

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY 22 MARCH 2023
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

THE MAYOR – COUNCILLOR DOWSON

Present:

Councillors Ansar Ali, Imtiaz Ali, Jackie Allen, Steve Allen, Ayres, Barkham, Bi, Bisby, Andrew Bond, Sandra Bond, Burbage, Casey, Cereste, Coles, Day, Dowson, Elsey, Mohammed Farooq, Saqib Farooq, Fenner, Fitzgerald, John Fox, Judy Fox, Harper, Haseeb, Hemraj, Hiller, Hogg, Howard, Hussain, Iqbal, Jamil, Alison Jones, Dennis Jones, Knight, Lane, Moyo, Gul Nawaz, Over, Perkins, Qayyum, Rangzeb, Ray, Robinson, Rush, Sabir, Sainsbury, Sandford, Shaheed, Sharp, Simons, Skibsted, Stevenson, Tyler, Warren, Wiggin, Yurgutene

104. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Seager.

105. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

106. Minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 February 2023

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 February 2023 were approved as a true and accurate record.

COMMUNICATIONS

107. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor advised that his 'Farewell Jolly' would be taking place on Saturday, 20 May 2023 at the Milton Ferry Golf Club. Tickets for this were now on sale and all were encouraged to attend.

108. Leader's Announcements

The Leader made a number of announcements on the following areas:

- Appointments had been made to the positions of Executive Director of Childrens Services and Young People and Executive Director of Adults Services.
- Project Gigabit would soon be providing residents and businesses in rural parts of Peterborough with fast, reliable broadband after a major contract was signed to upgrade the county's network.

- There had been an increase in attainment for primary school pupils in reading, writing and maths, and Peterborough had moved up in national league tables from 148th to 123rd.
- Peterborough's attainment score at Key Stage 2 was now close to the national average.
- Strong improvement had been seen in secondary outcomes, with Peterborough moving up 37 places to 35th out of 151 authorities.
- The Easter Holiday Activities and Food (HAF) programme was now available to primary and secondary children receiving income-related free school meals.
- Eligible families would be receiving supermarket vouchers for the Easter school holidays.
- Families were urged to check if they were eligible for free school meals.
- The latest phase of Household Support Fund had been agreed, with the Council being provided £3.65 million to help low-income families.
- The spring clean would commencing from 1 April, with the Council spending £120,000 on areas that weren't included in normal cleaning routes. Other requests would be considered via asktheleader@peterborough.gov.uk.
- Litter Action Week was to be launched at the Town Hall on Saturday from 10am.
- Thanks was sent out to ex-Councillor Shaz Nawaz for all his work, following his decision to stand down as Councillor.

The Mayor permitted Group Leaders to respond for longer than the normal one minute, in order to say a few words about ex-Councillor Shaz Nawaz. The following points were raised:

- Group Leaders congratulated the new director appointees.
- Members were delighted to hear news of school attainment and congratulated all involved, though comment was made that league tables did not benefit pupils.
- Members were further pleased to note the plans around city fibre and around the support to be provided to eligible families via free school meals and vouchers.
- The news of a spring clean was welcomed, though Group Leaders expressed a desire to see the city-maintained year-round.
- Members conveyed their thanks to ex-Councillor Shaz Nawaz for the support he had provided over the years.
- Members wished all who observed a Ramadan Mubarak.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

109. Questions from Members of the Public

One question was received from members of the public in respect of the following:

1. Low Traffic Neighbourhoods
2. Combined Authority meeting around bus transport
3. Lack of attendance by PCC at Combined Authority meeting to discuss bus services

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

110. Petitions

(a) Presented by Members of the Public

There were no petitions presented by Members of the public at the meeting.

(b) Presented by Members

There were no petitions presented by Members at the meeting.

111. 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 (a)-(d) were raised and taken as read in respect of the following:

1. Station Quarter
2. Fly tipping
3. Serco contract
4. Regional Pool car park
5. Delay in temporary Regional Pool car park
6. Representatives on the Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee on 15 March 2023
7. London Road Peterborough Properties Ltd and Peterborough United Football Club car parking revenue
8. Hilton hotel loan extension
9. Net zero carbon target update
10. Serco contract

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

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

112. Executive and Committee Recommendations to Council

112(a). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Timetable for Reviewing Peterborough City Council Constitution

Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee in relation to a review of the Council's constitution, specifically in relation to the Contract Rules.

Councillor Sandford moved the recommendation and advised that a review of the constitution would be taking place, following consideration by the Constitution and Ethics Committee. This involved several streams of working, including a review by the committee of the Council's model of governance, considering the potential for a hybrid structure. Members would have a chance to feed into the review in several workshops to be held in June. The recommendation in front of Members today was specifically around the Contract Rules, as changes were required following the procurement service moving back in-house. It was requested to provide authority to the Monitoring Officer to make the necessary changes.

Councillor Jamil seconded the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Delegate authority to the Director of Law and Governance & Monitoring Officer to make any necessary changes to the Contract Rules, following the implementation of revised procurement procedures.

112(b). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Process for Appointing to Outside Bodies

Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee in relation to the process for appointing to outside bodies.

