

Public Document Pack



Forest Heath
District Council

To: All Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

C.C. Councillor Stanbury, Portfolio Holder
Councillor Glossop, Portfolio Holder
Councillor Lukaniuk
Councillor Ridgwell
Councillor Appleby
Appropriate Officers.

Our reference

Your reference N/A

Contact Christine Brain

Direct Dial 01638 719729

Email christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk

7 March 2019

Dear Councillor,

FOREST HEATH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - THURSDAY 14 MARCH 2019

The Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny has agreed that this Call-In item can be considered as a matter of urgency at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019, in accordance with S100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, in order that this matter can be resolved within the necessary timescale.

Agenda No	Item
------------------	-------------

7.	<u>LATE URGENT ITEM - Call-In - Future High Street Fund (Pages 1 - 18)</u>
----	---

Report No: **OAS/FH/19/006**

Yours sincerely

Christine Brian
Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)

Jen Eves • Assistant Director of HR, Legal and Democratic Services
Tel 01284 757015 • **Fax** 01284 757110
Email democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk

District Offices • College Heath Road • Mildenhall • Bury St Edmunds • Suffolk • IP28 7EY
www.westsuffolk.gov.uk

Forest Heath & St Edmundsbury councils

West Suffolk
working together

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Call-In Future High Street Fund	
Report No:	OAS/FH/19/006	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	14 March 2019
Portfolio Holders:	<p>Councillor Lance Stanbury FHDC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07970 947704 Email: lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk</p> <p>Councillor Susan Glossop SEBC Portfolio Holder Planning and Growth Tel: 07473 041394 Email: susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk</p>	
Lead officers:	<p>Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) Tel: 01284 757613 Email: julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk</p> <p>Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</p>	
Purpose of report:	To investigate the called-in decision relating to the Portfolio Holders Decision Notice regarding " <i>the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund</i> ", published on 28 February 2019.	
Recommendation:	<p>Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or 2) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committee. 	

Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>		<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:		• N/A	
Alternative option(s):		• N/A	
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
Wards affected:		All	
Background papers:		Press release by the MHCLG on 26 December 2018: £675 Fund to Transform High Streets	
Documents attached:		Appendix 1 – Completed Call-In Request Form Appendix 2 – Portfolio Holder’s Decisions Notice – 28 February 2019 - Attached Appendix 3 – Portfolio Holder’s Report – 27 February 2019 - Attached Appendix 4 – Call-In Meeting General Guidance Notes	

Key issues and reasons for recommendation

1. Call-In Request

- 1.1 In line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, as contained within Part 4 of the FHDC Constitution, Councillor Victor Lukaniuk, with the support of Councillors Andrew Appleby, Christine Mason, David Palmer and Peter Ridgwell has called-in the Portfolio Holders decision notice published on 28 February 2019, in respect of the "Future High Street Fund".

The call-in has been actioned under items 1 and 8 of the principles for decision making, as follows:

- We in Brandon were not given the opportunity to make a case for funding; and
- The process was flawed.

The reasons given for the call-in are as set out in the Call-in Notice, attached as **Appendix 1** to this report.

2. Background

- 2.1 On 26 December 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued a press release setting out details of a "*£675 million fund to transform high streets and town centres opens to communities*", which was made available to all members as a policy alert.
- 2.2 On 19 February 2019, an intention to make a decision was published both on the Councils website and Intranet by the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth as follows:

The Forest Heath DC and St Edmundsbury BC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth will be asked to consider approving a submission of an Expression of Interest in round one of the MHCLG's Future High Street Fund. The objective of this Fund, which comprises a total allocation of £675m is to "renew and reshape town centres and high streets in a way that improves experience, drives growth and ensures future sustainability".

Other options would be considered later when the second round of bidding opens. In the current round, local authorities can bid for up to £25m. The submission will be made to MHCLG, who will then shortlist bids to be put forward to a second round of bidding, which will require production of a full business case. Expressions of Interest must be submitted by 22 March 2019.

In making their decision, the Portfolio Holders will need to consider a number of options, the wider strategic context, and which preferred option would be best placed at this time to meet the stringent criteria set by Central Government.

