



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

Held: THURSDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2017 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Singh (Chair)  
Councillor Govind (Vice Chair)

|                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Councillor Cank      | Councillor Malik    |
| Councillor Cleaver   | Councillor Dr Moore |
| Councillor Cutkelvin | Councillor Porter   |
| Councillor Grant     | Councillor Unsworth |
| Councillor Khote     |                     |

Also present:

Sir Peter Soulsby     City Mayor

In attendance:

Councillor Kitterick  
Councillor Willmott

\* \* \* \* \*

**10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

It was noted that Councillor Cleaver was present as a substitute for Councillor Newcombe.

**11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**12. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair asked Members to think of the victims of Hurricanes Harvey and Irma and the humanitarian crisis in Bangladesh, where many people were victims of severe flooding, with a large proportion of the country underwater.

Many people in the city had families and friends in affected areas and the collective thoughts of the Committee were with them.

### **13. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

AGREED:

That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 6 April 2017 and the Special Meeting of the Overview Select Committee held on 22 June 2017 be confirmed as correct records of the respective meetings.

### **14. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS AGREED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Chair advised the Committee that all actions from the meeting of the Committee held on 6 April 2017 had been completed.

With regard to actions agreed at the meeting held on 22 June 2017:-

- The decision regarding proposals to use the underspend on corporate budgets and housing benefit to make a contribution to the Economic Action Plan had been called-in and would be considered later on the agenda, (minute 3, "Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016/17", 22 June 2017 and 21, "Call In – Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016-17", 14 September 2017 referred);
- It was anticipated that details of comparisons between Leicester City Council and other local authorities of over payments of housing benefit would be submitted to the Committee at its next meeting as part of a report on income monitoring, (minute 5, "Income Collection April 2016 – March 2017" 22 June 2017 referred); and
- The requested briefing on emergency planning was included on the agenda for this meeting, (minute 8, "Questions for the City Mayor – The Fire at Grenfell Tower" 22 June 2017 and minute 23, "Emergency Management and Planning", 14 September 2017 referred).

### **15. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

AGREED:

That the Terms of Reference for the Overview Select Committee be noted.

### **16. MEMBERSHIP OF THE OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE**

AGREED:

That the membership of the Overview Select Committee for 2017/18 be noted.

**17. DATES OF MEETINGS OF THE OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE FOR 2017-18**

AGREED:

That the dates of meetings of the Overview Select Committee for the 2017/18 municipal year be noted.

**18. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received.

**19. PETITIONS**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

**20. TRACKING OF PETITIONS - MONITORING REPORT**

AGREED:

That the report be noted and petitions referenced 15/05/2017-1, 23/11/2016, 19/12/2016, 06/01/2017, 10/02/2017, 14/02/2017, 23/03/2017, 15/05/2017 and 15/05/2017-2, marked "petition process complete", be removed from the monitoring report.

| Action   | By                         |
|--|----------------------------|
| Remove those petitions marked 'petition process complete' from the monitoring report | Democratic Support Officer |

**21. CALL IN - REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING OUTTURN 2016-17**

The Monitoring Officer reported that an Executive decision taken by the City Mayor on 10 July 2017 regarding the Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016/17 had been called in by five Members in accordance with Procedure Rule 12 of Part 4D of the Council's Constitution, (City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules).

The Chair reminded Members that, although the called-in decision related to the revenue budget underspend, there were links between this decision and one relating to the remodelling of the Youth Service, which also had been called in. The called-in decision on the Youth Service had been considered by the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission and the minute relating to that discussion had been circulated to members of this Committee as supplementary information. A copy of that minute is attached at the end of these minutes for information.

Members were reminded that this Committee could only make a decision on what further action to take on the called-in decision relating to the revenue

budget and not that relating to the remodelling of the Youth Service. However, although not taking a decision on what further action to take on it, this Committee could comment on the call-in relating to the Youth Service remodelling, and these comments would be reported to Council when that call in was considered by Council.

