

CALL IN REQUEST

Date of decision publication: **20th October 2023**

Delegated decision ref: **N/A**

Executive Board Minute no: **Minute no. 49, Executive Board 18th October 2023**

Decision description: **Future of six high rise and resident rehousing - Bailey and Brooklands Towers, Ramshead Heights, Leafield Towers, Raynville Court and Grange**

Discussion with Decision Maker:

Prior to submitting a Call In, a nominated signatory must first contact the relevant officer or Executive Member to discuss their concerns and their reasons for wanting to call in the decision. Part of this discussion must include the Member ascertaining the financial implications of requesting a Call In.

Please identify contact and provide detail.

- Director/author of delegated decision report.
- Executive Board Member

Detail of discussion (to include financial implications)

Cllr Barry Anderson spoke with James Rogers (Director), Gerard Tinsdale (Chief Officer), and Cllr Jessica Lennox (Executive Member) on 20th October. He outlined the reasons for the call-in, which are set out in more detail in the section below.

It was confirmed there were no financial implications of calling in the decision.

Reasons for Call In:

All requests for Call In must detail why, in the opinion of the signatories, the decision was not taken in accordance with the principles set out in Article 13 of the Council constitution (decision making) (principles of decision making) or where relevant issues do not appear to be taken into consideration. *Please tick the relevant box(es) and give an explanation.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Proportionality (ie the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respect for human rights
<input type="checkbox"/>	A presumption in favour of openness
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clarity of aims and desired outcomes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	An explanation of the options considered and details of the reasons for the decision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive promotion of equal opportunities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Natural justice

We understand the need to take action at these sites due to the high rise blocks no longer being fit for purpose. However we have the following concerns:

1. Whilst the report notes consultation and engagement with residents, it does not include a full breakdown of the views of residents about the proposals. We think this should be presented more clearly, along with greater detail on the numbers consulted and number of responses, in order to gauge whether the current proposals have the wide support of existing residents.
2. The proposals will result in the loss of 360 units of housing, which will clearly have an impact on the housing register in the context of an already large waiting list of people needing social housing. We do not believe this factor has been sufficiently addressed in the report in terms of the explanation of options considered.
3. The future of these sites is an important aspect, and whilst the report says this will be considered in detail at a later stage we believe this should have happened before beginning the process of clearing the sites. It is vital that the project does not become stalled and that desired outcomes for the sites are properly understood.
4. In terms of what happens to existing residents in the short to medium term, has sufficient consideration been given to options that would allow existing communities to be kept together during the decant process? We also think in general there has been insufficient consideration of alternative options.
5. We also have concerns about the potential negative impact on the Housing Revenue Account. This decision may place unsustainable strain on the HRA as funds will need to be borrowed for capital purposes, while at the same time inward revenue flows will be squeezed, while dwelling numbers are reduced throughout the construction cycles of whatever types of property are subsequently built, for however long that takes, the effects possibly lasting years.

We would ask that the decision is reconsidered in light of the above concerns.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

A Call In request may be made by a **minimum** of:

5 non-executive Members of council from the **same political group**;

or;

2 non-executive Members of council if **they are not from the same political group**.

This Call In request should be submitted to Scrutiny Support, 1st Floor West, Civic Hall by 5.00pm by no later than the fifth working day after the decision publication date. The following signatories (**original signatures only**) request that the above decision be called in.

Nominated Signatory



Print name Councillor Barry Anderson

Political Group Conservative

Signature



Print name Councillor Mark Dobson

Political Group Garforth and Swillington Independents

Signature



Print name Councillor Wayne Dixon

Political Group Social Democratic Party

Signature



Print name Councillor Robert Finnigan

Political Group Morley Borough Independents

Signature



Print name Councillor Diane Chapman

Political Group Liberal Democrats

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Signature.....

Print name

Political Group.....

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Support

For office use only: (box A)

Received on behalf of the Head of Democratic Services by:

Rebecca Atherton

Date: 27.10.23 Time: 10.05am SSU ref: 2023/24 - 78

For office use only: (box B)

Exemption status
checked:

Call In authorised: Yes

Date checked:

Signed: Rebecca Atherton

Signatures checked:

Date: 27.10.23

Receipts given:

Validity re article 13