

## Form to call in a decision – please complete all fields marked \*

If you require any assistance, please contact Democratic Services on 020 8541 9122.

### Your Details

First Name \*

Surname \*

Decision-making body \*

- |   |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cabinet | <input type="checkbox"/> Runnymede    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elmbridge          | <input type="checkbox"/> Spelthorne   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Epsom & Ewell      | <input type="checkbox"/> Surrey Heath |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Guildford          | <input type="checkbox"/> Tandridge    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mole Valley        | <input type="checkbox"/> Waverley     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reigate            | <input type="checkbox"/> Woking       |

Decision taken \*

MAGNA CARTA ANNIVERSARY (Item 12)

1. The outline Partnership Masterplan as set out in paragraphs 10 to 19.
2. Additional project funding support, comprising of £700,000 capital funding for the legacy programme and £300,000 revenue funding for the events programme, to be factored into the refresh of the Medium Term Financial Plan.
3. A major bid will be made to the Heritage Lottery Fund to contribute to the Magna Carta programme.
4. To delegate the financial oversight of the Partnership Masterplan to the Leader of the Council, with implementation by the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

Date decision taken \*

Reason(s) for calling in the decision

That despite a paper being presented to Communities Select Committee, this item lacks scrutiny and lacks detail or clarity in the proposals, in that:

1. The Cabinet Member, Assistant Chief Executive and Programme Lead Magna Carta were not present at the meeting of the Communities Select Committee to answer members' concerns and questions.
2. That the concerns raised by the Communities Select Committee and appearing as item 5b on the Cabinet agenda were not considered by the Cabinet. Being:
  - i. the receipt by the Committee of the financial information concerning these proposals on the day of the Select Committee meeting, which made it difficult for them to scrutinise the proposals in light of the financial information,
  - ii. the capacity of the highways budget to cover the costs of works required in the area to complement the celebration proposals

- iii. the absence of a detailed business case justifying the expenditure by the County Council of £1.2m (in addition to the highways provision) on these proposals at a time when there is considerable pressure on the Council's resources,
- iv. the absence of information on projected visitor numbers,
- v. the absence of detailed assessments on the impact of these proposals to include economic, environmental, and equality,
- vi. the absence of a detailed explanation of the concept ideas and events planning behind the proposals including the necessity for a new commission in the landscape,
- vii. the lack of private sponsorship committed to these plans,
- viii. that the estimated £200,000 annual staffing costs for this project, from existing resources, could potentially delay achievement of proposed efficiency savings elsewhere in the Council.

In addition the following concerns raised by some members:

- i. the report to Cabinet does not make it clear that the County Council previously withdrew its financial support of up to £5m to fund a new visitor centre in Runnymede to mark the 800th anniversary,
  - ii. the economic and health information used to support the proposals is incomplete and does not compare the Egham statistics with neighbouring areas as a means of benchmarking,
  - iii. whether the proposed changes to the highways in the area would provide adequate infrastructure to support the celebration proposals,
  - iv. the need for better assurances that the proposals will be a joint venture including Runnymede, Spelthorne, and Windsor and Maidenhead Councils.
3. That the concerns raised by the Section 151 Officer under paragraph 33 of the report to Cabinet were not discussed at Cabinet.
4. That the report by consultants was not available for consideration.

#### Desired outcome

That the Communities Select Committee reconsiders the item with the Cabinet Member and responsible officers present and if necessary requests the Cabinet to reverse those decisions that it considers have not been fully considered, are too ill defined in their scope and therefore not suitable for approval for expenditure.

#### Identified evidence

Item 5b of Cabinet Agenda with comments from Communities Select Committee. Note of apologies by Cabinet Member to Communities Select Committee and of officers available to give evidence. Video of discussion of item at Cabinet to note lack of consideration of items listed above.

Desired Witnesses

Cabinet Member for Communities and Events. Assistant Chief Executive.  
Section 151 Officer. Programme Lead Magna Carta.

**Member calling in decision**

1. Member \*
- Date of call-in
2. Member
3. Member
4. Member

Committee responsible for examining this decision

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cabinet                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communities  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Council Overview & Scrutiny | <input type="checkbox"/> Education               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Social Care           | <input type="checkbox"/> Environment & Transport |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Children & Families         | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Scrutiny         |