The Committee was further reminded that, at its meeting on 22 June 2017, it had supported the proposal to use the under-spend on corporate budgets, together with the housing benefit underspend, to make a contribution of £7.4million to the Economic Action Plan (EAP). (Minute 3, "Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016 / 2017", referred.)

In accordance with Procedure Rule 7 of Part 4E of the Council's Constitution, (Scrutiny Procedure Rules), the Chair invited Councillor Kitterick, as proposer of the call-in, to address the Committee for five minutes.

Councillor Kitterick addressed the Committee, noting that no details had been provided of what the £7.4million under discussion would be used for and suggested that it would be useful to receive this information. He questioned whether spending the £7.4million under the EAP was a higher priority for the Council than Youth Services, but stressed that until a list of projects on which the £7.4million was to be spent was available, it would not be possible to have a full debate on whether other services should take priority over investment through the EAP.

The City Mayor addressed the Committee at the invitation of the Chair, reminding Members that the Council had had to make large financial savings over the last seven years. Savings made had been put in reserves. Managing reserves in this way had enabled investment to be made in the economy of the city, such as through investment in high speed broadband, redeveloping the Haymarket Bus Station and supporting the food industry. However, as reserves reduced, so did the option of investing in this way.

The City Mayor reminded the Committee that a further £43million needed to be saved over the next three years. If the £7.4million under discussion was put in to reserves, by 2020 it would fund the operation of the Council for less than three months, but using it now would enable the Council to invest in jobs and the general economy of the city. The explicit endorsement made by the Committee at its last meeting of the proposal to invest the £7.4million in the EAP therefore was welcomed as, with reserves reducing, there could be little opportunity to use underspends in this way in future years. The City Mayor therefore asked the Committee to reconfirm its support for investing the underspend through the EAP, thereby agreeing that the call-in should not proceed to Council for consideration.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 7 of Part 4E of the Council's Constitution, (Scrutiny Procedure Rules), the Chair invited Councillor Willmott, as proposer of the call-in of the decision regarding the remodelling of the Youth Services, to address the Committee for five minutes.

Councillor Willmott addressed the Committee, thanking Members for recognising the links between the two called-in decisions. He stressed that calling-in the decision on the remodelling of the Youth Services was not an attack on the EAP, but he called for all options to be considered. He suggested that, given the amount of the underspend being allocated to the EAP, Youth Services did not need to be cut in the way proposed. However, there had been no debate on options such as this.

Councillor Willmott stressed that he was not opposed to the expenditure that had already taken place through the EAP and did not disagree that investments already made had helped the city, but asked Members to consider the following points:

- No list of projects to be funded through the EAP had been produced, so using some of the money to fund Youth Services for three years, (the length of the current budget cycle), would leave a significant sum for use through the EAP;
- There had been underspends in each of the last five years. More had been saved than would be needed to continue funding Youth Services, so some of these savings could be used to maintain those services;
- Youth Services were very important to the city. Reducing the number of sessions available from over 40 to 12 would affect thousands of young people; and
- Youth Services were a professional service that needed to be properly funded, both in terms of providing sessions for young people to attend, but also in the preventative work they undertook. Members therefore were asked to consider the choices to be made.

Some support for the points raised by Councillor Kitterick and Councillor Willmott was expressed by some members of the Committee. It was questioned why no details of proposed investments had been provided, as the EAP was considered to be a significant part of the Council's investment programme for the city. It also was suggested that, for a Council facing cuts to its budget, £7.4million was a significant amount of money to be putting in to the EAP.

In reply, the City Mayor reminded the Committee that this had been discussed in some detail at its last meeting, (minute 3, "Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016 / 2017", referred). He advised Members that, although the £7.4million underspend was not a small amount of money, it was not a large proportion of the savings the Council had had to make. Not using it for investment through the EAP therefore would not necessarily release funding for use on specific service areas.

It was recognised that Youth Services were being remodelled, not stopped, so would continue but, while expressing support for the EAP and what had been

achieved through it, some members of the Committee felt that it would be useful to receive more specific information on what the £7.4million under discussion would be spent on. Some children in the city lived in very deprived circumstances and the Council should be supporting them. This raised the question of whether this was the best use of the money, when services such as those at Sure Start centres were being cut.

