

Cllr Rose Written Representation in relation to agenda item: Application for Community Right to Bid under the Localism Act 2011

Dear decision session member,

It is probably worth me saying up front that I was the Chair of York Open Planning Forum when we ran the local heritage list of community sites and considered lots of similar locations to identify which are of community value and local non-grade-listed heritage, so I'm not without some experience and knowledge albeit pre/circa Localism Act 2011.

For people in Acomb, as across the city, there are only a small handful of live music venues of community value. The Crescent, the Fulford Arms, and Victoria Vaults, come up top three no matter whom you ask across the city. People will travel specifically for those venues. We have lost others over the years, and we're in danger of losing this one.

CAMRA have made reasonable points. They're an eligible body. In all honesty, I'm surprised it wasn't already listed, given the activity surrounding the venue in the press and public discourse in recent years. As the report states, credible experts believe this important and great venue can open, and it was last open as an independent venue that brought genuine cultural value to our city. The fact that there are still parties interested in reopening and purchasing the site, despite the owners' repeated assurances to the press that it's not viable, speaks to this ongoing importance as a musical and cultural hub. The list of current ACVs included in the report comprises 22 locations, none of which can provide what Victoria Vaults can.

I do not agree with the owners that this is an abuse of process. Wednesbury unreasonableness is a huge accusation, clearly refuted by the independent assessment of officers in the report, whether the nomination is worthy or not. There is clear social value – and there are numerous responses agreeing with this in this report, as well as the countless comments across York on social media. I don't believe that it "attempts to appropriate a private residence (noting the change of

use/planning permission situation), that this nomination is beyond timeframe. And I don't believe it has been proven to be financially unviable as a venue – not least as I note the additional paper from a local ward councillor explicitly stating that four groups are actively interested right now.

I usually wouldn't comment on planning or ACV or licensing applications far beyond my local immediate area and council ward, but in this instance it is something that even Acomb residents have been talking about and feel strongly about and I fully agree. Whatever happens in the future, it is impossible to argue that it is not by all reasonable definitions an asset of community value, and errors in past process shouldn't count against the determination of that matter.

Warm regards,

Jason