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation and advised that the Constitution and Ethics Committee considered two options in relation to the process for appointing to outside bodies, which were: the decision to be taken by Full Council, or the decision to be taken by the Leader. Ultimately, the committee decided to recommend that the decision remain as current with the Leader, with some minor changes to the constitution to reflect current practice.

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

Councillor Hogg moved a procedural motion, under Council Standing Order 20.1 to refer the recommendation to the Constitution and Ethics Committee, and advised the recommendation should be returned to the committee in order to present Council with a recommendation that would allow a true vote. At the current time, whichever way Council voted, the decision on outside bodies would remain with the Leader.

Councillor Sandford seconded the procedural motion and advised that the matter before Members this evening had been a long-running issue. The discussion at the Constitution and Ethics Committee had led to a vote on the recommendation, with 4 voting in favour and 3 voting against. An amendment had been submitted to Council in an effort to change the recommendation to instead have Full Council as the decision maker for outside body appointments, however, it was advised that this could not be done. It was felt that the procedural motion was necessary in order to allow Full Council the freedom of choice in determining the decision-maker for this process.

Council debated the procedural motion and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- Comment was made that the Constitution and Ethics Committee should be allowed the option to reconsider the proposal.
- Suggestion was made that referring the matter back to committee would be a pointless endeavour, as the same recommendation would like be made to Council.

As mover of the procedural motion, Councillor Hogg summed up, advising that it felt like 'bad governance' to have the Council unable to make a decision. The Monitoring Officer, however, advised that there was a recommendation from the committee before the Council to be voted on.

A vote was taken on the procedural motion by Councillor Hogg (24 voted in favour, 30 voted against, and 2 abstained from voting). The procedural motion was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (33 voted in favour, 21 voted against, and 2 abstained from voting) to:

1. Approve the process for appointments to Outside Bodies as set out in Appendix 2 (Revised 'Section 5 – Appointments to External Organisations' – Leader of the Council as decision-maker) to the report.

112(c). Constitution and Ethics Committee Recommendation - Update to Civic Protocol

Council received a report from the Constitution and Ethics Committee in relation to the Civic Protocol.

Councillor Sandford moved the recommendation and advised that the Constitution and Ethics Committee had debated the matter on four separate occasions, with a number of contrasting views being provided. Although the recommendation did not reflect Councillor Sandford's own view, it was felt that in light of other important issues the Council currently faced, the matter of Mayoral attire should not be the Council's priority. It was also advised that, as Mayor Elect, Councillor Sandford would be abstaining from the vote should one be required.

Councillor Jamil seconded the recommendation and advised that sufficient debate had been held at the Constitution and Ethics Committee meeting for the recommendation to be able to be agreed.

Council debated the recommendation and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- Comment was made those who held the position of Mayor should take advice from officers on matters.
- Further comment was made that individual opinion on whether hats or other ceremonial garb should be worn was not relevant to the recommendation, and that the Mayor represented the whole of Peterborough as First Citizen and not in their own right.
- It was suggested that if a Member felt uncomfortable with an aspect of the Mayoral role, then they should not take on the role.
- It was noted that the revised protocol before Members had been drafted in order to provide clear guidance to the Mayor on the expected Mayoral attire.

As mover of the recommendation, Councillor Sandford summed up, advising that, should he be elected as Mayor in May 2023, he would be taking advice from officers on all aspects of the role and was disappointed that discussion had continued at this meeting.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. The Declaration of Acceptance of Office (outlined in Appendix 2 of the report);
2. The revised Civic Protocol (outlined in Appendix 1 to the report).

The Mayor made comment that he hoped individuals with republican views would not be denied the honour of taking on the role of Peterborough's First Citizen in the future.

112(d). Cabinet Recommendation – Flood Risk Management Plan

Council received a report from Cabinet in relation to the Flood Risk Management Plan.

Councillor Cereste moved the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Approve the updated Peterborough Flood Risk Management Strategy (FMS).

113. Questions on the Executive Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

Cllr Fitzgerald introduced the report which outlined the record of Executive decisions made since the last meeting.

Members asked questions on the following Executive Decisions.

Amendment to Hotel Loan Facility

In response to a question from Councillor Iqbal, Councillor Coles advised that it was anticipated the Council would see the loan paid back in full around July 2023.

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Coles advised that the Hotel Loan was not similar to Empower and it was anticipated that the building would be completed by July 2023.

In response to a question from Councillor Imtiaz Ali, Councillor Coles advised that while it was not the intention of providing the loan to make a profit, the Council was making a return on it's own loan from the Public Works Loan Board plus a little more.

Award of Insurance Contract

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Coles advised that matters in relation to planning for contract renewal were being addressed, particularly now the procurement service had returned in-house.

114. Questions on the Combined Authority Decisions Made Since the Last Meeting

The Mayor introduced the report which outlined the record of Combined Authority decisions made since the last meeting.

Members asked questions on the following Combined Authority decisions.

Combined Authority Board – 8 February 2023 - Announcements, Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

In response to a question from Councillor Hogg, Councillor Jamil advised that that he had offered his apologies to the meeting as the representative from the Fire Authority. Councillor Edna Murphy, of South Cambridgeshire District Council, attended as substitute.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

115. Notices of Motion

115(1) Motion from Councillor Dennis Jones

Councillor Dennis Jones moved his motion and advised that recent statistics showed seven out of ten Councillors faced abused. The Councillor was himself aware of members of his own Group who had received abusive message, which was considered normal for female Councillors. It was felt that Councillors took on their positions in order to make change for the better and did not deserve to be subject to such behaviour. It was suggested that the Council review this motion in six months' time to ensure that all involved were taking appropriate action.

