

**Report for:** Special Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017

**Title:** Monitoring Officer's Report on the Call-In of a Decision taken by the Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 relating to the Haringey Development Vehicle – Appointment of Preferred Bidder

**Report authorised by :** Bernie Ryan, Monitoring Officer

**Lead Officer:** Raymond Prince Deputy Monitoring Officer

**Ward(s) affected:** N/A

**Report for Key/  
Non Key Decision:** N/A

**1. Describe the issue under consideration**

To advise the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the call-in process, and in particular whether the decision taken by Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 relating to the appointment of a preferred bidder for the Haringey Development Vehicle (HDV) is within the Council's policy and budgetary framework.

**2. Cabinet Member Introduction**

N/A

**3. Recommendations**

That Members note:

a. The Call-In process

b. The advice of the Monitoring Officer and Chief Financial Officer that the decision taken by the Cabinet was inside the Council's policy and budgetary framework.

**4. Reasons for decision**

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is expected to take its own decision with regard to whether a called-in decision is outside or inside the policy and budgetary framework when considering action to take in relation to a called-in decision.

**5. Alternative options considered**

N/A

**6. Background information**

---

## Call-in Procedure Rules

- 6.1** The Call-In Procedure Rules (the Rules) appear at Part 4, Section H of the Constitution, and are reproduced at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 6.2.** The Rules prescribe that once a validated call-in request has been notified to the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), the Committee must meet within 10 working days to decide what action to take. In the meantime, all action to implement the original decision is suspended.
- 6.3** If OSC Members determine that the original decision was within the policy framework, the Committee has three options:
- (i) to not take any further action, in which case the original decision is implemented immediately.
  - (ii) to refer the original decision back to Cabinet as the original decision-maker. If this option is followed, the Cabinet must reconsider their decision in the light of the views expressed by OSC within the next five working days, and take a final decision.
  - (iii) to refer the original decision on to full Council. If this option is followed, full Council must meet within the next 10 working days to consider the call-in. Full Council can then decide to either:
    - take no further action and allow the decision to be implemented immediately, or
    - to refer the decision back to the Cabinet for reconsideration. The Cabinet's decision is final
- 6.4** If OSC determine that the original decision was outside the budget/policy framework, it must refer the matter back to the Cabinet with a request to reconsider it on the grounds that it is incompatible with the policy/budgetary framework.
- 6.5** In that event, the Cabinet would have two options:
- (i) to amend the decision in line with OSC's determination, in which case the amended decision is implemented immediately.
  - (ii) to re-affirm the original decision, in which case the matter is referred to a meeting of full Council within the next 10 working days. Full Council would have two options:
    - to amend the budget/policy framework to accommodate the called-in decision, in which case the decision is implemented immediately, or
    - to require the decision-maker to reconsider the decision again and to refer it to a meeting of the Cabinet, to be held within five working days. The Cabinet's decision is final.

## The Policy Framework

- 6.6** A definition of The Policy Framework is set out in the Constitution at Article 4 of Part Two (Articles of the Constitution) which is reproduced as follows:

### ***“Policy Framework***

*These are the plans and strategies that must be reserved to the full Council for approval:*

- *Annual Library Plan*
- *Best Value Performance Plan*
- *Crime and Disorder Reduction (community safety) Strategy*
- *Development Plan documents*
- *Youth Justice Plan*
- *Statement of Gambling Policy*
- *Statement of Licensing Policy*
- *Treasury Management Strategy*

*Any other policies the law requires must be approved by full Council.*

*Such other plans and strategies that the Council agrees from time to time that it should consider as part of its Policy Framework:*

- *Housing Strategy”*

- 6.7** The policy framework is intended to provide the general context, as set by full Council, within which decision-making occurs. In an Executive model of local government, the majority of decisions are taken by the Executive – in Haringey’s case this being the Cabinet/Leader/Cabinet member. Under the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 the determination of a matter in the discharge of an Executive function nonetheless becomes a matter for the full Council if the proposed determination would be contrary to a plan or strategy adopted or approved by the full Council in relation to the function in question. Case law makes it clear that it would not be a proper use of a full Council approved plan or strategy to seek to make it a means for full Council to micro-manage what ought to be Executive decisions.

