

**FULL COUNCIL 21 OCTOBER 2020
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Malcolm Handford</p> <p>For Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation:</p> <p>Thank you. My question is as follows. After six emails to its Complaints Resolution Team, followed up by a number of telephone calls and numerous broken promises, I am now ignored by CityFibre, the company contracted by this Council to bring Gigabit internet to Peterborough. Complaint resolution is, according to CityFibre, a response within one day and resolution within five days. Does the Cabinet still believe that CityFibre is a reputable and trustworthy company and does it feel it is acceptable practice for CityFibre to damage a resident's property whilst carrying out works and then fail to deal with the resident's complaint or even provide a written apology?</p> <p>Councillor Farooq responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Mr Handford for your question. I am pleased to say we have requested and received Mr Handford's contact details so that we can ensure that there is an investigation of the issues involved in this case. Cityfibre, like other utility companies, have customer service standards which would be passed to any contractor responsible for any works carried out on their behalf. I can confirm these standards are that CityFibre, as Mr Handford pointed out, aim to make initial contact within 24 hours and resolve general enquiries within five days and any more complex issues, such as those involving their contractors, are within 10 days. During the last six months, the performance in Peterborough has been, across all types averaging 5.7 days.</p> <p>As with any large-scale infrastructure project issues can occur which we would expect to be handled in a correct and timely manner. I have received assurances that this matter is being dealt with by CityFibre who are liaising with Mr Handford and the contractor responsible</p> <p>The City Council has worked closely with CityFibre for years to develop and expand the reach of their full- fibre network. It has become a platform for our Smart City initiatives, helps us attract businesses and develop our emerging tech sector and is a great boost to our City. This is why we take seriously any concerns raised by residents such as Mr Hanford. Thank you.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked: Yes I do. My question is, do CityFibre have appropriate liability insurance and if so, why have they not provided this information in light of their failure to provide a prompt resolution?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Mr Handford, I am sure with all the organisation s CityFibre do have their public liability insurance for any work they carry out, as you know, legally, every business in every sector, needs to have that public liability insurance. And you know furthermore, once the contractor completes the work, we, the city council officers, do a walk with the CityFibre and put right any defects caused by their sub-contractor. I hope that's satisfactory. Thank you.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Mr Trevor Chapman</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Good evening Mr Mayor and everyone. The council's policy of treating roads by micro-surfacing them has undesirable consequences. As well as making residential streets look messy and unkempt, the tiny stones thrown up by cars passing over the surface can cause damage to these vehicles, plus those parked on the roadway. Will the council pay for the repair of the damage caused? I'm sure most residents would rather wait a few more years for the council to re-surface the roads properly. Why has this micro-surfacing technique been deployed in Peterborough when it comes with so many problems?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor and thank you for the opportunity. Good evening Mr Chapman.</p> <p>The micro surfacing you asked about that has been used on Peterborough's roads for a number of years and is a recognised process used throughout the highways industry in the UK to extend the life of carriageways.</p> <p>The treatment forms part of the Council's annual highways programme and once the material is laid, our contractor erects loose chipping signage, speed advisory signage, along the road, any particular road that is being treated, to warn road users about the loose material and to lower their speeds to prevent or certainly mitigate the affect you allude to in your question. Dependant on how busy the road is, the scattering effect caused by vehicles is fairly soon reduced and once the material has had time to settle, the carriageway is swept thoroughly within a week or so to collect all possible loose material for re-use elsewhere. Following the completion of the works, officers and the contractor then visit the locations where the micro surfacing is laid to carry out a final inspection and undertake any remedial works should they be necessary, Mr Chapman. If you have any examples of vehicle damage, I would certainly like to see those examples and they will be analysed I can assure you, they will be analysed by our Highway Services. Thank you Mr Chapman. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor, I do. Firstly with regard to the response just given, I walked across that road only the other day, there were still numerous stones. The entrance to Whitewater is still carrying numerous puddles because it's not level. It is absolutely atrocious. It has not met residents expectations and we are horrified at the state the road has been left in. We expect our roads to be done to an acceptable standard and what happened in Whitewater falls way short of this expectation.</p> <p>What will the council do to remedy this matter as a matter of urgency, plus why was Cherry Orton Road resurfaced in a different but more acceptable manner?</p>

	<p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you again Mr Chapman for your follow-up question. I'm not aware of the roads that you speak about so without physical knowledge and seeing sight of the treatment I personally can't comment. But I will certainly get our Highways Engineers to look at the issues you cite. From a personal point of view I am very proud of our Highway Services Mr Chapman, the professionalism, and the dedication of our officer management team and hardworking, highly skilled crews who are out there in all weathers keeping our city's traffic flow to be one of the fastest commutes in the UK. I would also add Mr Chapman, that what you're saying about the service that we provide I don't recognise generally or even specifically, that we are in terms of national customer satisfaction scores, year after year we are ranked amongst the best in the UK, our Highways Services and are consistently annually ranked as the Best Highway Service provider in the East of England. It's not something I recognise Mr Chapman, that's not to suggest it's not the case of course it is, you're saying it is, so there must be an issue there. I will get our Highways Engineers out to look at where you're talking about and will do that within the next couple of days. Thank you Mr Chapman.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Catherine Emery Asked on her behalf by Ms Ambarchian</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Yes, good attempt at my name. Top marks for effort. Ken Stimpson School has several outdoor areas for sports and has used the public open space that surrounds the school for many, many years without issue as have lots of sports groups with young people. The fence that is proposed isn't an Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) requirement and it hasn't been mentioned in the last couple of Ofsted reports for the school. The risk assessment that kind of backs up the reasoning for the fence wasn't actually completed until after the planning application was submitted and actually the risks identified in the risk assessment do very little or nothing to mitigate the risks that were identified and that's not my view, that's according to the school's own commentary.</p> <p>Pupils will still use the area outside the fence. So, the question is, why is safeguarding being given as the reason that the for the fence? And to be clear, we're not, this question isn't about challenging the planning permission which has been given, it's challenging the installation, which is still very much within the hands of the council to decide whether or not to go ahead. The council has basically given itself planning permission, it's the councils land, you can choose not to go ahead within the installation. Will you take notice of these comments and the objections from Werrington residents? Just for context, there are over 1200 people that have signed the petition against the installation of the fence, and we can verify the postcodes for 800 of them which are Peterborough people. 200 have signed an open letter giving their addresses in full and names and 400 people have joined the Facebook group.</p> <p>So, the question is, why is safeguarding being given as a reason to for this fence and can the council rethink the installation?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Yes, I would Mr Mayor and thank you Nyree for your question. It's a little bit difficult, we have a number of questions round the same subject. You'll be aware I am sure</p>

as will Members. It's not easy for me to answer any questions about children's safeguarding I'm afraid. It's not within my portfolio so I am unable to answer the questions you ask specifically around child safeguarding.