Councillor Harper seconded the motion and advised that, while Councillor could and should expect political challenge as part of their role, this should not include abused and such behaviour should not be tolerated.

Council debated motion and the summary of the points raised by Members included:

- Members expressed wholehearted agreement with the motion.
- Comment was made that one particular party had shown a desire to move away from the democratic process regarding dealing with abuse.
- Further comment was made that political commentary and criticism should not be mistaken for bullying, with the former being an important aspect of democracy.

As mover of the motion, Councillor Dennis Jones summed up, advising that the atmosphere in the Chamber had improved in the past couple of years and it was important to continue to emphasis debate rather than hate.

A vote was taken on the motion moved by Councillor Dennis Jones (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain). The motion was **CARRIED** as follows:

"The intimidation and abuse of councillors, in person or otherwise, undermines democracy; preventing elected members from representing the communities they serve, deterring individuals from standing for election, and undermining public life in democratic processes.

This council notes that increasing levels of toxicity in public and political discourse is having a detrimental impact of local democracy and that prevention, support and responses to abuse and intimidation of local politicians must improve to ensure councillors feel safe and able to continue representing their residents.

This council therefore commits to challenge the normalisation of abuse against councillors and officers and uphold exemplary standards of public and political debate in all it does. The council further agrees to sign up to the LGA's Debate Not Hate campaign. The campaign aims to raise public awareness of the role of councillors in local communities, encourage healthy debate and improve the response to and support those in public life facing abuse and intimidation.

In addition, this council resolves to:

- **Write to the local Member of Parliament to ask them to support the campaign.**
- **Write to the Government to ask them to work with the LGA to develop and implement a plan to address abuse and intimidation of politicians.**
- **Regularly review the support available to councillors in relation to abuse and intimidation and councillor safety.**

- **Work with the local police to ensure there is a clear and joined-up mechanism for reporting threats and other concerns about the safety of councillors and their families and discuss the need to take a preventative approach that accounts for the specific risks that councillors face, as they do with other high-risk individuals, like MPs.**
- **Take a zero-tolerance approach to abuse of councillors and officers.”**

115(2) Motion from Councillor Sandra Bond

Councillor Sandra Bond confirmed that she no longer wished to move the motion.

116. REPORTS TO COUNCIL

116(a) Annual Pay Policy Statement

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2023. The Policy is attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

116(b) Revised Political Proportionality and Allocation of Committee Seats

Councillor Dennis Jones moved the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to:

1. Agree the allocation of seats on committees subject to political balance arrangements (Appendix 1 to the report).

116(c) Appointment of Statutory Scrutiny Officer

Councillor Coles moved the recommendation.

A vote was taken on the recommendation and Council **RESOLVED** (unanimous with no Members indicating to vote against or abstain) to appoint Philippa Turvey, Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager as the authority’s Statutory Scrutiny Officer.

The Mayor
6.00pm – 8.05pm
22 March 2023

**FULL COUNCIL 22 MARCH 2023
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 Christopher Taylor</p> <p>Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Local councils across the UK are being provided with significant funding from central government to implement Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs), 15 Minute Cities, and other restrictions on the freedom of movement of the local population, and as a consequence of this stands to rake in significant amounts of money from new fines on motorists. Local councils appears to ignore the public and push ahead with these undemocratic schemes regardless of the will of the people to meet net zero targets.</p> <p>People should be able to travel and live their lives as they see fit, without central or local government interference. What plans does Peterborough City Council have with regard LTNs and other restrictions on the freedom of movement of the citizens of this city, and when will these plans be submitted to, at the very least, public scrutiny via an open and robust consultation process?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Thank you for the question, you're not the only one to ask this question, not here in Peterborough. I'm going to give you a couple of answers if I may, I'll respond to your specific points.</p> <p>We have no plans, that's the first point, so there's nothing to submit or scrutinise.</p> <p>What I will say is I entirely agree with your view, and so do Members on this side of the Chamber. I can't speak for Members on the other side because they may have a totally different view, you'll have to write to the separately or ask them. But what I can say is that as long as I am Leader of the Council, we shall not be doing this, so I am giving you that assurance, and for anybody else watching.</p> <p>What I will say to you though, conversely, things are mixed up. The LTNs, 15 minute cities, 20 minute cities and we've taken an active interest in it. So all the things you are afraid of, that I'm assuming you refer to, we will not be doing. However, we do take seriously the improvements in walking and cycling and having a cleaner, greener city, so we take all those things very seriously as well and I know colleagues on the other side of the Chamber do. We are committed to improve all those things, but not at the expense you are talking about.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Are Peterborough apart of the 100 cities initiatives, which is also net zero driven.</p>

The Cabinet Member responded:

What I will say to you is that I keep getting these messages saying you are on a list, and I keep thinking, what list, what list are we on, where's this list? And it's only thanks to you and others that previously we signed up to UK 100 cities, but I'm happy to share with you, their view about the question you are asking, which is there is no provision or anything that can make us, neither are they saying we should be a 15 minute city or a 20 minute city. If you look on their FAQ section by the way, it does actually say that, so what we're committed to is about improving neighbourhood walking and cycling, but again, I am going to reiterate to you, we are not going to enforce things on people, without, certainly asking and we have no desire to do so. So check the FAQs, which were sent to me by the way by our Climate team about that. It makes quite clear that there is no requirement to do those things that you are talking about. Its news to me, but at least I know what list we're on.

