

**Corporate & Scrutiny Management Policy &
Scrutiny Committee**

9 May 2016

Report of the Assistant Director Governance & ICT

Schedule of Petitions

Summary

1. Members of this Committee are aware of their new role in the initial consideration of petitions received by the Authority. The current petitions process was considered by the Audit and Governance Committee on 2 October 2014 and endorsed by Council on 9 October 2014. This process aimed to ensure scrutiny of the actions taken in relation to petitions received either by Members or Officers.

Background

2. Following agreement of the above petitions process, Members of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee had been considering a full schedule of petitions received at each meeting, commenting on actions taken by the Executive Member or Officer, or awaiting decisions to be taken at future Executive Member Decision Sessions.
3. However, in order to simplify this process Members agreed, at their June 2015 meeting, that the petitions annex should in future be provided in a reduced format in order to make the information relevant and manageable. At that meeting it was agreed that future petitions reports should include an annex of current petitions and agreed actions, but only following consideration of the petitions by the Executive or relevant Executive Member or Officer.
4. This was agreed, in the knowledge that the full petitions schedule was publicly available on the Council's website and that it was updated and republished after each meeting of the Committee.
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13020&path=0>

5. Current Petitions Update

A copy of the reduced petitions schedule is now attached at Annex A of the report which provides a list of new petitions received to date together with details of those considered by the Executive or relevant Executive Member/Officer since the last meeting of the Committee. Further information relating to the two petitions which have now been considered by the Executive Members/Officers since the last meeting is set out below:

Petition Number

37. York Art Gallery

A hard copy of this petition, containing 90 signatories together with an online petition containing over 56 residents signatories, was handed in at the Executive meeting by Councillor Taylor on 24 September 2015. The petition asked “that York Public Art Gallery should be free of charge as art belongs to everyone”.

Consideration was given to the petition at the Executive meeting on 24 September, when consideration was given to the York Museums Trust’s revised charging plans. At that time the Executive agreed to note the York Museums Trust’s (YMT) revised charging plans and agreed a process for updating the legal agreements between CYC and the trust to reflect new funding levels.

A decision was also taken to Commission further work with regard to options for new legal structures to better protect the museum assets and to release £20k from contingency to fund the maximum cost of the new concessions. These decisions were taken in order to ensure a vibrant and sustainable museums service over the long-term.

Following this decision, on 25 November 2015 the Learning & Culture Policy and Scrutiny Committee agreed to set up a scrutiny review to assist in the establishment of a new legal framework for the relationship between City of York Council and York Museums Trust (YMT). Concerns previously raised regarding the charging plans were also considered as part of this Scrutiny Review and the final report and recommendations of this review will be presented at the Executive meeting on 28 April 2016.

49. **Trentholme Drive**

Consideration was given to this hard copy petition, signed by 32 residents of Trentholme Drive, which requested residents parking at the Executive Member for Transport & Planning's Decision Session on 14 April 2016.

The Executive Member considered an Officer report which set out the issues around commuter parking in the area and the following options were put forward:

Option one: Conduct a formal consultation, report the outcome to the Director of City and Environmental Services, who will decide whether sufficient support is evident to advertise an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Option two: Take no further action

Following consideration, the Executive Member agreed the undertaking of a formal consultation with residents of Trentholme Drive for a Residents' Priority Parking area. This was agreed as the documentation provided would enable residents to make an informed decision.

6. **The Process**

There are a number of options available to the Committee as set out in paragraph 7 below, however these are not exhaustive. Every petition is, of course, unique, and it may be that Members feel a different course of action from the standard is necessary.

Options

7. Having considered the reduced Schedule attached which provides details of petitions received and considered by the Executive/Executive Member since the last meeting of the Committee; Members have a number of options in relation to those petitions:

- Request a fuller report, if applicable, for instance when a petition has received substantial support;
- Note receipt of the petition and the proposed action;

- Ask the relevant decision maker or the appropriate Executive Member to attend the Committee to answer questions in relation to it;
- Undertake a detailed scrutiny review, gathering evidence and making recommendations to the decision maker;
- Refer the matter to Full Council where its significance requires a debate;

If Members feel that appropriate action has already been taken or is planned, then no further consideration by scrutiny may be necessary.

8. Following this meeting, the lead petitioner in each case will be kept informed of this Committee's consideration of their petition, including any further action Members may decide to take.

Consultation

9. All Groups were consulted on the process of considering more appropriate ways in which the Council deal with and respond to petitions, resulting in the current process. Relevant Directorates are involved and have been consulted on the handling of the petitions outlined in Annex A.

Implications

10. There are no known legal, financial, human resource or other implications directly associated with the recommendations in this report. However, depending upon what, if any, further actions Members agree to there may, of course, be specific implications for resources which would need to be addressed.

Risk Management

11. There are no known risk implications associated with the recommendations in this report. Members should, however, assess the reputational risk by ensuring appropriate and detailed consideration is given to petitions from the public.

Recommendations

12. Members are asked to consider the petitions received and actions reported, as set out in paragraph 5 above and on the attached Schedule at Annex A, and agree an appropriate course of action in each case.

Reason: To ensure the Committee carries out its new requirements in relation to petitions.

Contact Details

Author:

Jill Pickering
Democracy Officer
Tel No. 01904 552061
e: jill.pickering@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty
AD Governance & ICT

**Report
Approved**



Date 28 April 2016

Wards Affected:

All



Background Papers: None

Annexes: Annex A – Extract from schedule of petitions received and action taken to date