## **7. Current Call-Ins**

- 7.1** On 17<sup>th</sup> February 2017, a call-in request was received in relation to the Cabinet decision taken on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 on the recommendation to appoint Lendlease as the preferred bidder for the HDV.
- 7.2** On 24<sup>th</sup> February 2017, a second call-in request was received in relation to the same issue.
- 7.3** A copy of the public report to Cabinet, the draft minutes and the call-ins are reproduced as part of the meeting agenda pack.
- 7.4** Whilst neither request asserts that the decision taken was outside of the Council’s policy framework – and the Chief Financial Officer also confirms her

view that the Cabinet decision is within the budgetary framework; see paragraph 11 below - it does make a number of points in support of an overall assertion that the process for choosing a preferred bidder, and the creation of the HDV should not be allowed to proceed / delayed pending further scrutiny.

## 7.5 Key concerns in the call-ins are as follows:

### The First Call-In

- Lendlease has a record which demonstrates that it is not a suitable partner for the project
- The project will not deliver positive outcomes for the Council's tenants and leaseholders
- There has been a lack of consultation on the proposals with those likely to be affected
- The project will not deliver value for money
- The risks of the project outweighs any perceived benefits

### The Second Call-In

- The potential breach of the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty
- The potential legal risks of the decision being challenged in the High Court
- The construction exclusivity clause proposed for the preferred bidder possibly representing a conflict of interest
- The legal question of whether a varying of the terms of the partnership to reflect recent commitments which are beyond those set out in the original agreed procurement process requires a re-opening of the procurement process itself

7.6 The requests also detailed alternative courses of action, namely to refer the matter to Full Council with the proposal not to choose Lendlease as a preferred bidder and stop the HDV being formed, and consider alternative proposals to deliver regeneration and build new Council and affordable homes, some of which were detailed in the report to Cabinet (the first call-in); and to refer the appointment of Lendlease back to Cabinet with a view to delaying the process to facilitate further scrutiny of the issues set out at paragraph 7.5 above (the second call-in).

7.7 The purpose of this report is to address whether a decision falls outside of the policy and budgetary framework. However, the Monitoring Officer is aware that a report from the Director Regeneration, Planning & Development to this Committee will address all of the issues raised in the call-ins.

## 8. Monitoring Officer's Assessment

8.1 The Call-In Procedure Rules require that:

*"The [Overview and Scrutiny] Committee shall consider any report of the Monitoring Officer / Chief Finance Officer as to whether a called-in decision is*

*inside or outside the policy / budget framework. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall have regard to that report and any advice but Members shall determine whether the decision is inside or outside the policy/ budget framework.”*

**8.2** The Monitoring Officer considered the requests on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017 (the first call-in) and 24<sup>th</sup> February 2017 (the second call-in), and determined that they both met the 6 criteria for validity as set out in the Rules. Following investigation and consideration, the Monitoring Officer made an assessment of whether the decision was outside of the policy framework and concluded that – in agreement with both call-ins - it was not for the reasons which appear at paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6 below.

**8.3** The call-in requests made the following points:

#### The First Call-In

“We are concerned by the choice of Lendlease as the preferred bidder for the HDV for the following reasons:

(1) “The recent Heygate Estate renewal by Lendlease in Southwark, has in our view, not led to good outcomes for local residents or the council. A large council estate was replaced with many homes for sale and only a small number of social homes on site.

(2) “Lendlease have been sued by unions for blacklisting construction workers.”

(3) “Lendlease has admitted it overbilled clients for more than a decade and has agreed to pay \$56 million in fines and restitution in the United States of America.”

(4) “We are concerned by the particulars of the HDV and the agreement with Lendlease as mentioned in the public Cabinet report:

(a) We are concerned that the commitment to affordable and social housing is weak.”

(b) We are concerned that there is no guarantee that council tenants and leaseholders will have the same rights they currently have or will be offered a similar home in the same area. In our view ‘aim’ and ‘seek’ to provide protections are not sufficient assurances.”

(c) We are concerned that council tenants, leaseholders, local businesses and residents in general, have not been consulted on the proposal to form the HDV and the consequences it will have for these groups.”