2. **Question from Sue Magill**

Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council

I would like to ask why there was no representative from the Peterborough at the Combined Authority transport meeting on the 15th March. This made the voting process difficult. Why did no one attend this meeting or have a representative to take their place in case of emergency?

The Cabinet Member responded:

Thank you, Mrs Magill, you are not the only person to ask this question. There is a perfectly reasonable and rational explanation, but I'll start with some positive news for you before I respond to the direct question. There was no harm done, there was no vote lost or ground lost, in fact I attended the board meeting today which is where the decision are made. There were only recommendations for the transport and infrastructure Committee, which go to the board for approval. So, all the things that were not 'quote', approved, were approved today.

It's a very sensible question and I have asked permission from the Cabinet Member, Cllr Cereste responsible to share the information. It is very simple and unfortunately, his wife's father remains close to death and is very ill. So on that day, Cllr Cereste had already given apologies to the Combined Authority, but due to a series of mishaps, neither the CA or the people here could do anything about it in time to organise a substitute, so it was just one of those things about human error so we'll apologies for that. I can do that on behalf of the Council, particularly for those residents that went to that meeting. I know Cllr Dowson, particularly shares the views of some of the people in the rural communities and I guess it's about busses. If you watch back the Combined Authority meeting from today, you will see I made your case very strongly about the lack of buses in Ailsworth, Castor, Wandsford and those areas and I put that back to the Combined Authority as a challenge to try and help invest in those areas. So, there was no harm done your points were made properly, but on that particular day, it was just an unfortunate set of circumstances and understandably Cllr Cereste's put his family first, but he did do the right thing. Apologies were sent but unfortunately, it just didn't happen because of an internal issue about how that was managed.

The team here have looked at that and hopefully we have kind of fixed it. I hope that helps.

Supplementary question:

I attended this meeting in order to inform all of a lack of regular daily reliable bus services in our villages of Castor, Alisworth elderly, vulnerable and teenagers and non car drivers feel isolated and forgotten. In Wittering, teenagers walk along the A1 to Stamford. RAF personnel families feel isolated and I take on board what you've just said, but how can we be reassured in view of no one possibly turning up again. Not in such tragic circumstances naturally as Mr Cereste, Cllr Cereste but could there be a stand in just automatically takes over?

The Cabinet Member responded:

There is, but unfortunately the process failed. As in I won't go into detail, but I just don't want to embarrass the team here. Some one went on holiday, someone couldn't see the diary, the Combined Authority didn't do the right thing either. It was one of those perfect storms where the whole thing went wrong, the team have taken on board and reflected on it and have put in other measures to try and ensure it doesn't happen again, but people are human and make mistakes. So never say never, but we do our very best to ensure it doesn't happen. We thought there was a process in place, but on this occasion it failed, but as I said because I know I've got two other questions about the same thing, I will just be referring everybody to what I have just said and I'm acutely aware, because I have been out to the Rural's with Councillor Over who is passionate about the villages as are other Councillors, Cllr Hiller so we have a broad representation, so we are aware of the challenges, particularly around public transport and we will do what we can to fix it and we'll work with the Combined Authority who are working on a bus strategy which was just approved today. Okay?

3. **Question from Julia Cunnington**

Councillor Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council

Good evening, the question really has been put by Sue and you've answered but we felt that we ought to ask it together and separately, so the question has already been answered, so thank you for that.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I'm happy to answer any supplementary if there is a different question Mr Mayor but there may not be.

Supplementary question:

It's more of an offer as well, you say you visited our villages. It's an open invitation, please come and talk to me, I'm the chair of wittering parish council, I'll be happy to show you round our village and show you what the problems are and you can absolutely understand the sort of issues our residents are facing.

The Cabinet Member responded:

I'm happy to anytime, just contact the office and send me an invitation. Councillor Over though will testify or be testament to, that I met with a number of Parish Councils probably in the last six to eight weeks I think it was, I know it was dark and cold and so I'm always happy to speak to anybody wherever they are in the city, so just ask me

and we'll come and I'll bring any officers we need to. Its Lewis Banks if it's about public transport and the like, he's a very good officer. If there are any other problems, if its road safety, those kinds of issues, just because I know there are speeding issues as well, we are aware, as I say, we can only do what we can do with what we have.

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 John Fox

Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities

It is great news that the council have secured funding for the station quarter, which will be good news for many residents.

We must however ensure that the elderly and disabled residents are catered for and that before any decisions are made, the administration liaises with disability groups as a matter of course.

Council should be seriously looking for a Changing Places toilet to be built in or near the station itself, which is long overdue and in much demand.

At long last the Council can now take a serious look at the footbridge from the Station quarter to Queensgate striving to make it more user friendly for pedestrians, mobility scooter users, blind or partially sighted residents, the elderly and those with limited mobility.