- 2.3 On 28 February 2019, a Portfolio Holders Decisions Notice, attached at (**Appendix 2**) was published setting out the reasons for the decision and other options considered.

Published alongside the Decisions Notice, was a supporting Portfolio Holder's Report, **CAB/JT/19/008**, attached at (**Appendix 3**).

3. Call-In Meeting General Guidance Notes

- 3.1 Attached at **Appendix 4** to this report are guidance notes on how the call-in meeting will be conducted by the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

4. Proposals

- 4.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to either:
- 1) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or
 - 2) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committee.



Forest Heath
District Council

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
CALL-IN REQUEST FORM



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

To: **Assistant Director (HR, Legal and Democratic Services)**

I would like to call-in the decision as detailed below:

Decision making body (Cabinet or Portfolio Holder)

Date decision made:

PLANNING AND GROWTH
CLLR GLOSSOP CLLR STANBURY

28th FEB. 2019

What was the Decision made by Cabinet or Portfolio Holder:

THAT HAVERHILL BE THE APPLICANT
FOR THE "HIGH STREET FUND"

If the reason for the call-in is that the decision was outside the Budget Policy Framework Procedure Rules, please give an explanation

WE IN BRANDON WERE NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY
TO MAKE A CASE FOR FUNDING.
THE PROCESS WAS FLAWED

What action would you like to see the Cabinet / Portfolio Holder take to address the concerns outlined in the call-in, or what needs to be done to strengthen their decision?

TO REVERSE THE DECISION BECAUSE OF BRANDON'S
GREATER NEEDS

At what stage did you inform the Portfolio Holder or the Leader of the Council that you had concerns over this planned decision? If not a planned decision (that is if the decision did not appear on the Decisions Plan), what attempts did you make to speak to the Portfolio Holder before calling in the decision?

I INFORMED THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS ON THE 27th FEB
AND RECEIVED A REPLY FROM CLLR GLOSSOP 2nd MARCH
INFORMING ME THAT JONATHAN MILES (GROWTH OFFICER)
WOULD BE GIVING ME AN EXPLANATION, WHICH I
WAS UNHAPPY WITH, I WANT A REPLY FROM CLLR STANBURY

I HAVE HAD A REPLY FROM COUNCILLOR STANBURY
BUT IT FALLS SHORT OF EXPECTATIONS

Please state which of the principles for decision making set out in Article 12 of the Constitution has / have been breached (please tick)

		TICK
1	The decision was not reasonable within the common meaning of the word, ie it was not a rational decision based on sound judgement.	✓
2	The decision was not reasonable within the legal meaning of "reasonableness", ie all relevant considerations were not fully taken into account in reaching the decision and all irrelevant ones disregarded.	
3	In the case of 'quasi-judicial' decisions (ie a decision as to whether or not to grant a licence) a fair hearing was not conducted in accordance with the rules of natural justice to the person who was the subject of the decision.	
4	The decision was not proportionate (ie the action was not proportionate to the desired outcome).	
5	The decision was not taken on the basis of due consultation and professional advice from officers.	
6	Human rights were not respected and consideration was not given as to whether the decision would give rise to any implications under the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights.	
7	The decision was not taken in compliance with Council's schemes of delegation, financial rules and instructions relating to contracts.	
8	When making the decision, a presumption in favour of openness was not applied and a clarity of aims and desired outcomes was not displayed.	✓
9	Careful consideration was not given as to whether there was an interest that should have been declared.	
10	In the case of an executive decision taken by the Cabinet, or an individual Member of the Cabinet, or an Officer (where the decision is closely connected with the Cabinet), a proper record of the decision was not made together with a record of the reasons for the decision, details of any alternative options considered and rejected and any conflicts of interest.	

Referring to the box(es) ticked above, please explain how the principles set out in Article 12 of the Constitution have not been met, and provide documentation or evidence, where appropriate to support the call-in:

WE WERE NOT CONSULTED AND OUR NEEDS WERE NOT FULLY CONSIDERED WHEN THE DECISION WAS MADE TO EXCLUDE US FROM THE APPLICATION. THERE IS A COMPLETE ABSENCE OF DOCUMENTATION TO SUGGEST THAT OUR NEEDS WERE FULLY EXPLAINED TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS.

