



Local petitions and Calls for Action  
Consultation.

**Summary of Responses**

**A report prepared for Communities and Local Government**





Local petitions and Calls for Action  
Consultation

**Summary of Responses**

**A report prepared for Communities and Local Government**

The findings in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU  
Telephone: 020 7944 4400  
Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright, 2008

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: [licensing@opsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@opsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Communities and Local Government Publications  
PO Box 236  
Wetherby  
West Yorkshire  
LS23 7NB  
Tel: 08701 226 236  
Fax: 08701 226 237  
Textphone: 08701 207 405  
Email: [communities@capita.co.uk](mailto:communities@capita.co.uk)  
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

**75% recycled**

This is printed on  
75% recycled paper

July 2008

Ref: 08L9SR 05402/PSOR

ISBN: 978-1-4098-0256-3

## Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>About the analysis</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Summary of Responses</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Petitions questions</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Calls for action questions</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Overall questions</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendixes</b>	
<b>Appendix 1: Additional focus groups and depth interviews</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Respondents to the consultation document</b>	<b>22</b>



## Executive summary

This report presents an analysis of the responses to the *Local petitions and Calls for Action Consultation*. It has been produced by Henley Centre HeadlightVision for Communities and Local Government.

The *Local petitions and Calls for Action Consultation* was published on 27 December 2007. The document proposed a statutory duty on local authorities to respond to petitions, and sought views on how this would work. It also sought views on the implementation of the 'councillor call for action', which was created by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The consultation closed on 20 March 2008.

In total, 202 responses were received within the timeframe. A wide range of organisations responded to the document, including local authorities, independent organisations and members of the public. In addition a number of focus groups were held with members of the public, summarised in Appendix 1.

A majority of respondents agreed that overall the proposals for petitions and the councillor call for action will help to empower communities to engage with their elected representatives. Many also suggested a number of additional steps and points which should be taken into account.

Many respondents welcomed the use of petitions as a method of community empowerment. A number also emphasised that making responding to a petition a statutory requirement could potentially cause unnecessary bureaucracy and may not be tailored to local conditions or circumstances. Instead, many stated that they would prefer non-statutory guidelines that could be tailored to local conditions. Respondents also had a number of requests for guidance on petitions focused on specific definitions (for example: the definition of a 'local person') as well as on practical elements of the process (for example, how to deal with petitions relating to the functions of local authority partners).

Comments on the councillor call for action tended to be more procedural in nature – for example, focusing on what constitutes an acceptable timeframe for formal responses, how to deal with calls for action whose content concerns more than one area or councillor, and how to ensure that the councillor call for action works effectively within existing scrutiny procedures.

A number of respondents suggested areas that might be excluded from the councillor call for action. These areas included matters for which there is an existing statutory appeals process in place, individual complaints concerning personal grievances or commercial issues, or matters which have recently been considered.

The consultation responses are summarised in the body of the report.

## Introduction

The *Governance of Britain* Green Paper, published in July 2007, stated that petitions can provide an important way for local communities to express their views collectively, to generate local debate, and to improve the connections between residents and local authorities. The Paper announced that government is considering the introduction of a duty requiring local authorities to consider and investigate petitions from local communities, and guarantee a response on the issues that have been raised.

On 27 December 2007, Communities and Local Government published *Local petitions and Calls for Action Consultation*. This consultation sought views on how arrangements for local petitions can be strengthened and how the new system might operate. It also sought views on the 'councillor call for action', introduced under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The closing date for consultation responses was 20 March 2008.

The consultation posed six questions:

- What conditions must be met before a local authority is required to respond formally to a petition?
- How should government define the level of support required before a petition must get a formal, substantive response?
- What if any matters should be excluded from the councillor call for action?
- What guidance should government provide on the operation of the call for action?
- Would petitions and calls for action sufficiently empower communities to intervene with their elected representatives?
- Do you have other views on the operation of the new duty to respond to petitions and calls for action?

## About the analysis

This report presents an analysis of the responses to the *Local petitions and Calls for Action Consultation*.

