

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
SUBJECT:	CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS
DATE OF DECISION:	11 OCTOBER 2012
REPORT OF:	HEAD OF LEGAL, HR AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
None	

BRIEF SUMMARY

Under the Council’s Petition Scheme set out in Council procedure rules and Part 11 of the Constitution petitions containing a minimum of 750 but less than 1500 signatures and requesting a senior officer to give evidence will be referred to a public meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the first instance

This report details the receipt of 3 petitions that have reached this threshold and seeks to detail the Council response.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) To consider the responses provided in relation petitions reaching over 750 petitioners.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Council’s Constitution states that petitions containing a minimum of 750 but less than 1500 signatures will be referred to a public meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

2. The Council has received 3 paper petitions that contain over 750 validated signatures these are:
 - Making our Community a Safer Place;
 - Hollybrook Lodge; and
 - Save Oaklands Pool.
3. The “Making Our Community a Safer Place” petition states:

“ We the undersigned petition the council to Following the incident on Redbridge Hill on the 4th August 2012, we the residents of Redbridge Hill and surrounding districts have started this petition to have the undergrowth / scrub removed whilst retaining the trees, this will prevent a repeat of the incident of a vicious rape of a young girl.”

The petition has 872 validated signatures. The response is set out in Appendix 1.
4. The “Hollybrook Lodge” petition states:

“We the undersigned petition the council to The aim of this petition is for Southampton City Council to re-evaluate its decision in regard to the redundancy and subsequent eviction of Jim Emery”

The petition has 997 validated signatures. The response is set out in Appendix 2.

5. The “Save Oaklands Pool” petition states:
“We the undersigned petition the council to Save Oaklands Pool”
The petition has 889 validated signatures. The response is set out in Appendix 3.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

6. None.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue

7. Detailed with appendices

Property/Other

8. Detailed with appendices

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory Power to undertake the proposals in the report:

9. Local Government Act 2000 and Localism Act 2011.

POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

11. None

AUTHOR:	Name:	Ed Grimshaw	Tel:	023 8083 2390
	E-mail:	ed.grimshaw@southampton.gov.uk		

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	Making Our Community a Safer Place - Response
2.	Hollybrook Lodge- Response
3.	Save Oaklands Pool - Response

Documents In Members' Rooms

1.	None
----	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject/recommendations in the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment to be carried out.	No
--	----

Other Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	None	
----	------	--

Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	N/a
------------------------------------	-----