Suggested Witnesses (Internal / External) to be invited and their relevance to the call-in

N/A

Members calling in the decision (Call-in to be requested by any five members of the Council)

	Name of Councillor	Signed	Will you be attending the call-in meeting?
1	(Lead on Call-in) VICTOR LUKANIUK	<i>V. Lukaniuk</i>	YES.
2	CLLR PETER RICHARD RICKWELL	<i>[Signature]</i>	
3	DAVID PALMER	<i>DP</i>	Yes.
4	CHRISTINE MASON	<i>C Mason</i>	Yes.
5	CLLR ANDREW APPLEBY	VIA E-MAIL	yes.

Once completed, either by hand or electronically, please send to the Assistant Direct (HR, Legal and Democratic Services) **BY 5PM ON THE DEADLINE DATE PUBLISHED ON THE CABINET DECISION NOTICE**, otherwise the call-in will not be valid.

Amended: March 2015 (Constitutional Review)
Amended: November 2017 (Amendment made to Job Title)

Received on Thursday 7 March 2019, at 2-30pm.

CABIN
Scrutiny officer.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Forest Heath District Council
St Edmundsbury Borough Council**
Portfolio Holder Decisions Notice
(Published: Thursday 28 February 2019)

The following decision was taken by the Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough Councils' Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth on **Wednesday 27 February 2019** and, if not called in by Councillors, will come into operation on Friday 8 March 2019. An executive decision may be called in, in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules contained within Part 4 of each Council's Constitutions, by at least five Councillors submitting the required call-in request form to the Assistant Director (HR, Legal and Democratic Services) (e-mail: democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk) **by 5.00 pm on Thursday 7 March 2019.**

Should you have a query regarding any of the decisions taken, contact should be made with the named officer in the first instance, either on the telephone number listed against their name, or via email using the format firstname.surname@westsuffolk.gov.uk. Alternatively, you may also contact the relevant Portfolio Holder on the telephone number listed against their name, or via email using the format firstname.surname@stedsbc.gov.uk or firstname.surname@forest-heath.gov.uk Contact may also be made via Democratic Services, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk, IP33 3YU

Page 9

Agenda Item and Report No.	Declarations of Interest/Dispensations Granted	Decision(s) (including recommendations to Council)	Reason(s) for Decision(s)	Other Options Considered and Reasons for Rejection	Contacts
No Agenda Item No. as PH Decision Report No: CAB/JT/19/008	None	<u>Future High Street Fund</u> RESOLVED: That the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund, as set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008, be approved.	Bearing in mind the fact that whichever town West Suffolk chose to bid for the Future High Street Fund would be in competition with other towns across the whole of England and Wales, it is important to choose the town that has the best fit with the stated criteria (as summarised in Report No: CAB/JT/19/008). Whilst several other West Suffolk towns showed that they have challenges similar to Haverhill such as a poor range of shops and poor range of town centre uses, it was	Options under consideration and rejected for the reasons given accordingly are set out in Section 2 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008.	<u>Portfolio Holders:</u> SEBC Cllr Susan Glossop 07473 041394 FHDC Cllr Lance Stanbury 07970 947704 <u>Officer:</u> Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) 01284 757613

Agenda Item and Report No.	Declarations of Interest/Dispensations Granted	Decision(s) (including recommendations to Council)	Reason(s) for Decision(s)	Other Options Considered and Reasons for Rejection	Contacts
			<p>the opportunities in Haverhill that set it apart.</p> <p>The Government has stated that it proposes to open a second round of funding in the future and consideration was given to whether to submit two bids in round one. The amount of work that goes into writing an expression of interest is however, more extensive than may be thought, particularly with this fund which is very reliant upon support from stakeholders. It is considered that to ask stakeholders to support two bids at the same time would devalue the support. The preference of the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth is therefore, for a strong bid to be submitted in this round for Haverhill and then the same effort can be given to a second town in round two.</p>		

Leah Mickleborough
 Service Manager (Democratic Services) and Monitoring Officer
 28 February 2019

