

FULL COUNCIL 1 November 2023 QUESTIONS

Questions were received under the following categories:

<u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
<u>Questions from members of the public</u>	
1.	<p>Question from Sue Hamilton</p> <p>Councillor Marco Cereste – Cabinet Member for Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>My main concern is the siting, appearance and noise nuisance of this Monopole and Boxes. These have all caused me and others distress, and I fail to comprehend how anyone can agree this new siting which is less than 3m away from my dwelling would be acceptable!</p> <p>As well as the siting in such close proximity, and surely this is classed as a major material amendment, not a minor amendment due to the distance from the original siting, the appearance is not in keeping with the visual amenity of this area as not in scale with the low level housing and green space areas, and no attempt to hide the Monopole and Boxes from view, so bodes to be intrusive and not appropriate for this residential area.</p> <p>The noise nuisance of the constant motorised humming can be experienced in my back garden, which is unacceptable, preventing me from relaxing and enjoying the peace and quiet in my garden that I was able to experience before the installation. The noise can even be heard at nighttime in my back lounge and bedroom which again is unacceptable, even with the windows and doors tightly shut, and even worse in the summer months when windows have to be open. In addition to this, my neighbour living opposite has advised he too can hear this noise in his garden thus depriving us of our right to peace and quiet and enjoyment within our own properties which we are entitled to under the Human Right Act. He also has to view the Monopole from all 6 windows of his house. On 27 August 2023 Bristol Council ordered that a noisy Monopole that had been located at the rear of a resident's gardens be removed. If Bristol Council can do this for their constituents, then Peterborough Council can do the same for their Gunthorpe constituents. As you have advised, the devaluation of our properties due to the Monopole installation is not your concern, the cost of moving this Monopole is not our concern. The fact is it should never have been placed so close to a residential property.</p> <p>There are other areas where this Monopole and Boxes could have been erected such as:</p> <p>Woodland in Werrington Brook that has electrical supplies</p> <p>Open field opposite Barn Garden Centre</p> <p>East Coast Railway Area</p> <p>A15 Dual Carriageway</p>

	<p>Various Industrial Sites</p> <p>We have been advised that other areas were not even looked into.</p> <p>Surely from the number of objections received when you sent another proposal this July, you can see the residents are unhappy, as majority were unaware of the existing Monopole being erected, so did not have opportunity to comment. They have since had issues with TV signalling at a cost to themselves, and have commented on the noise, siting and appearance not in keeping with the area in their objections for the new proposal. I cannot even paint my fence that side as the Monopole and Boxes are so close to it, and when I complained to the Council, I was treated with contempt and no empathy, and advised to go to a DIY store and buy extension poles! I cannot use these poles to clean the dirt off the fence beforehand!</p> <p>Why was it authorised to be located so close to a residential dwelling? I feel Senior Officers should have arranged a site visit including Surveyors involved in the inspection.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Alan Wilson (1)</p> <p>Councillor Marco Cereste – Cabinet Member for Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>Please can the council explain what criteria they used in deciding what area of land is suitable for these masts and how Coniston Road fitted into these criteria?</p>
3.	<p>Question from Alan Wilson (2)</p> <p>Councillor Marco Cereste – Cabinet Member for Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>We have in Peterborough an excellent road system in our Parkways. Have the Council considered putting these masts on the grass verge along the Parkways where they wouldn't intrude on residential areas.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Pauline Hinchliffe</p> <p>Councillor Marco Cereste – Cabinet Member for Growth and Regeneration</p> <p>Many investigations have been carried out and have concluded that Peterborough City Council has failed in its duties to ensure that the development does not cause visual harm or nuisance to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>A resident at 25 Ennerdale Rise, adjacent to the mast and associated equipment, is currently suffering the noise emitted from the transmitter cooling fans located next to her garden fence which operate 24 hours a day. Owing to the situation Ms Hamilton's property would be considerably devalued.</p> <p>The mast was not installed where shown on the original plan. It is vastly different and does not merge with the existing features, ie lighting columns and telegraph poles. This is, in fact, a MAJOR change and not a MINOR one.</p>

