



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All Wards

**CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SCHOOLS
SCRUTINY COMMISSION
OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE
COUNCIL**

**22 AUGUST 2017
14 SEPTEMBER 2017
5 OCTOBER 2017**

CALL-IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION – YOUTH SERVICE REMODELLING

REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

1. INTRODUCTION

An Executive decision taken by the Assistant City Mayor, Children, Young People and Schools on 3 August 2017 relating to Youth Service Remodelling has been the subject of a five member call-in under the procedures at Rule 12 of Part 4D, City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules, of the Council's Constitution.

The procedure rules state that a scrutiny committee or any five councillors may request formally that the decision be called-in for a further review by giving notice in writing to the Monitoring Officer within five working days of the decision.

The five Councillors who signed the call in were: Councillor Wilmott (proposer), Councillor Singh Riyait (seconder), Councillor Chaplin, Councillor Kitterick and Councillor Sangster.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Council is recommended to either:

- a) Support the Assistant City Mayor for Children and Young People's Services decision, and thus confirming the decision with immediate effect; or
- b) Recommend a different decision to the Assistant City Mayor for Children and Young People's Services. (The original decision will still stand, unless the Assistant City Mayor takes a further decision to amend the original.)

3. REPORT

3.1 Process

The call-in submitted to the Monitoring Officer was in the following terms:

“We the undersigned wish to call in the decision on the £923,000 cuts to the Youth Service.

Given the needs of young people in the city and the recent criticisms of the council's leadership by Ofsted it is wrong to be cutting the youth service by 50%.

We further note that the following decision by Children's Scrutiny Commission has not been responded to by the Executive and should be before any decision is implemented:

‘It was proposed and duly seconded that the City Mayor and executive should be recommended to reconsider the savings target for Youth Services and that the required saving should come from the £7.4 million underspend that was not known at the time this review was commissioned, upon being put to the vote the motion was carried’.

And: That none of the £7.4 million underspend has yet been allocated to any projects so it is still available to offset these cuts.”

The Monitoring Officer has confirmed that the call-in satisfied the requirements of the procedure rules and it has therefore proceeded as per the process set out at Rule 12 of Part 4D, City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules of the Council's Constitution.

Where a call-in has been made, officers are to take no further legally binding action and the matter shall be referred to a meeting of the full Council. Prior to this it shall be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Committee if one is programmed or a special scrutiny committee if one is convened.

The call-in may however be withdrawn if:

- The decision maker and the relevant scrutiny committee (or via the Monitoring Officer, the scrutiny committee chair and vice chair unanimously) come to an agreement;
- The relevant scrutiny committee makes a resolution to withdraw; or
- The sponsor and seconder of the call-in inform the Monitoring Officer that they wish the call-in to be withdrawn.

Following consideration of a call-in by full Council, the original decision will be deemed to be revived in its entirety. Any agreement by the decision maker to change the original decision will require a further formal Executive Decision.

3.2 Scrutiny consideration

The call-in was initially considered at the meeting of the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission on 22 August. However, due to the budgetary links between this call-in and the call-in relating to the Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016/17, the Chair of the Overview Select Committee requested that both call-ins be considered at the meeting of the Committee on 14 September. It was noted however that the Overview Select Committee could not overturn any recommendation by the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission. The relevant minute extract from this discussion is attached as Appendix D.

3.3 Background

Appendices to this report are as follows:

Appendix A – Executive decision notice.

Appendix B – Executive decision report.

Appendix C – Minute extract from Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission on 22nd August 2017.

Appendix D - Minute extract from Overview Select Committee on 14th September 2017.

4. FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS

4.1. Financial Implications

The £7.4m underspend being referred to in relation to this decision is one-off in nature and has arisen due to the early achievement in savings in other divisions and the careful management of areas of significant pressure, such as adult social care, resulting in a better than expected outturn position. These savings will not recur.

If I refer to the 2017/18 budget report and in particular section 4.1 on page 5 of the report, the table shows that at the point Council approved its annual budget it was estimated that further savings of £40m would be required by 2019/20. This means that £40m per year in spending needs to be removed from the general fund budget. This level of savings significantly exceeds our current programme of spending reviews which includes the savings proposed in this report. Alison Greenhill, Director of Finance, ext 374001.

4.2 Legal Implications

The legal implications are set out in the accompanying Executive Decision Report. Kamal Adatia, City Barrister and Head of Standards, ext. 371401.

4.3 Climate Change

The climate change implications are set out in the accompanying Executive Decision Report. Duncan Bell, Senior Environmental Consultant, ext. 372249.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References Within the Report
Equal Opportunities	N	
Policy	N	
Sustainable and Environmental	N	
Crime and Disorder	N	
Human Rights Act	N	
Elderly/People on Low Income	N	
Corporate Parenting	N	
Health Inequalities Impact	N	

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS – LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

None

7. CONSULTATIONS

None.

8. REPORT AUTHOR

Graham Carey,
Democratic Services Officer