
**CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION
LEICESTER MARKET REDEVELOPMENT**

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORT, AND
CLIMATE EMERGENCY SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 26
August 2026
COUNCIL – TBA

REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Jacob Mann
- Author contact details: Jacob.Mann@leicester.gov.uk
- Report version number: V1

1. Summary

An executive decision taken by the City Mayor on 13 August 2026 relating to Leicester Market has been the subject of a 5-member call-in under the procedures at Rule 12 of Part 4D, City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules, of the Council's Constitution.

The procedure rules state that a scrutiny committee or any five councillors may request formally that the decision be called-in for a further review by giving notice in writing to the Monitoring Officer within five working days of the decision.

The 5 Councillors who signed the call in were: Councillor Kitterick (Mover), Councillor Porter (Seconder), Councillor Kennedy-Lount, Councillor Osman, and Councillor Orton.

2. Recommended actions/decision

The Committee is recommended to either:

- a) Note the report without further comment or recommendation. *(If the report is noted the process continues and the call in will be considered at a future meeting of Full Council);* or
- b) Comment on the specific issues raised by the call-in. *(If comments are made the process continues and the comments and call in will be considered at a future meeting of Full Council);* or
- c) Resolve that the call-in be withdrawn *(If the committee wish for there to be no further action on the call-in, then they must actively withdraw it. If withdrawal is agreed the call-in process stops, the call-in will not be considered at a future meeting of Full Council and the original decision takes immediate affect without amendment).*

Council is recommended to either:

- a) Support the City Mayor's decision, and thus confirming the decision with immediate effect; or
- b) Recommend different decision to the City Mayor. (The original decision will still stand, unless the City Mayor takes a further decision to amend the original.)

3. Scrutiny / stakeholder engagement

N/A

4. Background and options with supporting evidence

The Executive Decision Report, and Decision Notice are attached as appendices.

5. Detailed report

The call-in submitted to the Monitoring Officer was in the following terms:

"We the undersigned believe this decision needs further scrutiny before more money is approved. The Market is one of Leicester's oldest and most important public spaces. So any decisions about its future needs to be based on a clear plan, honest figures and proper scrutiny. The council is now asking the Mayor to approve another £1.9 million, to be borrowed over 40 years, after the project was delayed by around 10 months because of archaeological discoveries. We completely accept that protecting the city's heritage matters. But archaeology was a known risk before work even started. The council itself says early discussions took place with archaeological advisers to manage the risks and costs. That makes it entirely reasonable to ask: what allowance was originally made for this and why is another £1.9 million suddenly needed now? There are also big changes to the scheme itself. Instead of a more permanent structure, the council is now proposing 72 larger demountable stalls, while saying a permanent structure might be considered again in the future. That leaves taxpayers wondering is this a long-term solution or just a temporary fix that will need even more public money later? Then there's the £150,000 rent-free period for traders. We understand they've faced disruption and deserve support, but before signing off that amount, we need to know how it was worked out, who benefits, how much each business gets, and why 100% rent relief is needed. Most importantly, the original business case has been overtaken by changes to cost, design and timescales. The council should provide an updated version showing the full cost, the impact of extra borrowing, the expected benefits and how success will be measured. We also need to know whether the current design is the one people were consulted on, or whether it's changed significantly since residents and traders gave their views. We're not against investment in the market, quite the opposite. We want it to succeed and to stay a thriving part of Leicester into the future. But after so many changes, local taxpayers deserve to know exactly what they're being asked to pay for.

Before any final decision, we believe the council should fully answer these questions:

- i) What was the original total budget and how does it compare to the current one?*
- ii) What allowance was made for archaeology and other known risks?*
- iii) Why is an extra £1.9 million needed now and what will it cost to borrow over 40 years?*
- iv) What's the new completion date and what extra costs will the delay create?*
- v) Is the 72-stall plan permanent or temporary?*
- vi) If it's temporary, what's the future cost of a permanent structure?*
- vii) What evidence supports the £150,000 rent relief and why is it necessary?*
- viii) What measurable benefits will the revised scheme bring?*
- ix) Does the current scheme still deliver what was originally promised?*
- x) What safeguards are in place to stop more cost increases and delays?*

This is a major investment in one of Leicester's most historic places. The council cannot just ask for approval and trust that everything will be fine. The public deserves a clear explanation of what the final scheme will cost, what they'll get and why this is a long term plan or short term plan. That's why we believe this decision should be "Called In" so these questions can be properly answered before even more public money is wasted."

The Monitoring Officer has confirmed that the call-in satisfies the requirements of the procedure rules and it has, therefore, proceeded as per the process set out at Rule 12 of Part 4D, City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules of the Council's Constitution.

Where a call-in has been made, officers are to take no further legally binding action, unless the circumstances of Rule 12 (f) are fulfilled, and the matter shall be referred to a meeting of the full Council. Prior to this it shall be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Committee if one is programmed or a special scrutiny committee if one is convened.

The call-in may however be withdrawn if:

The relevant scrutiny committee/commission makes a resolution to withdraw; or

The sponsor and seconder of the call-in inform the Monitoring Officer that they wish the call-in to be withdrawn.

Following consideration of a call-in by Full Council, the original decision will be deemed to be revived in its entirety. Any agreement by the decision maker to change the original decision will require a further formal Executive Decision.

6. Financial, legal, equalities, climate emergency and other implications

6.1 Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from the call-in beyond those in the decision report.

Signed: Stuart McAvoy, Head of Finance
Dated : 20 August 2026

6.2 Legal implications

The legal implications arising from the call-in are explained in sections 2 and 5 above

Signed: Kevin Carter, Head of Law (Commercial Property & Planning)
Dated: 20 August 2026

6.3 Equalities implications

There are no comments in addition to those in the decision report.

Signed: Surinder Singh, Equalities Officer
Dated: 20 August 2026

6.4 Climate Emergency implications

There are no further climate emergency implications to those provided in the decision report.

Signed: Phil Ball, Sustainability Officer

Dated: 20 August 2026

6.5 Other implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

None

7. Background information and other papers:

None

8. Summary of appendices:

Appendix A Executive Decision Report – Leicester Market Redevelopment – dated 13 August 2026

Appendix B Decision Notice – Leicester Market Redevelopment – dated 13 August 2026

9. Is this a private report (If so, please indicate the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No