It was recognised that such investment would not on its own stop problems emerging, but it could help mitigate those issues. It therefore was suggested that the outcome of the remodelling of the Youth Services could be re-examined, to see if some of the underspend could be diverted to Youth Services, as it was recognised that social unrest amongst young people could arise from a lack of economic activity, as well as from a lack of Youth Services.

It also was suggested that more consideration should be given to budget issues, to prevent this situation from arising again. Other Members felt that sufficient consideration was given to this, as regular reports on the budget were received. However, government cuts had made a significant impact on Council services, making it harder to support those in need.

Some members of the Committee expressed the view that sufficient consideration had been given to alternative uses of the funding. Although it would be useful to receive detailed information on how it was proposed to spend the £7.4million under the EAP, the principle of the investment could still be supported. Consideration also had to be given to whether services were sustainable. On balance, it therefore was felt that it was appropriate to use the £7.4million to make a contribution to the EAP, it being recognised that this did not preclude future examination of how underspends should be used. In addition, it was possible that investment made now in the economy could help establish a situation where funding became available to be re-invested in youth services in the future.

**RESOLVED:**

That, in accordance with Procedure Rule 12(g)(ii) of Part 4D of the Council's Constitution (City Mayor and Executive Procedure Rules), the call-in of the Executive decision taken by the City Mayor on 10 July 2017 regarding the Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016/17 be withdrawn by this Committee.

| Action   | By                  |
|--|---------------------|
| The Executive decision taken by the City Mayor on 10 July 2017 regarding the Revenue Budget Monitoring Outturn 2016/17 to be implemented as set out in that decision | Director of Finance |

*Councillor Dr Moore left the meeting at this point.*

## 22. QUESTIONS FOR THE CITY MAYOR

### a) Visitor Numbers at King Richard III Visitor Centre

Councillor Porter stated that a recent article in the Leicester Mercury identified that 30million people visited Leicester and Leicestershire during the last year, which the City Mayor had attributed to improvements in the city and to the King Richard III Visitor Centre. He asked the City Mayor why, in view of this, only 100,000 of these visitors had gone to the King Richard III Visitor Centre and, in view of the comparatively low number of visitors, should consideration be given to reducing the admission price?

In reply, the City Mayor suggested that the figures quoted in the newspaper article should be treated with caution. The Visitor Centre was run by an independent trust, so the Council did not decide matters such as admission prices, but the number of people visiting the Centre was pleasing and those going there did secondary spending in local businesses.

He further noted that there was no doubt that the Visitor Centre was boosting the local economy significantly. This could be evidenced in a number of ways, such as the unprecedented number of hotels currently being built in the city.

The City Mayor drew Members' attention to the Lonely Planet guide, which described the King Richard III Visitor Centre as one of 20 "must see" attractions world-wide. This was an excellent tribute to the Centre and those who managed it.

### b) St Margaret's Bus Station

Councillor Cank asked the City Mayor if, in view of the increasing number of visitors coming to Leicester, consideration could be given to updating St Margaret's Bus Station, as it was becoming run-down.

The City Mayor agreed that the new Haymarket Bus Station showed that the St Margaret's Bus Station needed refreshing. There was considerable movement between the two bus stations, so the possibility of providing a more direct and visually appealing pedestrian link between them was being investigated.

### c) Children's Services

Councillor Cutkelvin noted that the recent Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) inspection of Children's Services confirmed that they were improving, but that further improvement was required. She asked the City Mayor to outline the key priorities for taking these services forward.

The City Mayor congratulated all involved in the great improvement in these services, expressing his gratitude to the very skilled and dedicated officers working to achieve this. He also thanked the Children, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission for its support and constructive criticism, noting that it was very rare for services to improve as much as they had done between

Ofsted inspections.

On behalf of the Overview Select Committee, the Chair endorsed these comments, welcoming the work and support that had enabled this to be achieved.

