

CALL-IN REQUEST

We, the under-signed, hereby request that the Scrutiny Committee review the decisions made by the Cabinet on Friday 1 June 2012 in Minute CA.7 relating to the Capital grants Scheme, as we believe that they do not comply with the principles set out in Article 13 of the Constitution, specifically:

An explanation of the options that were considered before a decision was taken, and the reasons for that decision –

- a) Scrutiny Committee reviewed the details of the scheme at its meeting on 24 May and recommended, after a thorough discussion of the terms and conditions and a useful suggestion from the Leader of the Council that the word “normally” should be included in the criteria, that the scheme eligibility criteria should be amended to read ‘*applications will normally be considered if organisations/projects meet the following eligibility criteria...*’. We are unclear why Cabinet has decided not to follow the Leader’s suggestion and has deleted the word “normally”.
- b) Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 May considered three options for distributing the available funding of £100,000 between the four area committees in 2012/13:
 - **Option 1** - dividing the available budget by four (the number of area committees).
 - **Option 2** - allocating funds on a per councillor basis
 - **Option 3** - calculating the number of parishes x £525 and the number of electors x 60 pence in each area

The Scrutiny Committee strongly preferred budget allocation option 2: funds to be allocated to area committees on a per councillor basis (10 votes), over option 3 (2 votes) and option 1 (no votes). The scrutiny committee felt that as each councillor had approximately the same number of electors this would distribute funding on an equal *per capita* basis.

We note that “Cabinet preferred budget allocation option 3, as this brought greater equality than the other options, ensuring a more even distribution across all four areas “. We therefore seek a more detailed explanation as to why the Scrutiny Committee’s strong recommendation was ignored.

The social, economic, and environmental well-being of the community and proportionality ie the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome

We note that Cabinet decided to distribute the grants budget between the four area committees by calculating the number of parishes in each area committee’s area x £525 and the number of electors x 60 pence in each area. We are concerned that Cabinet may not have realised that the Abingdon Area only contains 4 parishes (Abingdon, Drayton, Sutton Courtenay and Appleford) and so will now receive the smallest allocation of all the areas despite having significantly more residents, as shown by the table below :

	Abingdon	North East	South East	West	Total
No. of parishes	4	15	26	23	68
No. of electors	27916	20245	24580	16023	88764
£525 per parish (£)	£2,100	£7,875	£13,650	£12,075	£35,700
60p per elector (£)	£16,750	£12,147	£14,748	£9,614	£53,258
Total per area (£)	£18,850	£20,022	£28,398	£21,689	£88,958
Percentage of Grant	21.2%	22.5%	31.9%	24.4%	100.0%
Percentage of electorate	31.4%	22.8%	27.7%	18.1%	100.0%

Cllr Jim Halliday, Cllr Tony de Vere, Cllr Andy Crawford, Cllr Julie Mayhew-Archer