You say you have no issues with the planning process, which is pretty much where I come from, and I was a member, you'll be aware I know because we exchanged emails, I was a member of the Planning Committee that sat I think on 10th March when we decided this application so I'm sorry to say to you, from a child protection point of view and whether or not the council as the landowner has the right to or not has the right to go ahead with any installation in conjunction with the school, because it's the school that made the application you'll be aware of that, and it was the headmaster, the principle of the school that was actually at the planning committee meeting arguing the case for committee members to approve so that has to be my answer I'm afraid. I can't answer your specific question. If there are questions about the planning process I'm more than happy and completely able to answer that. My colleague Councillor Ayres is the Education Cabinet Member, you'll be aware Councillor Ayres I'm sure. I don't know if Councillor Ayres wants to actually chip in with your particular question or not. Lyn?

Councillor Ayres responded:

Yes, I can do. Good evening.

I have looked into the safeguarding aspect from the point of view of the local authority of course, because we are the people who are responsible as well for safeguarding and making sure that that is happening and the council 's been working in partnership with the school over several years to reduce safeguarding risks associated with the open nature of the site. Work has been undertaken to successfully help to mitigate the risks from the shared school Vivacity sports facilities at the site however other significant safeguarding risks remain and these relate to the schools for outdoor playing space which is currently open access to anyone who wishes to access it at any time. As a consequence, the school hasn't been using the playing field for around 12 months, placing restrictions on children's and young people's ability to benefit from a full range of outdoor sport activities. The installation of a fence was identified as a means of mitigating the safeguarding risks and supporting children's health and wellbeing.

Safeguarding of children and young people is one of the Council's statutory responsibilities alongside its role as champion for all children. Schools are judged by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) on the safeguarding measures they have in place when they do their visits, their inspection. Any identified failings can lead to a school being identified as requiring special measures. The focus, rightly, is on prevention and reduction of risk.

As part of the planning application process, the Interim Education Safeguarding Lead for Peterborough was asked to consider the safeguarding concerns which had been raised by the Headteacher and the proposal to install fencing as a means of mitigating these. Her assessment was that the installation of a fence would improve the school's ability to safeguard children and young people. This was recorded in a letter as I understand it, which was submitted as part of the planning application process and is, therefore, a matter of public record. Thank you.

A supplementary question was asked:

I do, my follow up question, everything Councillor Ayres said made a lot of sense and it's very, very difficult to argue with the words child safeguarding. As a parent, I know that. The real substantial part of my question is that by the school's own risk

	<p>assessment, the risks, the major risks identified, will not be solved by this fence. So I suppose everything you said makes complete sense except when you consider that. That's not really a question, is it?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>If I might come back on that Mr Mayor. The council was presented with a planning application. The planning application followed due process you'll be aware. There was representation from the Ward Councillors, there was representation from objectors, there was representation from the applicant in form of the school principal so as far as the councils procedural methodology is concerned, it's without question we have done the right thing. So what you're asking though, quite rightly I have to say, quite rightly, what you're asking is whether or not the fence should be there or not or if it should be in a different place or whatever. I personally can't comment whether the council can exercise any rights the council may or may not have as landowners, in that regard. I don't know whether Councillor Ayres has got anything to add to that?</p> <p>Councillor Ayres responded:</p> <p>The only thing I probably can add is that there was a site visit there by our safeguarding lead in early January, very early January, and as part of that site visit, the changes were reviewed and the proposal to have the fence put up, that was the basis which her later assessment which went forward into the planning application was made. Apart from that, I can't add anything on behalf of the local authority because as Councillor Hiller has said of course the application was made by the school itself quite properly.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Frances Green</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Yes thank you. Obviously following on from what was spoken about earlier, this area was a dual use area for residents of Werrington and with the school as well. What you're proposing is a single use for the school a vast area of fields that is used daily by many different people, walkers, joggers, children playing etc. The proposal for such a vast area to be fenced off with a fence that is considerably high and not pleasant looking, takes away so much of this field. I myself am a parent and have three children who went through Ken Stimpson School. They all were allowed to play out at lunchtime, breaktime on the fields and also had their PE out there. There wasn't an issue. I do appreciate in this day and age, that we all need to safeguard our children and I feel that the amount of space they are planning to take is vast. I can appreciate that they would like an open area for some sports. One football pitch size I think would be more than adequate. They have many other facilities to use in school. They have hard play area already. They have AstroTurf's, tennis courts, a hard play area, they have a gym that is now not used by the public during school time, they have many facilities for PE, it's not all to go outside. So therefore, I don't see why they need so much space.</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Miss Freeman for your question. As I said before, I'm at risk of repeating myself, from a planning perspective we were presented as a planning committee, we were presented with an application and it went through due process according to how we do these things and a decision was made.</p>

	<p>I think. A couple of comments you made about the use of the land and quite emotive terms, absolutely and I can understand your passion about this subject but under the terms of the consent that we did give as a planning committee a community use agreement must be entered into by the applicant and whilst that's not finalised I understand, I also understand that it's currently proposed that the pitch or pitches can be booked for formal use by the public outside school times and as with any formal pitch operated by the council the area will be freely available for casual use outside of school time. I'm not quite sure how that seems to be contradictory to what you are saying. Perhaps you'd expand on that with any follow up answer. I don't know whether Councillor Ayres wants to add anything to that?</p> <p>Cllr Ayres responded:</p> <p>I don't think I can except to add, I do agree with them, this person who made and given the answer, Frances Green, I do agree with her, course that the present-day safeguarding is very different to how it was when that school was developed in the first instance, which is I think was back in the early 80s or something in that order. And of course safeguarding is a very, very important aspect of every single school and indeed on behalf of the council as well.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>Just a comment really. Obviously, it says it will be available to walk around or to use freely out of school time but who particularly is going to want to walk around a fenced off area? Not me. Just another query as well. If you fence this area off, what guarantees do we have that area will then not be built on by the school in future and also what guarantees do we have that if this allowed this amount of land, are they then in a few more years' time, going to ask for more land under the guise of safeguarding?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller responded:</p> <p>Yes, I'll come back factually Mr Mayor and thank you again Miss Green for the follow up. What I would say to you is the land is retained in council ownership and I might add that any potential future use of that land for whatever reason would need a planning consent so it's not going to slip under the door or be land grabbed is an emotive term that I think someone else has used, unless we know about it and it has to follow due process again. I hope that has reassures you to a degree.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Keith Dalton</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor. Good evening everyone. Please can you answer why when the Peterborough Development Corporation specifically designed the green open fields and recreation facilities for the benefit of the local community and residents, that permission can be granted without consultation of most of the people who live and enjoy the scenery of the area.</p> <p>For instance, not a single household in Canonsfield, Wainright or Cranemore has been consulted. They live within 150 yards of the work and use the area constantly. The majority of households written to are over half a mile away and they are basically in Old Werrington, not New Werrington.</p>