Will the leader and cabinet member reassure this chamber that this will be actioned on and taken in serious consideration?

The Cabinet Member responded:

We are absolutely delighted that the Levelling Up bid was successful, and we have secured such a significant investment into our city which will be truly transformative.

We agree with the points raised about making sure the station is accessible to all and as such I can confirm that the Peterborough Station Quarter project will be designed will all users in mind. Part of the next phase is to carry out an access audit

	<p>on the design proposals to ensure compliance with Equality Act 2010, “Access for All” with the aim of ensuring the necessary facilities are put in place. I can absolutely confirm that Disability Peterborough and other stakeholders will be engaged to discuss the proposals with the support of Network Rail’s Built Environment Accessibility Panel (BEAP).</p> <p>Regarding the footbridge between Queensgate and the Station (car park) I can confirm that there are proposals being developed for accessibility improvements between the Station and the city centre. These are not fully developed at this stage but might, for example, include accessibility improvements towards Cowgate, Westgate or indeed both. I can assure you that I will instruct offices to consider all options and engage with all relevant stakeholders to ensure that accessibility is improved for all.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I’m really pleased to hear that I mean, it’s reassuring very much so, but will you also liaise with Councillors who are passionate about this, and you know who they are in this Chamber, who are really, really passionate about disability issues within the station quarter and the lack of facilities for people with limited mobility. So would you reassure us as well that you talk to all Councillors as well, so we know what’s going on because it’s an important issue and this is the time to get it right and the only way you’ll get it right is to listen to the experts and the experts are the people with the disabilities. They will tell you what is needed, listen and then act please.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>You’ve known me long enough to know that I am a big believer in communications, communication is everything and be assured that we will communicate with all of those with an input on this subject matter. I can confirm also that our disability Champion, Brian Tyler Councillor Tyler will be fully engaged in the conversation with regard to this. Yes in deed, the whole of the Councillor cohort will be engaged, talking to us about how we make sure this works properly for all.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Councillor Ansar Ali (1)</p> <p>Councillor Nigel Simons, Cabinet Member for Waste, Street Scene and the Environment</p> <p>It is extremely embarrassing to hear from residents in my ward, our city being called dirty Peterborough. The sight of ever-growing litter and fly tipping across our city is extremely heart-wrenching, this is particularly bad in my North Ward. I would urge urgent action to address this decline. Can I be advised as to what strategy and action the Council is taking to address this blight in our city?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The blight of fly-tipping and littering is not acceptable in our communities and our officers are working tirelessly to respond to this challenge.</p> <p>We know that nationally and citywide this is a problem, but we acknowledge that in some areas of Peterborough it is more prevalent than others and our approach is to focus on hotspot locations to address this.</p>

Our strategy is centred on 3 themes:

Behaviour Change, which includes:

- Media campaigns to highlight issues and promote correct disposal options
- Establishing litter picking groups to clear up neighbourhoods and help with bringing attention to this issue within hotspot areas and instil a sense of community pride, thanking the Community Wombles especially.
- We are recruiting 5 new education officers whose role will be to increase recycling awareness and work directly with communities to educate around the anti-social acts of fly-tipping and littering

Our second theme is services and infrastructure:

- We have 4 dedicated specialist investigators experienced in gathering evidence and bringing offenders to justice.
- We have a strong operator in Aragon services who is resourced to allow us to set a target to remove fly-tipping within 48hrs. Nationally, this is a good response time with some partners quoting well over a week.
- We are working hand in glove with Aragon to gather evidence and define Hot Spot locations.
- We have a dedicated 'Hit Squad' to target known fly-tipping areas on a constant basis.
- Enforcement
- We are increasing use of covert surveillance equipment to identify offenders.
- We are deploying overt cameras not only to enforce but to deter offending. At locations where the cameras have been installed officers noted a significant drop in the number of incidents, even after removal.
- Since the 1st of April 2022 179 Fixed Penalty Notices have been issued for Fly Tipping and Duty of Care and 35 cases have been sent to Legal for prosecution.

Supplementary question:

Thank you Councillor Simons for your comprehensive response. In terms of what is being done, I know that Aragon, when fly tipping is reported they clear that quite quickly. I'm concerned that more enforcement is not carried out and more people are not being caught and fined. That's something I'd like to see more of so we can send a strong message that we have zero tolerance on those who blight our city with fly tipping and litter etc. When people are coming into our city, our parkways look very very dirty, that's not very welcoming and quite often there is confusion who is responsible for keeping those parkways and pathways clean, so I think we need to make sure, whoever is responsible, we do the best we can. At the moment, it seems to many that I represent that not enough is being done to hold those responsible keeping the city clean, to account and those who are making the mess of our city to actually hold them to account and catching the culprits. I think what I'm really asking Mr Mayor is that we to do more in my North Ward and I know there is a book (illegible)... I know at times I will use my North Ward and I'm hoping that someone will win that box of chocolates, I'm... what I'm hoping to do is that there will be more covert cameras installed in North Ward because things are getting from bad to worse, thank you.

