

'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 |
| DATE OF MEETING | 10 th March 2026 |
| MINUTE No. AND TITLE OF ITEM | Agenda item 18: Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) Spending Round 2 |

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

The decision is not claimed to be outside the policy or budget framework, but the process for allocating NCIL funding did not comply with the council's general constitutional principles of decision-making, or the specific policies relating to CIL.

1) Public support for projects

Haringey's CIL governance [document](#) states that:

"Consultation with the community within each CIL Neighbourhood Group will be undertaken to compile an initial list of projects and the priorities, determined by the number supporting the same or similar infrastructure. The Council will then determine how neighbourhood CIL receipts are spent against the list of projects compiled".

The council has not provided any evidence that the schemes selected for funding came from public suggestions:

- The "London Borough of Culture ward murals" are part of a wider corporate project. The wider project may have broad support, and individual murals may be popular in some wards, but the council has not provided any evidence that there is public support in every ward for a mural. Nor does it appear to have made any attempt to contact the residents of Muswell Hill and Crouch End who specifically objected to murals when they were previously proposed.
- The council has not provided any evidence that the Civic Centre "communal woodland gardens" project was proposed or supported by local residents.

Adding corporate projects with no public support to the list for final approval bypasses the Council's own binding policy framework.

2) Funding status of proposed projects

The cabinet report states in Appendix C that the Civic Centre "communal woodland gardens" project is eligible for NCIL funding because it fulfils criterion B: *"The use of CIL funding is necessary as no alternative funding sources are available"*. But this is contradicted by paragraph 6.36 which

states: *“The proposed projects also provide some opportunities to reduce costs to the Council of delivering its existing Capital Programme by replacing planned borrowing with external funding.”*

Projects which have already been approved for borrowing under the capital programme cannot be described as eligible because “no alternative funding sources are available”.

3) Projects which are not capital infrastructure or addressing the demands of development

NCIL legislative requirements state that NCIL funds must be spent on infrastructure or ‘anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.’

The council has not explained how murals meet this definition. They are not “infrastructure”, so what is the development-induced demand that they are addressing in each of the nineteen locations where they are proposed?

4) Constitutional principles of decisions making

Section 12.02 of the constitution (“Principles of decision making”) states: *All decisions of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:*

- (a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);*
- (b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;*
- (c) respect for human rights in particular, giving consideration to such issues at an early stage in the process;*
- (d) a presumption in favour of openness; and*
- (e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes.*

Furthermore, the Council will explain what options were considered and give reasons for the decision.

The Cabinet report provided no detail or evidence that the CIL allocation pays due regard to the public consultation, failed to provide the source of each proposal, failed to outline the weighted support by proposal, and failed to respond adequately to why each proposal was selected.

This fails points (b) and (d) of the principles outlined above, as well as failing to meet the overarching principle of providing reasons for decisions.

2. Variation of Action Proposed

- Do not take this decision forward
- Bring a revised report to a future cabinet meeting including:
 - A list of all proposals which received more than one vote on the commonplace platform.
 - Evidence of residents nominating and supporting the specific projects identified for funding (not just support for the relevant categories of projects).
 - Calculations showing how competing projects were scored / prioritised
 - Evidence that projects are not being otherwise funded already
 - For proposals that are for more than one NCIL area, publish evidence of support from residents in each area.
 - Rerun the decision with all the above provided so that decisions around NCIL allocations are transparent, representative, evidence based and in line with council policy.

Signed:

Councillor: (Please print name): Cllr Rossetti

Countersigned:

1. Councillor: (Please print name): Cllr Cawley-Harrison
2. Councillor: (Please print name): Cllr Barnes
3. Councillor: (Please print name): Cllr Emery
4. Councillor: (Please print name): Cllr da Costa

Date Submitted:

13th March 2026

Date Received :

(to be completed by the Democratic Services Manager)

Notes:

1. Please send this form to:

Ayshe Simsek(on behalf of the Proper Officer)
Acting 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 Acting 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.