No notices were visible during the application period and this really disenfranchises the local population. Furthermore, the construction will be used for minimal amount of time in each year by school pupils, I estimate about 9% of the maximum time. There has never been any threatening incidents in the past 18 years. The headmaster claims he is safeguarding the students, and I understand these points, from potential threats, and yet he allows students to spend their breaks unsupervised in the Werrington Centre. There may well be a letter from parents giving permission for the young people to be allowed outside, but the headmaster cannot abdicate his responsibility in this case. If those same parents wrote and gave permission for their child to play X Box instead of attending lessons, he presumably wouldn't allow it. It seems like one side of the school premises is a draconian fence and the other a free for all in Werrington Centre. There is no consistency. In any event I believe an 8ft fence is not the solution to the issue. You don't need an 8ft fence to stop a dog pooing when a 3ft hedge would suffice. Furthermore, if a gunman or someone else wished to harm the students by some means, then they can shoot a gun through a mesh fence. Indeed I think the fence achieves the opposite of what they are trying to do. It's very design keeps people out but it also keeps the students locked in. It chokes them and they are just sitting ducks if that eventuality happens. They are cornered with no means of escape by people who want to harm them, because of an 8ft fence. I would also ask what does this teach our young people growing up? You need to be imprisoned to protect you from other human beings? We are all going through some form of isolation and imprisonment now, let's not impose more on our young people. I would ask the council members if they agree it is worth just pausing this project and sort of considering alternatives. Thank you.

Councillor Hiller responded:

Yes, I'd be happy to respond in general terms Mr Mayor. And thank you Mr Dalton for your lengthy question. There were myriad points that you made there Mr Dalton regarding children being assassinated and dogs pooing. Those aren't planning issues from our point of view. It does however give me the opportunity I think to outline the planning procedure and you mentioned the consultation Mr Dalton and I think that's very relevant. The publicity for this application were site notices, there were site notices Mr Dalton, you shake your head but there were site notices because I've been told there were site notices and members of the public have seen site notices so the fact that you didn't was you're not seeing them and other people did. There were press notice, neighbour notification letters to properties that butt the site, which you touched on, all, I have to say, all in accordance with the requirements of current planning legislation. Werrington Neighbourhood Council was also consulted on the application as were of course the Ward Councillors you'll be aware. Whilst the Neighbourhood Council didn't object to the proposals, the officer report to the committee cited that they had a number of comments and those comments were reported to the committee. And the report presented to the Planning Committee also stated there were nearly 200 initial consultations and that 79 representations were received, 45 in support and 39 were objecting. These are the facts as we were presented. Recognising the local interest, the application was duly "called in" by the Councillor John Fox, so the application was considered by the Planning Committee as I've said to a previous questioner on the 10th March this year. Councillors Mr and Mrs Fox both addressed the committee as did two objectors and so did the applicants and school principle Brian Irwin. After careful consideration of the officer's report, the points raised by the Ward Councillors, objectors and the applicant the committee, after debate, resolved to approve the application by a majority vote of 7 to 4 members. There's very little else I can say, we debated the issue, I must stress the correct planning policy procedure has been followed, the committee was properly chaired, and held in the presence of the council's legal officer, and open to any member of the public who wished to observe proceedings. I think it also might be relevant to mention, that in matters like these, Mr

	<p>Dalton, the planning process pertains to consent and refusals of application. It doesn't pertain to land ownership. The land ownership is a completely separate legal matter. I hope that covers a lot of your points Mr Dalton; I certainly haven't covered all of them but I hope I've covered the majority of them. Thank you, Mr Mayor.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Question from Janette Huygens</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>This has been a community space shared which the school have had access too for over 35 years with no safeguarding issues - why is the need for a 2.4m high prison style fence now? Residents of Werrington apparently will have to book access onto this space with the leisure centre and be charged for the privilege.</p> <p>Once this beautiful open space is fenced in as a land grab by the school what guarantees are there that this space will be freely accessible to the Werrington Community as originally intended by the PDC and not built on by the school or sold off in the future?</p> <p>Councillor Hiller may have responded:</p> <p>As the cabinet member for strategic planning and commercial strategy and investments, I can only address the planning aspects of this question.</p> <p>The publicity for the application was as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. sites notices 2. press notice 3. neighbour notification letters to properties that abut the site <p>This was in accordance with the requirements of the planning legislation.</p> <p>Werrington Community Council was also consulted on the application.</p> <p>The application was 'called in' by Cllr John Fox and so the application was considered by the Planning & Environmental Protection Committee at its meeting on 10th March 2020. Cllrs Mr & Mrs Fox both addressed the committee as did two objectors and the applicant. After careful consideration of the officer report, and the points raised by the ward councillors, objectors and applicant, Committee resolved to approve the application.</p> <p>Under the terms of the planning permission, a community use agreement must be entered into. Whilst not finalised it is currently proposed that the pitch(es) can be booked for formal use by the public (as with any formal pitch operated by the council) outside of school times and that the area will be available for casual use outside of school time.</p> <p>The land is going to be retained in council ownership.</p> <p>Development of the land for any other purpose would require planning permission.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Question from Mr Stuart Haw</p> <p>Cllr Allen, Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation</p>

In August I conducted research with a 40-person sample of local residents who were contacted through social media. They provided feedback on their experience of using local leisure services. This group proved relevant for the transition 70% of respondents had used Vivacity pools, 57.5% had used Vivacity Gyms, 40% had used the Athletics track, and 37.5% had used the Lido. At least half of the sample reported that price, variety of provision, location, community and social value were influential in their choice of leisure facility. In terms the future of these services, 32.5% of respondents preferred the City Council to run things in house, 42.% preferred a new leisure trust, and 25% preferred a community group or local sport club to run things.