	<p>They may just as well have erected the mast in the garden of 25 Ennerdale Rise: it is so close. And the existing trees do not hide the mast and will not grow any larger with age (they are already fully grown).</p> <p>The Peterborough City Council did not investigate any other sites and failed to publish the revised layout plan for the site which featured MAJOR location changes. Therefore, residents were deprived of their right to comment on the revised proposals. The site plan as submitted by the developer is also grossly inaccurate.</p> <p>A Peterborough City Council Planning Officer was contacted by my colleague, Richard Olive, and admitted that the department had insufficient resources to examine the proposals adequately and to check the accuracy of the application plan within the timescale allowed. This means that the Gunthorpe community must now face the consequences!</p> <p>Whom from the PCC Planning Office has bothered to visit the site after the revised location of the mast? It seems no-one can answer this! And no one has contacted Ms Hamilton at number 25 Ennerdale Rise either.</p> <p>Gunthorpe residents, knowing full well about the dispute, have recently lodged 89 objections to a mast proposal. Local Councillors and Paul Bristow MP admit the mast should not have been erected there in the first place. It would appear that Ms Hamilton could have a good legal case to fight.</p> <p>In conclusion I would like to know when will the Peterborough City Council be removing the mast which is still causing such anguish and nuisance to the residents of Gunthorpe?</p>
5.	<p>Question from Ed Murphy</p> <p>Councillor Steven Allen – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities</p> <p>Last month the council posted on its Facebook page that it had changed the lighting in Peterborough city centre and also displayed the Israeli flag icon in its post. Other authorities chose to take actions which were deemed to be non-partisan such as the Paris authorities switching off the lights on the Eiffel Tower. A number of residents complained about the actions of Peterborough city council and how it was being perceived as partisan and inappropriate.</p> <p>How much does the council spend on its communications team and communications each year, whose decision was it to take the action that many complained about and who subsequently decided not to display the peace flag the council had purchased and agreed to display following complaints and concerns raised by councillors and residents?</p>

COUNCIL BUSINESS

Questions on notice to:

- a. The Mayor
- b. To the Leader or Member of the Cabinet
- c. To the Chair of any Committee or Sub-committee

1. Question from Cllr Christian Hogg (1)

Councillor Nigel Simons – Cabinet Member for Infrastructure, Environment and Climate Change.

Regarding the recent cabinet member decision for the charging of new and replacement bins OCT23/CMDN/49.

This item has had a long and complicated path through the decision-making process first being put forward in 2021 and was agreed as part of a MTFS in November 2021, there was a previous cabinet member decision SEPT22/CMDN/24 in September 2022, this was pulled as it had been due to return to the Financial Stability Working Group (FSWG).

It was discussed at the FSWG meeting Wednesday 19 October 2022 where it was agreed to amend it to include a reduction for residents in receipt of Council tax relief.

Can the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure, Environment and Climate Change please explain why it has taken so long to get this decision made and what is the loss of income to the council over the last year caused by this decision not being in place?

2. Question from Cllr Chris Wiggin (1)

Councillor Steve Allen – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities.

Please could the cabinet member provide an update on the implementation of the Small Homes in Multiple Occupation Article 4 Direction?

3. Question from Cllr Christian Hogg (2)

Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council

On 21 January 2023 I asked what the status was of the gravel car park at the front of the POSH ground as it was clearly being used by the club, including the use of marshals on match days for allocated parking. This land is still in the ownership of PCC and was not part of the sale for the ground back to POSH in March 2021 (MAR21/CMDN/91)

	<p>It was decided to lease the car park, with a capacity for circa 100 vehicles. Can the Cabinet Member for Legal, Finance and Corporate Services please inform council if this lease is now in place and from what date did it commence?</p>
4.	<p>Question from Cllr Chris Wiggin (2)</p> <p>Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Where companies go into administration, creditors can be left with only pennies in the pound. Can the Cabinet Member for Legal, Finance and Corporate Services reassure Council about the status of our loan to the developers of the Hilton Gardens Hotel and confirm what status we have as creditors, presumably we are secured creditors, but do we have a fixed or floating charge on assets?</p>

	<p><u>Questions on notice to:</u></p> <p>The Combined Authority Representatives:</p>
1.	<p>Question from Cllr Christian Hogg</p> <p>Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald – Leader of the Council</p> <p>Can the Council Leader please explain why he voted against the adoption of the new combined authority's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP), despite giving assurances to various group leaders and the Chief Executive that he was happy to support it?</p>