Communities and Local Government received 202 responses to the consultation document within the specified timeframe. These responses came from:

- 150 local authorities (51 Borough Councils, 29 District Councils, 24 County Councils, 24 City Councils, 7 Metropolitan Borough Councils, 2 Town Councils, 7 Metropolitan District Councils, 5 Parish Councils and 1 Unitary Authority).
- 10 charity or not-for-profit organisations
- 5 independent bodies
- 2 fire or police authorities
- 2 unions
- 20 members of the public
- 6 associations (including residents' associations, Association of Council Secretaries and Solicitors and Development Trust Association)
- 7 'other' organisations (including responses from the Greater London Authority, Local Government Ombudsmen, Audit Commission and Local Government Association).

It is important to note that these responses do not constitute a representative sample of all those with an interest in local petitions and calls for action. Moreover, not all responses contained comments on all of the questions in the document. Rather, this report reflects the range of opinions expressed by those organisations and individuals who chose to respond to the consultation.

The responses are qualitative in nature, and the length of responses received varied considerably. Because of the qualitative nature of the responses, the results presented here are unweighted.

Moreover, because of the nuanced nature of the responses, the report is a textual analysis which reflects the overall balance of opinion from stakeholders, and is not a quantitative attempt to measure the responses.

Where the analysis refers to a majority or minority of respondents, this should be read as a minority or majority of those who chose to respond to that particular question.

Responses were sorted and categorised via an electronic database, following the structure of questions outlined in the consultation document. The structure and numbering of the questions outlined in this report reflects the structure and numbering of the questions in the consultation.

Alongside the analysis of the responses to the consultation document presented here, a number of focus groups and in-depth interviews with members of the public were completed as part of the consultation process. These responses are not analysed in the main body of this document, but a summary of the major points raised by participants is included in Appendix 1 of this document.

# Summary of Responses

## Petitions questions

### Question (a)

**The Government believes there should be a statutory duty on local authorities to respond to local petitions. What conditions must be met before a local authority is required to respond formally to a petition?**

The initial set of questions in the consultation document concerned the range of conditions which should be met before a local authority has a statutory duty to formally respond to a petition.

The consultation document outlined a series of issues for discussion. The responses to these issues are outlined below:

*i) The subject of the petition relates to the functions of the local authority, or other public services with shared delivery responsibilities with the local authority through the Local Area Agreement or other partnership arrangements*

Overall, around 90 respondents expressed an opinion on this issue. A **majority** of those agreed that the subject of petitions should relate to the functions of the local authority, or other public services with shared delivery responsibilities with the local authority through the Local Area Agreement or other partnership arrangement. As the **Hampstead Garden Suburbs Residents' Association** noted: *"One condition should be that the subject of the petition relates to the functions of the local authority, or other public services with shared delivery responsibilities with the local authority through the Local Area Agreement or other partnership arrangement."*

- However, a strong theme from other respondents was that **councils should be encouraged to take on a leadership role and be the first point of contact for all issues of significant concern to local residents – including those outside of direct local authority control**. The NCVO commented that: *"If local Government is to truly lead a place then it is vital that councils and councillors take responsibility for responding to the whole range of potential issues and concerns raised by local people and groups through petitions and other mechanisms."*
- Many emphasised the need for a **clear process for dealing with petitions relating to the functions of local authority partners**.
- Many public, independent bodies and local authority responses emphasised the need for guidance around dealing with **petitions relating to services where delivery responsibilities are shared with other organisations**.

- Many local authorities also emphasised the need for guidance on **dealing with petitions relating to issues that cover two or more councils**.
- A further suggestion made by a small minority of respondents was that **government place a duty on local authorities to forward on petitions when they are not responsible for the appropriate agency or public body**. As North Yorkshire County Council notes: *"Perhaps there should be a duty on local authorities to forward on petitions to the appropriate body."*

*ii) The petition has been organised by a 'local' person*

Overall, around 100 respondents commented on this issue. There was a **broad consensus that establishing a clear definition of what it means to be a 'local' person was crucial to setting any requirements for the petitioning process**.

Across the responses, most commonly proposed definitions of 'local' were:

- Anyone who **lives in the local area**, or:
- Anyone who **works in the local area**, or:
- Anyone **educated in the local area**.

A number of respondents also **emphasised the need for clarity around how to define the 'local area' in question**.

Though only a few respondents offered a specific definition of how to determine a 'local' person, a small number of proposals were suggested, including:

- Those who **appear on the electoral register within the local authority**.
- In the case of young people, those who appear on **school or college registers**.

A **minority** of local authorities said that a petition organiser should have lived, worked or attended school in the area for a **'qualifying period'**, though **respondents did not specify how long this qualifying period should be**.