(d) We are concerned that the construction exclusivity clause that will see a percentage of construction contracts going to Lendlease’s construction arm may not represent the best value for money.”

(e) There are several instances in the Cabinet report where it is suggested Lendlease may charge for their expertise, management etc. We understood that one of the reasons for the HDV was to save the council money and avoid paying for such expertise.”

- (f) We believe that overall, the risk of the proposed actions, outweigh the suggested benefits.”

### The Second Call-In

“In deciding to proceed to the Preferred Bidder stage the Cabinet has, in our view, given insufficient or perhaps minimal weight to the evidenced recommendations of the HRSP, as ratified by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel. (O&SP) and issued by the Council. The Cabinet is therefore proceeding despite:

- Not having consulted fully, transparently or properly with affected tenants, leaseholders and businesses regarding the crucial and specific details regarding transfer of the land where they reside; or, relating to businesses not having regard to the impact of choices they face concerning the business which they lease, rent or have on license
- There being a lack of transparency in newsletters and communications issued by the Council to tenants and leaseholders, on the named estates, regarding what exactly ‘estate renewal’ and/or ‘regeneration’ in this context could mean for their current homes.
- A lack of clarity and consistency regarding the verifiably deliverable security of tenure and conditions on which tenants will be able to return to their homes. This is evidenced by the clear commitments in para 2.4 of the report - ***‘to do our utmost to rehouse council tenants in the area where they currently live and on similar terms’***. This contrasts with guarantees and commitments regarding security of tenure and rent levels which have been made elsewhere, including the minuted response to Cllr Bevan’s question regarding Council tenants’ rents on HDV property. These minutes make clear the Cabinet position that there was a ***‘Clear commitment to Council tenants on rent rates, ensuring the rents on the new estates match rents for equivalent Council homes’***.
- The above assurances, although demonstrating the utmost good intentions, nevertheless from the viewpoints of tenants, do not constitute a legally binding guarantee; nor do they reflect either the Council’s own Estate Renewal, Rehousing and Payments Policy para 7.30, or the agreed terms within the procurement process to which the appointment of a development partner will be subject.
- Despite assurance being given verbally that there will be no loss of equivalent council housing, i.e. that the new estates will contain at least an equivalent equal number of council homes at target rents and secure tenancies, there is no written and legally enforceable guarantee of this.
- Having no completed and detailed risk assessment which sets out the liabilities and benefits of such a venture in a clear and transparent way for councillors, in order for them to make an informed decision, and so Haringey residents have assurance that their elected councillors have fully considered impact and risks.
- Not having conducted a full and complete due diligence regarding the companies bidding to become the preferred bidder, including their record with regard to trade union activities, blacklisting of certain workers, previous contracts and legal disputes regarding public sector contracts

- Issues being identified regarding the preferred bidder's company structures and tax arrangements which should form part of any due diligence
- Not having conducted detailed and specific Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs) of the impact this decision will have on key groups such as black and minority ethnic individuals and families; older people; lone parents; people with physical and or mental ill health and other vulnerable groups, despite already having publicly named particular sites, land and assets to be transferred in Category 1, and potential assets to be transferred in Category 2. The official paperwork refers to EQIAs being done when sites are identified, yet, as evidenced from the Council's own documentation, they have been named already. This may be in contravention of the Public Sector Equality Duty to which all local authorities are subject.
- Case law indicates that these assessments should be done before decisions are made, and that a written record is useful for demonstrating compliance, as per the Equality and Human Rights Commission guidance.
- Relying on a business case some eighteen months out of date which has no reference to the potential impact of Brexit on the economy, or other current economic indicators, and which appears to minimise the risks of the overarching joint venture recommended as the way forward when compared to the risks highlighted for the other five (rejected) options.
- Selecting a preferred bidder about which very clear and evidenced concerns have been raised including their development of the Heygate Estate in Southwark, with a huge loss of social homes and very poor outcomes for tenants and leaseholders, as well as the recent legal case brought against the developer by the District Attorney in New York City.
- Providing no verifiable evidence that this private partnership would achieve the regeneration outcomes or indeed generate income/profit for the council. The Cabinet report asserts that this will be the case – para 4. 7 of the report provides an example of this , stating ***'the Council accepts a degree of risk in that it will commit its commercial portfolio to the vehicle, and will (subject to the satisfaction of relevant pre-conditions) also commit other property, as its equity stake in the vehicle. It has also to bear the costs of the procurement and establishment of the vehicle, and a share of development risk. However, in return, the contribution to its Corporate Plan objectives, including high quality new jobs, new homes, including affordable homes, and economic and social benefits, would be at a scale and pace that would otherwise be unachievable. The Council will also receive a financial return, principally through a share of profits, that it can reinvest in the fulfilment of its wider strategic aims as set out in the Corporate Plan'***. There is no verifiable evidence to back up these claims, although there is written evidence from other authorities that in fact, similar partnerships have been dissolved, with significant losses to the public purse. In addition, accounts filed at Companies House from such joint ventures disclose losses to local authorities.
- Opacity regarding the equity which the Haringey Development Vehicle partner would be providing to match the Council's transfer of assets. In

