

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 10
17 OCTOBER 2018	PUBLIC REPORT

Report of:	Fiona McMillan, Director of Law and Governance	
Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Councillor Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources	
Contact Officer(s):	Pippa Turvey, Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager	Tel. 452460

OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS	
FROM: <i>Directors</i>	Deadline date: <i>N/A</i>
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 submission of E-Petitions, the presentation of petitions to Council officers, and the presentation of petitions at Council meetings.

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 submitted to the Council.
- 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. TIMESCALES

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

4. BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

E-Petitions Presented

Bretton Court

The petition was submitted by Alan Gasparutti on 17 October 2018. The petition contained 16 valid signatures and called on the Council 'to renovate and repair Bretton Court, and make it suitable to accomodate [sic] the homeless within Peterborough [sic]'.

As the petitions contained less than the minimum number of signatures required by the Petitions Scheme (20) the lead petition was advised that the petition was rejected as invalid and no further action was taken.

Petitions Presented to Councillor Officers

Anti Social Behaviour

The petition was submitted by Fiona Onasanya MP on 14 September 2018. The petition contained 151 valid signatures and is in relation to 'anti social behaviour around the shops at Central Avenue, Dogsthorpe.'

The Head of Services for Prevention and Enforcement responded and advised that the Council had been previously made aware of concerns at the location referred to and, in August 2018, a site meeting took place with the lead Council officers, shop owners, residents and Ward Councillors Dennis Jones and Bella Saltmarsh to discuss similar issues to those raised in the petition.

This led to the identification of a number of actions, which the Council have been working through with the relevant departments to overcome. Examples include: increased parking patrols, working with the Police to request support for ASB / Drug activity, refocusing CCTV cameras to build evidence and monitor activity, working with Cross Keys Homes to implement crime reduction solutions around the shops etc. Since the Council's intervention, local Councillors have continued to visit the area and have reported a decrease in anti-social behaviour in the area and calls for service are reduced.

The Head of Services is confident that recent actions are making a difference, however, noted that the petition raises ongoing concerns. The petitioner was invited to discuss their issues in further details if they wished to do so.

Petitions Presented at Council Meetings

Kings Garden Residents Petition

The petition was submitted by John Peach on 17 October 2018. The petition contained 40 valid signatures and called on the Council to take 'urgent action to make residents feels safer within their homes and the police to actively investigate the constant anti-social behaviour. To investigate the tenants Cross Keys Homes are putting into Elizabeth Court and for Cross Keys Homes to increase the checks made to make on other residents within the area to feel safe and secure.'

The Assistant Director for Community Safety responded and clarified that Elizabeth Court is owned by Cross Keys Homes and is leased by Peterborough City Council to provide temporary accommodation to homeless households. The occupants are not tenants of Cross Keys Homes, and nor do they allocate the placements - this work is carried out by the City Council Housing Needs team. Cross Keys Homes are responsible for overseeing the management of the site and we work in close partnership with them to respond to problems identified such as anti-social behaviour.

It was further advised that a multi-agency meeting was convened with colleagues from Housing Needs (City Council), the ASB team (City Council), and Cross Keys Homes. This has identified that whilst some issues have been reported to services, they are relatively low in number and not all are directly related to Elizabeth Court. It is apparent that there are a number of other anti-social issues in and around this location, most strongly connected to gatherings in the alleyway that links to Park Road.

From the meeting, a number of actions have been agreed to help improve this issue. Some examples include:

- Joint assessments of the proposed placements of homeless households with Cross Keys Homes and the Housing Needs service, to ensure that all potential occupants of properties at Elizabeth Court are a suitable match for this community
- Security improvements to Elizabeth Court to prevent non tenants using the location

- Review of CCTV provision and installation of more signage to notify that the property is being monitored
- Joint work with Police colleagues to respond to allegations of ASB and criminality
- Targeted engagement with residents of Kings Court. Our ASB manager will write to residents to invite more information on the issues to build a clearer picture, as we recognise reporting is low.

The Council will continue to monitor and see through these tasks over the coming weeks, and will provide an update to the petitioner as this progresses.

Cherry Tree Pub

The petition was submitted by Councillor Dowson on 17 October 2018. The petition contained 1286 valid signatures and called on the Council 'to take a more proactive approach towards saving the Cherry Tree Public house. A designated community asset, now standing empty for two years.'

Due to the number of signatures, following the initial response from officers the lead petitioner may request to have the petition debated at Scrutiny, Cabinet or Council.

The Property Records Coordinated responded and acknowledged that the property has been listed as an Asset of Community Value since September 2017, accepted on the register due to its stated history and in recognition of its recent use and value as an asset to the community as stated in the petition.

It was further advised that, unfortunately, the property being listed as an Asset Of Community Value will not provide Peterborough City Council any legal basis to assist in the petition's aims to return the property to full use. The provisions provided by being a listed asset are only invoked upon the intended sale of the premises or upon receipt of a planning application to change the use or demolish the property.

The Petitioner was referred to the below extract from guidelines issued during the application process:

In most cases, once an asset is listed the owner cannot then dispose of it without:

- *Notifying the local authority of their intent to sell the asset or grant a lease of more than 25 years.*
- *Waiting until the end of a six week "interim moratorium" period if the local authority does not receive a request from a local community interest group to be treated as a potential bidder.*
- *Waiting until the end of a six month "full moratorium" period if the local authority receives a request from a local community interest group to be treated as a potential bidder.*

It is important to note that the owner does not have to sell the asset to the community interest group. Listing as an Asset of Community Value may also be taken into account in any application for planning permission. This will not necessarily prevent a change of use but in certain circumstances may add additional protection to the existing use of the asset.

Unfortunately as it appears that in this case the private owners do not wish to sell or alter the use of the building these conditions will not be triggered. Enquiries have been made into the legal position and at this time, as the building is not a listed historic building there are no provisions within law under these circumstances to force the private owner to sell or put the property to any particular use.

5. REASON FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

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.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 There have been no alternative options considered.

7. IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no legal, financial, or equalities implications arising from the issues considered.

8. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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

8.1 Petitions presented to the Council and responses from officers.

9. APPENDICES

9.1 None.