

'CALL IN' OF DECISIONS OF THE CABINET

This form is to be used for the 'calling in' of decisions of the above bodies, in accordance with the procedure set out in Part 4 Section H.2 of the Constitution.

TITLE OF MEETING	CABINET MEMBER SIGNING
-------------------------	------------------------

DATE OF MEETING	19/3/2018
------------------------	-----------

MINUTE No. AND TITLE OF ITEM	44. CONFIRMATION (continued below)
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

1. Reason for Call-In/Is it claimed to be outside the policy or budget framework?

44. CONFIRMATION OF THE SITE PROPOSED FOR A YOUTH ZONE AND APPROVAL OF CAPITAL AND REVENUE FUNDING TOWARDS THE PROJECT

REASONS FOR CALL-IN
See attached pages (1) + (2)

2. Variation of Action Proposed

VARIATION OF ACTION PROPOSED
See attached pages (3)

Signed:

Councillor: Bob Hare (Please print name): BOB HARE

Countersigned:

1. Councillor: Clive Carter (Please print name): CLIVE CARTER

2. Councillor: Liz Morris (Please print name): LIZ MORRIS

3. Councillor: David M. Beacham (Please print name): DAVID BEACHAM

4. Councillor: Viv Ross (Please print name): VIV ROSS

Date Submitted: 26 MARCH 2018

Date Received :

(to be completed by the Democratic Services Manager)

Notes:

1. Please send this form to:

Michael Kay (on behalf of the Proper Officer)
Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager
5th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road, Wood Green, London N22 8HQ
Tel: 8489 2920
Fax: 020 8881 5218

This form must be received by the Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager by 10.00 a.m. on the fifth working day following publication of the minutes.

2. The proper officer will forward all timely and proper call-in requests to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and notify the decision taker and the relevant Director.
3. A decision will be implemented after the expiry of ten working days following the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee's receipt of a call-in request, unless a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee takes place during the 10 day period.
4. If a call-in request claims that a decision is contrary to the policy or budget framework, the Proper Officer will forward the call-in requests to the Monitoring Officer and /or Chief Financial Officer for a report to be prepared for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee advising whether the decision does fall outside the policy or budget framework.

CALL-IN

SIGNED: BOB HARE

COUNTER-SIGNED: CLIVE CARTER, LIZ MORRIS, DAVID BEACHAM, VIV ROSS

TITLE OF MEETING: CABINET MEMBER SIGNING

DATE OF MEETING: 19 MARCH 2018

MINUTE NO 44

CONFIRMATION OF THE SITE PROPOSED FOR A YOUTH ZONE AND APPROVAL OF CAPITAL AND REVENUE FUNDING TOWARDS THE PROJECT

REASONS FOR CALL-IN

1) Outside the budget framework

We believe the decision taken by the Leader on "Confirmation of the site proposed for a Youth Zone and approval of capital and revenue funding towards the project" to proceed at the signing on Monday 19 March was outside the budget framework.

There are two points to make on the budget framework, either or both of which mean the decision is outside it.

a) There is no explicit allocation in the MTFs to the Youth Zone project of the £3m capital required.

We note that the budget for youth work appears to include £3m for one year. However, we consider a project of this scale and importance should have been costed specifically and by name, otherwise almost any activity within the broad description of youth work could be argued to be within the budget.

b) There is no source identified for the annual revenue cost of the Youth Zone.

As was clear from the responses of officers to questions at the signing, there is no clear idea of where the funding of £0.25m annually that will be required from the council for the Youth Zone for the first three years will be found. This is unacceptably vague for a significant annual cost equivalent to 42% of the annual budget for Early Years Prevention Services. There has not been any discussion where of this unplanned cut could be made to existing provision by the present cabinet or council committees, and the decisions about what to cut are being passed on to the next council.

Funding after the first three years is hoped to be found from other funders, but the sourcing of the sum required of £1m annually is not guaranteed, with the potential in the event of a shortfall for continuing calls for significant revenue support from the council. The accompanying document for the signing notes that the council will have to contribute additional revenue funding to support the fund-raising from third parties, but no indication of the scale or sourcing of that funding was provided.

