

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 7
21 SEPTEMBER 2015	PUBLIC REPORT

Contact Officer:	Gemma George, Democratic Services Manager	Tel. 01733 452268
------------------	---	----------------------

OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S	
FROM : Directors	Deadline date : N/A
It is recommended that Cabinet notes the actions taken in respect of petitions.	

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is submitted following the presentation of petitions to Cabinet at its meeting held on 15 June 2015 and to Council at its meeting held on 15 July 2015.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to update Cabinet on the progress being made in response to petitions.
- 2.2 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No. 3.2.3 – ‘To take a leading role in promoting the economic, environmental and social well-being of the area’.

3. TIMESCALE

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	NO	If yes, date for Cabinet meeting	N/A
---	-----------	----------------------------------	-----

4. OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

Presented to Cabinet – 15 June 2015

4.1 **Petition relating to noise pollution being created by Peterborough Regional College**

This petition was presented to Cabinet on 15 June 2015 by Councillor John Peach on behalf of local residents in the vicinity of Peterborough Regional College. The petition objected to the noise pollution being created by Peterborough Regional College and sought exploration into the number of events being held at the college and also the provision of an alcohol licence, as residents did not believe that they had been consulted prior to its issue.

The Council’s Licensing Regulatory Officer, in consultation with Noise Pollution Officers, responded to the lead petitioner and Councillor Peach stating that the main issues appeared to relate to alleged loud noise emanating from music functions held in the main hall.

It was confirmed that no previous complaints had been received regarding noise emanating from the college and further information regarding dates and times of events which had caused issue were sought from those residents who had signed the petition.

It was further confirmed that the alcohol licence issued to the College had been correctly advertised at the time of application and no objections had been received. A minor variation to the licence had been applied for in 2013, and again, this had been correctly advertised and no objections had been received.

There had been no specific times or dates provided back to the Council's Licensing Regulatory Officer from the petitioners and it was further advised to Councillor Peach that the Licensing Regulatory Officer would visit the College, alongside a Noise Pollution Officer, in order to make the College aware of local resident's concerns.

4.2 Petition relating to the creation of car parking spaces for residents of Wild Lake, Orton Malbourne

This petition was presented to Cabinet on 15 June 2015 by Councillor Graham Casey on behalf of residents of Wildlake, Orton Malbourne. The petition requested that more car parking spaces be created for the residents of Wildlake, as the parking was no longer adequate for the area due to an increase in vehicle numbers in the last few years. It advised that more spaces could be created by removing unnecessary large areas of shrubs and unused grass areas.

The Council's Head of Planning and Highway Services responded to the lead petitioner and Councillor Casey stating that whilst the Council did not have a statutory obligation to provide parking, it was acutely aware of the pressure on parking throughout many areas of the city.

At the location in question, the road and footways were the responsibility of the Highways Department, however parking areas and landscaped areas fell under the Council's Strategic Resources Department. Any conversion of such landscaped areas would therefore fall under the remit of Strategic Resources. The costs of undertaking such work would be significant and in these times of challenging service budgetary pressures for the authority, the Council was unable to undertake works of this nature. The Council would however continue to work with communities with the resources it had available.

Presented to Council – 15 July 2015

4.3 Petition relating to the Reduction of the Speed Limit in Eyrescroft, Bretton, from 30mph to 20mph

This petition was presented to Council on 15 July 2015 by Mr David Thomas on behalf of residents of Eyrescroft. The petition requested that the Council look to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Eyrescroft, Bretton. The petition was further supported by Councillor Stuart Martin.

The Council's Head of Peterborough Highway Services responded to the petition stating that at its meeting on 17 April 2013, Council had called upon the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee to investigate the benefits of extending 20mph signed speed limits throughout all residential areas in the Peterborough District and to present proposals to Cabinet.

A cross party task and finish group investigated the impact of 20mph speed limits in residential areas and reported its findings and recommendations to the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee on 20 January 2014. The recommendations of the report were then considered by Cabinet on 28 July 2014 at which time Cabinet resolved:

1. To await authorities to publicise impacts of 20mph speed limits;
2. To undertake a public consultation, alongside the Budget consultation, to gain views of residents on 20mph speed limits; and
3. To agree to support any Parish Council wishing to implement 20mph speed limits, utilising its own budget to do so.

As Eyrescroft fell within the area covered by Bretton Parish Council, point three above would apply in this instance. The extent of the funding required to implement such a speed limit would need to cover the full costs of following items:

- Initial speed survey;
- Publication and consultation of Traffic Order;
- Implementation of 20mph signs; and
- Follow up speed survey (to determine the impacts of the 20mph limit).

An initial estimate of the costs required would be in the region of £2,000 - £3,000, but this could be refined if the Parish Council wished to progress the matter forward.

4.4 Petition relating to Maintaining the aims of the Itter Park Management Plan 2013-2018

This petition was presented to Council on 15 July 2015 by Councillor Jonas Yonga on behalf of local residents. The petition requested that the Council maintain the aims of the Itter Park Management Plan 2013-2018 and keep the park up to the green standard which it achieved in 2007.

The Amey Partnership Manager responded to the lead petitioner and Councillor Yonga stating that it had been agreed to implement a 20% reduction in the maintenance of parks and cemeteries as part of the 2014 / 15 budget and this had been applied across all sites in Peterborough.

Itter Park was being maintained using a satellite team, who tended to all horticultural works within the park. The bins were being emptied three times per week and the park was litter picked twice weekly.

When the satellite team attended the park, they challenged any misuse of the park and its onsite sport facilities to ensure they were being used for the correct purposes.

Work was being undertaken closely with the Friends of Itter Park in order to try and address any concerns, the main one being Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), which was not only occurring within the park.

Productive discussions had led to the securing of some facilities for Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) staff to utilise the old attendants hut during the evenings in order to try and reduce ASB as much as possible.

It was further advised that the Park had once again been given Green Flag Status, with several positive comments received from the judges.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 As the petitions presented in this report have been dealt with by Cabinet Members or officers, it is appropriate that the action taken is reported to Cabinet, prior to it being included within the Executive's report to Council.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 6.1 There have been no alternative options considered.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no legal implications.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

8.1 Petitions presented to Council and Cabinet and responses from officers.