A small number of respondents from across respondent groups argued that **the definition of a 'local' person should be flexible and non restrictive**, for example including:

- Any person who can **demonstrate any kind of link to the area** (such as living or working locally).
- *All* people **using or accessing the services of a council** should be able to petition it on issues that fall within its remit.
- A small group of local authorities suggested that **complete discretion** should be given to the local authority to define who constitutes a 'local' person.

### There were differing opinions on the issue of under-18s participation in the petitioning process:

- About two thirds of respondents who commented on this issue thought that **children should be allowed to raise and sign petitions**. Many of them said that the inclusion of school children would encourage youth involvement in democratic processes
- Around a third of respondents were **sceptical about the ability of children to effectively engage with the petitioning process**.

#### *iii) The petition should demonstrate sufficient support from local people*

As noted in the responses to (ii) discussed above, a range of viewpoints were expressed around the importance of 'locality' in determining the response to petitions. Around 50 respondents commented on whether a petition should demonstrate sufficient support from local people.

### Overall, there was a lack of consensus around what should constitute 'sufficient support' for a particular petition:

- **About half of the respondents thought that it is important to determine the minimum level of support among local people**, since whether or not a council has a duty to respond to a particular petition should depend on the level of support for the petition
- **Conversely, a minority of respondents supported setting a low threshold of support to avoid ruling out local issues or excluding minorities** on topics which affect a very limited part of the district.

As the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham notes: *"A balance has to be drawn between i) requiring a local authority to respond to all petitions, even those with very little support, with all the attendant costs and ii) setting a very high threshold level of required signatures before a response is required, which would somewhat defeat the object."*

- A small minority of councils suggested that there should be **no minimum stipulated level of support** for any petition, as they run the risk of creating a complex or bureaucratic workload
- Around **a third of councils** argued that the definition of a specific threshold level of support should be **relevant and proportionate to the issue covered by the petition**.

*iv) The petition should satisfy minimum requirements in relation to its manner, form and content.*

Overall, there were around 70 responses to this issue. **The majority** of those who responded to this question agreed with the statement that petitions must satisfy minimum requirements of form, content and procedure.

There were a range of suggestions around what the major requirements should be:

- Petitions should contain at least a clear **statement of the proposition** they promote
- Petitions should contain the **name and address of the petitioner**
- Petitions should **name the local authority or authorities** from which a response is sought
- Petitions should contain **details of the area to which it relates**, and the names, addresses and signatures of those supporting it
- The **e-mail address** of the petition organiser should be included, especially for online petitions
- The **petition formats should be standardised**, and there should be a petition template available at council offices and on websites.

In addition, a number of other suggestions were made by a minority of local authorities:

- That **each page of the petition should include the proposition the petition promotes**, so that it is clear that each signatory is aware of the cause which he/she is supporting
- **Each signatory should be obliged to date their entry** to ensure that the support for the proposition is *'current'*
- The petition should note **who is likely to be affected by the proposal**
- The petition organiser should **include on the petition the qualification that entitles him/her to raise a petition.**

In addition, **many non-profit organisations stressed the importance of ensuring that standards around format are simple and manageable** so that the technical requirements do not discourage people from submitting petitions.

## Question (b)

**In particular, how should we define the level of support required before a petition gets a formal, substantive response?**

The second question in the consultation document addresses the level of support that should be required before a petition warrants a formal, substantive response. **Overall, some 150 respondents commented on this question.**

The most common overall comment on the level of support required was that there is a danger that **quantitative requirements and “complex formulas” could cause the petitioning process to become too bureaucratic.** As Lancashire County Council noted: *“We do not feel that any complex formulas should be entered into as they would detract from the actual sentiments and intentions expressed”.*

Similarly, while a minority were in favour of defining an overarching figure for the level of responses, respondents also emphasised the importance of **allowing local authorities to use their judgement and experience of local circumstances to evaluate the level of response required.** As Kirklees Council noted: *“In the end we may need to accept that a requirement of... precise numbers may be counterproductive and therefore a flexible approach is needed. It would be most unfortunate if a petition were rejected for lack of numbers because say, the electoral roll had just been reviewed.”*

The consultation document outlined a range of explicit measures that could be used to define the level of support required for a petition to merit a formal, substantive response:

*i) Defining the level of support: A fixed number of signatures*

Overall, a significant minority of local authorities agreed with the principle that **only petitions signed by a certain number of people warrant a formal response from the authority**, though a range of views were expressed on the precise number.

