|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Officer report to: | Council |
| Date: | 29 January 2018 |
| Report of: | Head of Law and Governance |
| Title of Report: | Petition submitted in accordance with Council procedure rules – Where are our promised 1000 Westgate bike racks? |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Summary and recommendations | | |
| Purpose of report: | | To set before Council a petition meeting the criteria for debate under the Council’s petitions scheme. |
| Decision required: | | Yes |
| Corporate Priority: | | Not applicable. |
| Policy Framework: | | Not applicable. |
| Recommendations: | | |
| 1. | That Council in line with the procedure for large petitions:   * hears the head petitioner for the petition; * debates: * the proposal contained within the petition; or * relevant motions submitted by councillors by the deadline ; and * decides the action it wishes to take. | |
|  | The petition states: *Where are our promised 1000 Westgate bike racks?*  *One of the planning conditions attached to the development of the Westgate Shopping Centre was the provision of 1022 bike parking spaces. These bike racks were intended to replace those removed from the City Centre during the construction works and provide additional spaces to encourage more sustainable travel.*  *So far, Labour-run Oxford City Council (who voted through the development on their own land) have failed to enforce this condition, allowing the Westgate to open with only a small fraction of the promised cycle parking and without the promised cycle hub. Overall, Oxford now has far fewer cycle racks than before the Westgate development began.*  *The Council have, however, found time to expand the number of car parking places in the City Centre and negotiated a reduction in car parking fees leading to increased traffic and a worsening of Oxford's already badly polluted air.* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Executive Board Member responsible : | Councillor Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services |

# The petition

A paper extract of the signatories to an online change.org petition was handed to the clerk at the Council meeting on 27 November as part of the petitioner’s address to Council (Minute 64 refers).

The extract contains 2156 signatures, 1950 of which are valid, with the remainder providing insufficient address details or not UK addresses.

The signatures have been validated and checked as unique as far as possible. Signatories come from a range of postcodes, including a number from outside the city but within the county.

As over 1500 signatures are provided with a name and full address or street number and postcode, the petition meets the criteria for debate at Council.

The online petition may contain a different total number of signatures.

The petition organiser has requested a debate at Council.

The petition is available to view on [change.org](https://www.change.org/p/oxford-city-council-oxford-city-council-where-are-our-promised-1-000-westgate-bike-racks-089aef70-1c8a-4f8b-a16a-24f3092eb16c) and states in full:

*Where are our promised 1000 Westgate bike racks?*

*One of the planning conditions attached to the development of the Westgate Shopping Centre was the provision of 1022 bike parking spaces. These bike racks were intended to replace those removed from the City Centre during the construction works and provide additional spaces to encourage more sustainable travel.*

*So far, Labour-run Oxford City Council (who voted through the development on their own land) have failed to enforce this condition, allowing the Westgate to open with only a small fraction of the promised cycle parking and without the promised cycle hub. Overall, Oxford now has far fewer cycle racks than before the Westgate development began.*

*The Council have, however, found time to expand the number of car parking places in the City Centre and negotiated a reduction in car parking fees leading to increased traffic and a worsening of Oxford's already badly polluted air.*

There is no specific action requested in the petition.

# Actions for Council

Actions open to Council include:

* noting the petition
* taking the action the petition requests
* not taking the action the petition requests
* commissioning a further review
* where the matter falls to the Executive to make the final decision, decide whether to make recommendations to the Executive to inform that decision.

The Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services and the Executive Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services have beeninvited to comment on the petition and their comments will be circulated in the briefing note to Council.

# Constitution rules and procedure

The Council’s scheme for handling petitions is set out in the Constitution. The scheme specifies that petitions requesting action within the Council’s powers and containing over 1,500 signatures will be debated by Full Council if a debate is requested.

The Constitution states that there is a limit of 15 minutes for dealing with each petition.

The scheme also specifies that the petition organiser can address Council for up to five minutes at the start of the debate in order to present the petition. Should the lead petitioner speak for 5 minutes this then allows 10 minutes for debate and decision.

The motion for debate is the one set out above in paragraph 7.

An alternative substantive motion must be proposed if councillors wish to take any action other than adopting the action in the petition; not adopting the action in the petition; or deferring, referring or noting the issues raised by the petition.

If a Councillor wishes to put an alternative substantive motion on a petition then they must send this to Committee and Members’ Services by 10.00am on 26 January (the working day before the full Council meeting). This is then published in the Council briefing note. Any amendments to motions set out in the briefing note must be sent to Committee and Members’ Services by 11.00am on 29 January (the day of the meeting).

# Financial implications and legal issues

The implications of this report will depend on Council’s recommendations, if any, and Council should be mindful of the possible costs in formulating its recommendations.

The implications will depend on Council’s recommendations, if any. Any recommendations will be considered in detail by the City Executive Board, before returning to Council should this be necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Report author** | | Jennifer Thompson |
| Job title | | Committee and Members Services Officer |
| Service area or department | | Law and Governance |
| Telephone | | 01865 252275 |
| e-mail | | [jthompson@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:jthompson@oxford.gov.uk) |
| Background Papers: | | |
|  | Paper petition available for inspection. | |