response to clear questions about this, the Cabinet minutes record that the HDV partner was ***'not expected to write a cheque on the day that land transfers to the Haringey Development Vehicle, but commit cash or make a binding guarantee to commit the cash when the vehicle needs it.'*** This answer raises many questions with regard to the contributions being made by the private partner, and the financial model being pursued.

- Admissions, not known until the meeting, that the preferred bidder would also have exclusive status as a contractor within the partnership. This raises questions regarding the financial model and the assertions throughout the report that the Council will make profits from these joint venture developments. This may also create a conflict of interest which has not been adequately addressed, in that the development partner will have the right to both vote at board meetings on decisions to allocate sites for development and also act as paid construction contractor on those same sites.
- Lack of clarity about what the Council can legally seek to achieve within the preferred bidder stage given that key assurances which have recently been made were not specified or agreed during the procurement process itself
- There being delivered to the Council a sixteen page Letter before Action. This was confirmed as being received prior to the Cabinet meeting and is in the public domain, setting out the legal risks the Council may now face of the Cabinet decision being challenged in the High Court.
- Cabinet members making a number of promises and commitments during the Cabinet meeting which may not be deliverable or enforceable due to potential tensions with the plans and approaches set out in the Housing strategy as indicated above (bullet point 3) and below in the section on the Policy Framework

**In addition, Recommendation 3.5 of Cabinet Report on the Appointment of the Preferred bidder says:**

***"[Cabinet] Agrees to proceed to the Preferred Bidder Stage („PB Stage“) so the preferred bidders proposal can be refined and optimised, in particular to formalise the structure of the vehicle, finalise legal documents and further develop site and portfolio business plans, as required to establish the HDV..."***

However, this appears to contrast with the Legal Advice set out in the previous report agreed at the same Cabinet meeting (*Governance Arrangements for the HDV [Item 8]*) which states:

***Under Regulation 30 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 any further negotiations between the Council and the preferred bidder must not have the effect of materially modifying the essential aspects of the procurement (including the needs and requirements set out in the contract notice or the descriptive document) and does not risk distorting competition or causing discrimination. So any proposal that would have such an effect on the Members Agreement or any other legal agreements relating to the HDV would be in breach of these Regulations and must therefore be avoided***



Therefore, aspects of the decision made by Cabinet might possibly be legally unsound and/or unenforceable, and should hence be revisited by Cabinet.

The Cabinet report itself, makes several references to risk, and the acceptance that there is risk, yet these are never quantified or detailed. Neither are the benefits set against the liabilities and risks in an objective and clear structure which is necessary for an informed decision on such a huge and complex project.

Consequently, we the undersigned contend that the decision to select Lendlease as preferred bidder with whom the Council will establish the joint venture HDV, to 'proceed to the Preferred Bidder Stage ('PB Stage') and to give Delegated Authority to the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development after consultation with the Leader of the Council to agree any further documentation as is required at the PB Stage,' is premature and should be reconsidered by Cabinet with a view to more extensive scrutiny work taking place beforehand".

