Call-in Reasons for Rejection

A call-in request relating to the Early Help Redesign proposals: https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=1320 was considered and rejected by the Monitoring Officer. The members requesting the call-in were provided with a full response.

The Children and Young People's Services Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the reasons for the rejection of the call-in request as set out below.

Reasons for rejection

The Monitoring Officer confirms that the request for a call-in of the decision of the Cabinet in relation to the Early Help Redesign (CAB02 21/22) received on 5 August 2021 has been rejected.

The key factors in determining whether to accept a call-in request as outlined in Standing Orders are as follows:

- 1. The item has already been considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee
- 2. Significant new information has become available since previous Scrutiny Committee consideration;
- 3. It is a decision that the Committee can or would expect to preview;
- 4. A delay in making the decision would be likely to significantly damage the interests of the County Council.

Monitoring Officer's Assessment

I have considered the content and grounds given for call-in and the information considered by the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet ahead of the decision taken on 27 July 2021. I have assessed these against the factors for determining whether to accept a call-in as set out above and in Standing Orders.

The matter has been previously considered by the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee on two occasions, with the committee's considered recommendations in relation to the plans for the implementation of the proposal being presented to Cabinet in a written report. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee addressed the Cabinet at its meeting in public on 27 July 2021 and the two leaders of the minority groups also submitted statements to the Cabinet. In light of the above it cannot be reasonably asserted that the Cabinet was not fully aware of the output of the Scrutiny Committee and the views expressed by minority group members. The matter was subject to full and timely scrutiny.

The call-in request referred to new information coming to light since scrutiny, namely members being made aware of the reaction to the decision by vulnerable families. The reaction of residents to the proposal, especially given the extensive public consultation which generated such public views, does not amount to new information. There is no evidence of new information arising since the proposals were considered by the Scrutiny Committee on 20 July.

There is nothing to suggest delay to the implementation of the decision would be likely to cause significant damage to the interests of the Council. There is however a timetable for next steps including staff consultation and a referral for further scrutiny would delay those steps and would disrupt plans for the

implementation of the decision. Delay would be better avoided but would not cause significant damage to the Council's interests.

There were further grounds highlighted in the call-in request that fall outside of the factors that need to be taken into consideration when assessing if a call-in is accepted or rejected. These were addressed in the response provided to those supporting the call-in request and did not provide any or sufficiently compelling grounds for a call in of the decision.

For the above reasons I conclude that the request should be rejected as having not provided any reasonable grounds for further consideration by the Scrutiny Committee.

The call-in request is therefore declined.