

CALL-IN REQUEST FORM

This form must be completed and signed by any THREE members of a 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 Officers: Charlotte Cameron, Tel: 01733 384628, or Dan Snowdon, Democratic and Constitutional Services Manager, Tel: 01733 384628. 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, 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:	16th July 2024
Title of Decision Called in:	Ken Stimpson Academisation Area of fields to be demised, area of land referenced
Date Decision Called in:	19th July 2024

	REASONS FOR CALL-IN	Tick which reason applies
1.	Decision is contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework rules set out in Part 4 Section 6 of the Council's Constitution? <i>(If this is the case it will require a reference to Council by a Scrutiny Committee on a report from the Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer)</i>	
2.	Decision has not been dealt with in accordance with the Council's Constitution.	
3.	Decision does not follow principles of good decision-making set out in Part 2, Article 11 (Decision Making) of the Council's Constitution.	✓
If reason 3, 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.	✓

(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.	
(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.	✓
(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.	

Detailed Reason(s) for Call-in. Please detail the reasons below why the Scrutiny Committee should review or scrutinise the decision and consider referring it back to the Executive, please be specific in how it applies to the reason for call-in as identified on page 1 of the form. E.g. if you have ticked reason 1 on the form then please identify which major policy is affected and how/why or which area of the budget framework.

Please see attached sheet giving reasons for call in

Details of Alternative Course of Action or Recommendations you wish to propose. Please specify what course of action you are proposing should be taken and any recommendations that you are proposing should be considered by the Scrutiny Committee.

The city council has always expressed an intention to enable public consultation through its planning process. Even in March 2024 officers were still stating the public view would be heard through the planning permission consultation. The decision should go to planning.

We need some transparent consultation forum to enable full discussion of all views in order to prevent further unnecessary delay and cost through legal challenges. A consultation forum would also give the academy the opportunity to explain its vision and aspiration for use of the fields which it has currently been unable to do.

Scouting should consider if all possible alternatives have been discussed and reported to cabinet, such as the academy fencing 4 pitches and the council undertaking to maintain the additional unfenced 4 pitch area left open for educational use and public use. Scouting is particularly important given it is a minority administration and cross party concerns.

	Name (please print)	Member of Which Scrutiny Committee	Signature	Date
1.	Sarah Hillier	Children and Education	S.A. Hillier	19-7-24
2.	John Fox	Growth	JF	19/7/24
3.	CHRISTIAN HOGG	Growth Committee & Resources	CH	19/7/24

3a) No alternative possible decisions were presented to Cabinet. Evidence presented is just highlighting the outcome of report recommendations, not looking at any alternatives recommendations. No Cabinet discussion or questioning of points raised by the public and Ward Councillors demonstrates a lack of consideration of all alternatives and the views of the public. There has been no public consultation or discussion with key stakeholders prior to report.

3b) The report has not given sufficient evidence of the recommendation that the decision does not need to go to planning. The City Council believed this decision had to go to planning as recently as March, 2024. We believe there is a divergent view that has not been put to Cabinet that the change of land use should go to planning.

There has been only a limited reference to an equalities impact statement, and no reference to a health impact statement which are highly encouraged in policy decision-making, and given the high-profile nature of this decision should have been a key consideration, especially with the loss of amenity and health consideration to the community.

3d) Please see above

The full impact of the loss of amenity and fencing of the fields will have on the community has not been properly considered. The perceived needs of the school have been stated as being given priority over the needs of the community, but with no regard to the proportionality of this. No alternative ways to meet the safeguarding requirements has been considered. There have been no serious safeguarding issues in the 40 years of dual use of the land. Therefore, the response to fence the entire 8 pitches (Area C) lacks proportionality.

3f) There is a perception of lack of fairness from public attendees and ward Councillor at the Cabinet. It did not feel that speakers were listened to. This is evidenced by lack of Cabinet questioning and debate which gave an impression of predetermination of the decision. This view of predetermination was reinforced in Council

leader Dennis Jones' comments in interview to BBC Radio Cambridgeshire on the morning of 17 July, 2024.

There is also a question of planning recommendations as per point 3b).

Mr John Greg, Executive Director of Children's Services, was put up to respond to questions raised by speakers but failed to answer many questions and gave cursory answers to those he did answer.

- 3h) There were no questions asked of the public, former MP and Councillors. There was no debate by Councillors. There were no reasons for the decisions given by Cabinet, addressing points raised. There is a very strong public perception that the decision was made prior to cabinet, not open to scrutiny and was undemocratic. Given the importance and permanence of this decision, it is essential the decision-making process is transparent.

This page is intentionally left blank