Cabinet Member responded:

I'll try and pick the bones out of that. Obviously we've got six covert cameras and we are looking to get more but obviously we will be deploying them in areas of the greatest

	<p>need. If that is in North Ward, then obviously, it will be in North Ward but we don't want to say where we are putting the cameras for obvious reasons. I visited several times in your ward recently Ansar, and I did notice that the mosque was immaculate. It would be fantastic if we could get more engagement from the mosque so we can go out further than the mosque area and do some cleaning up and obviously I know you've gone to the school recently to try and educate the children, so I appreciate that. Obviously, as you are aware, we are naming and shaming as well. I think if we all work together, I'm sure we will make a real difference.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Dennis Jones</p> <p>Councillor Andy Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>I have read, with some alacrity, that PCC does not have a break clause in the Serco contract until 2031 at an estimated cost of £105m.</p> <p>My question is two-fold. Why was this signed with no break clause in the first place? And five years on from signing and one year on from the city being close to bankruptcy, what was the prevailing culture within the cabinet at that time where a now retired councillor was able to sign the city up for such a contract? Hindsight is a wonderful thing but no break clause without the benefit of a crystal ball does appear to be rather careless.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The contract extension in 2018 was signed by the then S151 Officer and the then Monitoring Officer, and approved via CMDN by the then portfolio holder, so we know from that process that the Monitoring Officer was content with the legality and the S151 Officer was content with decisions financial probity. The former holder then signed off the decision, so we can assume safely that he received assurances to that case. None of those individuals holding the purse remain in the Council so we can't say with 100% certainty the reasoning that led to the CMDN, but the best recollection of the Cabinet Members at the time, was that there were financial reasons that might have affected the Councils bottom line that required the extension and strategical and tactical contractual management reasons for why the contract was extended in this way.</p> <p>I can't comment regarding the removal of any break clause, but I am given to understand that there is likely to have been an opportunity to vary that part of contract in a 2018 extension either, but we are going onto the realms of speculation here. But when I'm portfolio for this area for procurement there is a vanishingly small chance that I would accept a contract for this Council where break clauses were not included.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I think you've kind of pre-empted what I was going to say, is what lessons have been learned since then. Assuming this was such a good deal, would you have no hesitation of repeating the exercise, hopefully not, as this was the only show in town, or perhaps more options might have been assessed with Cabinet colleagues, with no crystal ball in sight 13 years tied into any contract for any service appears to have be rather a long time.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p>

	<p>I was struck by your question with the one word you used, alacrity, which means eagerness and briskness. I am delighted to say you are eager and brisk despite your current situation and I did offer you my cushion to sit on, but I know you don't need it. However, the issue for me I think is opposition Members need to make sure that they exercise the duties that they have in terms of asking questions about CMDNs when they come up and also challenging things in Council. So, if that had happened in 2018, and we had similar alacrity with officers then, sorry with Members then we would know much more detail. I'm sorry, I've had to fish around to come up with an answer. I don't want to mislead anyone and give an answer that might be incorrect, but what I can say in conclusion is that the Government arrangements have now changed and all such decisions of in excess of half a million pounds would be reported to and subject to a full Cabinet approval process. So, there is no chance of, as you say, a large contract just being decided on one CMDN.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Councillor Hogg (1)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities</p> <p>At the Full Council meeting of 25 January Councillors were given assurances that "no one would be inconvenienced in the short term" by the closure of the Regional Pool Car Park and that disabled parking spaces lost by the closure would be replaced for the use of customers of the Regional Pool. On 13 February the car park was closed to prepare for the forthcoming development of the phase 3 University building. At the time of writing this question no extra disabled parking spaces have been provided for Regional Pool customers. Why has this been allowed to happen despite firm assurances that extra provision would be put in place before the closure of the car park?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Whilst initially planning permission was secured for temporary replacement parking, at the time the permission was granted, it was deemed unnecessary to provide additional parking as there was ample existing parking provisions in nearby car parks.</p> <p>However, that position has changed over recent weeks, with both Bishop's Road and Car Haven car parks often full to capacity. This appears to be a result of post-Covid recovery, which is a good thing, and a strong city centre offer; and maybe also the presence of the University at that location.</p> <p>As an interim arrangement, additional parking places have been created on the site of the regional pool and all 4 accessible bays around the pool itself have been maintained. I am pleased to confirm that a contractor has now been appointed to install the temporary car park, which was originally intended on the site where planning permission was granted, and their mobilisation period has commenced.</p> <p>Within this construction plan for the temporary car park, there is a specification for 5 accessible bays, and to convert the 2 loading bays to provide circa 12 places this is including now taking into play some of the staff places. Whilst we anticipate that this will meet demand, officers will continue to work with Peterborough Limited who operate the facility to identify if any further accessible provision can be provided.</p>

