

<b>CABINET</b>	AGENDA ITEM No. 10
<b>18 NOVEMBER 2019</b>	<b>PUBLIC REPORT</b>

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

## OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
<b>FROM:</b> <i>Directors</i>	<b>Deadline date:</b> <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?	<b>NO</b>	If yes, date for Cabinet meeting	<b>N/A</b>
---	-----------	----------------------------------	------------

### 4. BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

#### **Petitions Presented at Council Meetings**

##### Gunthorpe Polling Station

The petition was submitted by Councillor Sandra Bond on 24 July 2019. The petition contained 158 valid signatures and called on the Council to "provide a polling station for the polling district of GUN1 in future elections".

The Electoral Manager responded:

*"We will shortly be conducting a review of all of the polling stations used across the authority and will use this petition to evidence the need for a designated polling station for the GUN1 polling district."*

*The review will be open to public consultation and we would be keen to receive suggestions as to what locations should be considered.*

*The desirable criteria we are looking for are:*

- *The location should be situated within the polling district boundary*
- *It must be easily accessible to all electors including wheelchair users*
- *It should be large enough to accommodate staff, their equipment and still have space for electors to cast their vote comfortably*
- *It should be available at short notice in case of any unscheduled elections*

*Once the review has concluded, a report will be submitted to Council for approval.”*

### Cromwell Road Parking

The petition was submitted by Councillor Jamil on 24 July 2019. The petition contained 62 valid signatures and called on the Council to address concerns around car parking spaces that are taken up by people who do not live in the vicinity of the block “by the introduction of Residents Only Parking”.

The Network and Traffic Manager responded:

*“In principal I have no objection in taking the proposal forward through the legal process but wish to point out the following matters:*

- *There are approximately 30 properties fronting this section of road*
- *There are approximately 14 parking spaces*
- *On the basis of one vehicle per property the number of vehicles would likely exceed the number of parking spaces*
- *There is therefore no guarantee of a resident who has purchased a permit being able to park in this area*
- *I also note that there is shop located within this section of Cromwell Road and I would need to make provision for customers to park. I would therefore suggest that a short period (e.g. 30minutes) of limited waiting should be combined with the resident parking restriction to facilitate this.*

*Should the residents wish to proceed with the request, please advise me accordingly and I shall add the proposal to a future order which is likely to be in late November or December 2019, but may be subject to change. The whole process from the start of consultation on the legal order would typically take 4-6months before the proposals would be implemented on site.”*

### **E-Petitions Received**

#### Speed Limit Restrictions within Eastfield

The e-petition was submitted by Councillor Qayyum on 12 August 2019 and contained 26 valid signatures. A paper petition was submitted alongside this on 25 September 2019 that contained 198 valid signatures. Both petitions called on the Council to “Install 20 mph speed limits and speed humps in the following roads - Park Lane, Norman Road, Saxon Road and Kingsley Road - 400m from the school entrances of John Fisher, St Thomas Moore and Abbotsmede Schools in either direction.”

The Principal Sustainable Transport Planning Officer responded:

*“There is a regeneration project happening around Abbotsmede Primary School. Phase 1 involved the creation of a new car park and phase 2 is planned for next year with proposals for a one-way system on Kingsley Road and part of Norman Road with a new 20mph speed limit as part of this work.*

*A councillor lead cross party task and finish group investigated 20mph signed only limits and reported its findings to Cabinet. Cabinet made recommendations to gain more evidence at both a national and local level before committing to a city wide roll out.*

*Since the task and finish group presented the findings a number of authorities have committed to implementing or have implemented signed only limits. However there is still limited conclusive evidence on the impact in terms of mode of travel, reduction in speed and casualties and overall costs involved. An updated report will be going to Cabinet in the future but at the current time there are no plans to make the other roads listed in the petition 20mph.”*

### Bretton Parking

The e-petition was submitted by Mr Gasparutti on 25 May 2019. The petition contained 74 valid signatures and called on the Council to “to restrict the development of HMOs in Bretton, as this has led to more residents, and led to more vehicles, leading to difficulty in the movement of vehicles”.

The Head of Planning Peterborough and Fenland responded:

*“Thank you for your communication regarding the above. I am not sure if you are aware but HMO’s do not always require planning permission. Under the planning legislation new HMO’s for more than 6 persons need permission. HMO’s for up to 6 persons do not need planning permission and are ‘permitted development’. The Government does allow Councils to remove this permitted development right where it can be demonstrated that there is the need to do so. Where the permitted development right has been removed (under what is known as an Article 4 Direction) this just means that planning permission has to be applied for. An application needs to be considered against the appropriate planning policies for such development and take into account any other material planning considerations. It is therefore not the case that the Council can introduce a planning based ‘ban’ on future HMO development.*

*I have looked at the information for the Bretton Area and there are 51 registered HMO’s out of a total of 5235 dwellings. Whilst there are a number of streets with pockets of HMO’s, the wider picture does not suggest that there is a significant issue in the area as a whole.*

*Notwithstanding my observation above, the Council has commissioned some research into HMO’s in Peterborough and the results of this are expected next year. The work will help inform a decision on whether Article 4 Direction controls need to be introduced and if controls are to be introduced in which parts of the City this needs to be.”*

## **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.