- 8.4** As stated at paragraph 7.4 above, both requests also set out alternative courses of action.
- 8.5** This decision is a decision on a preferred bidder following a procurement process, and could not in itself be contrary to the Council's policy framework.
- 8.6** It is the Monitoring Officer's view, the Cabinet's decision was consistent with, and not contrary to, the commitment to affordable housing as detailed in the Local Plan, Housing Strategy and other published policy and delivery documents that inform the Council's work on housing and regeneration. I also accept the assertion made in the report of the Director Regeneration, Planning & Development to this Committee, that all bidders were clear about the role of the HDV in delivering the Council's priorities in this area.

## **9 Conclusion**

For the above reasons, the Monitoring Officer concludes that the Cabinet's decision was not outside the policy framework.

## **10. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

N/A

## **11. Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)**

### **Finance and Procurement**

Article 4.01 as written in the Council's constitution states that the meaning of the budget includes "the allocation of financial resources to different services and projects, proposed contingency funds, setting the council tax and decisions relating to the control of the Council's borrowing requirements, the control of its capital expenditure and the setting of virement limits. The determination of the

Council Tax Base is delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and the Cabinet Advisory Board.

Further, this decision is a decision on a preferred bidder following a procurement process, and could not in itself be contrary to the Council's budgetary framework.

Whilst there is no claim by the call-in that the decision is outside the budgetary framework, the Chief Financial Officer has confirmed that the decision is not outside the budget framework.

### **Legal implications**

The Monitoring Officer's views are set out above.

### **Equality**

N/A

### **12. Use of Appendices**

Appendix 1 Call-In Procedure Rules

### **13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

N/A

# Part Four, Section H

## Call-In Procedure Rules

---

1. When a key decision is made by the Executive (that is, the Leader, Individual Cabinet Members or the Cabinet) or a committee of the Cabinet, the decision shall be published and shall be available for inspection at the Civic Centre and on the Council's website, normally within 2 working days of being made. The right to Call-In does not apply to a decision by way of an appeal hearing or a quasi-judicial procedure.
2. The notice of the key decision will be dated and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 working days after the publication of the decision, unless a valid request has been received objecting to the decision and asking for it to be called-in. This does not apply to "urgent" decisions.
3. The Monitoring Officer will deem valid a request that fulfils all of the following 6 criteria:
  - (a) it is submitted by any five Members of the Council.
  - (b) it is received by the Democratic Services Manager by 10am on the fifth day following publication.
  - (c) it specifies the decision to which it objects.
  - (d) it specifies whether the decision is claimed to be outside the policy or budget framework.
  - (e) it gives reasons for the call-in and outlines an alternative course of action.
  - (f) it is not made in relation to a decision taken in accordance with the urgency procedures in paragraph 18 below.
4. The Democratic Services Manager will forward all timely and proper call-in requests, once deemed valid by the Monitoring Officer, to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Manager and will notify all Cabinet Members including the decision maker and the relevant Chief Officer.
5. A key decision will be implemented immediately after a call-in request is deemed invalid by the Monitoring Officer or after the expiry of ten working days following the receipt of a valid call-in request by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, unless a meeting of the

Overview and Scrutiny Committee takes place during the 10-day period.

6. If a call-in request is deemed valid, the Democratic Services Manager will forward the call-in request 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 inside or outside the policy or budget framework.
7. Unless a key decision is designated "urgent" pursuant to paragraph 18, when it shall be implemented immediately, no action shall be taken to implement the decision until 5 working days have elapsed after the date of the publication of the decision. In the event that a call-in request has been received, no action shall be taken until the Monitoring Officer has determined the validity of the request.
8. Subject to paragraph 5, when a request for call-in is deemed valid, all action to implement the key decision is suspended until the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has met to decide what action to take. The Committee must meet no later than 10 working days after the Chair has received a valid call-in request.
9. Discussion of any called-in decisions shall precede all other substantive items on the agenda of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Any reports of the Monitoring Officer and Chief Financial Officer shall be part of that agenda.
10. The Committee shall consider any report of the Monitoring Officer / Chief Finance Officer as to whether a called-in decision is inside or outside the policy / budget framework. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall have regard to that report and any advice but Members shall determine whether the decision is inside or outside the policy / budget framework. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee determine that the decision was within the policy / budget framework, the Committee has three options:
  - (a) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may decide not to take any further action, in which case the key decision is implemented immediately.
  - (b) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may decide to refer the decision back to the decision maker, in which case the decision maker has 5 working days to reconsider the key decision before taking a final decision.
  - (c) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may decide to refer the decision to Full Council.