	<p>Our hot new is that I heard today that additional places will now be added to that to provide more parking facilities, accessible parking places, but I can share more about the programme over the coming days.</p> <p>Supplementary questions:</p> <p>The question I have hear is not so much about parking spaces but disabled parking spaces and the fact is that we made some changes to what had been the coach car park but we did add a single disabled place. And we were given assurances by both the Leader and the Cabinet Member that there would be nobody inconvenienced before the closure of the car park. This simply did not happen and still hasn't happened. You say you are very strong on communication, what have you done to communicate with users of the pool to highlight to them the situation and the steps you are looking to put this right?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Communication is a two-way thing in as much, I need the information the relevant council officers to allow me to share the information. The pool I believe is scheduled to reopen on Friday, and indeed, extra parking places are now in the process of being provided and we are taking about accessible parking places. So, it is being addressed. I do think that there's been some sort of a lag which is unfortunate, but we're getting there, and getting there with gusto now and the additional accessible bays will be provided. I can't give you the exact numbers, but I hear today that additional ones were going to be on site.</p> <p>Hogg, it will be four, because I had a briefing from the officers.</p> <p>Allen, well I've got here a total of 12, so is that to your satisfaction?</p> <p>Hogg, so it's about the communication.</p> <p>Allen, sorry Mr Mayor, can I just tie a ribbon on this, there will be no less than there were previously, but I am waiting on the exact numbers, there may be more.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Skibsted</p> <p>Councillor Steve Allen, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Communication, Culture and Communities and Councillor Marco Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>I asked a question about car parking at the regional pool to Councillor Cereste at Full Council in January. The council leader claimed in the PT on 28 January that, although the car park would close for users on 11 February, that "no one would be inconvenienced at all" by this closure. On 2 February I was informed by a senior officer that PCC was waiting for contractors to confirm the exact timelines for completing the works of building a temporary car park, which were not expansive and that we could expect this facility to be open "within the next few weeks".</p> <p>I see no sign of this work and we are now at the end of March and the original regional pool car park was closed on 11 February.</p>

	<p>Why was this promised and what is the cause of the delay in building and opening this much- needed. temporary car park?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I think I have comprehensively answered your question with the previous answer, but if you've got a supplementary, whack it at me and I'll see how we do.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>What was the cause of the delay, because as I said in my question, I was told on the 2nd February that it would be opening in a matter of weeks, so I am not totally clear about the delay in opening the temporary car park and as Councillor Hogg said we were told that nobody would be inconvenienced, well they have been inconvenienced, so why has it taken so long and it hasn't started yet as far as I can see. I know you're saying its on progress, but what's caused the delay?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Obviously, contractual obligation is always relevant on these kind of things, most unfortunate because of an operational issue, but the pool I believe is rescheduled to be open this Friday or maybe Monday. I am waiting for the final update on that, but I don't think people have been inconvenienced other than by the fact that the pool has been closed, so there will be spaces and the pool is about to open with additional spaces to be provided. So, there was no inconvenience on the basis that whilst it's been closed, you couldn't park there anyway.</p> <p>Skibstead, sorry that wasn't the answer to my question. I asked why there was a delay. Allen, I said contractual mobilisation at the start of my statement.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford (1)</p> <p>Councillor Sandford</p> <p>In view of the responses that have been received for previous questions, I'm happy to withdraw this question. I'm really sorry to hear about Councillor Cereste's personal circumstances.</p> <p>All I would just add in withdrawing the question though is the point about the rural bus services came up. The reason the villages don't have a bus service is that four years ago they had one and the administration refused to provide any subsidy to enable it to continue.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>I agree with Councillor Sandford that the administration didn't provide any support, because frankly we've got not money to do so, its as simple as that. All bus subsidies were under review at the time and unfortunately, you have to make choices, but we have to find a solution as I said to you through the Combined Authority. What I forgot to mention by the way, and I was chastised for it by my colleague on the left, so I mentioned some of the rural wards, but Eye, Thorney and Newborough being the biggest one and Councillor Elsey's ward of Wittering also which I mentioned in dispatches, these are all important areas to the Council and we have to redouble our</p>

	<p>efforts and it's good that if you're making noises through elected representatives and to the Council about finding solutions. So, it is very much on the radar and I respect Councillor Sandford's passion and enthusiasm for buses. If you want to know anything about them, he could talk to you about them for three hours about them, then move onto trees, because this is very important, and the fact is that I come back to the point though that we can't fund everything as a Council.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Seager</p> <p>Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>When the council sold back the freehold of the football ground to London Road Peterborough Properties Ltd it retained a large area of the gravel car park at the front of the sight fronting London Road. It seems that PUFC are using this space and charging for vehicles to park there on match days. Is Peterborough City Council leasing this land to PUFC or in a commercial arrangement to split the proceeds of the parking revenue?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The Council are currently investigating ways to regularise the ongoing use of the site and to secure an income based on any proposed use. Options include creating a new, temporary, pay and display car park and leasing the site in its entirety to third party organisations. The Council are in discussions with several parties including Peterborough Town Football Club. Any regularisation of the site will be for the short term as it remains a key future strategic development site. The Council expect to be in a position to regularise the use of this site in the coming weeks.</p> <p>A point of fact is that I don't think it is accurate that money is being taken from members of the public from the club. I'm not entirely sure that that is an accurate comment.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Question from Councillor Ansar Ali (2)</p> <p>Councillor Andy Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>Over recent days a number of residents of my North Ward have expressed concerns at the further delay and deferral of £15 million of loan repayment by Hilton Hotel Group to the Council. They feel the Council will not get its money back or make any profit from this loan as originally stated. Can I please have an explanation of the situation?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>The Council has ensured the hotel loan facility is fully secured by a first charge over the hotel. In addition, the loan drawdown each month is approved by the Council's quantity surveyor, which ensures the monthly drawdown is only a percentage of the construction costs incurred during that month.</p> <p>So what this means is that in effect, should the development should fail, the Council would own the building as it stood, so in terms of losing money, no that's not the case.</p> <p>The Council has not provided the loan to make a profit, it was provided to ensure the regeneration of this area and to ensure a prestigious hotel was secured for</p>

