

SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION / ASSESSMENT FORM FOR COUNCILLORS

What is the broad topic area?

Conflicts with urban Geese in York

What is the specific topic area?

i.e. what should be included & excluded from the topic? what are the driver behind the topic?

Improving the experience of residents and visitors to public parks and gardens by reducing contamination by geese dropping depositions

Ambitions for the review:

i.e. what is the review trying to achieve & why e.g. financial / efficiency savings and/or performance improvements? what will be different as a result of the review?

The presence of large numbers of wild geese in the centre of York creates a number of operational and safety problems, these include large amounts of droppings in paved areas, parks and gardens making these sites unwelcoming and unusable; damage to vegetation through grazing, and intimidation of children and other animals. Geese can usually be found at Rowntree Park, in and along the River Ouse between Scarborough Bridge and Rowntree Park (including War Memorial Gardens, Kings Staith, Tower Gardens and Eye of York), River Foss between Yearsley Bridge and Foss Basin, Hull Road Park, Chapman's Pond, Hogg's Pond, Rawcliffe Lake, University of York campus, Wigginton Pond, other remote ponds and lakes in York.

We would like to reduce the level of geese dropping depositions in the currently effected parks and gardens. We will not just look into the latest geese population management and control practises but also into technical options for dropping removal and its external funding possibilities.

-
1. Does it have a potential impact on one or more sections of the population? Yes No
 2. Is it a corporate priority or concern to the council's partners? Yes No
 3. Will the review add value? and lead to effective outcomes?

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is it timely, and do we have the resources? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Will the review duplicate other work? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer is 'Yes' to questions 1 – 4 and 'No' to question 5, then the Committee may decide to proceed with the review. To decide how best to carry out the review, please provide information on the following:

1) Who and how shall we consult?

i.e. who do we need to consult and why? is there already any feedback from customers and/or other consultation groups that we need to take account of?

- Officers and previous reports
- Friends of Rowntree Park and other support groups for parks and gardens
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
- University of York Geese Management officer
- Experts in urban wildlife management of Askham Bryan College
- RSPCA
- Other councils in the UK and best practises from Europe, USA & Canada
- Providers of paddock cleaning equipment
- Public Health experts

2) Do we need any experts/specialists? (internal/external)

i.e. is the review dependent on specific teams, departments or external bodies? What impact will the review have on the work of any of these?

Internal expertise it necessary to outline the previous initiatives and proposals to understand why they have not been successful to a level recognised as successful by local residents.

The task group would try to rely on external experts and specialists as much as possible. If we are able to find a manageable solution for York there will be a wider impact for other local authorities.

3) What other help do we need? E.g. training/development/resources

i.e. does this review relate to any other ongoing projects or depend on them for anything? What information do we need and who will provide it? What do we need to undertake this review e.g. specific resources, events, meetings etc?

Access to all CYC formal documentation related to Geese management over last five years.

Administrative support where necessary.

4) How long should it take?

i.e. does the timings of completion of the review need to coincide with any other ongoing or planned work

14 weeks. The aim is to conclude the work of the task group by the end of February 2016 to produce recommendations to the committee in March.