

## APPENDIX 1

### CALL-IN REQUISITION

**To:** Susanne Millar, Chief Executive, Glasgow City Council

#### **Standing Order 30 - Call-In of City Administration Committee Decision**

We, the undersigned members of Glasgow City Council, hereby requisition the call-in of Item 2 of the City Administration Committee held on 3 September 2026, relating to the allocation of funding arising from the Pladis/McVitie's community benefit contribution.

#### **Grounds for Call-In**

The decision should be called in on the grounds that the City Administration Committee was not provided with sufficient information or evidence to enable members to properly assess and determine whether the recommendations before them accurately reflected the views expressed through the community engagement and consultation process.

In particular:

##### **1. Insufficient consultation evidence was presented to the Committee**

Members were asked to note and approve a process stated to represent the views of the community. However, the report did not include the underlying consultation evidence, survey findings, stakeholder submissions, details of proposals received, or a comprehensive summary of the feedback gathered through the engagement process.

As a consequence, members were unable to independently assess whether the recommendations accurately reflected the views expressed by residents, community organisations and stakeholders.

##### **2. Concerns regarding the characterisation of community engagement**

It has been alleged that the report presented to the Committee did not accurately reflect the role and outcome of discussions held through the Area Partnership and related engagement processes.

Individuals who attended those meetings understood them to be consultative and feedback sessions rather than decision-making forums. Participants were advised that their views would inform recommendations and that decisions would ultimately be taken by the City Administration Committee.

Concerns have subsequently been raised by participants regarding the conclusions attributed to those engagement sessions and whether the report accurately represented the views expressed.

##### **3. Lack of transparency in the decision-making process**

**OFFICIAL**

## OFFICIAL

During consideration of the report, committee members were advised that additional information relating to the consultation process could be provided separately.

Given that the report invited members to endorse a process said to reflect community views, the omission of key consultation material from the committee papers limited members' ability to properly scrutinise the recommendations and reach an informed decision on the basis of the evidence.

#### 4. **Need for further scrutiny of the evidence base**

Questions remain regarding:

- the consultation methodology employed;
- the results of any surveys undertaken;
- the organisations and stakeholders who submitted proposals;
- the assessment criteria used in determining recommended projects;
- the extent to which recommended allocations align with identified community priorities; and
- whether alternative proposals were considered and, if so, on what basis they were not recommended.

#### **Remedy Sought**

We request that the decision be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee for consideration in accordance with Standing Order 30, and that the Scrutiny Committee be provided with the full consultation evidence, engagement records, survey results, project assessment information and any other material relevant to the determination of whether the recommendations properly reflect community views and were supported by an adequate and transparent decision-making process.

#### **Signed:**

1. Councillor James Adams
2. Councillor Eunis Jassemi
3. Bailie Ann Jenkins
4. Councillor Cecilia O'Lone
5. Councillor Jill Pidgeon

Date: 08/09/2026

OFFICIAL