Portfolio Holders

Title of Report:	Future High Street Fund	
Report No:	CAB/JT/19/008	
Report to / date of decision:	Portfolio Holders' Decision	27 February 2019
Portfolio Holders:	Lance Stanbury FHDC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07970 947704 Email: lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk	Susan Glossop SEBC Portfolio Holder Planning and Growth Tel: 07473 041394 Email: susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk
Lead officer:	Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) Tel: 01284 757613 Email: julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To agree the submission of an Expression Of Interest for Haverhill in round one of the Future High Street Fund. The deadline for the submissions is 22 March 2019.	
Recommendations:	It is RECOMMENDED that the FHDC and SEBC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth approve the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund, as set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008.	
Key Decision: (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)	Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within 48 hours and cannot be actioned until five clear working days of the publication of the decision have elapsed.		
Consultation:	•	

Alternative option(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options under consideration are set out in Section 2 below. 		
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
The expression of interest is not successful	Med	Adhere to the guidance given with the fund; and encourage a wide range of stakeholders to support our case.	Low
Local Haverhill businesses are not supportive of the Expression of Interest	Low	Ensure the benefits of the fund are adequately explained	Low
Local Haverhill businesses, residents and stakeholders expect the expression of interest to include a wider range of elements than would be practicable/possible	Medium	Explanation of the fund; its purpose; the competitive nature; and the likely level of funds if successful.	Low
Local residents and or stakeholders from other towns raise concern at the election of Haverhill as a subject for the Expression of Interest	High	Explanation that the fund is competitive and fairly prescriptive about the elements one should include. Explanation that a thorough assessment has been undertaken to assess which of our towns would be most likely to secure funding.	Medium
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		N/A	
Documents attached:		None	

1. Background to Future High Street Fund

1.1 Background

1.1.1 MCHLG has allocated £675m into a fund to support the High Street. The objective of the Future High Street Fund (FHSF) is to **renew and reshape town centres and high streets in a way that improves experience, drives growth and ensures future sustainability.**

1.1.2 The fund sets out the themes under which it is expected any identified need for investment will fall. These are as follows:

- Investment in physical infrastructure
- Acquisition and assembly of land including to support new housing, workspaces and public realm
- Improvements to transport access, traffic flow and circulation in the area
- Supporting change of use including (where appropriate) housing delivery and densification
- Supporting adaptation of the high street in response to changing technology

1.1.3 MCHLG has allocated £55m of the Fund to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport to support the regeneration of heritage high streets. The precise details of this element of the fund have not been set out as yet.

1.1.4 The FHSF will work as follows:

- There will be two rounds of the Fund, both with a two-phase application process
- Phase 1 of application process is an Expression of Interest stage where places will be assessed on the need for funding, nature of the challenge and the vision for the future of the town centre
- Phase 2 of application process is for those who pass to Phase 2, there will be an amount of revenue funding available to work up project proposals. Funding decisions will be based on project plans and business cases.
- In the first round of the Fund, projects which are 'shovel ready' may be fast-tracked for funding.
- An announcement on the second round of the Fund is expected soon.
- It is expected that projects will be co-funded by public and private sector stakeholders and this will be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of projects.
- The Fund will contribute up to a maximum of £25 million to each successful place. However, MCHLG has stated that it expects to see a range of project sizes coming forward, many of which are in the region of £5-10 million per town centre.

1.1.5 The fund will run to the following timetable:

- **December 2018:** Phase 1 opens and Expressions of Interest invited
- **22 March 2019:** deadline for Expressions of Interest
- **Summer 2019:** announcement on places moving to Phase 2
- **Late 2019:** first round of final business cases to be submitted
- **Spring 2020:** all remaining final business cases to be submitted
- **Not before 2020:** Second round of applications opens

1.1.6 Other points to note:

- MCHLG has stated that it will not accept bids covering town centre areas that are not facing significant challenges.
- MCHLG originally stated that it expected local authorities to put forward a single, transformative submission covering one high street or town centre in their area; however this has now been changed. It is now possible for Local Authorities to submit multiple bids depending upon their size. West Suffolk can put in two bids, however it doesn't have to be both in the same round.