Finally, respondents were asked to share feedback. The majority of responses covered an issue with communication. As can be seen with the following responses

“Communication needs to be improved about detail and information of possible opening. It is important during these difficult times to have these details as there are a lot of people who rely on this facility to improve their mental health and well being.”

“To the management of vivacity, lack of communication!! A basic email send to customers would of been nice, larger and smaller gym establishments have managed to communicate with customers, I’m a monthly payment customer so this doesn’t effect me but what about the annual payers, that have paid and have had no communication or replies, I am glad vivacity is being taken over, let’s hope who ever takes it over has better customer service”.

“As a Vivacity member, the communications around its closure have been extremely poor. And I find it sad the reopening of some sort of swimming pool in town isn’t more of a priority. I hope something happens soon.”

“Better communication with current members.”

As such I would like to ask the Council, what are the plans to ensure communication is improved to provide local residents and members of leisure services with sufficient information regarding the future of these services?

Councillor Allen may have responded:

We recognise and agree that communications with customers of Vivacity should have been more frequent and informative over the past few months. It is worth noting that the circumstances during this time have been complex, with a combination of managing the impacts of the pandemic (including the vast majority of Vivacity's staff being furloughed), and the difficult decision that had to be made by Vivacity's Trustees to end their contract with the Council. However, going forwards, we, the Council, are absolutely committed to ensuring that all past, present and future customers of all of Peterborough's arts, culture, heritage and leisure services are regularly and effectively communicated with about services, events and other important news.

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 Cllr Fower**

For Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health:

Could the relevant Cabinet Member please let me know why a temporary testing centre has not been set up at the Paston and Gunthorpe Community Centre, which would allow for thousands of people in Walton, Werrington, Paston and Gunthorpe, who do not have access to a car, the funds to take public transport, or the physical capacity to travel long distances the opportunity to be tested and this increase safety to the whole of Peterborough?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

Yes I would Mr Mayor and thank you very much. Good evening members and whoever is watching in the wild world there. Councillor Fower, thank you for your question. So, we have currently have several testing sites for Covid-19 in Peterborough. When selecting the sites, there is a balance between finding sites that meet the Department of Health and Social Care criteria, as well as looking at local Covid-19 rates and giving geographical coverage across the city.

It's not possible to have them everywhere of course, that would just not be feasible. But people now are also able to book postal kits for home testing by internet and phone, and we are looking at how we can support people who find this more difficult. Thank you very much.

A supplementary question was asked:

Yes Mr Mayor, it's only a quick one. Thank you very much for the response Councillor Fitzgerald. I just wondered if you could ... seek some clarity with regards to what is the criteria you just mentioned? And would you be willing to look to reassess the possibility of having such a service at the said centre.

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

I'm happy to take advice from our Director of Public Health on that criteria and I'm sure she will happily circulate it to you and other Members. We don't set the criteria as mentioned in my reply to you. It's a national criteria. In terms of the centre you refer to in particular, I think again Councillor Fower, it's down to need, demographics, geographical coverage across the city. It's got to go somewhere and we can't place them everywhere. You will also know we have had various testing centres across the city and that remains the case today. But I'll have Dr Robin circulate the advice that meets the Department of Health and Social care criteria. Thank you very much.

2. **Question from Cllr Sandford**

For Councillor Fitzgerald, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Public Health

At the July Full Council meeting a motion was passed asking the Director of Public Health to write to our local MPs requesting that they press the Government to give councils more decision-making power in respect of local lockdowns and other measures designed to control Coronavirus. Could the Cabinet Member for Public Health tell me if these letters were sent and what replies have been received?

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

I'm surprised in part that we got this letter because Councillor Sandford should know that the letters were sent to the MPs because a copy was sent to him at the time, so I'm told. Of course, I'm happy to be corrected. But for Members sake, the Director of Public Health has confirmed that a letter was sent to both MPs to make them aware of the Council motion, and we haven't had a written reply but we didn't ask for a written reply to be perfectly truthful. But I have had replies from both Sharlesh Vara and Paul Bristow. So, on Sharlesh Vara's part, he has conveyed the views of the Council as included within the correspondence from Dr Robin's office and he sent that onto the Cabinet Office and awaits a response from them. Those eagle eyed amongst you or that pay attention to the Parliament Channel like some of us might do on here, will know that Paul Bristow MP for Peterborough has been very vocal about standing up for Peterborough on all sorts of matters and it's no different here. So if you were to check Hansard you will recall that he recently said in the House, Peterborough has done the right thing, and we do not want to be in Tier two, and I want the Minister to hear this very clearly, we do not want to be in Tier two and we will do everything to present this. So he's very aware about the good work that the council's Public Health Team are doing supported by all our Enforcement Team that are at work in the community on a daily basis that took us out the government's watch list and has managed so far, let's touch wood, to keep the lid on the numbers, you will note that where we are in the country is nowhere near some of the areas like Yorkshire and the Humber, seaside, Manchester and Liverpool. We are, you know, doing very well and I'd like it to remain so, so all our teams working hard should be applauded for all the great work going on and both MPs are aware of that too. Thank you.

A supplementary question was asked:

Thank you Mr Mayor. I'm very grateful to the Cabinet Member for that response. We keep hearing from council leaders across the country that they aren't being properly consulted before local lockdown measures are concerned. So it's really good to hear that our MPs are making that case in Parliament.

Having a more localised approach is even more necessary for contact tracing. The contact tracing done by our team here in Peterborough is delivering a 92% success rate but they only get leads passed onto them about three days after the national service has tried and failed to actually make contact people. So could the Cabinet Member find ways of pressing the government to devolve contact tracing more entirely to councils and also to give us the resources that are needed.

