gate after being approached by Stef and Philips managing agents on behalf of Paul Simon Magic Homes who had acquired the properties. The estate provides 83 units of self-contained accommodation which we have been able to use for homeless households.</p> <p>Since taking on the lease at the end of 2016, the council has paid a total of £2.3m to Stef and Philips.</p> <p>It is important to note that, if the council did not have access to this accommodation and had to rely instead on bed and breakfast provision, the cost in rent for one year alone would have been in excess of £1.6m, and so the arrangement at St Michael's Gate has prevented the council from spending in the region of £2.5m, as well as providing self-contained accommodation for homeless households.</p> <p>And of course, the good news story, is that during the time that the council has leased St Michael's Gate, 380 households have been successfully moved through St Michael's Gate into permanent housing. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Shaz Nawaz asked a follow up question:</p> <p>I do Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Allen for your response. You were quoted in the Peterborough Telegraph on 4th October this year saying if we hadn't purchased them, them as in St Michael's Gate, and someone else had, they may not have leased it to us, which is a fair point. But my question is why did we not use the provision of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 to provide security of tenure to us through that current lease?</p> <p>Councillor Allen responded:</p>

	<p>I didn't quite get the gist of what you are saying, but what I will reiterate is the important things. The purchase price is a commercial decision, calculated as being the best option to PCC (<i>Peterborough City Council</i>) and council taxpayers. We need the properties to fulfil a real and present demand on provision of accommodation to ameliorate the homeless crisis in this city. We saved circa £500,000 per annum calculated against loan costs and savings on current rental payments. Magic Homes could indeed also raise the rental in the future, one must be aware of that. We gained an appreciable book asset and importantly take back control of the situation, bringing this long running saga to a close.</p> <p>Councillor Holdich spoke:</p> <p>Mr Mayor, if I could just add to that. The answer to that question briefly is that it is not within the act.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Murphy</p> <p>To Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Early into this financial year it was reported that the budget was not balanced, and millions had been overspent and in Spring we were informed cuts of over £5million would be required. Could the Cabinet Member confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the current budget position at the end of the second quarter? b) Are savings of over £9million now required? c) What revenue savings have been made? d) What are the current (as of the end of the second quarter i.e 30 September) projections and plans for dealing with the overspending to balance the budget within the next six months? <p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor, and thank you Councillor Murphy. Yes, I'll be delighted to respond.</p> <p>I report the in-year budget position at each Cabinet meeting and those reports are also presented to Full Council. They provide a forecast of the potential end of year financial position. In effect the financial risks we need to manage in the coming months. The last reported risk level was £5m and the actions to be taken are set out in item 9b) of the Full Council agenda for this evening. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p> <p>Councillor Murphy asked a follow up question:</p> <p>Yes, and first of all I'd like to thank you for answering the question and letting us know that the last count you had you thought it was about £5million that we were short of. I do see that the timeline on the reports that we've got later on is a bit old, we are now into the third quarter so have you got any indication about how short fall is at the end of the second quarter which is the end of last month. I accept that not all the figures will be in but we know that Chief Exec's Department etc and so on the tables before us tonight are going to be spending more than we thought and we know you weren't going to get the savings from the county council joint working etc. So, is that 6million more like 12million now?</p>

	<p>Councillor Seaton responded:</p> <p>Thank you, Mr Mayor. I'm not sure how you've gone from 6million to 12million. Other than to make it up, which kind of isn't the sort of responsible thing I would expect in this Chamber. The figure is still around the same, it's not changed and as at this point in time, my expectation is that we've identified savings we can make that will cover that sort of figure.</p>
11.	<p>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Sandra Bond</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>Fulbridge Road Werrington is a busy road where drivers seem to think they can exceed the speed limit of 30mph.</p> <p>Please could the relevant Cabinet member tell me what plans they have in place to inform drivers using Fulbridge Road, Werrington that they are exceeding the speed limit?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller has responded:</p> <p>National legislation prohibits the use of 30mph repeater signs within a 30mph speed limit that is covered by street lighting - as is the case with Fulbridge Road.</p> <p>Road safety is of vital importance to the Council and we will be undertaking an authority wide road safety review once we have received the latest accident cluster information to see what road safety improvements are needed. I will ask our highways officers to investigate further and update you accordingly.</p>
12.	<p>WARD SPECIFIC: Question from Councillor Sandra Bond</p> <p>To Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments</p> <p>I recently emailed PCC members mailbox requesting a general waste bin for Manor Drive, Gunthorpe. The reply I received was as follows 'With regards to installing a litter bin, this site is still not all adopted by the council and therefore extra bins will not be considered at this point'.</p> <p>Please could the relevant Cabinet member tell me when will PCC adopt more of the Roman Fields Estate, Gunthorpe so that residents living there can have resources such as general waste bins?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller has responded:</p> <p>The Local Highway Authority have two Section 38 (Highways Act 1980) road adoption applications in process for the development known as Roman Fields, which is split into two phases. There are no legal agreements in place for either phase yet, but Phase 1 is currently with our Legal Team. Subject to the developer providing some outstanding information, we will hopefully soon be in a position to complete the legal agreement. In terms of adoption, that will commence after a 12-month maintenance period, which is triggered by the issue of the Provisional Certificate. The Provisional Certificate will be</p>

<p>issued upon satisfactory completion of all highway works contained within the relevant legal agreement. At present, the actual build has not been fully completed and there is a list of remedials (correction/improvement works) on the highway works carried out so far that still needs addressing. It is expected that adoption of the first phase of Roman Fields is likely to be at least 18 months away. The second phase plans have yet to be technically approved, and the build is some way off from completion, therefore it is likely to be 2-3 years before adoption can take place. In the meantime, the developer, Keepmoat Homes, are responsible for the maintenance of the highways, and provision of any street furniture.</p>
--

Questions on notice to:

d) The Combined Authority Representatives

1.	None received.
----	----------------