- There was **a degree of consensus on the minimum level of acceptable signatures.** The range of suggested options varied from **5 to 250 signatures, with 200 or 250 signatures the most common response**
- Parish and Borough councils, and members of the public **tended to favour defining the level of support in terms of a fixed number of signatures**
- Local authorities with smaller constituencies tended to list smaller figures, with parish councils frequently listing figures between **5 and 100**
- Borough and district councils were likely to provide slightly higher figures, ranging from **50 through to 500**

- **County and city councils** provided higher figures still ranging from 200 to 1000.

*ii) Defining the level of support: Percentage of the electorate*

Respondents who supported this approach argued that the **percentage of support should be measured in proportion to the population of the area**. They believed that this approach most accurately measures the relevance of an issue to the whole population.

- A range of figures, from **1 to 25 per cent**, were suggested as **signifying an appropriate level of support for a petition**. Though there was little consensus on the absolute percentages, the most popular responses were **1, 2, 5 and 10 per cent**
- A minority of respondents argued that **the appropriate percentage should depend on the nature of the petition**. The appropriate percentage will vary depending on the nature of the petition topic, and the number of people affected.

*iii) Defining the level of support: A fixed number of signatures or a percentage of the electorate, whichever is the lower (The hybrid approach)*

A significant minority of the local authorities who responded to this question believed that the 'hybrid' approach has a number of advantages. In particular, the approach was seen as **the best way to encompass both localised and authority-wide issues**. This approach was also seen to **maximise the chances of a petition generating a formal response**.

In terms of the number of signatures deemed appropriate, recommendations varied. The most frequently suggested combination was **200 signatures, or 5 per cent of the relevant population**, though suggestions ranged from **1 per cent of the population to 25 per cent, and 150 to 1,000 responses**.

- The 'hybrid' approach was **supported particularly by non governmental organisations and pressure groups**. These respondents felt that this approach provided the **greatest degree of flexibility and would be the least bureaucratic**.

## Calls for action questions

### Question (c)

#### What matters, if any, should be excluded from the call for action?

The recent Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 empowered all councillors to refer to local government matters for consideration by the relevant overview and scrutiny committees of their local authorities.

The referral amounts to a **“councillor call for action”** (CCfA). Any councillor will be able to refer a local matter affecting his or her ward or division to the appropriate overview and scrutiny committee of his or her authority. The committee is required then to put the matter on its agenda, and discuss it at a meeting. It is not to be required to take any further action; but all the powers it has – to mount inquiries, to require information, and to make reports and recommendations – are to be available to it, if it decides to take the matter up.

Overall, about **two thirds** of respondents (around 130) expressed an opinion on which matters should be excluded from the scope of the councillor call for action.

Those areas **nominated for exclusion** were:

- **Any matters for which there is already a statutory appeals process.** CCfA should not replicate or be used to circumvent existing legal appeals processes, including:
  - Planning and licensing applications
  - Council tax complaints or queries
  - Housing benefits complaints or queries
  - Reviews required by statute to be investigated privately
  - Issues currently under dispute in a court of law
  - Quasi-judicial functions and individual applications involving a separate right of appeal and associated processes.
- **Individual complaints concerning personal grievances or commercial issues.** A majority of local authorities stated that the call for action should only be used for issues of genuine concern to the community as a whole. Issues nominated for exclusion were those concerning:
  - Employment and staffing concerns of private companies
  - Personal disputes and grievances
  - Complaints against the staff of local authorities
  - School admissions

- **Matters which have recently been considered or issues planned for future action or discussion.** Many local authorities responding to this question stated that this principle should be imposed to safeguard against repetitive calls for action

A minority of respondents who mentioned this also provided the caveat that if the person raising the call for action demonstrates compelling new evidence, the issue should then be considered

- **Any issue that could be dealt with by alternative means should be excluded until all such avenues have been exhausted.**

Overall, the responses from **county, district, city, and borough councils** tended to support more exclusions from the CCfA, while **parish councils, the general public and independent organisations** tended to favour fewer legislative restrictions.

