

Annex C (i)

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:	Executive
Date of publication of decision:	Decided 16 th November, published 17 th November (I assume)
Title of Decision Called in:	Castle Gateway update report and next steps
Date Decision Called in:	19 November

	REASONS FOR CALL-IN	Tick which reason applies
1.	Decision contrary to the policy framework?	
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.	
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.	

Annex C (i)

(f)	Follow procedures correctly and be fair.	
(g)	Make sure they are properly authorised to make the decisions.	
(i)	Take appropriate professional advice from Officers.	

Detailed Reason(s) for Call-in.

We wish to call-in the decisions on Castle Gateway for the following reasons:

Poor project progress highlights the need for cross party working rather than swings dependent on who is in power. Labour has a mandate, but just a one seat majority. Consensus, backed by tangible and sound financial business cases is needed, not hopes. There are big lessons which look unlearnt from the likes of the Community Stadium and Guildhall.

Specifically:

1. Spark was only to be a short lease and if the extension goes through will have been in for essentially a decade, paying well below market rent without sufficient positive overall good to justify this. Serious consideration should be given to other site uses, including a sale. The site is one location in the Piccadilly area, it is not pivotal. If the lease is extended there is no clear plan for after, it is simply a delay.
2. There is insufficient detail to show clear benefit on the return to the council from a generous lease extension to Mahavir Properties (Coppergate Centre).
3. The magnitude of the direction change on St George's Field Multi Story Car Park has too little analysis given the associated write-offs and impact it would have.
4. The reduction in city centre car parking is unacceptable and will be a real issue for businesses, The reduced car usage hoped for in the Local Transport Plan remains a hope./
5. If city centre parking is cut as proposed there is inadequate planning for the resulting revenue drop.
6. Report, round estimate, figures (e.g. Castle and Eye of York c. £1 million, St George's MSCP c. £2 million and Castle Mills c. £1 million) provide insufficient depth for members to analyse, never mind time being money and officer time not being tangibly considered.

Castle Gateway area needs development but the report shows little sign of historically poor progress changing, merely further cost. The following is needed:

1. A realistic assessment of what is key to the project, rather than various sites joined together, as well as consideration of the appropriate public/private sector division.
2. Cross party discussion and agreement on the future to truly achieve for York.
3. True, business quality, scrutiny of spend by councillors.

Annex C (i)

	Name (please print)	Signature (<i>please note that signatures will not be published with the agenda. Electronic signature will be accepted</i>)	Date
1.	Mike Nicholls	M. Nicholls	20/11/20
2.	Chris Steward	C. Steward	20/11/20
3.	Mark Warters	M. Warters	20/11/20

For office use only:

Received on behalf of the Monitoring Officer by: Democratic Services

Name: Dawn Steel Date: 19/11/23 Time: 17:55

Validation Check (if necessary):

Monitoring Officer / Chief Operating Officer

Valid: YES

Reason: *In accordance with constitutional requirements.*

Completed by: *[Signature]*

Date: *23/11/23* Time: *15:15*