Councillor Fitzgerald responded:

Thank you, Councillor Sandford. Again, I will ask Dr Robin because I'm not going to take the stats you gave there at face value. What I would agree with you, is that we in Peterborough are more successful than the national testing service. As to how long we get them, I don't know if it three days, Liz might be able to nod and tell me, it could be quicker, it could be longer, but I don't think that's true but I'm getting a nod that's

	<p>not entirely accurate. So in terms of... yes, we are always happy to step up and assist government and in fact government themselves through the Cabinet Office have, you know, praised Peterborough. They came and did a visit some time ago now although it's only weeks but it seems a lifetime ago and said what a good job we were doing so I think they have trusted us so far to manage, in a devolved way, the response to Covid-19. Not just in Peterborough but in the wider sense across the county. Because we are one Public Health team. So, I'm sure Dr Robin will press the necessary people if she feels that more needs to be done, that's is the case, but I think we are well on top of it. I'll ask her to convey or correct or confirm the stats Councillor Sandford and share that with all members as to what our position is in terms of the number of days etc etc. But all I can say is we are doing a good job and it's well done the Public Health team and all the other officers that have been seconded to work in terms of enforcement and prevention and advice during this Covid crisis.</p>
3.	<p>Question from Councillor Wiggin</p> <p>For Councillor Holdich - Cabinet Member for Leader of the Council and Deputy Mayor of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority:</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown by ward of allocated spending from the New Towns Fund?</p> <p>Councillor Holdich responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Wiggin for your question. The Council is still waiting to hear the outcome of the Towns Fund bid that was submitted at the end of July. The Towns Fund Board on behalf of the city council you will recall, is one of the first cities prepared and submitted an investment plan. I am not in a position yet to reveal what the allocations are from that Plan but I am sure through the Towns Fund Board that it will be made known as soon as we are told by Government.</p> <p>Council will recall that we did receive an allocation of £1m accelerated Towns Fund award at the end of September. This funding is allocated and is expected to be spent as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central 34% Bretton 14% Across the city 14% East 10% North 9% Orton Waterville 5% Paston & Walton 5% Fletton & Woodston 2% West 2% Werrington 1% <p>Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>Yes, thank you Mr Mayor. Thank you Councillor Holdich. For the answer to my question. I would like to say well done to our great team at the city council for securing that funding and getting the bids in. It's good news that we are ahead of the trend, however it is noticeable from that list that there are parts of the city that have been missed out. There are.....the Towns Fund is part of the government's agenda to level</p>

	<p>up. But in order to level up, we need to level up our city as well. There's lots of people at the moment who don't want to be in this city centre because they are worried about Covid. That may change going forward, it may not we don't know , but there are areas such as Hampton, Fletton High Street not on the list. Big district centres that are important to the way our city is built and has come to be through the development corporation as we were an original new town. What plans does the city council have to level up areas of our city?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded</p> <p>Thank you Cllr Wiggin. Fletton and Woodston are getting money out of this but one has to follow the rules of the bid. As far as levelling up is concerned, what improvements are done do benefit the whole city. In this case, open spaces issues, it was done as a more scientific basis because it was based on an audit of all our facilities done in 2018 of those most in need and that list reflects the audit that was done. Thank you very much.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Barkham</p> <p>For Councillor Cereste - Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:</p> <p>Can the relevant Cabinet Member signpost me to where I can find out the locations of all the litter bins in the Peterborough City Council area and how many litter bins are situated in each city council ward?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Aragon Direct Services (ADS) are currently in the process of GIS mapping and they intend to map all the litter bins across the City once this is complete. We will be able to show councillors information and happy for members to see it for their individual wards. We currently have circa 1600 litter bins across Peterborough.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>So just to clarify, presently we don't know that exact locations of the bins that we own, is that correct.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded</p> <p>I don't know that that is correct, I would say that it's not held in one repository and I would imagine, I'm pretty sure that the team that looks after certain area will know exactly where everything is.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Cllr Day</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>What impact will the governments 'Changes to the current planning system' paper and the 'Planning for the Future White Paper' have on Peterborough?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Its and interesting question and very topical. As you are aware, there are two Government consultation documents they're substantial and they do in themselves</p>

propose large scale and wide-ranging changes to the current planning system. It would take a fair bit of time to overview the proposals comprehensively this evening within the context of this question to Cabinet element of our meeting. I think it is also worth stating that the first of these initiatives has just finished its consultation period and the other is still out for consultation at the end of the month. The devil is always in the detail, Cllr Day you'll be aware and what is being proposed now might not be legislated without some changes to the consultation process. I am happy, more than happy to provide a written response regarding the effect of any planning changes to this Authority, but only I think, sensibly until the proposals are in some form of representative policy.

A supplementary question was asked:

I wanted to make a couple of points and raise a question. Under the changes to the current planning system white paper affordability is not given appropriate weighting using the standard method as it sees growth more for least affordable areas and it directs growth to the more affordable areas. So for Peterborough, a mere forty percent increase, that's 1300 houses are proposed to be built a year under these proposals. We've only achieved that once in the last 20 years in Peterborough, so if these do go through, and I have heard, I have read the document, the tone of the document that this will happen and once passed through it will happen quickly. Though that level of building will prove difficult. Also of the raising the affordable housing threshold of 40-50 dwellings will have a significant impact for the council to deliver affordable housing it will also impact affordable housing in rural areas and with the permission in principle proposal, this will result in reduced requirements placed on developers reduced control at a local level on decision making and financial implications for Peterborough City Council because there will be reduced planning fees for developers. Some of us are calling this the builders charter. So my question is how are these proposals compatible with the environmental bill and environmental law and how will the reduced control of local level in decision making affect our local plan.

The Cabinet Member responded

Thank you for the follow up and the points of interest you have raised Councillor Day. I have been active in the council's response to both of these planning initiatives and would repeat they are out to consultation or one is out to consultation and one has just finished so as I said to you before, the devil is in the detail and to predict what actually may be legislated for I think wouldn't probably be particularly sensible at this point in time until such time the Government has firmed up with proposals again I have to say a fair degree of opposition. You mentioned housing test increase based on an algorithm I personally don't think that is viable. We are a particularly high performing local planning authority. We are building more houses than we are targeted for currently and to increase that by something like 40 percent is bonkers in my opinion, but that's what we are up against currently. I can't really comment on any of the points you make until I know exactly what has been legislated for, but I hear what you're saying. I don't think we are disagreeing, the affordability level from 40 – 50 is a deep concern to myself and a number of other people, but we have made good representation. MPs, my own MP Shailesh Vara is particularly anxious that Government listen to what we are saying. And what we are saying is based on sound common sense.