**d) Adult Social Care**

Questions from Councillor Cleaver on behalf of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission:

- The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission had noted the successful work done through the Better Care Fund in terms of improving hospital discharge back to the community for older people. The Commission asked that steps be taken to ensure that this success was recognised and built on when the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) was brought into effect, and that the long-term strategic aims remained intact within the STP framework.
- The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission had been advised that a Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust mental health assessment action plan needed to be completed. The lack of an action plan was considered to be a contributory factor in delays in completing health assessments, so could the completion of the plan preparation be considered a matter of urgency, with reports on the outcomes from the plan being presented to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission and the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission?
- The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission had been advised that there was a view that people in Leicester could be very poor at managing their own health and wellbeing. This raised the question of whether it would be useful to have a joint Council and health services campaign aimed at getting people to be aware of, and act on, the behaviours which impacted on their health and lives.
- The Council had had to pause a number of housing projects that catered for specialised needs, because the government had put them at risk through its announcements on the Local Housing Allowance (LHA). The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission therefore asked that the Council urge the government to stop delaying announcements on LHA levels and to lobby so that any announcement would allow this, and other local authorities, to build the supported and sheltered homes they needed, as these schemes would allow more people to live independent or semi-independent lives in the community, rather than in institutional care.

Councillor Cleaver also noted that government cuts had led to the need to seek ways in which local communities could help each other. She therefore asked the City Mayor to consider ways in which volunteering could be encouraged. For example, graduates in relevant disciplines could be encouraged to gain experience by visiting and/or assisting people in need.



The City Mayor expressed his support for the views of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission and those expressed by Councillor Cleaver. He stated that he felt the current situation to be disgraceful and there was a need to engage with voluntary workers and other agencies. He also suggested that he would welcome further discussions with Councillor Cleaver on these matters.

**e) City Heritage**

Councillor Unsworth asked the City Mayor to join him in thanking the Leicester Mercury for highlighting the history of the city. Leicester was a diverse city and the historical information provided by the newspaper, along with the information contained on the panels being erected around the city, showed the city's culture of tolerance and commitment to others.

The City Mayor agreed that the Leicester Mercury had, for a long time, been important in letting people know what was happening in the city. He congratulated the newspaper on their work that it did reminding people of the rich history of the city. In particular, the Mr Leicester pages made a significant contribution to this, highlighting local history and making it relevant to local people with well-informed and well-illustrated articles. The commitment maintained to the city, despite changes to the newspaper, was welcomed.

**23. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING**

The Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance gave a presentation providing an overview of emergency planning and management, a copy of which had been circulated with the agenda.

The Director drew particular attention to the following points:

- The definition of a major incident was used nationally;
- The Local Resilience Forum (LRF) was a multi-agency partnership of various different category responders. It was not a legal entity and had no powers to direct its members. However, there was a legal duty for all partners to plan and prepare together;
- Membership of the Forum included a military representative, who could access specialist equipment and resources;
- The Local Authority Resilience Partnership (LARP) was comprised of local authorities working together to ensure that best use was made of their combined resources;
- Financial contributions made by the members of the LRF facilitated the employment of both a Co-ordinator and administrative officer to support the Partnership;
- Leicester City Council contributed £33,000 per annum to the LRF. This had remained at the same level for a number of years, in recognition of the

importance of this partnership working;

- In addition to the contribution to the LRF, the City Council funded a full-time resilience officer to support the City Council's Resilience Manager and a full-time administrative officer. District authorities provided funding to Leicestershire County Council, which was used towards the costs of employing a number of resilience officers;
- There currently were approximately 200 emergency centre volunteers and managers;
- The Council held a list of buildings designated as emergency centres, but different ones were used depending on the location and nature of individual incidents;
- The recovery phase after incidents could be long. Good practice was to initiate recovery at the outset of an incident;
- A database had been compiled that helped to identify some of the most vulnerable people in the community. A Vulnerable Persons Plan also had been drawn up, which recognised that although they could need some assistance, vulnerable people could still be able to help themselves to some degree in an emergency;
- Decisions on whether to deploy armed Police in response to security threats was a decision for the Police to take
- Following major incidents, such as those recently experienced in London, regular contact was made with resilience workers in the areas affected. This enabled everyone to be aware of the implications of particular threat levels and if there was anything specific to individual local authority areas;
- Emergency planning and management fell within the City Mayor's and Deputy City Mayor's portfolios;
- Members were welcome to visit the emergency control room located in City Hall; and
- Both the Forum and the Partnership were becoming increasingly robust, due to the high level of commitment to them across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.

