

Title of Report:	Request for the Revision of the Constitution
Report to be considered by:	Council
Date of Meeting:	15 May 2014
Forward Plan Ref:	C2758

Purpose of Report: For the Governance and Audit Committee to consider an amendment to the constitution and make a recommendation to full Council.

Recommended Action:

1. That Governance and Audit Committee recommend to full Council that a petition of 1,500 or more signatures will trigger a debate at Full Council.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Legal to amend the Constitution to reflect the amendment.

Reason for decision to be taken: The matter was discussed at a previous Council meeting where it was suggested that a formal request be brought back to Council for a decision.

Other options considered: None

Key background documentation: None

The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Strategy principle:

CSP9 - Doing what's important well

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Strategy priorities and principles by:

Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Jeff Brooks
E-mail Address:	jbrooks@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	31 March 2014

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Gillian Durrant
Job Title:	Lib Dem Group Executive
Tel. No.:	01635 519097
E-mail Address:	gdurrant@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy: The constitution would need to be amended
Financial: None
Personnel: None
Legal/Procurement: None
Property: None
Risk Management: None
Corporate Board's Recommendation: Corporate Board were supportive of the proposals in the report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			x
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?	<input type="checkbox"/>		x
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?	<input type="checkbox"/>		x
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?	<input type="checkbox"/>		x
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?	<input type="checkbox"/>		x
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?	<input type="checkbox"/>		x
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at www.westberks.gov.uk/eia			<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes:	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Constitution currently allows a debate at full council following receipt of a petition of 5,000 or more signatures (see 2.2 below). This report recommends that this be reduced to 1,500 signatures, in line with many other local authorities.

2. Proposals

- 2.1 This report proposes that the Council's constitution be amended so that when a petition of 1,500 or more signatures is presented at Full Council, a debate will be held on the subject of the petition.

The constitution currently states in Appendix C (Procedure Rules for Dealing with Representations) to Part 13 (Codes and Protocols), paragraph 1.4

- (e) **Petitions for Debate.** For a petition to be reported to a Full Council meeting for debate by the elected Members of West Berkshire Council, it must contain a minimum of **5,000** petitioners. Where a petition relates to a local issue, affecting no more than two electoral wards in West Berkshire, this requirement may be reduced to **500 per ward at the discretion of the Monitoring Officer.**
- (f) Where a Full Council meeting debate is triggered by a petition, the Petition Organiser or their nominated spokesperson will have up to five minutes to present their petition and the petition will then be discussed by Councillors for a maximum of 15 minutes. The Council may decide to take the action the petition suggests, not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate or to commission a further investigation into the matter.
- 2.2 The number of signatures required on a petition to trigger a debate at Full Council in the 6 unitary authorities in Berkshire are:

Authority	signatures required	Electoral Roll (Dec 2012)	Percentage of Electorate	Population (2011 census)
Windsor & Maidenhead	1,000	106,474	0.93%	144,600
Bracknell Forest	1,500	85,724	1.75%	113,205
Reading	1,500	118,219	1.26%	155,700
Slough	1,500	94,330	1.59%	140,200
Wokingham	1,500	113,379	1.32%	154,400
West Berkshire	5,000	120,970	4.13%	153,800

- 2.3 Following the consultation on the proposed 2014-2016 budget cuts, the residents of Pangbourne and the surrounding area raised a petition requesting that the opening

hours of Pangbourne library be maintained. They were advised by the Council's Monitoring Officer, that because the library users came from more than two wards (some lived across the border in Oxfordshire), the petition would need to have over 5,000 signatures in order to trigger a debate at Full Council. The petition organisers felt that this was unachievable because the numbers on the electoral roll in the wards concerned were relatively small, and only a proportion of them use the library. Their problem was compounded by the fact that the Council's e-petition software did not permit people living outside of West Berkshire to sign this petition.

- 2.4 The numbers on the electoral roll in Pangbourne ward and neighbouring West Berkshire wards:

Ward	Electoral Roll	percentage of electorate	Population (2011 census)	Percentage of population
Pangbourne	2,262		2,984	
Basildon	2,470		3,107	
Sulhamstead	2,212		2,963	
Purley-on-Thames	5,275		6,552	
Total	12,219	41%	15,606	32%

- 2.5 As you can see from the above figures, 41% of the electorate of these four wards would have had to sign the petition (or 32% of the entire population, including babies and children) for a debate to be triggered at Full Council. A large number of people living in these wards may also be members of their nearest library, which could be in Goring, Theale or Tilehurst, and therefore not be inclined to sign a petition for Pangbourne library.

Had the petition limit for a debate at Full Council been set at a reasonable figure of 1,500 instead of 5,000 this amount of signatures may have been achievable, and the users of Pangbourne library would have had a greater impact on local democracy.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 This item is not relevant to equality.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 This amendment would enable the people in West Berkshire to bring to Full Council matters that are important to them, and to hear the councillors debate these issues in a public meeting. The lower number of signatures required to trigger a debate would encourage the engagement of the local population with politics.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report.

Consultees

Local Stakeholders: N/a

Officers Consulted: None

Trade Union: N/a