

## **Requests for Call-in - Reasons for Rejection**

A call-in request relating to the [Residential based in-house services - Marjorie Cobby House, Selsey](#) decision (CAB07 21/22) was considered and rejected by the Monitoring Officer. The members requesting the call-in were provided with a full response.

The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the reasons for the rejection of the call-in request as set out below.

### **1. Reasons for rejection**

- 1.1 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**

#### **2. Previous Scrutiny**

- 2.1 The matter has previously been considered by the relevant scrutiny committee. The Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee received the proposal again and a Task and Finish Group (TFG) was set up to consider the proposal. It was agreed that the Group would report direct to the Cabinet on the output of its deliberations.
- 2.2 The TFG met to consider the matter at a single meeting. The Cabinet Member for Adults' Services and the Executive Director for Adults & Health attended and answered the questions of the TFG. These were recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
- 2.3 The TFG arrived at a set of comments and recommendations. There was no request for the matter to be returned to the full Committee and no comment was made that the TFG had not had the time to consider nor the information it needed to carry out its scrutiny. A summary of its conclusions and recommendations was submitted in writing to the Cabinet Member for Adults' Services and was also sent to the other members of the Cabinet.
- 2.4 The TFG's recommendations on the plans for the implementation of the proposals were presented to the Cabinet at the public meeting of the Cabinet.
- 2.5 The matter has been subject to scrutiny as settled by the relevant scrutiny committee. Although the matter has not been scrutinised by the full Committee the scrutiny arrangements were agreed and supported by the Committee itself.

### **3. New information since scrutiny**

- 3.1 The call-in request refers to the trajectory of the coronavirus pandemic and the pressures on health and social care services as new information. Neither of these relate to information which has come to light since the scrutiny of the proposals. The same must be said for the pressures on care and health services and the particular pressures being faced in the forthcoming Winter. Those were factors which led to a change in the original proposal so that the timing of the implementation of the decision is to be left to the discretion of the Executive Director for Adults & Health. The two considerations which the call-in refers to as new information were in fact fully taken into account when preparing the final proposals for consideration both by the TFG and the Cabinet.

### **4. Expectation of scrutiny**

- 4.1 The question of whether this is a matter the Committee would expect to scrutinise does not need to be further considered as the matter has been scrutinised as arranged by the appropriate committee and its recommendations and comments presented to the Cabinet prior to its decision.

### **5. Urgency and risk to the Council's interests**

- 5.1 The call-in request appears to base the case for what is in the interests of the Council on whether the implementation of the decision is premature because important questions remain unanswered. It states that there are outstanding questions of bed capacity within Marjorie Cobby House, with discussions in the TFG throwing doubt on the assertion that this service is significantly underutilised. The notes of the meeting of the TFG have therefore been reviewed.
- 5.2 The notes include the following extract from the record of discussion dealing with this point:
- 5.3 The following concerns were raised by the Task & Finish Group: -
- The accuracy of data in the report including the lack of detail on length of stay/average occupancy, lack of evidence re under use
- 5.4 The following answers were given by the Executive Director for Adults & Health and Cabinet Member for Adults; Services: -
- Although Marjorie Cobby House has a capacity 34 beds, only 20 can be used due to lack of hoists and turning room for wheelchairs
  - 13 – 15 beds are occupied per month
  - Stays at Marjorie Cobby House are up to six weeks
- 5.5 This appears to show that the specific questions raised by the TFG were answered. It does not appear from the record that there were outstanding questions nor that the level of use of the facility was in doubt. The issue of impact on other service demand and capacity and

whether there was adequate provision to meet need displaced from the facility were also answered at the TFG by the Executive Director for Adults & Health and re-stated at the public Cabinet meeting.

- 5.6 For all of the above reasons I conclude that the request should be rejected as having not provided reasonable grounds for further consideration by the Scrutiny Committee. The decision will therefore take effect in line with the decision taken by the Cabinet.