### Question (d)

**What guidance should government provide on the operation of the councillor call for action.**

Respondents were asked to comment on the sort of guidelines that they wished to see on the operation of CCfA. **Just under half of respondents expressed a viewpoint on the sort of guidance they wish to see issued around CCfA.**

Of those, about 30 respondents expressed a wish to **use or develop their own internal operational guidelines on CCfA**, rather than having explicit Government-produced guidelines. As High Peak Borough Council noted: *"High Peak Borough Council does not believe that the Government should need to provide guidance as each individual authority should be allowed to develop an appropriate mechanism at a local level."*

Reflecting an alternative perspective, however, around 60 respondent organisations referred to **specific areas of government guidance that they wished to see in relation to CCfA.**

The most commonly-requested areas for further guidance from government included:

- The definition of an **acceptable timeframe** in which formal CCfA requests should be considered and responded to by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- The most appropriate response to **vexatious or repetitive CCfAs**. As Liverpool City Council suggested, their main concern is that *'We would be keen to ensure that our Select Committees continue in their development ... and are not overly 'burdened' with CCfAs, particularly those which are frivolous, vexatious or derogatory'*. Would an **annual limit be set** on the number of calls for action each member could submit?

- The appropriate response to cross-cutting CCfA whose content **concerns more than one area or councillor**
- The appropriate response to CCfA whose implications refer to **two-tier areas and cross-party multi-member wards**
- Guidance on how to ensure that CCfA works effectively **within existing scrutiny procedures.**

Other areas for clarification mentioned included:

- The appropriate response to CCfAs that have **implications for council partnerships with private companies** for service delivery
- The scope for **delegating the response to CCfA to partners in service provision**
- Clarity around the **cost implications** of different procedures and how they can and should be met. (NB: The LGPIH Act Impact Assessment notes that the funding of local authorities will increase to cover the additional cost implications of CCfA)
- Clarity around consideration of calls for action **during an election period**
- Guidance on **how the CCfA will operate alongside other local scrutiny procedures.** For example, as Hampshire County Council noted: *'For instance, regarding the scrutiny of health services, there should be a filtering system which encourages the public to raise local concerns via appropriate community involvement forums. The Local Involvement Networks (LINks) should form the first mechanism and then if appropriate, refer the matter to the relevant local (parish, borough or district, then county) authority's Overview and Scrutiny Committee'*
- Guidance should be offered on any **Data Protection and Freedom of Information issues**
- Providing additional guidance to local authorities on **how to evaluate** the effectiveness of CCfA procedures
- Keeping statutory guidance in this area to a **minimum**, and ensuring that such guidance is published in **plain English.**

It is notable that some respondents appeared to be **unfamiliar with the existing scrutiny process.** There were also a number of requests for guidance received around the **most appropriate means of informing the general public about the call for action procedures.** These requests should be viewed in the context that CCfA is a tool to empower councillors to act as community champions on issues of concern in their local area. Citizens may ask their councillor to trigger a councillor call for action, but the decision to launch a call for action lies with the councillor. The consultation suggests that councillor call for action would be complemented by the petitions proposals it sets out, which provide a mechanism for members of the public to directly call for action from their local authority.

## Overall questions

### Question (e)

**Taken together, would petitions and calls for action sufficiently empower communities to intervene with their elected representatives? Should we contemplate other measures?**

The majority of respondents agreed that **overall petitions and calls for action will help to empower communities to engage with their elected representatives**. A number of **additional steps and concerns** should be considered:

- A minority of local authorities and independent organisations suggested that **after an initial period, the position on petitioning and calls for action should be reviewed**, to assess their effect on empowering the community. As St Helens council noted: *"Once the call for action has been implemented and the proposed provisions for petitions introduced, bedded in and evaluated, it would be appropriate to review the position to see whether any further measures would be necessary"*
- **A majority of local authorities stated that petitions and calls for action alone do not sufficiently empower communities**; they should be supplemented with additional initiatives at a local level in order to effectively empower communities
- A minority of local authorities also raised concerns about **the risk that new structures or mechanisms have the potential to conflict with existing procedures** designed to deal with petitions. It is therefore important that **new empowerment mechanisms should not overburden local authorities unnecessarily**.

