

Annex 3

Call-in Request Form

This form must be completed and signed by THREE City of York Councillors and MUST be returned to Democratic Services within 5 working days of the decision being published (not including the day of publication).

Decision taker:	Cllr Lomas
Date of publication of decision:	21/02/24
Title of Decision Called in:	Civic Protocols
Date Decision Called in:	27/02/2024

REASONS FOR CALL-IN		Tick which reason applies
1.	Decision contrary to the policy framework?	x
2.	Decision contrary to or not wholly consistent with the budget?	
3.	Decision is Key but it has not been dealt with in accordance with the Council's Constitution.	x
4.	Decision does not follow principles of good decision-making set out in Article 7 of the Council's Constitution.	x
If reason 4, please tick which specific element of Article 7 the decision maker has not followed, did he or she not:		
a)	Meaningfully consider all alternatives and, where reasonably possible, consider the views of the public.	x
b)	Understand and keep to the legal requirements regulating their power to make decisions.	
c)	Take account of all relevant matters, both in general and specific, and ignore any irrelevant matters.	x
d)	Act wholly for proper purpose and/or in the interests of the public.	
e)	Keep to the rules relating to local government finance.	
f)	Follow procedures correctly and be fair.	
g)	Make sure they are properly authorised to make the decisions.	
h)	Take appropriate professional advice from Officers.	

Detailed Reason(s) for Call-in.

Please explain below why one of the reasons for call-in applies (e.g. for number 1- which major policy affected and how/why).

PLEASE NOTE: *If you wish to produce and rely on significant supplementary, external evidence in support of your reasons for this call-in it must be provided to Democratic Services prior to the publication of the agenda. It will not be permissible to introduce and rely upon evidence at the meeting without it being subject to prior circulation unless by consent of the Chair.*

Key Decision

This should have been a key decision as a minimum; the Lord Mayoralty affects all wards and all members of the council. They are by statute the first citizen of the city and York's Lord Mayor is second only to the City of London, holding the title Right Honourable (which only York and London do within England). The ancient right to appoint a Mayor comes from royal charters dating back to 1212 and the office is of immense standing in York, the UK and internationally. Any change to how the office operates is significant to our city and the country. In regard to the office of Sheriff, York is one of only a small number of cities who retain the right to appoint a sheriff independently of the Crown. This right comes from royal charters and letters patent. The office of Sheriff of York dates back to 1396 and its current legal standing is as a "Local Officer of Dignity".

The paper makes changes to the roles of the Lord Mayor and Sheriff which affect the constitution in regard to their duties, in particular "To act as an ambassador for the City locally, nationally and internationally", "actively promoting and supporting local business and economic activity", "actively promoting and supporting local tourism", "residency in the Mansion House". This alone should have meant a full council decision.

Article 7, 3.2 of the constitution helps define Key Decisions as:

- c) whether the decision is likely to be a matter of political or other controversy
- d) the extent to which the decision is likely to result in or attract substantial public interest.

It was clear such significant changes to the Mayoralty and Shrievalty of England's second civic city, which had no consultation whatsoever, would meet the above criteria.

Consultation and Analysis

Lack of consultation is of great concern. There are only 3 members of the council with any experience of civic office, none were consulted. Other interested parties were not engaged with, including the Civic Trust and former Lord Mayors and Sheriffs. Indeed, no group leaders, councillors or the public, charities or businesses were consulted. There was no consultation with other CYC officers in terms of the Lord Mayor's and Sheriff's roles in promoting economy development or with organisations such as Visit York in regard to tourism. The only consultation was with the incoming Lord Mayor, who at the point of the decision being made was not known to the public and their views were not shared in the paper. No alternatives or comparisons were given.

Equalities Impacts

The lack of any equalities impact assessment meant the executive member could not take account of how these changes will affect members with disabilities or those with poorer socioeconomic backgrounds. A full EIA should have been provided.

Lack of Financial Detail

Details regarding the actual costs were not articulated. The paper fails to offer any detailed financial breakdowns or budgets. There is no cost benefit analysis against monies spent or context on positive impact. The executive member gave the media a figure of £53k ahead of the meeting, but at the meeting a different figure of £130k was given by officers.

The proposed savings are not articulated, with the exception of the reduction in allowances. The paper fails to properly describe where and how the savings will be made and their impacts.

The paper made no mention of purchasing new "badges of office", nor any costs, yet at the meeting officers said new civic regalia was being commissioned. The executive member was not given any financial costings for these when agreeing this.

	Name (please print)	Signature (<i>please note that signatures will not be published with the agenda. Electronic signature will be accepted</i>)	Date
1.	ASHLEY MASON	A Mason	27/2/24
2.	CHRIS STEWARD	C Steward	27/2/24
3.	KEITH ORRELL	K Orrell	27/2/24

For office use only:

Received on behalf of the Monitoring Officer by: (signature)

L. Tomlinson

Name: Lindsay Tomlinson

Date: 28 February 2024

Time: 09:23

Validation check (if necessary):

Monitoring Officer / ~~Chief Operating Officer~~

Valid: YES / ~~NO~~

Reason: The call-in form raises prima facie questions of compliance which could form the basis of an arguable case.

Completed by: (signature)

Bygn Roberts

Date: 28 February 2024

Time: 18:25