# Record of individual Cabinet member decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

| | |
|---|---|
| **Decision made by** | Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of Vale of White Horse District Council |
| **Key decision?** | Yes |
| **Date of decision** (same as date form signed) | 21 November 2022 |
| **Name and job title of officer requesting the decision** | Nick King, Economic Development Manager |
| **Officer contact details** | Tel: 07801 203545<br>Email: nick.king@southandvale.gov.uk |
| **Decision** | To approve submission of the Rural England Prosperity Fund (REPF), as an addendum to the council's UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) three-year investment plan. |
| **Reasons for decision** | Subject to approval by HM Government, submission of the addendum will enable the Council to unlock £528,032 of funding to be distributed as capital grants. The funding would be used to provide capital funding support to rural businesses and communities as described within the addendum. |
| **Alternative options rejected** | Do not file an addendum, and do not claim funding through the REPF scheme. |
| **Climate and ecological implications** | Individual projects are neither decided or detailed at this stage, but the addendum outlines that the council will be selecting intervention options that will enable capital grants to support rural businesses and communities in the following areas, that would support the Council's climate objectives:<br><br>• capital funding for net zero infrastructure for rural businesses, including the adoption of low carbon tech.<br>• capital grants to support development of business infrastructure such as EV charging points.<br>• equipment to support the showcasing of local food and drink products.<br>• provision of net zero infrastructure for rural communities and to support rural tourism activity: EV Chargers, Community Energy |

| | |
|---|---|
| | schemes<br>• Funding for resilience infrastructure and nature-based solutions that protect local businesses and community areas from natural hazards<br><br>In the event that funding is confirmed, the climate action team will be consulted to ensure that grant fund criterion is strongly aligned with the Council's climate objectives. |
| **Legal implications** | • Funding acceptance would be subject to a memorandum of understanding. A draft MOU has not yet been circulated by DEFRA.<br>• Legal advice would also be sought to ensure the scheme is delivered in line with appropriate subsidy legislation, and in relation to the drafting of an appropriate grant agreement template. (This would only proceed once funding is confirmed by HM Government). |
| **Financial implications** | • The indicative budget outlined in our REPF addendum has been agreed by the Council's Section 151 Officer ahead of submission.<br>• The indicative budget outlines to HM Government how the fund would be targeted in Vale over the two years of the scheme (2023 to 2025).<br>• No administrative budget has been made available by Government to deliver the scheme, aside from a four per-cent allocation attributed to UKSPF that would amount to a £40,000 administrative budget for UKSPF and REPF combined (total budget £1,528,032) over the three-year duration planned for the schemes.<br>• It is anticipated that to effectively deliver the scheme (in combination with UKSPF) additional staff resources will be required beyond those funded directly by the scheme.<br>• An action plan outlining how the scheme will be implemented will be developed following confirmation of funding from Government. |
| **Other implications** | • If funding is confirmed, programme rollout would be subject to a completed equality impact assessment.<br>• The risk assessment for this scheme will be encompassed within the previously compiled risk assessment for UKSPF.<br>• It should be noted that there are multiple challenges and opportunities in areas of our rural economy and communities that do not form a focus of our REPF plans, this is largely due to the limited budget available for the scheme. An audit trail detailing why all interventions not included were excluded will be maintained.<br>• The scheme is high profile with rural stakeholders, and there is a reputational risk for the council if funding is not granted / made available.<br>• It should also be noted that the addendum focuses on a narrow subset of interventions that have been highlighted as priorities through stakeholder consultation and evidence reviews. On this basis, managing wider stakeholder expectations regarding the availability of the funding will be key to limit any reputational damage to the council. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • Economic Development will consult with Officers from the Council's Grants, Infrastructure Development, and External Funding teams explore how the fund can be leveraged to gain or support existing funding available directly through the council and via external sources. | | | |
| **Background papers considered** | • REPF Vale Draft Addendum<br>• REPF Prospectus | | | |
| **Declarations/ conflict of interest? Declaration of other councillor/ officer consulted by the Cabinet member?** | | | | |
| **List consultees** | | **Name** | **Outcome** | **Date** |
| | Cabinet Member | Cllr Neil Fawcett | Agreed | 17/11/22 |
| | Legal legal@southandvale.gov.uk | Christine Cox | Agreed (with comments addressed) | 17/11/22 |
| | Finance Finance@southandvale.gov.uk | Donna Ross | Agreed | 17/11/22 |
| | Human resources hradminandpayroll@southandvale.gov.uk | N/A | No comments received at time of decision. | N/A |
| | Climate and biodiversity climateaction@southandvale.gov.uk | Kim Hall | Fully support filing addendums | 17/11/22 |
| | Diversity and equality equalities@southandvale.gov.uk | Lynne Mitchell | Supportive – great to see that it's been recognised that an EIA will need to be completed should we get funding and prior to rollout | 14/11/22 |
| | Health and safety healthandsafety@southandvale.gov.uk | N/A | No comments received at time of decision. | N/A |
| | Risk and insurance risk@southandvale.gov.uk | N/A | No comments received at time of decision. | N/A |
| | Communications communications@southandvale.gov.uk | Emma East | Agreed | 14/11/22 |
| **Confidential decision?** If so, under which exempt category? | No | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee chairman?** | N/A |
| **Has this been discussed by Cabinet members?** | Yes. |
| **Cabinet portfolio holder's signature**<br>To confirm the decision as set out in this notice. | Signature _____Emily Smith_____<br><br>Date _____21/11/22_____ |

## ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.

| For Democratic Services office use only | | |
|---|---|---|
| Form received | Date: 21 November 2022 | Time: 15:07 |
| Date published to all councillors | Date: 21 November 2022 | |
| Call-in deadline | Date: 28 November 2022 | Time: 17:00 |

## Guidance notes

1. This form must be completed by the lead officer who becomes the contact officer. The lead officer is responsible for ensuring that the necessary internal consultees have signed it off, including the chief executive. The lead officer must then seek the Cabinet portfolio holder's agreement and signature.

2. Once satisfied with the decision, the Cabinet portfolio holder must hand-sign and date the form and return it to the lead officer who should send it to Democratic Services immediately to allow the call-in period to commence.
   Tel. 01235 422520 or extension 2520.
   Email: democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk

3. Democratic Services will then publish the decision to the website (unless it is confidential) and send it to all councillors to commence the call-in period (five clear working days) if it is a 'key' decision (see the definition of a 'key' decision below). A key decision cannot be implemented until the call-in period expires. The call-in procedure can be found in the council's constitution, part 4, under the Scrutiny Committee procedure rules.

4. Before implementing a key decision, the lead officer is responsible for checking with Democratic Services that the decision has not been called in.

5. If a key decision has been called in, Democratic Services will notify the lead officer and decision-maker. This call-in puts the decision on hold.

6. Democratic Services will liaise with the Scrutiny Committee chairman over the date of the call-in debate. The Cabinet portfolio holder will be requested to attend the Scrutiny Committee meeting to answer the committee's questions.

7. The Scrutiny Committee may:
   - refer the decision back to the Cabinet portfolio holder for reconsideration or
   - refer the matter to Council with an alternative set of proposals (where the final decision rests with full Council) or
   - accept the Cabinet portfolio holder's decision, in which case it can be implemented immediately.

# Key decisions: assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key'

The South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils' Constitutions now have the same definition of a key decision:

**A key decision is a decision of the Cabinet, an individual Cabinet member, or an officer acting under delegated powers, which is likely:**

**(a) to incur expenditure, make savings or to receive income of more than £75,000;**

**(b) to award a revenue or capital grant of over £25,000; or**
**(c) to agree an action that, in the view of the chief executive or relevant head of service, would be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward in the area of the council.**

Key decisions are subject to the scrutiny call-in procedure; non-key decisions are not and can be implemented immediately.

In assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key', you should consider:

(a) Will the expenditure, savings or income total more than £75,000 across all financial years?

(b) Will the grant award to one person or organisation be more that £25,000 across all financial years?

(c) Does the decision impact on more than one district council ward? And if so, is the impact significant? If residents or property affected by the decision is in one ward but is close to the border of an adjacent ward, it may have a significant impact on that second ward, e.g. through additional traffic, noise, light pollution, odour. Examples of significant impacts on two or more wards are:

- Decisions to spend Didcot Garden Town funds (significant impact on more than one ward)
- Changes to the household waste collection policy (affects all households in the district)
- Reviewing a housing strategy (could have a significant impact on residents in many wards)
- Adopting a supplementary planning document for a redevelopment site (could significantly affect more than one ward) or a new design guide (affects all wards)
- Decisions to build new or improve existing leisure facilities (used by residents of more than one ward)

**The overriding principle is that before 'key' decisions are made, they must be published in the Cabinet Work Programme for 28 calendar days. Classifying a decision as non-key when it should be a key decision could expose the decision to challenge and delay its implementation.**