### Question (f)

#### Do you have other views on the operation of the new duty to respond to petitions and the call for action?

A relatively small number of respondents chose to make additional comments on the new duty:

- One overarching theme is that **clear, accessible, and transparent information** is necessary to ensure and encourage the correct use of any new statutory procedures or guidelines
- Many local authorities responding to the consultation stated that they already have a variety of means at a local level by which councillors engage with the community. Around 70 local authorities already have their own guidance on responding to petitions, and **many did not want the new statutory guidance to conflict with their existing procedures**
- A number of local authorities emphasised that petitions should **represent a starting point for debate**. While it is important to take into account the views of petitioners, it is also important to note that petitions should not be the only form of engagement
- The **details of any new procedures** (for example, timeframes) should be decided locally, so they can be tailored to each council's needs.

A number of local authorities and independent organisations expressed additional views on CCfA:

- A significant minority of local authorities were insistent that issues should be resolved informally where possible, and Councillor calls for action should be considered a **'last resort'**: *"Scrutiny must be the final point of call"* (Walsall Council)
- Ensuring the provision of **training courses and materials** to assist councillors in the practical application of CCfA.

Finally, a number of authorities noted the potential dangers of the new duty to respond, particularly in terms of their potential to become the focal point for protest against change. As Northampton Borough Council noted *"Petitions may show the weight of opinion for or against an issue in terms of numbers of signatures (or at least the quality of organisation behind such initiatives). However they too easily can become a negative force, simply focused on stopping change. In that sense they may make the role of local democracy in taking difficult decisions between competing views even more difficult by falsely raising expectations that because more people express a loud view that makes it automatically right. This is not likely to be empowering, but risks bringing about even greater frustration."*

## Appendix 1

### Additional focus groups and depth interviews

In addition to the analysis of responses to the consultation document, a wider process of research was completed comprising of six general public focus groups with between seven and nine participants, and four individual in-depth interviews were completed. This research was commissioned by Communities and Local Government and completed by **Connect Research**, an independent market research agency.

A range of social groups were interviewed as part of the research. The structure of the focus groups and depth interviews is shown below:

Location	Age range	Signed/Organised a petition
Suburban South	15 - 18	No
Urban North	18 - 24	Yes
Urban South	25 - 44	Yes
Urban Midlands	25 - 44	No
Suburban North	45 +	Mixed
Rural Midlands	45 +	Yes
Urban South	65	Yes - organised
Urban South	40	Yes - organised
Urban Midlands	55	Yes - organised
Urban North	50	Yes - organised

A note summarising the main emergent comments from the general public focus groups is included below. General public members were not interviewed about the councillor call for action procedures.

### Outline of findings from the general public focus groups and in-depth interviews

Most respondents agreed **that the subject of a petition should relate to the functions of the local authority**. However the focus group attendees also proposed the duty should go *further* than local authority functions, including suggestions such as:

- Refuse collection, fire and ambulance services, post offices, hospitals, GP surgery, local transport, and parking

- Closures to local roads, poorly maintained highways
- To raise awareness of vandalism, poor street lighting or areas prone to crime.

Respondents were asked **if the petitioner should be a local person**. Overall, their responses fell into two broad categories:

- Those who argued that **anyone who lives or works in the local area should have the right to raise a petition** – regardless of their age or length of residency
- Those who suggested that the right to petition should be restricted to **those on the electoral register**, or who have **lived in the local area for a minimum period of time**.

Respondents were also asked for their views on **the percentage of the electorate who should sign a petition prior to it having to receive a formal response**. Specific figures suggested varied widely, from **1 to 30 per cent**, to a **simple majority of 50 per cent**.

Respondents were also asked **if a petition should satisfy minimum requirements in relation to i) manner, ii) form, iii) content**. The most common suggestions for the sort of information that should be included in a petition included:

- The **aim** of the petition
- Some **basic personal information** (name, age, address) on those signing the petition (though there were some respondents who expressed concern around data-privacy issues here), and of the individual raising the petition
- An **outline of the issue** to which the petition refers, including the desired outcome
- Any **other relevant background information**.

Respondents were also asked their opinion on the **value of electronic petitions**. Most respondents were in favour of e-petitions as easier and convenient. However, participants also **raised a number of concerns around the operation of electronic petitions**:

- Concerns over how local authorities can effectively and reliably **verify electronic signatures**. Some felt that **electronic petitions could be more open to fraud**
- Many people lack internet access, and it is **important not to exclude these people from the petitioning process**
- Some people saw these petitions as **'faceless'**.

## Appendix 2

### Respondents to the Consultation

The following organisations responded to the '*Local Petitions and Calls for Action*' consultation. Please note that for privacy reasons, this list does not include the names of members of the public who contributed to the consultation, though their responses were analysed and included in this summary document.

