

## NOTIFICATION OF CALL-IN FOR SUBMISSION TO THE MONITORING OFFICER

|   |   |
|---|---|
| ITEM  |   |
| Decision Maker and Reference Number   | CASINER<br>Schultz & Wellbeing  |
| Date of decision  | 17th March 2016   |
| This notification must state:<br><br>Which decision or which part of a decision is being called in.<br><br>The grounds for the call in as laid out in rule 4.5.16.5 (see overleaf). | Whole<br><br>4.5.16.5a - Under 2.11.1 -- removal of the floating services support in conflict with Corporate Plan Dim 2<br>- failure to take into account SAYPP working timeshand proposals<br><br>c. Decision outside budget & policy framework<br>- failure to relate to Corporate Plan Dim 2<br>- County proposals from SAYPP were not properly considered |
| In accordance with Scrutiny Procedure Rules set out at Part 4, Section 5 of the Constitution we confirm that we wish to call in this decision.                                      |   |
| Signatory   |   |
| 1   | Chris Chappell  |
| 2   | PE Cratt  |
| 3   | Albet-Hayes   |

## Return to Monitoring Officer (c/o Democratic Services)

Date / time received: 12.01 dock. ~~21/3/16~~ 21/3/16.Monitoring Officer's comments: Received as valid  
members given until midnight on 22/3/16.

# NOTIFICATION OF CALL-IN FOR SUBMISSION TO THE MONITORING OFFICER

## Part 4 Section 5 of the Constitution

### Scrutiny Rule 4.5.16.5

- 4.5.16.5 Call-in should only be used in exceptional circumstances including but not limited to;
- a where there is evidence which suggests that issues have not been handled in accordance with the decision-making principles set out in this Constitution;
  - b where a key decision has been taken which was neither published in accordance with the requirements for the Forward Plan, and is not subject to the urgency procedures set out in this Constitution; or
  - c where a decision is outside the Budget and Policy Framework.

\* Equality impact statement was not properly considered