	<p>Peterborough. The Council is charging interest on the outstanding loan balance at a commercial rate of interest which is higher than the Council's borrowing costs from the Public Works Loan Board. There is a net income to the Council, which is fed into the Medium-Term Financial Programme and interest will continue to be charged until the loan is refinanced and repaid to the Council.</p> <p>So what this means is that throughout, the Council received interest payments on the load from Propiteer and when the building is completed and they refinance, they'll get the loan fully repaid</p> <p>The refinance process for Propiteer will be much more straightforward and less risky once the construction has completed and the hotel operational. This has been confirmed by the Council's quantity surveyor who has also raised no concerns about Propiteer's ability to refinance once the hotel is operational.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>I feel reassured. One of the things that concerns me is that when we borrowed the money to loan to this hotel group, we borrowed at a lower rate of interest, because the interest rates were low and we get a reduction as a public sector organisation, but interest rates on loan repayments have gone up in recent years quite considerably in recent years, and I just want to see whether we will get that uplift in a repayment.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Indeed, on the extension there has been an uplift. In terms of whether we would do the same deal again, it's going to be extremely difficult to do that and I wouldn't approve it unless it was legally appropriate to do so.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Councillor Sandford (2)</p> <p>Councillor Cereste, Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Planning, Housing and Transport</p> <p>In July 2019 the Council set targets of getting both the Council itself and the whole city to net zero carbon by 2030. Could the relevant cabinet member give a report on what progress has been made towards reaching these targets?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>As you know, the council is committed to achieving its net-zero carbon target across the organisation's operations by 2030. Since this target was announced in 2019, real and meaningful progress has been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have appointed a dedicated Principal Climate Change Officer, whose work includes the annual publication of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan. The latest draft was recently reviewed by the relevant Scrutiny Committee and indicatively shows that our emissions have reduced, quite considerably. Excluding. If you remove emissions from the goods and services purchased, by 24% relative to the 2018/2019 baseline. • We have recently undertaken a programme of Climate Debates, the aim of which was to share information on greenhouse gas emissions across the city and discuss potential decarbonisation options. The findings will be used to develop a city-wide climate change action plan and associated targets which

	<p>will also be consulted on before a final version is brought before Council for adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council was recently awarded a grant of £15million by the Government to deliver the PIRI project which will deliver low carbon heat and power. • We have received funding to roll out a citywide programme of Carbon Literacy training, which incidentally is available to all councillors also, and I would encourage you to sign up and complete the training. • We have received over £2.5m in funding this year to improve walking and cycling across the city and we plan to recruit an officer to lead the deployment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. • We also plan to kick off work to produce a climate change adaptation plan later on in the year. <p>No one has ever said that achieving net-zero would be easy, it's something that we all need to work together on as a city and for us to be able to achieve it. That's why it's so important that our targets are reviewed on a regular basis, and we are tracking our progress towards them as we speak.</p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p>Councillor Cereste focuses quite heavily on the Council's own carbon management plan and I quite recognise that we have achieved quite a lot, but he conveniently skips over the fact that it only accounts for a tiny proportion of Peterborough's carbon emissions. Now the resolution passed in 2019, so we want to be the whole of Peterborough to net zero by 2030, but four years on from that we have no plan in place in order to achieve it and if you look at our local area energy plan it says that the target, it should not be 2030, it should be 2040. So, can he tell us what the target is for the whole of Peterborough and when there is going to be a plan in place, because if we don't even know what the target is, how are we going to know if we've achieved it.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member responded:</p> <p>Well as you've asked the question before and I've answered before, is the target for the Council is 2030, we assume or we anticipate that with a fair wind a target for the city will be 2040, but it is both unreasonable and not sensible to expect that the people of Peterborough to do as they are told. So whatever happens in the future it is with the cooperation of the people of Peterborough and with the cooperation the businesses in Peterborough and we can hope or aspire to being able to deliver something by 2040.</p>
10.	<p>Question from Councillor Hogg (2)</p> <p>Councillor Coles, Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Governance</p> <p>There have been many questions asked by residents regarding the Serco contract that was signed in 2018, which removed certain key performance indicators and also any break clauses. How was this allowed to pass through the council's decision-making process?</p> <p>The Cabinet Member may have responded:</p> <p>The contract extension in 2018 was signed by the then S151 Officer and the then Monitoring Officer, and approved via CMDN by the portfolio holder. The officers and member involved are no longer here so we can't say with 100% certainty the reason</p>

but it is assumed that there were financial, strategic and / or tactical contract management reasons at the time for extending in this way. Governance arrangements have now changed, and all such decision in excess of £05.m would be reported to and subject to Cabinet approval.

I also believe the KPIs were significantly reduced prior to the 2018 contract extension, so not directly linked.

	<u>Questions on notice to:</u> d. The Combined Authority Representatives
	None.

This page is intentionally left blank