AGREED:

- 1) That the presentation on emergency planning and management be received and noted;
- 2) That the Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance be asked to arrange a visit for interested Councillors to the emergency control room located in City Hall; and

- 3) That Councillors be invited to contact the Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance to let her know if they are interested in observing a simulated exercise, so that one can be arranged at a suitable time.

| Action  | By   |
|---|--|
| A visit to the emergency control room located in City Hall to be arranged for interested Councillors                                      | Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance                      |
| Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance to be advised if Councillors wish to observe a simulated emergency exercise | All Councillors  |
| If sufficient interest is shown by Councillors in observing a simulated exercise, one to be arranged at a suitable time                   | Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance / Resilience Manager |

#### 24. SCRUTINY COMMISSIONS' WORK PROGRAMMES

##### a) **The New Bus Services Act 2017 and the impacts to local bus services provision**

Councillor Khote, Chair of the Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Scrutiny Commission, presented the scoping document for this review, advising that it was due to be considered at the Commission's meeting on 12 October 2017.

This legislation would enable the Council to advise bus operators what routes and fares the Council wished to see provided.

AGREED:

That the scoping document "The New Bus Services Act 2017 and the impacts to local bus services provision" be endorsed.

##### b) **The Role of Arts and Culture in delivering health and wellbeing outcomes**

Councillor Unsworth presented the report of the above review, making the following points:

- This review had been hosted by the Heritage, Culture, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny Commission, with major contributions from members of the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission;

- The review arose from concern that ways needed to be found to support vulnerable people in the community at a time when resources were being eroded;
- Linking with the arts and culture could help generate feelings of wellbeing through achievement, but also through creating things; and
- All Scrutiny Commission Chairs were asked to work with the Assistant City Mayors to incorporate the findings of this review in to their work, as it was important to remove the stigma of mental health issues, which it was known could prevent people seeking timely help.

The following points were made in discussion:

- The report was welcomed, but there was concern that government expenditure on physical health currently was much higher than that on mental health;
- The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Sustainability and Transformation Plan for health services was being developed at present. Mental health would be considered as part of this;
- A number of local arts organisations and groups were finding it hard to get funding to support themselves, which could impact on the availability of arts and culture activities for those seeking to use these resources for health and wellbeing reasons;
- Arts and culture also were important in reducing social isolation. This needed to be reflected in all services, including those relating specifically to health;
- All services, whether provided by the Council or other bodies, needed to find ways of working together to ensure that good practice was spread and continued; and
- Restricted financial resources could make it difficult to find any funding needed to implement the recommendations of the review, but ways should be sought of facilitating and encouraging their implementation. For example, consideration could be given to whether currently empty buildings could be used to stage exhibitions.

AGREED:

That the report of the review “The Role of Arts and Culture in delivering health and wellbeing outcomes” be endorsed.

## **25. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

AGREED:

That the work programme for the Overview Select Committee be noted.

**26. PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

AGREED:

That the Plan of Key Decisions be noted.

**27. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 8.07 pm





# Minute Item 21

## MINUTE EXTRACT

Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SCHOOLS SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: TUESDAY, 22 AUGUST 2017 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T:  
Councillor Dr Moore (Chair)

Councillor Chohan  
Councillor Malik

Councillor Riyait  
Councillor Willmott

Co-opted Members (Voting):  
Mr Gerry Hirst Roman Catholic Diocese

In Attendance:  
Councillor Russell – Assistant City Mayor, Children Young People & Schools

Also Present:  
Ms Rabiha Hannan Muslim Faith Representative

\* \* \* \* \*

### **17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Aldred, Councillor Cole and Mr Al-Azad.

### **18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were asked to declare any interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

There were no declarations of interest.

