

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| COUNCIL | AGENDA ITEM No. 7(c) | |
| 11 OCTOBER 2017 | PUBLIC REPORT | |
| Contact Officer(s): | Stephen Gerrard, Interim Director of Law and Governance | Tel. 01733 452390 |

PETITION FOR DEBATE ‘LACK OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION ON LTP4’

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| RECOMMENDATION | |
| FROM : Interim Director of Law and Governance | |
| <p>It is recommended the Council either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. note and take no action for the reasons put forward in the debate; 2. take the action, or part of the action, requested by the petition; or 3. refer the petition to either Cabinet, a Cabinet Member, or the relevant Scrutiny Committee for consideration having regard to the comments made in the course of debate. | |

1. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

1.1 A petition has been received by the Council with contains more than 500 signatures from people who live, work or study in the city. As such, the right to a debate of the petition by a meeting of the full Council has been triggered, according to the Petitions Scheme.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 As set out in the Council’s Petitions Scheme, if a petition contains more than 500 signatures from people who live, work or study in the city, it may trigger the right to be debated by a meeting of the full Council.

2.2 On 21 September 2017 a petition was received with the Council from Nyree Ambarchian, which included 596 signatures. Following the undertaking of a verification process, the petition was confirmed to include over 500 eligible signatures.

2.3 Ms Ambarchian requested that the petition was debated by a meeting of the Full Council, as per the Petitions Scheme.

2.4 The petition is titled ‘Lack of Public Engagement and Consultation on LTP4’. The petitions calls upon the Council to:

1) Halt plans for pedestrian crossings at Junction 18 / Rhubarb Bridge. Relook at, and be open about, the negative impact of current proposals. Put plans on hold while you seek funding for a replacement pedestrian and cycle bridge.

2) Re-run public engagement and consultation around the Local Transport Plan 4. We don't feel adequate public consultation took place prior to the adoption of this plan. As part of this, provide detailed, costed options for Junction 18 / Rhubarb Bridge and consult people on the alternatives.

3) *Debate both these things at a Full Council meeting as soon as possible. Hold a public meeting in 2017 on these issues for the public to share their thoughts with officers and councillors.*

2.5 The summary and background to the petition reads:

The proposals for Rhubarb Bridge will have severe negative impacts on residents – halt the current plans for pedestrian crossings:

- *Carry out an air quality impact assessment and publish the results online.*
- *Relook at the equality impact assessment - we don't believe it presents a true and honest assessment of the impacts. For example, you currently say the plans will have 'no negative impact' on any user – but air pollution is worse at ground level and you're bringing people into direct conflict with cars – so it's inconceivable that there will be no impact. Ask an independent organisation to complete the equality impact assessment, in consultation with residents.*
- *Set out in writing, and publish online, your commitment to find funding for a replacement bridge.*
- *Hold a meeting with the Combined Mayor for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to discuss the plans for Junction 18.*

We don't believe the public consultation prior to the adoption of LTP4 was anywhere near adequate considering the major changes and detrimental impacts on residents within the plan:

- *The Local Government and Public Involvement Health Act 2007 requires local authorities and passenger transport authorities to involve citizens in local decision making and service provision, to ensure local representatives are given genuine opportunities to influence decisions and delivery.*
- *Efforts to engage with the public around this plan were minimal (described by one council officer as 'light') particularly efforts to consult with hard-to-reach groups. One example of the lack of accessibility of LTP4 is that the commonly understood local name for the bridge at Junction 18 (Rhubarb Bridge) isn't even mentioned in the plan, making it very hard for the public to understand the proposals.*
- *There is also a mismatch between the user hierarchy set out in LTP4 (i.e. pedestrians and cyclists, then cars), and the proposals set out for Junction 18 which prioritises cars. Currently the system at Junction 18 is equitable for all users – we want to maintain this status quo.*

2.6 A copy of the petition is available to Members to view upon request.

3. IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Finance Implications – There are no financial, legal, or equalities implications arising from this report.

3.2 Governance Implications – This report will be debated following the presentation of the petition. The Leader Petitioner has five minutes to present this petition. Members will then be invited to debate the request contain therein. The usual rules of procedure will apply to this debate. Each Member may speak once for no longer than 3 minutes. A Member may not speak again, except on a point of order, by way of a personal explanation, or by way of a statement of accuracy. The Mayor will invite a vote on the recommendations at the close of the debate.

4. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

4.1 Peterborough City Council Petitions Scheme.

5. APPENDICES

5.1 None.

This page is intentionally left blank