1.2 **Haverhill**

1.2.1 All five towns, Brandon, Bury St Edmunds, Haverhill, Mildenhall and Newmarket were assessed against the same criteria which included:

- Proportion and/or number of vacant properties
- Openings/closures of commercial units (Nov17 – Nov18)
- Proportion of Independents
- Average rental value (per sq ft per annum)
- Changes to residential (A1 – C3)
- Diversity of uses in the town centre area
- Out Commuting (% 16-74 in employment travelling over 20km to work)
- Resident/customer surveys
- Pedestrian flows and footfall trends
- Volume & Value report, 2015
- Air Quality
- Environmental factors
- Perception of safety and occurrence of crime
- Housing demands
- Ambition and Opportunities
- Innovation
- VENUESCORE (2014-2015) VENUESCORE™ is an annual survey compiled by Javelin Group, which ranks the UK's top 3,500+ retail venues (including town centres, stand-alone malls, retail warehouse parks and factory outlet centres).

1.2.2 Bearing in mind the fact that whichever town we choose to bid for would be in competition with other towns across the whole of England and Wales, it is important to choose the town that has the best fit with the stated criteria.

- 1.2.3 Whilst several other towns showed that they have challenges similar to Haverhill such as a poor range of shops and poor range of town centre uses, it was the opportunities in Haverhill that set it apart.
- 1.2.4 It will be possible for the Expression of Interest to be written to show the extent of the challenge in Haverhill set against the potential to fund initiatives that can change the fortune of the town centre. If successful and if transferable, it will be possible (subject to future funding) for other towns to benefit from the initiatives piloted in Haverhill (if the bid to the FHSF is successful).
- 1.2.5 Regardless of whether the bid to the FHSF is successful or not, it is a stated ambition of West Suffolk that its market towns should be supported and promoted. To this end, there are a number of projects that are currently being worked on in each of the towns. For example, Brandon Leisure Centre improvements; 17/18 Cornhill redevelopment, Bury St Edmunds; Mildenhall Hub; and Newmarket High Street Design work.

2. Options for consideration

- 2.1.1 Three options have been considered to make the most of the Future High Street Fund opportunity.
- 2.1.2 Do nothing: This option was quickly discounted as to not apply for funding would definitely result in no funding coming forward. The only benefit to this option is that some time and effort is saved.
- 2.1.3 Choose a different town: It was important to consider which of the towns would give West Suffolk the greatest chance of success. This was a different consideration to the question, which of our High Streets would we most like to have funding to spend in.
- 2.1.4 Bid for more than one town: Up until very recently, to submit for more than one town per local authority area was against the rules of the fund. However, it is now possible that West Suffolk could submit a second Expression of Interest for another town. It is considered that this option is still available to us as the government has stated that it proposes to open a second round of funding in the future. The consideration was therefore, whether to submit two bids in round one. The amount of work that goes into writing an expression of interest is more extensive than may be thought. Particularly with this fund which is very reliant upon support from stakeholders. It is considered that to ask stakeholders to support two bids at the same time would devalue the support. The preference therefore is for a strong bid to be submitted in this round for Haverhill and then the same effort can be given to a second town in round two.

This page is intentionally left blank

CALL-IN MEETING GENERAL GUIDANCE NOTES

Description: guidance for members on conducting a call-in meeting, and steps taken once a decision has been made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

- 1) The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will introduce the call-in, and indicate who is to speak in support of the decision, and who will be the main spokesperson for the Call-In Members.
- 2) The lead call-in member who requested the call-in will then outline to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee their reasons/concerns, making reference to the principles of decision making.
- 3) The decision maker and (supporting officers) to respond to the points raised by the lead call-in member, making reference to the principles of decision making.
- 4) Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to discuss the evidence presented, and will ask the lead call-in member and the decision maker questions.
- 5) The call-in member and decision maker will then briefly sum up/give a closing statement.
- 6) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will debate the decision and the reasons for the call-in and make recommendations to either:
 - i) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or
 - ii) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 7) The decision to refer a matter for reconsideration by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee must be taken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the basis of a simple majority vote.

This page is intentionally left blank