11. When the Overview and Scrutiny Committee refers a decision to Council (when the decision is deemed to fall within the policy / budget framework), any Council meeting must be held within 10 working days (with an extraordinary meeting being called if necessary) of the date of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's referral.
12. When considering a called-in decision (when this decision is deemed to fall within the policy / budget framework) the Council has two options:
  - (a) The Council may decide not to take any further action, in which case the decision is implemented immediately.
  - (b) The Council may refer the decision back to the decision maker, in which case the decision maker has 5 working days to reconsider the decision before taking a final decision.
13. Once a final decision has been made there is no further right of call-in. This decision or any other key decision having the same effect may not be called-in again for a period of six months following the date at which the final decision was taken.
14. If the Overview and Scrutiny Committee determines that the decision is outside the policy / budget framework, the Committee shall refer the decision to the decision maker and with a request to reconsider it on the grounds that it is incompatible with the policy / budget framework. The decision maker shall have 5 working days in which to reconsider the decision.
15. The decision maker has two options:
  - (a) Amend the decision in line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's determination, in which case the decision is implemented immediately.
  - (b) Reaffirm the original decision, in which case the decision goes to a Council meeting which must convene within 10 working days of the reaffirmation of the original decision.
16. When considering a called-in decision where a decision maker fails to amend a decision in line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's determination, that it falls outside the policy / budget framework, the Council has two options:
  - (a) Amend the policy / budget framework to accommodate the called-in decision, in which case the decision is implemented immediately.

- (b) Require the decision maker to reconsider the decision again and refer it to a meeting of the Cabinet to be held within 5 working days of the Council meeting. The Cabinet's decision is final.

**17. Abuse of Call-in**

- (a) Members are expected to ensure that call-in is not abused, or causes unreasonable delay to the functioning of the Cabinet.
- (b) The call-in procedure is to be reviewed annually (see paragraph 18 g), if such a review leads to the conclusion that the call-in procedure is being abused, the Constitution may be amended to include greater limitations.

**18. Call-In and Urgency**

- (a) The call-in procedure set out above shall not apply when the action being taken is urgent or time-critical in terms of (b) below.
- (b) A key decision will be urgent if any delay in implementation likely to be caused by the call-in procedure would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests.
- (c) A key decision which has not been given the requisite publicity for a key decision or a private meeting and which the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee has agreed is 'urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred' is not regarded as urgent for the purposes of call-in unless it fulfils the criteria of paragraph (b) above.
- (d) If a key decision is urgent and therefore not subject to call-in, this will be stated on the record.
- (e) In order for a key decision to be deemed urgent, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee must agree that the decision is both reasonable in all circumstances and that it should be treated as a matter of urgency. In the absence or unavailability of the Chair the consent of the Mayor is required. In the absence of both, the consent of the Deputy Mayor shall be required.
- (f) Decisions taken as a matter of urgency must be reported to the next available meeting of the Council, together with the reasons for urgency.
- (g) The operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency shall be monitored annually and a report submitted to Council with proposals for review if necessary.

**19. Call-In and the Forward Plan**

- (a) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee should consider the Forward Plan as its chief source of information regarding forthcoming Cabinet decisions.
- (b) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may select a forthcoming decision and examine the issues around it.
- (c) In order not to obstruct the Council in its business, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may call-in a key decision in advance of its actually being taken. In such a situation all the time-limits apply as above, except that a key decision cannot actually be implemented any sooner than it would have been had the Overview and Scrutiny Committee not called it in.
- (d) Where the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has called-in a key decision from the Forward Plan before its due date, the decision cannot be called-in again after the final decision has been taken.

**20. Monitoring Arrangements**

The operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency shall be monitored by the Democratic Services Manager, and a report submitted to Council annually with proposals for review if necessary.