6. **Question from Councillor Howell**

	<p>Cllr Allen, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation:</p> <p>Construction of the university and the Posh stadium will transform the Embankment. There are also plans to relocate the regional pool. In view of this transformation is the future of the Embankment Athletics Arena guaranteed?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor, and thank you Councillor Howell for your question regarding the transformation and the future of the embankment. The Council, let me reassure you, recognises the significance of the Athletics Track in Peterborough, which provides important facilities for many individuals, clubs and societies, helps tackle some of the health and wellbeing challenges in our city, and grows local talent. We're fully committed to ensuring the Track continues to be a feature in our city, and be assured we are in active discussions with service users about arrangements that will help achieve this.</p> <p>With regard to the Embankment, excellent progress is being made with the University Phase 1 scheme which will be on site in early 2021 and also with plans for an associated innovation hub that will quickly follow as phase 2.</p> <p>We are also fully committed to delivering the later phases of the University working with ARU and CPCA Anglia Ruskin University and the Combined Authority. How and where exactly that comes forward will depend on the outcome of the current Embankment master planning work that the Council is working on with CPCA and Peterborough United.</p> <p>The masterplan will provide an important framework for the potential new stadium in the Embankment area that Peterborough United are leading the case for. Any ideas or proposals to change the current provision of activities will be subject to full discussion and consultation as it would be for any new uses across the Embankment area, which I will reiterate, we recognise as hugely valuable, and is currently perhaps under-used, asset currently for the City.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>The Peterborough Nene Valley Athletics club which as around 400 members, many of which use it to compete and train. Bearing in mind what you've said are there any plans to enhance existing spectator facilities currently there's no grand stand which prevents certain events from being staged there.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded</p> <p>That's a good proposal to put forward. As I've said we are in consultation and active discussions with the local athletics club with a view to them being much more involved in that facility. And indeed we are talking to other service users and I believe that you want it to be improved, and I agree with you we should really make sure that that particular facility is used to good purpose.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Councillor John Fox</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p>

	<p>Would the Cabinet Member for planning please enquire with planning officers that if a possible controversial planning application is forthcoming in a ward, that they liaise with Ward Councillors to see if there is any feasibility of possibly extending the area of consultation.</p> <p>Recently we have had a planning application submitted and after the decision was taken several hundred people have complained because they did not know about the plan as they would have objected.</p> <p>I do appreciate that it is not legally required to consult with a much larger area than usual but I feel that by liaising with the ward councillors, who will have local knowledge of the layout of the area, that no immediate houses that would be directly affected would be left out of the consultation process.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Yes Mr Mayor, I'm more than happy to and I thank Councillor Fox for his question. I think that I understand the sentiment behind Councillor Fox's question Mr Mayor pertaining as I imagine it does from the last questions we've had from the public to the fencing issue within his Werrington ward and his effort at the planning committee meeting in March. Whilst there's nothing preventing Cllrs or indeed neighbourhood councillors or anyone in mounting an awareness campaign for an application they deem contentious. The requirements regarding the publicity of planning and associated applications is set by in the planning legislation and operated under the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Whilst I can see why dedicated and conscientious ward members like Councillor Fox wish to see the extent of publicity expand for certain applications Mr Mayor, the risk is that this could lead to a delay in the determination of planning applications at a time when Government is keeping a close eye on the performance of planning authorities. Additionally, it could also result in an inconsistent approach to publicity for applications. You will appreciate I'm sure as what one person may view as a controversial proposal another may not be as exercised. With regard to the number of residents who object to a particular application I think it is also worthwhile to mention generally, Councillor Fox and Mr Mayor, that Peterborough is a plan led Authority and planning applications are required in law to be decided in accordance with adopted plan policy unless any material planning considerations outweigh it. In this regard I think it is important to say that the sheer number of objections to a planning application is not essentially material it is the substance of the objections that is important.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>No I don't Mr Mayor, I'd just like to thank him for his precise and definite reply and I appreciate that.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</p> <p>For Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance:</p> <p>Austerity measures from central government have caused a massive strain on our budgets. Apart from the current negotiations with central government, what other alternatives are we pursuing to deliver sustainable budgets, over the next three to five years?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p>

	<p>Thank you very much Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Nawaz for your question. In answer to it we need to look at the situation pre and post COVID-19.</p> <p>Pre-Covid we had a budget deficit of £14m from 2021/22 onwards. We'd actually identified £11m of ongoing savings to close that gap with a year to address the remaining £2m and I was confident that at the start of the year that we would move to a sustainable budget.</p> <p>Clearly, COVID-19 changed that situation and I think a BBC survey in June suggested 158 out of 173 Councils who responded had a problem this year. Other data supports that. Thankfully we still have a balanced position. So far we have received some like £28m of additional government funding. I expect more and, indeed, another national £1bn tranche was announced on the 12th October. I hope for good news on that.</p> <p>However, like nearly all Councils, we have a considerable challenge next year. It is almost impossible to predict the course of this pandemic, the timing of economic recovery, potential vaccines, income lost and the further expenditure needed to support work with our communities. Hence you know we can only use our best endeavours to estimate the gap to a sustainable budget coming years.</p> <p>Phase 1 of the Medium Term Financial Strategy, which we launched for consultation on the 16th October, gives that best estimate. The gap is currently due to the COVID-19 emergency and is why we have approached MHCLG with a range of short and medium term, one off and continuing options.</p> <p>They have said they recognise that even with the considerable support already provided, there will be individual authorities with unique circumstances, which is why they are encouraging Councils to approach them to discuss the future financial position. I'm grateful they'll continue to work closely with us as this Council supports our community through the pandemic. Thank you Mr Mayor.</p> <p>A supplementary question was asked:</p> <p>Thank you for your comprehensive answer, I'm sure that you will agree we were in quite a bit of trouble even before COVID and also being a former banker, it is wise to learn from the past. So, on reflection looking back what do you think the Council could have done better so that perhaps today, we'd be in a much better position. And I ask that question Councillor Seaton just to understand how we can move forward so we don't repeat the short comings of the past?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded</p> <p>There are a couple of points there Councillor Nawaz. First you say we were in quite a bit of trouble; I've just said we have a gap of £14m and we had a year to find the remaining £2m, so I would not agree with you on that, I think we were in a very good position to get to a sustainable situation. You know, yes I am a banker and you are an accountant, we're numbers people, you're an expert in tax avoidance, maybe I should have listened to you a bit more. But I don't think that given the problem we've currently got is due to the pandemic it serves any purpose to look back over the recent years and say we should have done things differently. We were in a good position at the start of this year. The pandemic has changed everything and it has changed that for every single council in this country.</p>
9.	Question from Cllr Hogg

