Nottingham City Council Executive Decision Call-In Request Form

This form should be submitted to the Head of Democratic Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Resources by midnight on the fifth working day after the decision publication date. The signed form should be submitted in original hard copy. If the form is being submitted after the office has closed on the fifth working day, it should be signed, scanned and emailed to *all* of the following individuals:

Head of Democratic Services

debra.lamola@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Overview and Scrutiny Review Co-ordinators

jane.garrard@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

angelika.kaufold@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

The original hard copy of the form must then be provided to the Head of Democratic Services on the following morning.

For further information about the call-in procedure please see the Overview and Scrutiny Guide to Call-In and/ or contact the Overview and Scrutiny Review Co-ordinators on 0115 8764315 or 0115 8764296.

Date of decision publication:	28/01/2015
Portfolio Holder Decision reference number:	1829
or Executive Board minute number:	
or Executive Board Sub Committee minute nu	mber:
or Area Committee minute number:	
or Officer Decision reference number:	
Description of decision:	
Lease for Former Wilford Library, Wilford Road	d, Wilford, Nottingham, NG11 7AX
The following signatories request that the above	ve decision be called in.
1. Signature	Print name Kouer STEEL
2. Signature Lacker.	Print name JEANNIE PACKER
3. Signature C Novices	Print name FILEEN MOKLEY
Nottingham City Council Overview and Scrutiny 1 Call In Request Form Updated May 2013	

Reason for requesting the decision be called in

The request for call-in must be based on one or more of the following reasons below. [Tick the appropriate box or boxes and provide details for the reason, appending additional sheets if necessary]

Reason for requesting call-in:	
a) The decision is outside the policy/ budgetary framework	NI/A
, budgetally framework	N/A

Reason for requesting call-in:	
b) Inadequate consultation relating to the decision	X

There has been a lack of clarity and transparency in respect of the two proposed bids although this was promised by the portfolio holder (see attachment 1).

Only the details of one of the bids were circulated among councillors at the decision meeting of September 10th 2014, full tender details were not, and still have not been, provided, although promised.

A summary of tenders provided to Cllr Chapman at meeting was not made available to ward councillors and only subsequently at publication was a less detailed summary made available as an exempt appendix.

Local residents views on the tender process and eventual decision were not sought, indeed a survey of Wilford residents that was carried out by Wilford Community Group stated that a Post Office facility was their prime requirement, and this has not been considered (see attachment 2)

Reason for requesting call-in:	
c) Relevant information not considered	X

The terms of the lease, in particular those in relation to covenants on the building and those ensuring the community use of the property are maintained, and not discussed within the decision.

Relevant information could not be considered as full details of tenders have not been disclosed to all ward councillors.

All ward councillors and the Portfolio Holder expressed a preference for a post office counter to be part of the plans, no information relating to this is publicly available at the time of the decision (see attachment)

Newspaper reports (see attachment 4) before the decision is final suggest that the building will be demolished and rebuilt. There was nothing suggesting this in the information given to Councillors so this has not been considered.

Tender documentation requested 'letters of support'. No details are considered of the letters of support from local residents and organisations.

The original proposal from West Bridgford Spiritual Church (see attachment 5) was for a 'non-denominational church' facility – in part. This is not confirmed in the current bid as outlined in the decision.

Reason for requesting call-in:

d) Viable alternatives not considered

X

Alternative bid which includes a post office counter and facilities based upon the consensus of views expressed by local residents as the result of a survey by Wilford Community Group (see attachments 2 and 3)

Reason for requesting call-in:

e) Justification for the decision open to challenge on the basis of evidence considered

X

Ward councillors were assured that they would have the opportunity to jointly scrutinise the proposals offered and report back should they not be satisfied the provision of community facilities were not being adequately served (see attachment 1). The justification for the decision is open to challenge as this did not take place.

Suggestions for Call In Panel meeting

If the call in request is valid a meeting of the Call In Panel will be held. Please list below any evidence and/ or contributors that you think should be made available to the Call In Panel.

[Please note that these will be considered as suggestions only and the final decision on evidence and contributors will be made by the Chair of the Call In Panel.]

Suggested list of evidence to be provided/ contributors to attend the Call In Panel meeting

Attachment 1: email dated 19th September 2014 from Cllr Steel to Stuart Knight, Director of Strategic Asset and Property Management

Attachment 2: Wilford Community questionnaire results indicating local desire for Post Office counter

Attachment 3: Post Office scoping letter outlining potential counter in library building

Attachment 4: Nottingham Post article dated Feb 3rd 2015 indicating the hitherto undisclosed intention to demolish and rebuild the library building.

Attachment 5: email dated 8th July 2014 RE: 'WB Spiritualist Church PROPOSAL for Wilford Library'

For office use only:
Received on behalf of the Head of Democratic Services by: Lelbua La T Na.
Received on behalf of the Head of Democratic Services by: Debua La Tola: Received via email 04/02/15 &3.12 (signature)
The state of the first
Name: Date: Time: 10.30a
Validation Check:
Head of Democratic Services
Date of publication: 98 01 15 Date of call-in:04 02 115 In time: YES NO
Office checks that call-in is valid against requirements as set out in the Constitution:
Reason The Call-In is valid on the basis that it is a relevant
decision as defende in 8.14(a) of the OTS Procedure Rules and
complies with S 14(c) as to being in time, signed by 3
allys and eiling reasons as defined in that section.
The war were the second
Completed by: Debua hattoa (signature)
DEBRA LA MOLA (name)
Date: 05/02/15 Time: 10. 50am.
Time. No. 19 State
Validation Check: (if necessary)
Director of Legal and Democratic Services
Valid: YES / NO
Reason:
Reason
Completed by: (signature)
(name)
Date:

Referrals:

Date copied to Corporate Director / Portfolio Holder

Name of Corporate Director

Name of Portfolio Holder

Date copied to Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Nottingham City Council Overview and Scrutiny Call In Request Form Updated May 2013