No evidence was provided that Onside will be able to raise the funding required in the long-term in the competitive environment of London, with potentially large financial implications for the council, and/or for the continuation of the provision of youth services through the project, and for the inevitable competition for funds that the rest of the local voluntary sector would experience.

2) Outside the policy framework

While the broad aims of the policy framework could be argued to justify almost any action, there are numerous deficits in the proposed action that amount to a failure to meet the council's policies for the successful provision of youth services, for the efficient use of council funds, and for good governance. We are therefore Calling In this decision for all these reasons, whether they are considered legally outside the framework or not.

These reasons include:

a) General Exception Notice

No evidence was provided in the General Exception Notice to support the assertion that third party funding and planning consent could be put at risk by a delay to allow the usual 28 days notice. The deputation and councillors present at the signing challenged this point without receiving an answer. The investment of £3m and annual cost of £0.25m for the first three years is a highly significant decision, and should not have been taken by the outgoing administration using a GEN. The only answer received by the deputation and councillors on this point was that the work of the council could not cease because of elections. However, we consider the scale of the commitments made to be so large, with such large impacts on the way in which youth provision is delivered for the whole borough that this was not 'business as normal' but completely exceptional. The Libdems as the official opposition knew nothing of this recent proposal for a partnership with Woodside High School, and it has only been discussed within the Labour Group. The first opportunity we had to even comment on it was at the Cabinet Signing by General Exception Notice. The decision to waive CSO 9.01.1 which specifies that contracts with a value of £0.5m or above should be tendered is further evidence of the inappropriate haste of the process towards this decision.

b) Decision not based on agreed strategies

This very large capital and revenue investment is not based on agreed strategies for youth services. There has been no consideration of the effects on young people of the potential reductions in other sports facilities.

c) Three way arrangement

The arrangement between Woodside, Onside and the council has not been discussed by cabinet.

d) Lack of draft contract

No draft contract was made available that takes into account the three-way arrangement. The supporting papers refer to the need for a new lease for Woodside to allow them to lease to Onside, but no draft was made available either.

e) No tender for service and strategy

It became clear from responses to questions at the signing that it is openly admitted that there had been no process of tendering for the service. An officer present at the signing said they had searched for alternative providers of the OnSide model without success. Given the nature of the Youth Zone proposal, this is not surprising, however, it does not mean that the Youth Zone proposal represents the right policy for Haringey.

f) Location of Youth Zone

A single Youth Zone necessarily means that a substantial majority of the children or young persons attending will have to travel a significant distance, quite possibly needing to take more than one bus or mode of transport in going and returning. This will constitute a very significant barrier to the use of the Youth Zone by younger children, as well as by older children for whom post-code problems can become a barrier. In answer to questions from councillors, the W3 bus was quoted as crossing the borough and serving the Youth Zone. In fact, the W3 bus travels from Finsbury Park to Tottenham, necessitating at least one additional bus for many young people, and two additional buses for many others. All young people using the W3 bus for all or part of their journey would have up to a 10 minute walk from the nearest point of the W3 bus route to the proposed Youth Zone.

g) Equalities Impact Assessment

The EqIA states there has not been time to consult with residents including young people. The EqIA notes that earlier engagement with young people showed that they wanted more accessible activities and were worried about safety on streets. However, the EqIA is particularly inadequate in dealing with the issues important for accessibility of travel and postcode safety, which must raise the question of whether the decision itself can be valid.

h) Bruce Grove Youth Space

The document accompanying the signing does not lay out a clear proposal for the BGYS. Changes to the services or facilities provided here as a result of the Youth Zone should also have been assessed and been the subject of an EqIA, as indicated in the Cabinet Minutes of March 2017.

i) Lack of Police support

In answer to questions, the Leader suggested that a letter of support had been submitted by the Police over a year ago in another context. Given the significant change in the way in which youth services would be provided, with impacts on young people's safety, ability to take up the services proposed to be provided, and consequent impacts on diversion and broader education, the views of the police on the single location are particularly important, and should have been provided as part of the documentation for the signing.

3) Variation of Action Proposed

We propose that this decision is paused to allow proper consideration of youth strategy, evaluation of the Youth Zone proposal, and consultation by the incoming administration after 3 May.