	<p>For Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:</p> <p>Following the report from Cross-party Fly-tipping Task and Finish Group which was positively received by both the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet (at a meeting in July 2019), can the Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment please let council know which of the recommendations have been implemented and in what timescales?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you for the question Councillor Hogg. An update report on this very subject has been recently produced at the request of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee, we will of course be circulating to members of that committee and anyone else who wants it really and I would be happy to send you a personal copy Councillor Hogg if you so wish.</p> <p>To summarize if I may, SCRAP It Fly Tipping Campaign in conjunction with the Recycling for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) Partnership, which Peterborough is a member, continues to work on sharing intelligence and best practice in the fight against fly tipping, which we already agree is a despicable thing to do. The Covid-19 situation has curtailed much of the practical aspect of the project, however the project is continuing to deliver and move forward.</p> <p>The PES service continues where possible to investigate incidents of fly tipping and have issued over 80 FPN's since April this year, they have also supported the installation of physical measures in some locations where necessary to limit fly tipping where possible.</p> <p>Following the reopening of the Fengate HRC, closed temporarily to comply with essential travel requirements arising from the March 2020 lockdown measures, fly tipping has not materially reduced as one might have expected it to do.</p> <p>The separately identified measures which required business cases to be developed in order to support new unplanned funding remain paused during the unprecedented financial situation the council is in; however, they will of course be kept under review through the budget setting process for 2021/22.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Cllr Murphy</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>I've been working to tackle the issue of derelict and unused garages which are potentially a hazard whilst cars not using them exasperate the parking problem in many areas across the city for example in Ravensthorpe where I have identified that in some areas and blocks up to a third are not used as garages.</p> <p>What work has been undertaken between the local authority and owners in order to tackle the problem. Will the council look into an action plan to make use of the land where appropriate and demolish garages which are no longer of the size for modern cars and will the Council now also work with owners, housing associations, housing cooperative and others to use any land that is freed up to improve parking facilities within neighbourhoods and perhaps build some new homes if appropriate land is made available.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p>

	<p>The Council is working through a review of all its asset types to identify opportunities that support a range of different Council Priorities. Where such opportunities exist, we will seek to clarify ownership issues and work with stakeholders to assess the viability of any developments.</p>
11.	<p>Question from Councillor Shaz Nawaz</p> <p>For Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Finance:</p> <p>How much money has been invested in the Millfield area compared to the city centre over the past four years?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Millfield has received investment of around £0.7m whilst the City Centre has had, comparing like for like, around £1.9m. However £1.5m of that is North Westgate which will help regeneration and provide an important connection with the Lincoln Road area.</p>
12.	<p>Question from Councillor Howell</p> <p>Cllr Cereste, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment:</p> <p>On occasion, Aragon has claimed it was unable to empty residents' bins due to roadworks in the street, a huge inconvenience to residents, particularly with the roadworks in question were planned. This has been a particular problem during the CityFibre works around the city. In what ways can Aragon and CityFibre (or other roadworks agencies) work together to ensure that bin lorries can always access residential streets, and how might communications between Aragon and residents be improved so they understand why their bins have not been emptied and when Aragon will return to empty them?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The denial of access to the waste collection teams is an inconvenience to everyone concerned. PCC has arranged direct contact between City Fibre and Aragon to help minimise these issues, although it is acknowledged that there will be times when it is impossible to avoid delays in collection. The collection management team inform Peterborough Direct and local councillors when this happens and are happy to work with all parties to discuss any other means of communication to residents.</p>
13.	<p>Just to clarify for Members, this question relates to Constitution and Ethics Committee, and a section of a report to that Committee on the use of resources and facilities. I believe the point the officer made was regarding the Mayors allowances and expenses being used specifically in relation to that role. The Committee agreed to keep the overall issue of use of resources and facilities under review and not bring the specific proposals forward to Full Council at this time.</p> <p>However to answer the question, as you will know, the Mayors allowances and expenses are a public record published annually on the Council website.</p>

As this will not specifically include the period since 4th March when we last met in the Town Hall, I'm able to inform you that I have incurred costs of just £186.85 during the nearly eight months since.

For Councillor Gul Nawaz, Mayor of Peterborough:

At a recent committee meeting a report was produced and it was explained that the intention was for members to look at special responsibility allowances and how they were being used for the duties connected with the members responsibilities, the officer particularly cited the Mayor amongst other allowances and expenses (see agenda page 98 item 4.4(F)). Can the Mayor tell us how much in allowances and expenses have been received since his appointment and how much has been claimed/received since the last time the Council meet in the town hall?

The Mayor responded:

Just to clarify for Members, this question relates to Constitution and Ethics Committee, and a section of a report to that Committee on the use of resources and facilities. I believe the point the officer made was regarding the Mayors allowances and expenses being used specifically in relation to that role. The Committee agreed to keep the overall issue of use of resources and facilities under review and not bring the specific proposals forward to Full Council at this time.

However, to answer the question, as you will know, the Mayors allowances and expenses are a public record published annually on the Council website.

As this will not specifically include the period since 4th March when we last met in the Town Hall, I'm able to inform you that I have incurred costs of just £186.85 during the nearly eight months since.

14. **Question from Councillor Wiggin**

For Councillor Allen - Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Housing, Culture and Recreation:

Following the motion passed at the July council meeting regarding Section 21 no fault evictions, council resolved to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to reiterate its support for these reforms and urge him to respond to the consultation and introduce legislation in this Parliamentary session. Could the relevant Cabinet Member please confirm this has happened, and provide an update on any responses or other correspondence received from the Secretary of State on this issue?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I can confirm that we have written to the Secretary of State, but as yet have not received a response. I will let you know once that happens. However, I can report that since July, the Government has taken further action in relation to section 21 and have extended the period of notice for no fault evictions to 6 months' notice. This is a huge step and gives services sufficient time to support households at risk of homelessness to prevent.

