

Report on 2No. Petitions Relating to Relocation of Carousel

Summary

1. This report presents information on two petitions received by the Council in regard to the relocation of the Carousel as part of the Christmas 2015 attractions, which were previously presented to Corporate & Scrutiny Management Committee (CSMC) in November 2015 as part of their regular schedule of Petitions.

Background

2. At every meeting, members of the Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee consider a full schedule of petitions commenting on actions taken by the Executive Member or Officer, following consideration of the petitions by the Executive or relevant Executive Member.
3. The full petitions schedule is publically available on the Council's website and is updated and republished after each meeting of the Corporate & Scrutiny Management Committee – see:
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/mgEPetitionListDisplay.aspx?RPID=11192152&HPID=11192152&VM=2>
4. In November 2015 the schedule considered by CSMC contained two petitions on the Parliament Street Carousel, and CSMC agreed to refer those petitions to this committee, taking into account that the issues raised fell within this Committee's remit. The relevant extract from the schedule of petitions is attached at Annex A.

Petitions Update

5. At the time of their receipt, both Carousel petitions were referred to Make it York, for their comments, the new body set up to provide a joined up approach to the promotion and development of the city and develop a

more commercial approach to traditional public sector led activities e.g. festivals and events. In response Make it York confirmed that they had been working hard to try and improve the city's 2015 York Christmas attractions. They confirmed they had many new things planned, many of them for children, and that the new layout of attractions were considered both commercially sensible and in the best interests of the overall Festival.

6. At the same time, Make it York expressed concern about some phrasing used in the e-petitions as there were no plans to ban the Carousel from the city. The carousel operator had been invited to use a "pitch" that he frequently used during the rest of the year, he had been offered what were felt to be very favourable terms and an offer had been made to work with him to ensure the new position would be heavily promoted.
7. Make it York were also concerned that the petition had stated that the carousel was being replaced by a licensed bar, when that would not be the case. They reported that there had been an unprecedented demand for market stalls at the St Nicholas Festival and that it would be market stalls sited on St Sampson's Square. A food and drink offer was planned for the bottom end of Parliament Street.
8. Concerns were also raised, as part of the public participation session, at the 8 October Full Council meeting, by Mr John Warrington, as owner of the Carousel ride and Tom Hughes regarding the suggested alternative siting for the ride offered at the Eye of York over the Christmas period.

Consultation

9. The Managing Director of Make it York will be in attendance at this meeting to respond to any questions arising.

Options

10. 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;
 - Agree that appropriate action has already been taken or is planned, and therefore no further consideration by scrutiny is necessary.
11. 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.

Implications

12. 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

13. 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

14. Members are asked to consider the petitions received and actions reported, as set out in 4 above and in Annex A, and agree an appropriate course of action in each case.

Reason: To ensure the Committee carries out scrutiny's requirements in relation to petitions.

Contact Details

Author:

Melanie Carr
Scrutiny Officer
Tel No. 01904 5520540
e: melanie.carr@york.gov.uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Andrew Docherty
AD Governance & ICT

**Report
Approved**



Date

12 January 2016

Wards Affected:

All



Background Papers: None

Annexes:

Annex A – Extract from Petitions Schedule

Abbreviations:

CSMC - Corporate and Scrutiny Management Policy and Scrutiny Committee