- Age Concern England
- Allerdale Borough Council
- Amber Valley Borough Council
- Ashford Borough Council
- Association of Council Secretaries and Solicitors
- Association of North East Councils
- Association of Police Authorities
- Audit Commission
- Aylesbury Vale District council
- Barnet Borough Council
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- Birmingham City Council
- Blythe Valley Borough Council
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council
- Braintree District Council
- Brighton & Hove City Council
- Bromley Borough Council
- Bromsgrove District Council
- Bucks County Council
- Cambridge City Council
- Castle Point Borough
- Cheltenham Borough Council
- Cheshire County Council
- Chesterfield Borough Council

- Chichester District Council
- City of London Corporation
- City of York Council
- Commission for Rural Communities
- County and Unitary Councils Officer Overview and Scrutiny Network
- Coventry City Council
- Coventry City Council (Cllr. John Gazey)
- Crawley Borough Council
- Cumbria County Council
- Daventry Town Council
- Decorum Borough Council
- Derby City Council
- Derby Community Safety Partnership
- Derbyshire County Council
- Development Trust Association
- Devon County Council
- District of Easington Council
- Dorset County Council
- Dorset Fire Authority
- Durham County Council
- East Herts Council
- East Lindsey District Council
- Eden District Council
- Exeter City Council
- Fareham Borough Council
- Gateshead Council
- Great Yarmouth Borough Council
- Greater London Authority
- Greater Manchester Police Authority
- Hampshire County Council
- Hampstead Garden Suburb Residents Association
- Harrogate Borough Council

- Harrow Council
- Help the Aged
- Hertsmere Borough Council
- High Peak Borough Council
- Hillingdon Borough Council
- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Hull City Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council
- Hyndburn Borough Council
- International Centre of Excellence for Democracy
- Isle of Wight Council
- Kent County Council
- Kirklees Council
- Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Lancaster City Council
- Leeds City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Lincolnshire Country Council
- Liverpool City Council
- Local Borough of Bexley
- Local Government Association
- Local Government Ombudsman
- London Borough of Bexley
- London Borough of Camden
- London Borough of Greenwich
- London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
- London Borough of Hillingdon
- London Play
- Maidstone Borough Council

- Malden District Council
- Marden Parish Council
- Medway Council
- Mencap
- Milton Keynes Council
- Milverton Parish Council
- Motor Neurone Disease Association
- NASUWT The Teachers Union
- National Autistic Society
- National Council of Voluntary Child Care Organisations
- National Council for Voluntary Organisations
- Newcastle City Council
- Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council
- Norfolk Police Society
- North Devon District Council
- North Tyneside Council
- North Warwickshire
- North Yorkshire County Council
- Northampton Borough Council
- Northamptonshire County Council
- Northumberland County Council
- Norwich City Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council
- Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Oxford City Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Packington Parish Council
- Portsmouth City Council
- Reading Borough Council
- Ribble Valley Borough Council
- Rochford District Council

- Rossendale Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
- Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Salford City Council
- Sanctuary Group
- Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
- Save Milverton Action Group
- Sevenoaks District Council
- Shropshire County Council
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
- Somerset County Council
- South Bedfordshire District Council
- South Norfolk Council
- South Ribble Borough Council
- South Tyneside Council
- Southwater Parish Council
- Sport Relief
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council
- St Helens Council
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
- Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
- Stoke-on-Trent City Council
- Suffolk Coastal District Council
- Suffolk County Council
- Sunderland City Council
- Swale Borough Council
- Swannington Parish Council
- Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
- Teesdale District Council
- Telford and Wrekin Council
- The Chartered Institute of Housing
- The Consultation Institute

- The Democratic Society
- Thurrock Council
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
- Trafford Borough Council
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
- UNISON - Trade Union
- Unlock Democracy
- Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
- Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
- Waltham Forest Council
- Wansbeck District Council
- Warwickshire and West Midlands Association of Town Councils
- Warwickshire Council
- Waveney District Council
- West Lancashire District Council
- West Sussex County Council
- West Wiltshire District Council
- Westminster City Council
- Wigan Council
- Wolverhampton City Council
- Worcestershire County Council
- Workingham Borough Council
- Wychavon District Council
- Wycombe District Council



**ISBN: 978-1-4098-0256-3**

ISBN 978-1409802563



9 781409 802563