### **25. CALL-IN OF DECISION - YOUTH SERVICE REMODELLING**

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report relating to the Call-In of Executive Decision: Youth Service Remodelling. The decision had been called-in under Part 4D, Rule 12f of the Council's constitution and subsequently the matter had been referred to the Commission.

The Commission were recommended to:

- a) Comment on the specific issues raised by the call-in, for forwarding to the next meeting of full Council on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017;
- b) Resolve that the call-in be withdrawn;
- c) Note the report, which would have the effect of rolling the call-in forward to Council without comment.

The sponsor Councillor Willmott confirmed that the call-in was not being withdrawn.

The Chair invited the sponsor Councillor Willmott to address the Committee which included the following points:

- At the last meeting the Commission agreed to request the executive to reconsider the proposals for Youth Service Remodelling yet a few days later the decision was published and that did not mention or address any of the concerns that were raised at the scrutiny meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017,
- There was concern about the decision and due process being followed. It was felt there should be consideration by the Executive of the Commissions comments and an acknowledgement that they had considered that,
- It remained a concern that whilst option 2 was the recommended proposal for the revised model it was still a 50% reduction in youth services of the council, as well as a reduction of 1-1 support and a reduction in youth street work across the whole of the city,
- At the last Commission meeting the point was made that when the review of Youth Services was commissioned the department was not aware that for the 6<sup>th</sup> year running there would be a £7.5million underspend in the budget which it was acknowledged was not a one off underspend,
- There had been no discussion politically of what the £7.5million underspends could be used against and on enquiring with officers members were told there was no allocation for those monies yet. There should be discussion in full Council – as that was the only forum that could affect/review budget decisions – and it ought to be members who suggested what that should be spent on.

Councillor Russell, the Assistant City Mayor for Children, Young People and Schools explained that it had been intended to update scrutiny on the decision taken albeit the decision had now been called-in. Responding to the concerns that the comments of the commission had not been considered she explained that the decision taken did include some changes following comments as well as recognition of the contribution from youth representatives at the last meeting. In terms of where the £7.5million underspend was to be spent this was to be allocated to the Economic Action Plan as agreed and minuted by the Overview Select Committee, although that was now subject of a call-in too.

Members of the commission discussed the call-in further which included the following comments:



- There were strong concerns about 50% cuts being made to the youth service which would put that service in jeopardy, as well as the unknown actual impact of that level of cuts on existing staff,
- The decision would fundamentally weaken the youth service and it was questionable whether the service would be able to deliver on the aims as set out in proposals,
- The remodelling and budget savings decision had been taken together without a wider discussion about what we want the youth service to look like moving forward,
- Concerns had been raised by members of the community and people were speaking out about the cuts to the youth service,
- At the time of making the budget decision members did not know of the underspend or additional monies becoming available (*in Adult Social Care*) which must surely impact on the overall budget, therefore members should have an opportunity to reassess and set priorities.
- The political environment had changed and proposals should at least be delayed until the budget statement in autumn to see the overall budget envelope.

Councillor Russell commented that any wider discussion would need to be understanding of the full breadth of issues across the council. It was important to note that there was a flourishing young people's council and the service wanted to continue with youth participation as far as possible.

The Chair thanked members for their contributions and surmised that based on the discussion that had occurred previously and the comments made today the Commission were not going to resolve to withdraw the call-in.

The Commission were agreed that there should be a wider discussion on the cuts proposed to youth services with more examination of that and a wider discussion of how budgets were deployed. The Commission were also in agreement that Council should reconsider the decision made and revisit the budget.

The Chair confirmed that the call-in would proceed to Council and Council would be asked to consider the Commissions comments.

AGREED:

That the report be noted and that Council be asked to consider the Commission's comments outlined above at the next full Council meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017.