15.	<p>Question from Cllr Hogg</p> <p>For Councillor Farooq, Cabinet Member for Digital Services and Transformation:</p> <p>Following the decision to replace the Ask Peterborough app with a skinned version of FixMyStreet in 2019 there was a presentation where it was suggested that once an initial implementation of systems integration with established council departmental systems a working group would be set up to include councillors and other stakeholders to help iron out any issues that arise. Considerable time has now past and there are a few issues that have come up and continue to do so. When will this user group be formed to help give the residents of Peterborough the service they deserve?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may respond:</p> <p>"Whilst highways and trees back office system integrations have been completed for some time, waste and street scene integration is still being tested. Development and testing were delayed by Covid-19. As a result, dog fouling, graffiti, rubbish and fly tipping are still logged manually. Once waste and street scene has been properly integrated later this year, we expect service efficiency to improve as well as better management of customer expectations. We can then look to holding a review with stakeholders to identify and address any remaining issues.</p> <p>In the meantime, if residents or councillors are having issues using report.peterborough.gov.uk site (Powered by FMS) they should access the contact page from the 'Help' menu this will raise a support ticket with MySociety's helpdesk and will usually be responded to the next working day.</p> <p>If the issue is related to a problem they have already reported on FMS e.g. a pothole, fly tip etc. My Society obviously cannot comment or resolve these issues, these should be escalated via the customer service centre or through member services. "</p>
16.	<p>Question from Cllr Fower</p> <p>For Councillor Hiller, Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Commercial Strategy and Investments:</p> <p>Earlier in the year, councillors were asked to submit suggestions and ideas on ways to encourage and improve cycling in their ward, after a government grants was announced. I submitted a lengthy list of comments and remarks, but have not received a full update as to how many of these were enacted, or will be, therefore could the relevant cabinet member let me know what cycle related improvements, initiatives, street furniture and schemes have been implemented so far this financial year, what my community can look forward to and while we are at it, for the previous financial year?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>We received a number of suggestions and ideas from Councillors and members of the public to inform the walking and cycling improvements that were carried out as part of the first tranche of the Government's Emergency Active Travel Funding. The measures undertaken with this initial tranche of funding focussed on the city centre to encourage people to walk and cycle and assist with social distancing alongside the 'School Streets' initiative offered to every school. We received further suggestions, all of which were reviewed, ahead of the application submitted as part of the second tranche of funding. However, the funding guidelines stipulated that the schemes should be linked</p>

to our draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, which we will be consulting on soon. To assist in the delivery of these schemes we have setup a Cross Party Working Group and we look forward to seeing their recommendations.

Supplementary notes:

We have also allocated an additional £500k to make improvements to the Green Wheel Cycle Network.

Tranche 1

Broadway: The lower section near Westgate has had bays suspended to allow more room for pedestrians.

Cattle Market Rd: Parking bays have been suspended to create more room for pedestrians.

New Road: A pop-up cycle has been installed and the street has become one-way.

City Road: A pop up cycle lane has been installed between St Johns and Northminster and the road has become one way.

Priestgate: A pop-up cycle lane has been installed on Priestgate, the road has become one way with parking bays suspended to allow more room for pedestrians and cyclists.

Crescent Bridge: A pop up cycle lane has been installed on Crescent Bridge. We have monitoring devices in place for this scheme and they are showing an average of 190 cyclists per day. Traffic is also being monitored and there are no congestion issues currently.

Signage: We are producing a number of signs on some of the key routes around Peterborough to advise people how long it takes to walk and cycle to a destination as a further means of encouraging people to travel sustainably.

School Street Closures: A school street is a road outside a school with a temporary restriction on motorised school-run traffic at school drop-off and pick-up times. We have had 10 schools that have confirmed their interest in being involved in this scheme.

Tranche 1 budget: £175k

Tranche 2

We submitted our tranche 2 proposals via the CPCA on Friday (7th Aug). We have 3 schemes that we are intending to deliver with the tranche 2 funding and we have been provisionally allocated £625k by DfT and the CPCA:

Oundle Rd from Pleasure Fair Meadows car park to Lady Lodge Drive
Park Road from Huntly Grove to Dogsthorpe Rd
Broadway from junction of Eastfield Rd to Park Crescent

Questions on notice to:

d. The Combined Authority Representatives

1. **Question from Councillor Sandford**

For Councillor Holdich, Deputy Mayor for the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Combined Authority:

Please could we have an update on progress with the CAM metro system and in particular whether it will provide any benefit to people living in Peterborough?

The Combined Authority Representative responded:

This is a very long answer, but there is a very short answer, which I will give you at the end. CAM is one of the key priorities of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and is at the centre of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan. It is the key to levelling up the CPCA area, ensuring that all parts of the CPCA can enjoy the growth experienced in recent years by both Cambridge and Peterborough. It will do this connecting key employment sites to affordable, quality homes. A company has been set up to promote the CAM and oversee its delivery and Lord Mair was appointed to chair the company from 1st October.

Lord Mair, is a geotechnical engineer with so many letters after his name, it's not true and Emeritus Sir Kirby Laing Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of Research at the University of Cambridge. He is a leading expert on tunnelling. In 2014 he was elected a vice president of the Institution of Civil Engineers and on 1st November 2017 became the Institution's President for 2017–18, its 200th anniversary year. He was appointed an independent crossbencher in the House of Lords in 2015 and is currently a member of its Select Committee.

Work is currently ongoing to develop a delivery strategy for the CAM programme with a view to creating a single, One Cam programme for delivery of this important project. Whilst the One Cam programme is in development, it is too early to commit to any dates for delivery, but work is expected to begin shortly along the GCP routes into Cambridge. There is certainty about the benefits of the network to Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. The CAM will include a central tunnels section in Cambridge, new garden communities contributing to the cost of infrastructure, a zero carbon, autonomous, smart mass transport system with regional routes intended to be part of a region-wide network linking quality housing to good jobs. The Mayor recognises the importance that I have placed upon a CAM route linking Peterborough to the wider region and also the opportunity that brings to create a mass rapid transit system within Peterborough in due course. This all begins once the Cam company starting its work and completing the outstanding business case in 2021.

The short answer I will give you is that Charlotte Palmer and myself had a telephone conference with the Mayor two or three weeks ago as we want to progress the business case for the rapid transport system in Peterborough and the Mayor expressed a wish that it should link up with the CAM so we are looking at delivering the one for Peterborough but also links up with the CAM but obviously the CAM version

is a few years away. Thank you, I hope that is a comprehensive answer and if you have got anymore, I will have to try and answer it.

Supplementary question

No I have no supplementary question, that was a very comprehensive answer.