

CALL-IN REQUEST FORM

This form must be completed and signed by at least **TWO** members of any Scrutiny Commission or Scrutiny Committee and **MUST** be returned to the *Proper Officer within **3** working days of the decision being published (*not including the day of publication*). Please telephone the Proper Officer to make them aware that the Call-In form is on its way.

**Please note that the Proper Officer can be any of the following Senior Democratic Services Officer: Paulina Ford, Tel: 452508 or Democratic Services Manager, Gemma George, Tel 452268. The Call-In Request will only be valid if it has been received in person by any of the above people within the 3 working day deadline. The form may be emailed or hand delivered. If sent in the post you must call the Proper Officer to advise that it has been posted and it will need to be received by the Proper Officer within the 3 working day deadline.*

Decision taker:	Cabinet
Date of publication of decision:	31 December 2015
Title of Decision Called in :	City Centre Anti Social-Behaviour Enforcement
Date Decision Called in:	6 January 2016

	REASONS FOR CALL-IN	Tick which reason applies
1.	Decision contrary to the policy framework?	
2.	Decision contrary 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.	tick
4.	Decision does not follow principles of good decision-making set out in Article 11 of the Council's Constitution.	tick
If reason 4, please tick which specific element of Article 11 the decision maker has not followed, did he or she not:		
(a)	Realistically consider all alternatives and, where reasonably possible, consider the views of the public.	tick
(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.	tick
(d)	Act for a proper purpose and in the interests of the public.	
(e)	Keep to the rules relating to local government finance.	
(f)	Follow procedures correctly and be fair.	tick
(g)	Make sure they are properly authorised to make the decisions.	
(h)	Be responsible for their decisions and be prepared to give reasons for them.	
(i)	Take appropriate professional advice from officers.	tick

Detailed Reason(s) for Call-in. *Please explain below why one of the reasons for call-in applies (eg. For number 1 - which major policy affected and how/why)*

We the undersigned ask the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee to call in this decision and refer it to the next meeting of Full Council, so as to allow all councillors the opportunity which they have been so far denied....to debate the important changes which are being implemented in the way crime and anti social behaviour is being handled in the city.

It is clear from reading the catalogue of errors and procedural irregularities which have accompanied this decision that it has not been taken in a way which conforms to the principles of good governance. Over the past few weeks we have seen:

1. A report going to cabinet about city centre enforcement. The title of the report relates to the city centre, as does most of its content and the recommendations proposed.
2. The originally published decision related to city centre enforcement. Officers then said that an error had been made and they needed to republish the decision as the cabinet had intended the decision to relate to the entire city.
3. A new decision was published on 31 December but without rescinding the original one. This is still headed "city centre enforcement" but it says that the decision covers the whole city.
4. Reference to the attached transcript of the debate at cabinet shows that the discussion was about the whole city but at no point is any amendment moved to the recommendations in the report. At the end of the debate Cllr Holdich moves that "the recommendations" (i.e. those in the report are agreed). This means that the officer who recorded the decision at the meeting was correct and the second decision notice is trying to alter the decision after the event.

Substantive issues

The reason for the call in is to allow for a public debate on the changes to the enforcement team. These changes have only been necessary because of the unannounced changes in policing.

What is clear is that the Police imposed a change in their structure on 1 November without any public consultation or any consultation with members of this Council. Councillors were only informed of these changes by letter after the implementation date. As a result of these changes the Cabinet has been required to draw together its enforcement teams to deal with low level crime.

There will be new enforcement teams comprising police officers, PCSO's and council enforcement officers. But the diversion of a number of Police officers away from neighbourhood policing and into the five new response based teams at Thorpe Wood will reduce the number of full time police involved in neighbourhood policing patrols.

Whilst the scrutiny committee can debate the changes, the decision made by the Cabinet regarding the enforcement teams has been pre-determined by the changes in the Police. This has been done without prior consultation with members let alone making the public aware of the changes.

Detailed Grounds For Call in

It is clearly erroneous to claim that this is not a key decision. It will have a significant effect on the way law enforcement is carried out in two or more wards of the city. Therefore it satisfies the criteria for a key decision and should have been published as such in the Forward Plan.

The sequence of events clearly show a flawed decision making process and it is still unclear some weeks after the event what decision has actually been made.

Looking at the principles of good governance:

4a. It is abundantly clear that decisions have been made without any consultation with the public on a matter of great public concern in these times of increased terrorist activity and concerns about security. We have also been informed by a trade union representative that they were not consulted about the proposals either.

4c. How can this criteria be satisfied when the report discusses enforcement in the city centre and refers only in passing to issues affecting the rest of the city. In the discussion at cabinet there was very little reference made to the report and there is confusion over what decision was actually made at the end of the meeting

4f Having a report which relates to one specific part of the city and then trying to make a decision about another part and then claiming that the recommendations have been incorrectly recorded, hardly constitutes a sound and rigorous decision making process.

4i Some officer advice is given verbally at the meeting but there is nothing in the report about the implications of extending the proposed new structures across the city. We have been told outside the meeting that there will be only one policing team covering 90% of the city and that will only contain two full time police officers.....whether that is precisely true or not, such city wide implications are not even discussed in the report.

	Name (please print)	Signature	Date
1.	Cllr Nick Sandford	Via email	04/01/16
2.	Cllr Ed Murphy	Via email	04/01/16
3.	Cllr Asif Shaheed	Via email	05/01/16
4.	Cllr Mohammed Jamil	Via email	06/01/16

This page is intentionally left blank