

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE PANEL REPORT

Wards Affected: All	Type of Report: Call-in
Author Name: Wendy Vincent	Consultations:
Tel: 01553 616377	
Email: Wendy Vincent@west-norfolk.gov.uk	
OPEN	Portfolio: Leader

Committee: Corporate Performance Panel
Date: 5 April 2023
Subject: Call-in of Officer Delegated Decision – Shared Prosperity Funding for King’s Lynn Bid Ltd ‘The Place’ Project

Summary

This report deals with the Officers Delegated Decision advertised on 17 March 2023. The deadline for call-in was 31 March 2023

The decision has been called-in and the Chief Executive has determined that the call-in is valid.

The report outlines to Members how the call-in process may be used in this case and what the issues are relating to the matter.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 An Officers Delegated Decision was advertised on 17 March 2023 with a deadline for call-in of 31 March 2023. A copy of the report is attached at Appendix 1.

2 Grounds for Call-In

- 2.1 Standing Order 12.3 (d) requires grounds to be given for calling-in a Cabinet Members delegated decision, reasons given are set out below.

3 Call-in Requisition

- 3.1 The Call in was made by Councillor C Morley and supported by Councillors T Parish, C Hudson, J Ratcliffe, J Rust and S Squire

Councillor Morley called in the decision as follows:

Whilst the Council has endorsed the criteria for securing the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, I am of the firm opinion that individual allocations should be open to scrutiny. Allocation of funds to "The Place" and Kings Lynn Bid Ltd is one such case. Furthermore, I now believe funding from the Community Fund needs retrospective examination.

To me some obvious questions need to be answered, such as, and in no particular order:

1. Both The Bank House and Sainsburys are Directors of Kings Lynn Bid Ltd. Have they offered matching contributions?
2. Graham Robin Middleton, Councillor, is named as an active Director yet not mentioned in the register of interests, having signed off the delegated authority.
3. Is there evidence that "The Place" needs this funding? The unaudited financial statement posted by Kings Lynn Bid Ltd for 31/3/22 states " the directors of the company have elected not to include a copy of the income and expenditure accounts within the financial statements", yet the Company has net assets of £198,677? Can they not afford their own energy bills? I am sure many households in West Norfolk would wish to understand they have to fund this company when their own families are suffering.
4. Can we see some form of business accounts from "The Place". In particular, why are some services charged and others not? What is the basis of these charges, cost or market prices.
5. Are some customers merely getting a free ride? Or, as it claims in the Paper - "equality of access"- when some could afford to pay.
6. What evidence is there that this proposition within "The Place" is a harbinger of success for the White Barn? To me, this request seems to throw even more doubt about the business case for the White Barn within the Guildhall Project - say no more at this stage.

3 Validity of Call-in

- 3.1 The Chief Executive has made the following ruling:

The call-in is valid in respect of Standing Orders 12.3 and 12.4 (a) to (h) has not fairly taken into account the views of Members requesting the call-in.

4 Call-in Process

- 4.1 Standing Orders 15.33 and 15.34 sets out the call-in debating procedure, as follows:

15.33 On receiving valid notice of a call-in under Standing Order 12, the Corporate Performance Panel should follow the steps outlined below (a-f) in debating the subject matter:

(a) The Proposer of the call-in and their supporters address the Corporate Performance Panel about the call-in and why it should be upheld;

(b) The Panel Members receive a submission from the relevant Portfolio Holder;

(c) The Panel Members receive submissions from Officers;

(d) The Panel Members receive submissions from members and, at the discretion of the Chair, other interested parties.

(e) The Panel debates the call-in (in accordance with this Standing Order) during which they may question or seek further information from any of the four parties referred to in (a), (b), (c) and (d) above.

(f) The Proposer shall exercise a right of reply after the debate.

15.34 Following the debate, the Panel will decide (in Accordance with Standing Order 12) either to support the Cabinet/Officer's/Cabinet Member's recommendation(s)/decision(s), or, to uphold the call in.

4.2 If the Panel upholds the call-in it may then take one of three courses of action in accordance with Standing Order 12.9:

(a) report to Council, Cabinet or the relevant Cabinet Member or officer requesting that the Cabinet/Cabinet Member or officer amend or substitute the recommendation(s) or decision(s); or,

(b) if the issue is considered urgent or straightforward, formulate a counter-recommendation or amendment; or,

(c) investigate the matter further at another meeting within thirty working days (beginning with the day after the issue of the notification of the call-in) and then follow the same process as set out above.

4.3 If the Corporate Performance Panel:

(a) does not end the call-in within 30 days from the date of the decision which has been called in (and the recommendation or decision remains in dispute); or

(b) refers a call-in directly to Council under paragraph 12, the Council shall determine whether to approve the recommendation or decision that has been called-in or to revoke, vary, amend and/or remit it back to the Cabinet/Cabinet Member/officer for further consideration.