



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All Wards

COUNCIL

22nd February 2017

**PETITIONS FOR DEBATE BY FULL COUNCIL – RUSHEY MEAD LIBRARY AND
RUSHEY MEAD RECREATION CENTRE**

REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

1. INTRODUCTION

A petition has been received which asks the City Council to ensure that Rushey Mead Library and Rushey Mead Recreation Centre remain open and continue to provide services for the Community.

The Council's Petitions' Scheme (adopted in September 2014) states that any petition that receives 1,500 or more valid signatures, the lead petitioner may ask that it be subject to a debate at Full Council. The lead petitioners have indicated that they wish their petition to be subject to a debate.

The lead petitioners did not indicate a total figure for signatories to the petition, and although the petitioners have indicated that approximately 4,000 people have signed the petition, the Council does not verify numbers of signatories once the 1500 threshold is reached.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Council is recommended to consider the petition and make any recommendations in accordance with the Petitions' Scheme.

3. REPORT

The petition received from Mrs Vijyaben Chauhan has met the criteria of 1,500 signatures of people who have provided an address in Leicester of where they live, work or study. The petition is in the following terms:

"We the undersigned petition the City Mayor, Peter Soulsby of Leicester City Council to ensure that both the Rushey Mead Library and the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre remain open and continue to provide services for all of the community of Rushey Mead. These two premises provide much needed

essential space and services for local people. It is a lifeline for many people, including women, disabled people, single mothers, elderly people, young children and families.

There are no other Council Community facilities in the area and so we demand that there are no cuts to the provision and that both of the buildings remain open and continue the service provision.”

The lead petitioners have been invited to speak on their petition for five minutes to be followed by a Councillor debate for a maximum of 15 minutes.

Following the debate, the Council can decide how to respond to the petitions and may decide to:

- Recommend to the Executive to either take or not take the action the petition requests.
- Recommend to the Executive a different course of action as a result of the debate.
- Commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee.

Following the Council meeting the petition organisers will receive written confirmation of this decision.

The background to the petition is attached to the report.

4. FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

4.1. Financial Implications

The petition submitted relates to proposals that form part of the wider Transforming Neighbourhood Services Programme. The programme has financial savings attached to it and options being proposed will have financial consequences. Any alternative options considered will have to assess the impact on the delivery of savings expected to be achieved.

Alison Greenhill, Director of Finance, 374401

4.2 Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report, though it should be noted that in the Executive decision notice dated 23 January 2017, subsequently called in to and considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the decision to close the Library has been taken as part of the wider Transforming Neighbourhoods decision. Should a further Executive decision in relation to the Library be considered following the debate of this petition any legal implications which may arise out of the substantive issue will be considered as part of that Executive decision.

Emma Horton, Head of Law (Commercial, Property & Planning), 37 1426

5. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References Within the Report
Equal Opportunities	N	
Policy	N	
Sustainable and Environmental	N	
Crime and Disorder	N	
Human Rights Act	N	
Elderly/People on Low Income	N	
Corporate Parenting	N	
Health Inequalities Impact	N	

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

None

7. CONSULTATIONS

None.

8. REPORT AUTHOR

Francis Connolly
Senior Democratic Support Officer.